time something of the same feeling that exists now, but that feeling was frank enough not to take refuge in legal quibbles. It was stated then, as it is now outside of this parliament, that there should be one rule of justice for the Catholics and another rule of justice for Protestants; that there should not be one law for both the Catholics and Protestants, but that the Catholics should have one law requiring them to respect the Protestant rights in the province of Quebec, while in the province of Ontario the Catholics should rely upon the generosity of the majority. Indeed, the Hon. A. T. Galt, then the accredited representative of the Protestant minority in Quebec, went to England to secure the adoption of clause 93. Now, eminent legal men in this House, eminent jurists, have tried to make out a case that this clause 93 in the British North America Act should be cut in two, and that wherever a Protestant province outside of Ontario is concerned you should read only the first paragraph of it, thereby giving an absolute freedom to the majority to do whatever they like. I will not give you my own authority, I will not give you the authority of any man of my creed and nationality in opposing the proposition laid down by the leader of the opposition and by Mr. Haultain; I will go to the highest authority in this empire to prove that this argument is but a sham pretense, because the opposition in this parliament is afraid on the one hand to grant justice to the minority in the west and is afraid on the other hand to state it frankly before the people of Quebec.

When the British North America Act was presented to the British parliament, Lord Carnarvon was Secretary of State for the Colonies and was responsible for the legislation as such, and Lord Carnarvon has given a definition of what were the respective powers of the federal and provincial authority. I respectfully beg the liberty of commending that opinion of Lord Carnarvon to the leader of the opposition in this House. That hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) has charged the government with trying to confuse the federal and the provincial powers in this Bill, and throughout the country the press has stated that education belonged to the provinces, and that there was no interference of the federal parliament possible in educational matters, unless in Ontario and Quebec. It has been stated that the powers of the British North America Act are divided into three classes; those that belong exclusively to the federal government in clause 91; those that belong exclusively to the provinces in clause 92; and those questions on which both the federal and provincial parliaments have concurrent jurisdiction. A clearer definition was given in the British parliament when the Bill was introduced there, and I suppose we will all accept the good British theory that if there is a division of opinion as to the effect of a law, we must go to the real thought of the enacting legislature in order to properly understand it. Lord Carnarvon said in the House of Lords on the 19th of February, 1867, when moving the second reading of the British North America Act:

> In this Bill the division of powers has been mainly effected by a distinct classification.

Does he say that the classification is threefold? No, sir.

> That classification is fourfold: First, those subjects of legislation which are attributed to the central parliament exclusively. Secondly, those which belong to the provincial legislature exclusively. Third, those which are the subject of concurrent legislation, and fourth, a particular clause which is dealt with exceptionally.

He then enumerates the powers that belong to the provinces and the powers that belong to the federal parliament, none of which includes education; and he continues:

> Lastly, in the 93rd clause which contains the exceptional provisions to which I refer, your lordships will observe some rather complicated arrangement in reference to education. I need hardly say that that great question gives rise to nearly as much earnestness and division of opinion on that as on this side of the Atlantic. This clause has been framed after long and anxious controversy in which all parties have been represented and on conditions to which all have given their consent. The object of the clause is to secure——

Complete autonomy to the provinces? No, Sir.

> The object of the clause is to secure to the religious minority of one province the same rights, privileges and protection which the religious minority of another province may enjoy. The Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada, the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, and the Roman Catholic minority of the maritime provinces will thus stand on a footing of entire equality.

It is true that the origin of that clause was a compact between the delegates from Upper Canada and the delegates from Lower Canada, but fortunately at that time there were at the head of both parties in this country men who had enough sense of justice to understand that in laying the basis of our confederation the result of a compact between the provinces should be crystallized under law into a triumphant principle, and it was that principle which was embodied in this clause—not to furnish arguments to legal quibblers who might come thirty years later, but on the contrary, to lay down as the basis of justice in this Dominion, that a man, in whatever province of Canada he may choose his abode, can rest assured that justice and equality will reign and that no matter what the majority may attempt to do they cannot persecute the minority.

Later on an interpretation was put upon that clause of the British North America