

that Mr. Galt moved an amendment, which is to be found in the same book at page 112; we find this amendment moved, not by a Catholic, but by the representative Protestant of the minority of Quebec:

And in any province where a system of separate or dissentient schools by law obtains, or where the local legislature may hereafter adopt—

Notice that, Mr. Speaker, not in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario alone, as we have so often heard it declared in this House and outside.

Where a system of separate or dissentient schools by law obtains, or where the local legislature may hereafter adopt a system of separate or dissentient schools, an appeal shall lie to the Governor in Council of the general government from the Acts and decisions of the local authorities which may affect the rights or privileges of the Protestant or Catholic minority in the matter of education. And the general parliament shall have power in the last resort to legislate on the subject.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we find in the same book and on the same page a facsimile of the motion which was made by Mr. Galt, in the handwriting of Mr. Galt, which motion proves that Mr. Galt wanted the compact with regard to separate schools extended so as to apply not only to Quebec and Ontario, but to all the provinces, not only to the provinces which were then in existence, not only to Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but also to those provinces which might come in later and form part of the confederation. What then happened, Mr. Speaker? We are told that the compact existed only between Quebec and Ontario. Well, Sir, we find in the handwriting of Sir John A. Macdonald, in the same facsimile to which I have just alluded, that there was a vote taken on the question whether these powers with regard to separate schools should be extended to all the provinces, that is to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and others which might come in; there was a vote taken, and we find the result stated in the handwriting of Sir John A. Macdonald, a document which was found among his papers after his death, by his then secretary, Mr. Joseph Pope, and this is how it reads:

Nova Scotia votes, yes; New Brunswick votes, yes; Canada votes, yes.

So, Mr. Speaker, the agreement did not cover only the two provinces but it covered all the provinces which then entered into the union, and the provinces which should be created in the future.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. member this question? These were the delegates who went home after the resolutions were submitted to the parliament here and accepted by that parliament, and after the most emphatic assurance was given by the Attorney General of Canada here that

the delegates would bring back no Bill but one which was exactly in accord with the resolutions. Then that amendment was made in England, but it was not assented to by the parliament of Canada except in so far as the representatives of those provinces were satisfied and assented to it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see that my hon. friend wishes to deny this agreement. This is an important question, one to which I am sure he has given much attention, and I am surprised to hear him express the opinion that those who made that agreement in England were not authorized to do so. Will he say for one moment that Sir Charles Tupper was not authorized to speak for his province of Nova Scotia? Will he say that Sir Samuel Leonard Tilley did not represent his province of New Brunswick, and was not authorized to do what he did on that occasion? Will he say that Sir John A. Macdonald, that Sir George Etienne Cartier, were in error, and did not carry out the promises which they made to this country?

Mr. SPROULE. I will say this, if the hon. gentleman will allow me to say it, that when the question arose in the Canadian parliament as to whether the Bill, after it had passed the imperial parliament, should or should not be submitted to the Canadian parliament, an amendment was moved that it should be submitted, and it was claimed as a reason for that amendment that laws were often brought back from the imperial parliament that did not exactly accord with the resolutions that were made and carried by the Canadian parliament, and that therefore it was necessary to review these laws and ascertain whether they were exactly in accord with the resolutions. In opposition to that amendment Sir George E. Cartier was the one who spoke on behalf of the government, and declared that he would bring back no law but one which was exactly the same as the resolutions.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think my hon. friend is entirely mistaken as to that. He reminds me of something which I have read somewhere, that it was perfectly understood between Mr. Galt, Sir George E. Cartier and Sir John A. Macdonald that when they went to England they would see that the Protestant minority in Quebec was absolutely protected, and would receive special power to dispose of their money and control the administration of their schools. I think my hon. friend must remember that. Therefore it was not understood that those Quebec resolutions should be embodied in a law passed in England in precisely the same form as they were passed here. No, there was a conference *de novo*, the delegates of each province united together, discussed the question and they came to the conclusion, a conclusion which cannot be denied, that the compact in regard to separate schools should