schools. I knew that was the intention at that time, and I also knew that the Act, drafted under these circumstances, was submitted for consideration to their Lordships of the Privy Council; and they felt it to be their duty to declare that the man who drew that Act, the draughtsman of that day, had failed to carry out the intention of the legislature. I made up my mind that the draughtsman of to-day, so far as his limited light allowed him to go, would make no such mistake. Their Lordships, in the Manitoba school case, said:

It was not doubted that the object of the 1st subsection of section 22 was to afford protection to denominational schools, or that it was proper to have regard to the intent of the legislature and the surrrounding circumstances in interpreting the enactment. But the question which had to be determined was the true construction of the language used. The function of a tribunal is limited to construing the words employed; it is not justified in forcing into them a meaning which they cannot reasonably bear. Its duty is to interpret, not to enact. It is true that the construction put by this board upon the 1st subsection reduced within very narrow limits the protection afforded by that subsection in respect of denominational schools. It may be that those who were acting on behalf of the Roman Catholic community in Manitoba, and those who either framed or assented to the wording of that enactment were under the impression that its scope was wider, and that it afforded protection greater than their Lordships held to be the case. But such considerations cannot properly influence the judgment of those who have judicially to interpret a statute. The question is, not what may be supposed to have been intended, but what has been said.

I meant to say what I intended. Perhaps incidentally it may interest the House to know that at the time the Manitoba School Act was passed, and at the time these difficulties arose in Manitoba, the imperial authorities thought proper when they were called upon to give military assistance to the Dominion of Canada to fix the terms upon which they would give the assistance asked for. The imperial authorities of that day, to their credit be it said, faithful to the traditions of the imperial parliament, the mother of parliaments, the parliament of that people who have always held sacred their covenants, acting through their representative, Lord Granville, sent to the Governor General of Canada a cablegram on the 5th of March, 1870, which reads as follows:

The proposed military assistance will be given if reasonable terms are given to the Roman Catholic settlers, and if Canadian government enable Her Majesty's government to proclaim transfer simultaneous with movement of troops.

They were prepared to give the assistance asked for at that time by the Canadian government on condition that reasonable terms should be given to the Roman Catholic minority. The assistance was accepted in the terms stated, and to give effect to these terms the Manitoba Act was passed, and we all know the result. This is a sad chapter in the history of Canada.

Dealing now with section 16, I would like to say that the second paragraph in that section was added—although in my judgment absolutey unnecessary—because it was thought advisable to re-enact the provisions of section 11 of the Act of 1875. This was for the purpose of making it quite clear that this parliament was merely carrying out a solemn promise already made. That very paragraph was intended to give legislative sanction to the conditions now existing with respect to grants in aid of education. At the present time these grants are dependent upon an annual vote of the legislature, and it was not clear to me that the annual grant made by the legislature gave to those who benefit by it a right or privilege within the meaning of section 93. And I thought that if separate schools are to exist, they should be made effective for the purposes for which they were intended and should be placed, to use the words of Mr. Balfour, in a position in which they can effectively play their necessary and inevitable part in the scheme of national education. I have given you now, Mr. Speaker, the whole secret of section 16. Where now are the shackles, the manacles, the invasion of provincial rights? What are we doing? I say that in the future it would be a serious reflection upon the people of the Dominion if the solemn promises made in 1875, repeated in 1880, and oft repeated since were not carried out.

It is unnecessary for me to go over what occurred in 1875. That will be found in the debates of the Senate and the House of Commons when the Bill was introduced. All that has been gone over repeatedly, but let me draw attention to a fact not yet mentioned, namely, that a year later, in 1876, the Keewatin Bill was introduced by Mr. Mackenzie, and from the Bill clause 11 of the Act of 1875 was omitted. On being asked for an explanation, Mr. Mackenzie spoke as follows:

The Bill is only temporary in its character. Section 11 refers only to the Act of last session. The laws established by this Bill are those in force at the present moment in the Northwest Territory—neither more nor less. The Act of last session proposed the creation of a municipal system and conferred practically all the powers of self-government as a province. It is only when such powers are exercised that the clause in question comes into operation.

After some discussion, Mr. Blake said:

The Act of last session has not yet been put in force. At present all the Territories of the Northwest are governed from Manitoba. The Act of last session proposed, and I think rightly proposed, a system which gave rudimentary representative institutions coincidently with its going into effect. The Bill of this session takes off a very small portion of the enormous territories of the Northwest for the