

with any child, Roman Catholic or otherwise, in any of our public schools. But, Sir, if they are fit for the Roman Catholics of Ontario to attend, and fit for the Roman Catholics of the province of Quebec to attend—I am speaking of the British-speaking children—and fit for the Roman Catholic children of the province from which the hon. gentleman who interrupted me comes from. I would like to know how it can be said they are unfit to use in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). It depends on the books they are to use.

Mr. McCARTHY. The books are the same as they are in our province—substantially the same.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). No, not the same at all—far different altogether from what they are in Nova Scotia.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not speaking about Nova Scotia; I am speaking about Manitoba. They are substantially the same. And in the argument which took place before the Committee of the Privy Council here, with the curriculum and the course of studies spread out, the only objection which Mr. Ewart, on behalf of the minority, made to the books used was a history called "Buckley's History," and it turned out, on investigation, that "Buckley's History" was being used in the convent schools in the city of Winnipeg. So that the petition here does not give any ground for interference. I ask this Parliament—if they will look at this matter as business men, apart from political influences, and as the council of this country ought to have looked at it when this petition was presented, and an inquiry was made—what conclusion could His Excellency the Governor General arrive at other than that the grounds set forth in the petitions did not entitle the petitioners to any relief? Why, Sir—let me give it as a typical instance—in the North-west Territories, where separate schools are established by law, there is but one course of studies for separate schools and for Protestant schools—one curriculum and one set of books. The only distinction is that in some sections there are Catholic school trustees and a Catholic teacher. But the course of studies is the same in both; and when the Roman Catholic bishops appealed here against that state of things, and asked that that law should be vetoed, what did the Government do? Why, they refused to interfere. The Government that now insists that Manitoba, an independent province, must restore the separate school system as it existed in 1890—that same Government, when appealed to against the ordinance of the North-west assembly, when appealed to against the ordinance of the North-west assembly, which established practically but one set of schools, although allowing separate schools, so far as the election of offi-

cers and the appointment of teachers were concerned, permitted that law to go into effect—depriving the bishops of the control and of the right to say what books should be used, other than those who were on the Council of Public Instruction. That law was allowed to remain on the statute-book as not inflicting any injustice on the Catholics of the North-west. Then, why ought we to interfere with Manitoba, if we take the grounds put forward? The order has been made. The Bill is before us. I ask every man in this House, can he conscientiously say that he ought to interfere with a free legislature which has thought fit to abolish separate schools, even on the showing of the petitioners themselves?

Mr. AMYOT. Rank tyranny.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask whether, upon the showing of the petitions themselves, any fair and reasonable man would interfere. Remember, we are not legislating. Remember, it is not our jurisdiction. Remember, we are here to supervise. Remember, we are here to undo what we think has been improperly done. That is our course, that is our power, and that alone. Under these circumstances, I want to know whether it would be proper and right to interfere?

But, Sir, I will not stop there. I do not want to treat this thing technically. I will come to Mr. Ewart's argument. Mr. Ewart was not tied down by the petition. He came before the Council, representing the minority, and he spread his grievances before them. And what were the grievances? He divided his argument into six heads. Three of those, you will remember, were founded on affidavits, and he withdrew them. We may therefore dismiss them, as he thought proper to dismiss them. He cannot surely ask the Governor General to pass a remedial order upon certain grounds which he withdrew, and afterwards ask Parliament to implement the order of the Governor General, based upon those grounds. And what was left? There was left, Sir, the argument based on the fourth bill of rights, about which we hear no more, and the argument in favour of separate schools, without anything to support it beyond the statement that separate schools are preferable to public schools.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The affidavit about the bill of rights was withdrawn, also.

Mr. McCARTHY. It was, but still it was treated as historical, and I was quite willing that it should be so treated. But we have never yet had the truth with regard to that so-called bill of rights. It was said to be in the office of the Minister of Justice, and I asked for it at the time. I asked if the statement with regard to Lepine was true, to have the whole statement brought down. On two occasions returns brought down to this House were based on that document as if it was genuine, while we