

cipated in the Trust Fund but in the money voted by the legislature.

Mr. MONK. I did not know that, but it goes to prove that interpretation and there is no other interpretation possible because anybody who takes the trouble to read from end to end the ordinances of the Northwest Territories in respect to schools must arrive necessarily at that conviction. I do not know what distinction there would be between what are called separate schools and public schools. They are **not** separate schools in the sense that we ordinarily understand the term.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are separate schools but not denominational schools.

Mr. MONK. They are not denominational schools; certainly not. So, I do not see in the last enactment that there is any concession—very far from it. I think the last amendment goes perhaps a little farther than the original enactment which caused so much excitement because it defines more clearly what the privileges of the separate schools are. They were not defined at all in the original enactment. It defines them by reference to the chapters of the Northwest Ordinances where they are fully explained so that it defines more clearly these privileges and it may be argued that it secures to the separate schools the right of religious instruction. I am not just sure under the first enactment it would not have been possible to say in the Northwest Territories: You have the right to separate schools, that is granted, you will have them but you have no right even to the half hour of religious instruction because it is not laid down in the bond. It is not in the Dominion enactment and we will withdraw that right from you. This enactment goes a little farther because it refers to the ordinance which secures the right of religious instruction.

Will you just allow me to say one word in regard to what has been referred to by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa)? Is it a fact that we are by this Bill establishing denominational schools in the Northwest Territories? Before I touch upon that let me say this to the House. The fact that a very great difference of opinion has existed among lawyers led me to the conclusion that there is certainly no harm, holding as I do that the minority is entitled to the preservation of its rights, in repeating in the form of an enactment, as we do by this Bill, what is already assured constitutionally to the minority by section 93 of the British North America Act. And, I may go a step farther. That section forms part of the constitution, it is true, but I think one, who has at heart, as I have, I must admit, the maintenance of the very limited privileges that the minority are going to enjoy under this enactment might say in addition that we have had the ex-

Mr. BOURASSA.

perience of Manitoba. Surely no case of any province could be presented in which greater precautions had been taken than were taken at the time of the creation of Manitoba for the maintenance of the rights of the minority. Everybody knows what happened. I will not repeat the story of that unfortunate affair, but, as a matter of fact, by legislation of the province, the rights of the minority were taken away. They were taken away after every assurance had been given to that minority that their rights would be preserved. There never was anything to my mind more unworthy than the action of the Manitoba legislature in abolishing its legislative council, and at the time of that abolition giving the minority who helped to put through that abolition, every possible assurance that honourable men could give that at no time would their privileges be interfered with. They were taken away. The minority carried their claims before the courts. Ultimately, after an endless litigation, the highest court in the realm declared that they had a right to redress. That judgment of the Privy Council rendered years ago remains, as the members of this House know, unsatisfied to this day. Does that not give to those whose mission perhaps more particularly it is to secure the rights of the minority in these new provinces, the right to take every imaginable precaution in order that those rights should be maintained even in the Northwest? And I say this with due regard to the people of the Northwest, because I have implicit confidence in that population. I hope on this occasion at any rate that confidence will not be misplaced. I know the disposition of the people who inhabit that large territory. They are generous, they are broad-minded, and I have every confidence—because, as any educationist knows, everything depends on the way in which an education law is administered—that they will treat that minority with justice. But we must admit that after the Act of 1875 had been passed, and after the Act of 1880 had been passed, the Northwest legislature did confer rights upon the minority—gave them a council of public instruction, gave them certain rights without which up to the present it has been considered impossible, by the minority, to carry on Catholic education, and they had the use of the French language. These things have been taken away, and, in reality as was said yesterday, what we are endeavouring to preserve for them is merely the right to the material separation of schools, the right to be exempt from double taxation in educational matters, to which Catholics are subject all over the United States, and the right to that half-hour of religious instruction at the end of the day which exists in the Northwest for all denominations alike, I am happy to say, because I am