

Now, Sir, I never was a separate school adherent, I never believed in separate schools as against national schools. In 1896 I stated my belief, as I state it now; I knew it was not politically to my advantage, I knew it was not politically to the advantage of the Liberal-Conservative party; but, Sir, without thinking of ulterior things, I said to myself: There is the constitution, there is the pronouncement of the highest judicial tribunal in this empire, there is the minority coming with a grievance and having the right to appeal to the Dominion government and the Dominion parliament, the only power that has jurisdiction to right their wrongs; I said to myself: I believe it is right, I believe in the policy of attempting to carry out the constitution. Let me ask this question: If my right hon. friend, in 1896, had thrown his forces with the forces that made for remedial legislation, who can doubt that we would have carried it in this parliament. No one can doubt it. And why was it not carried? The ex-Minister of the Interior told why when he said here the other day: The member for North Toronto wished to restore the schools, but he failed, and he failed because the right hon. the leader of this government threw himself across the way and prevented it.

Why should not the member for Labelle save some of his argument that he so generously distributed yesterday, and apply it to his own chief, the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, and tax him for two things. When he said that they had been robbed of their rights in Manitoba and were suffering from injustice there to-day, why did he not add: and that, Sir, was due to the action of the present Prime Minister, my own leader. More than that: when in clause 16, as brought down on the 21st of February, his leader had provided for sectarian education in these provinces for ever with an endowment from the fund, why did he, at the beck and call of the Minister of the Interior, who was their enemy, looked upon in that light, who destroyed their schools system in Manitoba, who prevented them from obtaining and retaining their rights there—why did he take out the clause that gave them something, and substitute the clause that which according to the Finance Minister, the Minister of Customs and the ex-Minister of the Interior, gives you absolutely nothing but the last weary half hour of instruction at the day's end and the name of a separate school. I am carrying out now strictly the argument of the ex-Minister of the Interior, acquiesced in by all the members of the government who have spoken; and no one who has not spoken has deemed it necessary to rise and express his dissent from that argument. If his argument is correct and his facts are right—and they are assented to by the members opposite—what, may I ask the member for Labelle,

does the Northwest Bill provide at present, under those ordinances that are put into the constitution, and that are to become the measure and standard for all time to come? Listen to what Archbishop Taché says:

Nothing essential now distinguishes the Catholic schools from the Protestant schools but the designation, now ironical, of separate schools.

There is the church authority. Judge Rouleau says:

If separate schools exist now in name, they do not exist in fact.

There is the legal side of it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is that in Manitoba?

Mr. FOSTER. No, that is in the Northwest. We have those two, the one representing—shall I mention the word?—the hierarchy. I do not think hierarchy is an objectionable name; I think it is an honourable name, and I am quite sure it is an honoured name, and I venture to use it, and to use it in that sense. The one the representative of the hierarchy, the other the representative of the bench, both of them strong Catholics, both speaking the French language, and both on the spot and able to speak from knowledge, thus express themselves. Now, may I ask the member for Labelle, if he is absolutely convinced of his theory and if he drives it to its logical conclusion, why did he sit still and not open his lips when the malign influence of the Minister of the Interior and the ex-Minister of the Interior was dragging out of the Bill clause 16, No. 1, which gave to the Northwest minority that which they demand, and which was conclusively demanded by the argument of the member for Labelle? Must we again and again come to the conclusion, that with the member for Labelle it is the same as with the member for Brandon—they are both strong in the enunciation of their principles, but both very lax in carrying them out. On principle I am with Borden, but when it comes to a vote, I am with Laurier—that is the cynical and outspoken declaration of the ex-Minister of the Interior.

Now, let me come back to the Manitoba case. I was finishing that by saying that section 93 has two parts, and that the Prime Minister cannot get out of the obligation of the constitution by quoting only one part, in which he is relieved by a judgment of the Privy Council, and ignoring the other part, in which he is absolutely bound by the judgment of the Privy Council in so far as having a clear case for the action of this body under its jurisdiction. So much with reference to that.

One other point might be brought up. The ex-Minister of the Interior, speaking of the Manitoba question in 1896, said from his place in the House the other day: