

remedial legislation, in case the legislature of one of the new provinces should deprive the Catholics of any rights they may possess in relation to education outside the subject of separate schools. But I presume that he agrees that under subsection 1, is the only one under which the minority could come before any tribunal to have a law that encroaches upon these rights declared null. The proposed amendment deprives them of the right to ask for anything except protection of their rights in separate schools. I am not asking the hon. gentleman to express any view on the subject, but, in view of the history of the last thirty years I have come to the conclusion that while remedial legislation, so far as the Catholic minority are concerned, may exist in the letter of the law, it does not exist in fact. Anything that is not legally granted to minorities so that they may come before the tribunal and get a remedy of their grievance is no protection of their rights.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not quite agree with my hon. friend. I have always believed that every legislature in this country must be supposed to carry out the law with a certain degree of honesty and rectitude. Perhaps my hon. friend will not agree to that, but I may say this, that any law that might be passed in this parliament, if the provincial authorities did not try to carry it out according to its terms, that law would be of no effect, even if drafted by the ablest men you can find in this country. I say we must always rely to a large extent upon the honesty and rectitude of the legislatures. I know very well, Mr. Speaker, that in the province of Ontario, in spite of the law which now protects the minority in their rights, any provincial government could defeat the effect of that law without passing any legislation which would be declared illegal or unconstitutional under section 1. My hon. friend knows very well that the same thing could be done in the province of Quebec with regard to the Protestant minority. But I repeat, we must have some faith in the rectitude and in the honesty of provincial legislatures. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, why should we say that the rights of a minority are not sufficiently protected when the minority itself does not even complain of what has occurred since 1892? In 1892 an ordinance was passed by the Northwest legislature by which the rights of the minority were to a considerable extent curtailed. The minority came before this government for relief, and the government refused to disallow the ordinance. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) said the other day that the government refused to disallow that ordinance because it was too late; and also, because Mr. Blake had made a motion by which the government could not disallow that ordinance. I suppose my

hon. friend will not make that contention to-day?

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Blake was speaking about the Manitoba Act.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, about the Northwest. My hon. friend, in discussing the Northwest ordinances, said that they could not be disallowed because Mr. Blake had secured the adoption by the House of Commons of a certain motion which prevented the government from acting.

Mr. BERGERON. I was speaking about the Manitoba law, not about the Northwest law. I gave another reason regarding the ordinances, I said that the ordinance of 1892 was not disallowed because it was a re-enactment of an ordinance of 1891, and that it was too late to disallow the ordinance of 1891. Then in answer to my hon. friend who asked why the government had not disallowed the ordinance of 1891, whether it was too late to disallow the ordinance of 1892, I said, No, it was not too late, but the disallowance of the ordinance of 1892 would have been of no effect because it was a re-enactment of the ordinance of 1891. That was the answer I gave my hon. friend.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was pretty sure that my hon. friend, in discussing the question of the Northwest, had mentioned the motion of Mr. Blake. But he must remember that the motion of Mr. Blake had not the effect which he says it had.

Mr. BERGERON. I have just said that I was not talking about the motion of Mr. Blake in regard to the Northwest Territories. When I mentioned the motion of Mr. Blake, it was in connection with the Manitoba question, not the other, although it might have the same effect. But I was not talking about that.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, the government refused to disallow the ordinance of 1892, because the minority did not come here to ask the disallowance of an ordinance previously passed. I speak subject to correction, but that is my recollection.

Mr. BERGERON. It was the ordinance of 1892 that came down here in 1893.

Mr. BRODEUR. At all events, the minority since then has accepted that state of affairs. They had a right to come here and ask for remedial legislation. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) did not deny that they could have come to the government here and asked for remedial legislation. But they did not do so, they accepted the situation, they abided by the decision of the government.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. Frank Oliver, member elect for the electoral district of Edmonton, introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Lamont.