

educational question, for that section of the province. He has asked Judge Day, one of the ablest men and best judges that ever sat on the Lower Canada Bench, to frame a measure for the protection of the British and Protestant minority. Mr. Day, although a Protestant, has the confidence of the French Canadians. He is now here on this duty, and I do not doubt that he will produce a satisfactory measure.

And every person acquainted with the history of the matter knows that Mr. Galt resigned from the ministry because a measure was not passed which in his opinion afforded sufficient protection to the Protestant minority of Quebec. An arrangement was made, however, that he should go to London and meet the conference there. It was arranged before he started, that a clause would be embodied in the British North America Act which would protect the Protestant minority of Quebec, and that clause was embodied in the British North America Act, and it was one of the principal clauses which caused discussion on that Act in the House. The whole debate shows what was the intention of the legislature at that time. From beginning to end it shows that the principal clause discussed in the House was the clause for the protection of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec. How long is it since this hon. gentleman has got it into his head that minorities should not be protected? I have been in this House for some time, and I was astonished to hear his statements in reference to the minority of Manitoba. Could it have been possible that my ears mistook the sound of his voice, when I heard him on other occasion in this House, uttering entirely different sentiments. Let me quote some of them to show how the hon. gentleman has changed his opinions since then. In 1889, as hon. gentlemen who are members of this House must remember, there was a debate here in reference to the Jesuits' Estates Act. You know what part the hon. gentleman took in reference to that question. Was there any question about the protection of minorities then? Was there any question in the mind of the hon. gentleman as to the right of appeal to the Governor General in Council for the protection of the minority concerned in that case? What was the statement made by the Equal Rights Association, by its president, Principal Caven, in Toronto? A fundamental ground on which that Equal Rights Association was formed was that the right of appeal by the minority to the Parliament of Canada must be maintained. Did not the hon. gentleman at that time state in every part of the country that it was one of the sacred bulwarks of the constitution that that right, above all others, must be maintained—the right of appeal by a minority alleged to be oppressed on educational matters, to the Parliament of Canada? Let me read some of the statements made by the hon. gentleman in this House in the debate on that question:

Is it because this is a particular church? If it is a right in the province of Quebec to grant:
Mr. HAGGART.

money to the Church of Rome. It would be equally right in the province of Ontario to grant money for the maintenance of the Methodists or the Episcopalian body or Scotch body; and, if we did that, there would be no hesitation—and properly so—in bringing before the House the complaint of the minority whose money would be spent in that way and for that purpose. The legislatures are not to be at liberty to run in different directions, to promote in one province one nationality and one church, and in another province another nationality and another church, or in any other way to run counter, because such courses must inevitably bring about the dissolution of confederation. It is not because a province is kept in check, it is not because its legislation is vetoed, that there is danger to our system.

But if the other system is set up, if the alternative presented by my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby), is to be adopted; if you are to say that because a law has been passed within the legislative authority of the province, therefore it must remain; we can easily see, Sir, that before long these provinces, instead of coming nearer together, will go further and further apart.

These were the opinions held by the hon. gentleman in 1889. He was not arguing on behalf of the Roman Catholic minority, but on behalf of the Protestant minority of Quebec, and insisting that that clause in the British North America Act gave them the right of appeal to the Governor General in Council and the Parliament of Canada for redress. But the case is entirely different now.

Then the hon. gentleman attacked my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and asked did he not know that the judgment of the Privy Council held that the Manitoba Act took the place of the clauses in the British North America Act? Well, the hon. gentleman knew it just as well as did the hon. member for North Simcoe. He was not arguing on those lines at all, but on the lines laid down by the Privy Council of England. He knew what the judgment of the Privy Council was, but I believe in the opinion of many lawyers in this country—perhaps the majority—that the British North America Act was to be supplemented by these sections in the Manitoba Act. The Privy Council held differently, but my hon. friend was proceeding in the very words of the judgment of the Privy Council, from which I shall quote:

In their lordships' opinion, therefore, it is the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act which has to be construed in the present case, though it is, of course, legitimate to consider the terms of the earlier Act, and to take advantage of any assistance they may afford in the construction of enactments with which they so closely correspond and which have been substituted for them.

My hon. friend was proceeding in that line, but he is not the constitutional lawyer that the hon. gentleman is. He is not the keeper of the Protestant conscience throughout this country, and the hon. gentleman in his ex-