and its officers; and shall be remunerated out of the funds of the district or otherwise as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may decide; and upon the appointment of any such official trustee the board of any district for which he is appointed shall cease to hold office as such.

Now section 137 reads:

No religious instruction except as hereinafter provided shall be permitted in the school of any district from the opening of such school until one half hour previous to its closing in the afternoon, after which time any such instructions permitted or desired by the board shall be given.

It shall, however, be permissible for the board of any district to direct that the school be opened by the recitation of the Lord's prayer.

Now these functions can be transferred to an official trustee appointed by the commissioner, and that man may ride roughshod over the religious convictions of the people of the district. What did His Grace Archbishop Taché, in his complaint of 7th March, 1894, say in reference to such matters.

The petitioners do not object to the nomination of a superintendent, but they strongly object to his appointment when, by the ordinance, he is entirely and absolutely free from any control on the part of Catholics, who have no means to protect themselves against such an official, should he be badly disposed. The Catholics, as such, have no control over their schools, and the law complained of abandons, to a large extent, to the good will of the superintendent. He may be the best of men, and a very sincere worker for the success of Catholic schools, as well as other schools. On the other hand, the superintendent, in whose choice the Catholics have no voice, may be the worst enemy of our institutions, and work, cautiously, perhaps, but surely their destruction.

Well, it may be asked, has the Prime Minister no remedy for all this? Can it be that this law is to have no force? Yes, he has provided a remedy, but he has been careful not to allude to it. The hon. gentleman, for reasons which must be obvious has carefully avoided mentioning subclause 4 of section 93. Subclause 4 is that wonderful remedial coercion clause that caused such an uproar in 1896, and that is introduced by reference, into this Bill by the very gentlemen who, in 1896, refused to exercise it in Manitoba. What did the right hon. gentleman say on that subject. He gave an explanation on the 10th of March of how he stood in 1896 when he refused to carry out the law. He said:

In 1896 the position which we took and maintained before the country was that it was not right for the federal government to try to impose on the province of Manitoba a system of schools which the province of Manitoba had rejected, acting within the plenary exercise of its powers.

Now here is a peculiar expression:

If there had been a system of schools in the province of Manitoba in 1870 when it was admitted to confederation—

We are now told the admission to confederation is next month.

—the minority would have been entitled to those schools by the judgment of the courts; but the courts decided that there had been no such system of schools, and, therefore, the powers of the province of Manitoba were not in any way curtailed. There is a difference, therefore, in the position of Manitoba in 1870, as exposed in 1896, and the position which we are confronted with at the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is not quite a fair statement of the case. The excitement of 1896 and the attempt to apply a remedial law at that time, had nothing whatever to do with the existence of schools in Manitoba in 1870. The question which arose as to the existence of separate schools in 1870 had been disposed of by the Barrett case, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England had decided that in 1870 there had been no such schools; that was the end of that suit. But another question, an entirely different question, and very pertinent to the present discussion did arise, and upon that case arose the agitation of 1896. After Manitoba had been created a province, then, of its own free will, by its own legislature, it passed a separate school law, and after doing that, at the instigation of some hon. gentlemen who now are apparently great friends of the Catholic minority, the Manitoba legislature repealed their school law, and thereupon the minority raised the question that the legislature, having granted separate school privileges and having afterwards repealed them, this parliament had the right and authority to interpose and grant remedial legislation. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England decided that it was the duty of the government of the day to introduce such legislation. They did not express the exact form, but they said the minority were entitled to relief, and it was for the government here who had the power to enforce a remedy, to say what particular line of action should be taken. I do not suppose anybody ever thought that, if the Remedial Bill had gone through this House, there was any obligation to re-enact the exact provisions of the Manitoba law. But it was the duty of this parliament in carrying out the constitution, in carrying out this very subsection 4 which the hon. gentleman is seeking to use now, it was the duty of parliament to afford a remedy so far as the circumstances of the case should in the opinion of parliament require. So when the Conservative government of that day, in obedience to the spirit and letter of the law as laid down in England, introduced a Remedial Bill into this parliament and sought to do justice to the Roman Catholic minority, who stood in the path? The right hon. gentleman who is now seeking to impose a similar remedial clause upon these new provinces. He is asking