

would expound the law, we would give effect to the law, and justice would be the fulfilment of the law. But we are here occupying a sovereign position, with powers looking to all the considerations, looking mainly and chiefly, as we ought to look, at the benefit of the province for which we are legislating. The law does not extend beyond the boundaries of Manitoba, if we pass it, and our consideration ought to be with respect to the welfare of that province, and with respect to that alone.

Sir, when we talk about justice, let us look back at our history. When we secularized the clergy reserves, when we dispossessed the churches to whom the King had granted lands for their support, can that action be justified on the ground of justice? Those lands were actually set aside for that purpose, they were dedicated for that use, we had to apply to the Imperial Parliament to deal with them—I do not say that it was not wise and politic, but if you talk about justice and justice alone, it is difficult to justify that action. Take the seigniorial tenure. Take the Irish land law, when Parliament stepped in and made contracts between landlord and tenant. Could that be justified on the ground of what we call justice—altering contracts, saying that what people agreed to openly and above board should be set aside and abrogated? No. But it was just, politic and wise all the same. So here we have to consider this question from that point of view. We have to remember the province for which we are legislating. We have to remember that this Bill proposes that where there are ten children in a school district, and the school district may be five miles in diameter—not ten families, but ten children of school age—a school district may be appointed, a teacher employed, a school-house built and taxes which would have otherwise gone to support the public school be devoted to support a separate school. Remember that in the 700 schools which exist in that province, according to the return brought down, there are more than 100 where the average attendance is not seven; my hon. friend tells me that there are 192 schools where the average attendance is not seven. Remember, that Mr. Sifton has had in contemplation the introduction of a Bill to deprive schools where the average attendance is not seven of any share in the public grant, and I find that nearly one-third of all the schools would thereby be disbanded and destroyed.

This is the province in which it is desired to implant this demon of dualism. You split up this system of public schools in order to dissipate the public money and to waste it, and in order to make inefficiency where there may be, and we trust before long there will be, efficiency. And you admit, on the face of the Bill, that you cannot do it. You acknowledge you cannot touch the public grant. You put in an empty de-

Mr. McCARTHY.

claration, which is untrue in law and in fact, that the Privy Council has determined that the separate schools are entitled to a share of the public grants—an empty 'brutum fulmen' of no value, not worth the paper it is written on. And you leave your separate schools to what? You leave them to the tender mercies of all they can raise in the matter of taxation. I examined the question, to see what really was the benefit of these so-called separate schools. I find, Sir, that this is the result. In the old days, the Catholics got, of the legislative school grant, after deducting the charges of management, \$226.44. They taxed themselves \$242. The average cost of the Roman Catholic schools was \$469. Where is that to come from, under this precious Bill? Not out of the legislative school grant, for you cannot touch it. You leave, therefore, \$242 to do the work of \$469, and yet you ask us to believe that this is a practical measure. We are told that the Archbishop is satisfied with it, and that we, therefore, have got to bow, and to assume that it is perfectly right. But, Sir, I venture to say, if his Grace the Archbishop is satisfied with it, it is because there is some understanding which is yet to be carried out, and for which this reserved power in the last section is intended. Is it possible to imagine, that these people can support their schools without the assistance of a government grant? Is it possible to imagine, that the sum of money which formerly went to their administration and came to somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$5,000 or \$6,000, and for which there is no provision whatever made, can be dispensed with? How are they to be carried on? Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us. Perhaps the hon. gentleman in the Senate, Mr. Bernier, who was the superintendent of schools, and who had charge of this administration, whose salaries, and etceteras consumed about \$5,000 or \$6,000 of money for which there is no provision in this Bill; perhaps he can tell us, how is that system to be administered? Why, it is a delusion, a delusion and a snare, calculated to destroy and disturb, but not calculated to produce any beneficial result to anybody.

And, if I were to venture to criticize this Bill, I would say, that it rests, not merely under the construction put upon it by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), in not going far enough, but I would point out, that it goes, in many respects, altogether too far. What right have we here to do more than to restore the system, as it existed? One-half of this Bill is made up of new clauses, and, when we come to committee—if we are ever to get there, and it is not going to be in this Parliament, it is quite certain—it will be found out that more than one-half of this long Bill has been concocted or stolen, probably, from the Public School Act of 1890, and is now to be found in the Act which the province of Manitoba is ordered to restore. So, whatever way you