

ever rights and privileges the minority have are guaranteed, but with respect to the limitations and duties and the liabilities which are imposed by the ordinances, there is no guarantee given to the majority.

With reference to the provision in respect of the appropriation of public moneys, there does not seem to be any difference whatever between the original provision and the substituted provision. The substituted provision is this :

In the appropriation by the legislature or distribution by the government of the province of any moneys for the support of schools organized and carried on in accordance with said chapter 29 or any Act passed in amendment thereof, or in substitution thereof, there shall be no discrimination against schools of any class described in the said chapter 29.

Now, subsection 3 of the original clause specifically mentions the Dominion Lands Act, and there was a great outcry throughout the country with reference to that. Subsection 2 of the substituted clause, although it does not mention that specifically, certainly includes it, and the separate schools will be entitled under it to their share of any moneys which are appropriated or distributed by this government. If, therefore, there were objections to the original clause 16, the same objections certainly exist to the substituted clause, because there is no difference between them. If there is any difference, I would say that it is in the direction of extending the rights and privileges guaranteed to the minority in the Northwest, because, although I do not intend at this late hour to refer to the different provisions of those ordinances, there are other provisions giving the minorities in the Northwest Territories certain rights. For instance, there is a provision with reference to the educational council, that that council, which is composed of five members, must always contain two members of the Roman Catholic religion. There is no provision that the other three members must be men of the Protestant faith. All five may be Catholic, and two of them must be, but there is no provision that the other three must be Protestants. So that there is a right in that ordinance which will be included in the substituted provision, which was not in the original provision.

Before resuming my seat, I desire as a member of this House and a citizen of this country to enter my protest against what has transpired in reference to the shaping of this legislation behind the backs of the constitutional representatives of the people. I refer to the conferences which have taken place with reference to the educational clauses of the Bill between the Prime Minister and Monseigneur Sbarretti, the ablegate and representative of the Pope. Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to utter any words which would even be capable of being misconstrued into an expression of disrespect either with reference to the person-

Mr. CROCKET.

ality of the eminent gentleman who has come to this country in the capacity referred to at the instance of the Prime Minister and other gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House or with reference either to the great church of which he is the representative. I have no doubt that Monseigneur Sbarretti is a gentleman of the highest character and intellectual attainments, and I feel sure that he was doing what he conscientiously believed to be his duty as the emissary of His Holiness in this country. The criticism, which I make in reference to the matter, is not of him or of the church he represents, but of the Prime Minister, who as such is presumed to represent the whole electorate of this country—Roman Catholic and Protestant alike—and who, presumed in his public, representative capacity, to know no creed, has violated his duty by recognizing in the interest of a particular church a power, which is not recognized by our constitution, and which is wholly foreign to our system of government. The people of this country have a right to insist, and, I think, will insist that in no affair of state shall the premier or government of this country take counsel with or accept dictation from any foreign ecclesiastical power, be that power Roman Catholic or Protestant, and I have no hesitation in saying that if the Prime Minister has taken counsel with the Papal ablegate, as has been charged and re-charged in this House without contradiction as to what educational laws shall be imposed upon the new provinces in the Northwest while ignoring two of his most influential constitutional advisors and the premier of the Territories upon which the legislation is to be imposed, he has committed an offence against our constitutional government which the people will not soon forget. They have probably forgotten, as the right honourable gentleman seems himself to have forgotten his lofty, high-sounding professions of 1896 when, as leader of the Liberal party then in opposition, he moved the six months' hoist to the Manitoba Remedial Bill, but they will, I venture to predict, not so readily forget this affair of 1905.

I am here—

—said the right hon. gentleman as Mr. Laurier, democrat to the hilt and leader of the opposition in 1896—

—representing not Roman Catholics alone, but Protestants as well, and I must give an account of my stewardship to all classes. Here am I, a Roman Catholic of French extraction, entrusted by the confidence of the men who sit around me with great and important duties under our constitutional system of government. I am here the acknowledged leader of a great party composed of Roman Catholics and Protestants as well, in which Protestants are in the majority, as Protestants must be in the majority in every part of Canada. Am I to be told, I, occupying such a position, that I am to be dictated the course I am to take in this House by reasons that can appeal to the con-