man in this House, whether a lawyer or not, believe for a moment that such an interpretation could be placed upon the statute? Why, absurdity could not go further. Under the law the majority of ratepayers in a district can establish such schools as they think fit, and it would not make the slightest difference whether they were all Protestants or partly Protestants and partly Roman Catholics; or whether they had among them Jews and Mormons—they would be a majority for the establishment of a school. And, when these schools had been established the minority could establish separate schools. But the word 'separate schools' to my mind does not impart anything more than separation; it does not involve the idea that the separate schools so established should be absolutely under the control of the persons who established them, any more than is the majority school. I do not think that any such result could follow without a fuller and more definite expression of that intention than we find in the Act of 1875.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has travelled very far afield, but, for my part, I do not wish to depart from the point he raised this afternoon as to the difference between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2. My hon. friend has gone back to that old heresy and fallacy of his that there is no constitutional obligation upon this parliament to pass this legislation. I shall not touch further upon that now, though I may exchange some words with him upon it later on. But let me show him again, since he has declined to see it, so far, the difference between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2. Under section 16, No. 1, which practically re-enacted the law of 1875, there was no restriction whatever upon the power of the minority to establish such schools as they thought fit. So far as I know there was no restriction whatever. My hon. friend says that in that case, you could have many different laws for different districts. Sir, that would have been the legitimate and logical conclusion of the law. And, in order to obviate that in the Territories, they did what has been done in other places—they provided for a board of education which was separated into two sections, one to legislate for the Catholics and the other to legislate for the Protestants.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the right hon. gentleman permit me a question?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the statute conferred the absolute right to do that, how could the Board of Education interfere with them?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the laws which are meant to be interpreted by school trustees were always interpreted by able lawyers, perhaps many things would not be done which are done; but unfortunately these are often interpreted by the man on the street who does the best he can according to his knowledge. The legislature of that time thought it advisable to have two boards of education; they thought differently afterwards and abolished them, whether they acted within their right or not. Suppose the Act of 1875 did not authorize that to be done. After it had been in force for a number of years it was withdrawn, and it was held to be a grievance, and that grievance has been felt ever since. My hon. friend is familiar with the correspondence which took place between Archbishop Taché and others when this law was withdrawn in 1892, they made it the subject of complaint. My hon. friend might think that if the archbishop had been as good a lawyer as he is, he might have concluded that they had no right under the law of 1875 to this extra board. But they thought they had. Now we have enacted the law of 1875 again, so that they may not begin again. Although I have great respect for the opinion of my hon. friend, there are other lawyers besides himself in this House and out of it, who differ with him, and who believe that the establishment of the second board and its organization was a legitimate consequence of the law of 1875. And as we are not here to legislate simply for fancy purposes, but for useful purposes, we desire, in order to give satisfaction to the people, to pass such laws here as may not be exposed to the quibbles of lawyers in future years. Let us come now to the practical part of the case. What was the legitimate consequence of the law of 1875? If we take chapter 29, we find that the power to establish in a school district such a school as they think fit, is taken away from them. My hon. friend did not quote that, but it is a qualification of what he did quote, he only quoted section 41. I now quote from section 29:

> The minority of ratepayers in any district, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish a separate school therein, and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate school, shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

Then with a tone of triumph the hon. gentleman exclaimed: Is not that the same thing as we had before? Is there any difference? Is it not the same as the Act of 1875? I say no, it is not the same thing, and the reason is because there is something in this clause 29 which the hon. gentleman did not quote. It is this:

> There shall be a department of the public service of the Territories called the Depatment of Education, over which the member of the executive council appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council under the seal of the Ter-