get those. In the last analysis, it came to this: The Protestant minority could not get the legislation until after confederation. Then Mr. Galt said at London : Very well, then we must make that promise binding by the constitution ; we must add that other clause that not only if at the time of confederation separate schools exist but if legislation is had after confederation giving separate school privileges and then that these should be taken away, and the rights of the minority thereby be prejudiced, there will be an appeal to the sovereign power, the parliament of the colonies. That is the history of it and the whole history of it. You may search the whole history of it from first to last and that is a fair statement of the case. For New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, not by compact, but in London, was this united Upper and Lower Canada saving clause extended into a saving clause which applied to all the provinces at the time of the union. It was generalized, it was the compact principle extended to the other provinces. That is the Confederation Act. When you come to the British North America Act, you can get all there is in that Act and you have a right to get it. But I say to the right hon. gentleman who contends that he is bound by the Confederation Act to give to these Northwest provinces the same rights that are possessed by Ontario and Quebec, that he has pushed the contract beyond its absolute and reasonable meaning, and in the opinion of lawyers equally as good as himself he has no warrant for saying that he is compelled by the British North America Act to place into the constitution of the Northwest Territories such a principle as he proposes to embalm in that constitution.

One point more with reference to the Manitoba case. I have said that the Catholic or any minority in this Dominion never had a case so clear for remedial legislation as had the Manitoba minority in 1896. All the legal difficulties were out of the way, all the decisions were given, and the path was absolutely clear between that minority with its grievance and the power which had jurisdiction to remedy it, namely, this parliament. But the right hon. gentleman threw himself across the way and prevented it ; and if my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) complains that the Manitoba minority is suffering from injustice today, it is because his leader threw himself across the path of the Remedial Bill and prevented its enactment. More has happened since that. I regret in no single jot or tittle my act in 1896. Under similar circumstances, I would do the same thing, but I do not at all say that I will ever do the same thing under the circumstances that may arise after this. Why ? Because there is a power which after all is mightier than the constitution. We invoked the constitution in 1896. We tried to give it its full force in a clear case and we were prevented by the leader of a great party. After we were prevented, that leader and his party went to the people in 1896, 1900 and 1904, and the people declared that they did not want remedial legislation. In the interests of the 41 per cent which has been talked about in this House, in the interests of the province of Quebec which was specially interested, we on this side tried to get for the minority their rights in the only way we possibly could under the constitution. We were prevented from doing it by the Liberal party, and during three successive elections the Liberal party have endorsed the contention that no hands be laid on any province even though it deprives the minority of that province of the rights guaranteed it under the constitution. And I make bold to say that as long as grass grows and water runs, I shall not feel disposed to contravene that will three times expressed by the people of this country. Aye, Mr. Speaker, three times expressed, and expressed especially by that very 41 per cent we hear so much about, and in the province where it is strong set. To the man who says that this agitation is on to-day simply because we are opposed to a French premier—to the gentleman from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) I have no answer to make. A statement of the case is quite sufficient. To the same gentleman who said in another part of his speech that this is on because it is a party agitation, I have no answer to make. His statement answers itself. We read the newspapers, we scan the petitions, we know what is going on in this country, and if this is a party agitation very suddenly the Tory party must have greatly enlarged its sphere. Sir, I want to state one other thing. Whatever may have been said in 1896, I approached that question, and the government of which I was a member approached it, against the wishes of many of our best friends, not because we thought we had a political cinch in prospect, not at all ; but knowing that in all probability we were going down to our political death, and doing it because we thought we were under a constitutional obligation.

Now, Sir, I had intended to address an argument to the Minister of the Interior, but that hon. gentleman is not present ; perhaps it will be better to keep it for another time. But there is one point I cannot afford to let pass, because it is a point made by the Minister of Finance as well as by the ex-Minister of the Interior. It used to be good doctrine, good constitutional doctrine, it is yet—it used to be good Liberal doctrine, I don't know that it is now—but it used to be, formerly they coincided,—that if there was a member of the government who, on a grave question of principle, did not agree with his party on a measure involving that principle, he had no other hon-