

statements: I find that every quotation he made, every statement he made, was to be found in this little document of Mr. Ewart's, written in answer to Mr. Wade's pamphlet. He is a Minister of the Crown leading this House, or was leading this House a little while ago; but the source of his information is this skit of Mr. Ewart's in answer to a pamphlet put forth by Mr. Wade on behalf of the Manitoba school system. Not one solitary quotation, not one solitary statement, did the hon. gentleman favour the House with that was not to be found, and is not now to be read, in the pamphlet to which I refer, issued by Mr. Ewart in reply to Mr. Wade. No wonder, under these circumstances, that the hon. gentleman has gone very far afield, no wonder that his asserted facts and circumstances are not reliable, no wonder that the statements upon which he based his argument are not statements which we can trust. But let me point out the reason why. He commenced by telling us that it was a great mistake to suppose that the Catholics, at the time of confederation, had insisted on these clauses in the Confederation Act. It was a delusion that we had all been labouring under. We, who had lived through confederation, who ought to have known something about it, were told that that statement was utterly unreliable, and that in point of fact these limitations on the power of provinces in reference to education, had been insisted upon by the Protestants of the province of Quebec. I do not think I misrepresent the hon. gentleman, I think I am fairly repeating the arguments and the statements that he made. Well, Sir, nothing could be further from the truth; and let me prove it to him, let me show to him that, if it makes the slightest difference, he was making a very grave error. Sir, when this question of confederation was dealt with, as we all know, it first came up at a conference held in the city of Quebec. At that conference there were representatives from the old Canadas, from the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and the colony of Newfoundland. Certain resolutions were agreed to at that conference, and amongst them a resolution on the subject of education. Let us see what it was. It fell to Mr. Mowat to move as follows:—

That it shall be competent for the local legislature to make laws respecting first, agriculture; second, education.

Mr. D'Arcy McGee, whom, perhaps, the hon. Minister of Finance had not heard of, but who really was not a Protestant, nor was he a representative from the province of Ontario, moved, and it was adopted:

Saving the rights and privileges which the the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to denominational schools at the time when the constitutional Act comes into operation.

Now, we know perfectly well the history of the Separate School Act in the province of Ontario. In 1863 when the Sandfield-Macdonald Government, I think the Macdonald-Sicotte Government, was in power, an amendment had been made which practically gave the Roman Catholics the separate schools system as they have it to-day. That law was carried by a majority of the province of Quebec; and in one year afterwards Mr. D'Arcy McGee a leading Roman Catholic, not representing Ontario, but then representing one of the divisions of the city of Montreal, if my information is correct, who was present in the conference, in order that this law should not be changed, in order that this law which has been imposed upon the province against its will, should not be repealed, introduced a stipulation insisting, not on behalf of the Protestants but on behalf of the Roman Catholics of the province of Ontario, that the provincial legislature then about to be created under the Confederation Act, should have power over education, "saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minorities in both Canadas may possess as to denominational schools at the time when the constitutional Act comes into operation." The hon. Minister of Finance was therefore wrong when he told us that it was in the interest of the Protestants, and not of the Catholics, that this legislation was imposed. The hon. gentleman erred there, I think he will admit, he had not gone deep enough, had not quite mastered his subject; because I am quite certain the hon. Minister is incapable of misrepresenting a thing to us here, or that he knew he was making a statement which was not in accordance with the facts. Well, Sir, what happened? Why, it was pictured to us that John Sandfield Macdonald, a Catholic, had insisted, against the will of the Protestants of the province of Quebec, in expunging the guarantee and the provision which the Protestants insisted upon; and the resolution of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald was actually read in support of that. Sir, it is hardly credible, it is hard to understand, that a gentleman occupying the distinguished position of Finance Minister should have either wantonly or carelessly—I won't suggest anything else—have made such a misrepresentation to us of the position of affairs at that time. Why, Sir, the resolutions as they were submitted to Parliament, were the Quebec resolutions. The Quebec resolutions contained a clause with regard to education, as I have mentioned it to you, with the saving clause introduced by Mr. D'Arcy McGee. These resolutions came before the Canadian Parliament; these resolutions were adopted, and at the time they were adopted, the clauses upon which the question turns here this evening, and upon which we have to determine with regard to the rights of Manitoba, are not to be found, had not been thought of, and were not introduced. What Mr. Sandfield Macdonald said, and what I