

quence of the
in system of
and I desire
Union of the
ect, whether
the proposed
calculated to
or it is not
Canada and
protect them-
to the sense

that motion

school sys-
confederation,
number of
not legislative
government for
stem; it is
sist the do-
ot be in any
i, and in one
stage, in that
the separate
stitute cer-
ret that the
t necessary
on.

er changes,
at was then
Canada.

language?
A. Macken-

Alexander

so. Now, I
lugs. The
mulated at
ovince that
ot separate
olomon com-
lower Can-
nding that
ut. Acting
three local
lo in which
great deal
to say one
in Upper or
dered that
le at con-
the minor-
le be main-
never con-
as brought
e extended
the union,
ief by the
that time,
ot only to
ovince that
comes in,
ome privi-
ay or not
st remain
ing in the

resolutions to warrant that contention. In reading the resolutions assigning to the legislatures of the provinces the subjects which they could control, I find this laid down:

The local legislature shall have power to make laws respecting the following subjects:—

Among these is:

Education, saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the union goes into operation.

But it says nothing about the same right being extended to any other province that may come in. That was the solemn understanding come to when these resolutions went to the Home Government as a basis for legislation. But we are told to-day: "Oh, but the British North America Act says so-and-so." In the legislature one hon. gentleman got up and contended that the Bill that passed the Imperial Parliament should not become law until it was submitted to the Parliament of Canada, and the Parliament of Canada had an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon it, and either assenting to or dissenting from it; and also until there was an appeal to the people upon it. One reason he gave for that view was: We know by experience, he said, that it sometimes happens that we make laws on certain lines; but if, after these laws have been made and become constitutional laws, certain provisions are found in them that were never contemplated, we ought to have some opportunity of examining them before we are asked to assent to them. In opposition to that, the Attorney General, who was afterwards Sir George Cartier, spoke as follows:

In reply to what the hon. member for Hochelaga has just said, I shall merely tell the hon. members of this House that they need not take any alarm at the apprehensions and the predictions that the hon. gentleman has made.

That was the danger of something creeping into the law which it was never contemplated should be embodied in it.

I have already declared, in my own name and on behalf of the Government, that the delegates who go to England and will accept from the Imperial Government no Act but one based on the resolutions voted by this House, and they will not break faith in order to bring back any other. (Hear, hear.) I will pledge my honour and that of the Government to that effect, and I trust my word of honour will, at least, have as much weight with the House and the country as that of the hon. member for Hochelaga. (Cheers).

And it was accepted on that ground, but there was the resolution, there was what the provincial legislature was to have, the right to control education, save only as regards the compact entered into between the two Canadas. But afterwards, in clause 93 of the British North America Act, an improvement was introduced that goes even further than that. It says:

All the powers, privileges and duties at the union by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the separate schools and school trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects, shall be, and the same are hereby extended to the dissentient schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholics in Quebec.

Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union,—

That only applied to the two Canadas, Upper and Lower Canada, and it did not contemplate any other province. It did not contemplate that the resolution I have read should extend to any other province. It did not contemplate that it was to extend to provinces coming afterwards into the union. It says:

Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union, or is thereafter established by the legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council.

That does not give the right to establish them and then say that, once established, they are never to be disturbed afterwards. Now, the delegates who were acting on behalf of Manitoba were not satisfied with what had taken place in New Brunswick about education, and they wanted to pass a law which would go further than the British North America Act went, and secure for themselves greater powers and improve their position. They passed what is known as the Manitoba Act. Here is the clause of that Act applying to the subject:

In and for the province of Manitoba the said legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:—

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

They went further than the British North America Act, because that Act only provided that they shall enjoy what they have at the time of the union. But it was changed because of the New Brunswick case. The minority had not the right to have separate schools in law, and, therefore, that right could not be given back to them. The minority should enjoy the right which they had on going into the union. Is any right taken away from them which they enjoyed when they came into the union? Did the Privy Council say so? The Privy Council did not say anything of the kind. The Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba had not that right in practice, because there were no separate schools there in practice; they had what is known as parochial schools, which they might establish to-day upon the same basis. And, therefore, we are not going beyond the bound of reason, when we say that they have not the right, under the Act providing for the incorporation of Manitoba into confederation, to appeal against the Manitoba statute which did away with separate