stitutional invasion of the rights conferred under the Act of 1875. I shall cite his exact words. At page 3241 he says :

We have it that the clerical control of these schools was absolutely abolished. Every one recognizes that it was absolutely abolished and in addition to that, I desire to say—whatever we may think of the justification for the action which was taken—it seems to me perfectly clear, that in abolishing the distinctive character of the schools, the legislature of the Northwest Territories did go beyond the powers that were bestowed upon it by this section of the Act of 1875.

There is the opinion of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), that when the local ordinances abolished these rights they went beyond the power given to them under the Act of 1875. Upon that point Sir John Thompson expressed his opinion:

In making a report on one of the ordinances passed shortly before 1802 but somewhat similar in its effect—not so sweeping in its effect—Sir John Thompson in substance reported that this ordinance, contracts or diminishes the rights of minorities to an extent not contemplated by the Act of 1875, and that the Act of 1875 must nevertheless be held to remain in force notwithstanding the passage of the ordinance.

Now, there is the position. The First Minister insists upon the inviolability of that Act. The ex-Minister of the Interior finds that under the Act the minority were entitled to a complete dual system. This was taken away by an ordinance. If they had the right to have them then they have the right now in spite of any ordinances to the contrary. I propose a little further on to deal with that section which specifically continues these rights of the minority in force in that country. The position then is this, that the Prime Minister repudiates his speech and accepts a violation of the Act of 1875 and accedes to a proposition to perpetuate a violation of the inviolable. There is the position between the Prime Minister and the hon member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton).

But let us examine into these clauses for a moment, and we shall see just who has been making a compromise, who has been giving away his rights or his religious opinions. I find that the objections of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) are, first, that he objects to subsection 2 of section 16, and it is on account of this clause he says that he resigned, because he says that in that all the evils which he has dilated upon existed under the Act of 1875 in Manitoba. I wish to make myself clear, but I am not going to be dragged into the discussion of the merits or demerits of a separate school system. That is a matter of which I know nothing, and I am simply taking the argument and citing the cases cited by the hon. gentlemen opposite who have had more experience in dealing with these systems than I have had. He says that he objects to subsection 2 of section 16 because in that all the evils he has dilated upon exists, and he has persuaded the First Minister to accept a proposition that in his opinion has eliminated all the essential characteristics of a separate school system. What does subsection 2 of section 16 to which he makes objection contain? It says:

That a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the said province, or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name it is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit.

On that he builds up what he calls his university argument. He takes the general word 'education' at the beginning of that clause and ignores the fact that this general word is followed by a number of particular words. The reading of it is:

3. In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature in aid of education, and in the distribution of any moneys paid to the government of the said province arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act, there shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools.

He takes the comprehensive word 'education' and tries to read into that that there was some risk and danger of endowing a Catholic university, ignoring altogether the fact that the general word education is followed afterwards by the particular words 'separate schools and public schools,' so he creates a man of straw in this so-called university argument and then proceeds to demolish it. I submit that it is based upon a fallacious construction of that clause to which he raises his objection. Now, what are his other objections and why did he resign ? Now, he objects to endowing a separate university, he objects to ear-marking the public land fund. But what does the amendment do? Does it not create and endow schools from the same funds? Does the amendment make any distinction between these two sections? Now, let us deal with the position as it is. How does the amendment change the Bill, if it changes it at all? I desire to point out that if the rights of the minority to separate schools were created under the Act of 1875, and if they were entitled under it to a complete dual system, then I say that under the amendment exactly the same state of affairs will prevail. Let me read subsection 1 of the amended section:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudically affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act under the terms of chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinance of the Northwest Territories passed in the year 1901.

Now I find that section 41 of chapter 29 of these ordinances reads as follows :

The minority of the ratepayers in any district, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish a separate school therein, and in such case the ratepayers establishing such