

that right is guaranteed also together with their right to their share of the public funds spent on education. In other words, sir, all rights are guaranteed. We have in Newfoundland what is known as denominational education. Confederation does not change that one bit, not one bit.... Mr. Harrington does not deny this. But what he does suggest is that under confederation this guarantee might be upset or cast aside. And what reason does he suggest? The Manitoba school case, which was one of the most famous cases of its kind in North American history, about as famous as the Oregon school case. The Manitoba school case brought the Government of Canada toppling down when it happened. And that case taught all the governments of Canada a lesson they'll never forget. It taught them this lesson — not, not to meddle in educational matters in the provinces. Why, you couldn't dynamite the Government of Canada today into getting itself mixed up in educational matters. They won't touch it.... In our clause on education all denominational rights are guaranteed and our provincial government is not allowed to make any laws or changes that would prejudicially affect the rights of any denomination. But suppose some provincial government ever tried to do so. What then? Would the denomination concerned have to go to the Government of Canada seeking redress? No, they would not. The Government of Canada wouldn't be in the picture at all. They would go to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, and there they would get justice. The Supreme Court would have to carry out this clause, which guarantees the rights of all the denominations. And if by any chance, if by any remote chance, our own Supreme Court failed to carry out this clause, that would not end it either. For then, the case could be appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada itself. That, sir, is a vast improvement over the Manitoba clause. It's not with governments or cabinets or parliaments we'd have to deal, but with the very seat of justice — the Supreme Court itself. Mr. Harrington can rest his mind in this matter. I can tell him this. I for one would not be so foolish, so short-sighted as to advocate confederation if this education matter had not been fixed up to the satisfaction of all concerned. Not for one split second would I waste my breath advocating confederation if this education matter had not been thoroughly and

absolutely fixed up. I know my country, sir, believe me. I know the deep and unshakeable loyalty of our people — all our people — to their denominations. I know the loyalty of our people to their various school systems. We have a school system which is a Newfoundland system, that has grown up out of our Newfoundland ideals, our Newfoundland outlook on life. It is a system that has grown up naturally, and I am the last person who would upset it or allow it to be upset. Believe me, I went to Ottawa with that thought uppermost in mind. I cared not what material advantages there might be for us in confederation. My mind was made up. I was determined not to advocate confederation unless and until all denominational rights were fully guaranteed. Sir, it's bad enough to have to fight prejudice, but the one thing I will not fight is the deepest loyalty of our people. Thank God I do not have to do it, for the school rights of all our denominations have been fully protected and guaranteed. All education matters under confederation have been left just where they belong — right here in Newfoundland. So that's one question that won't turn our people against confederation.

I turn to Mr. Butt. I am frankly puzzled to understand what Mr. Butt was getting at when he mentioned the Sacco-Vanzetti case. He was speaking at the time about the Privy Council's Labrador boundary award, and the impression I gathered from his remarks was that he was trying to make out that maybe the Privy Council award is not binding and final seeing what happened in the Sacco-Vanzetti case.... I agree with you, sir, it is a matter for smiling. What the Sacco-Vanzetti case in Boston has to do with the Privy Council of Great Britain, is frankly more than I can see. Sacco and Vanzetti were sentenced to death by a court in Massachusetts in the United States. It was admittedly a terrible miscarriage of justice. But what has that got to do with the character or the nature of the Privy Council, or with a decision of the Privy Council of Great Britain? Instead of hinting, why doesn't Mr. Butt come right out and say definitely that he places no dependence on the decision of the Privy Council?

Mr. Butt says if you give away your control over your communications, if you give away your right to control your fishery, if you give away your right to set your own system of taxation, if you give away these rights you're in a bad way.