

hon. friend the leader of the House himself bound down by his personal vote on that question, but we have Mr. Laurier, the leader of the House of Commons bound hard and fast by his own vote, because he was present in the House of Commons on that occasion, and by the unanimous vote then passed, he voted, as did every other member in the House at that time, for submitting the question to the courts. I say, therefore, it does not lie in the hon. gentleman's mouth to properly censure such statesmen as Sir John Thompson and Sir John Macdonald for sending the question to the courts instead of dealing with it as he says, in a diplomatic way. It was Mr. Blake who suggested that course, and they fell in with him and agreed with him, and I do not think anything has occurred up to the present time to show that the action of parliament at that time on the motion of Mr. Blake, supported by Sir John Macdonald and other members of parliament, was wrong in any particular. It was the determination then arrived at that this question should be removed as far as possible from the domain of party strife. A judicial decision should be obtained, as Mr. Blake suggested. I have not his speech or resolution before me, but I speak from an accurate recollection of the case. He held that the facts and the law of the case should be investigated by judicial tribunals and that a reasoned opinion should be given for the guidance and for the information, as Sir John Macdonald put it afterwards, of the executive of the country. I repeat that my hon. friend should not rise in this House now and condemn those eminent statesmen to whom I have referred, Sir John Macdonald, Sir J. C. Abbott and Sir John Thompson, for having proposed a solution of the question, as far as it was possible to solve it, by an appeal to the courts. My hon. friend says further that the press are responsible for stirring up a religious feeling and a sectarian feeling upon this question. Now, that may be true, but I think if there is any portion of the press that is more responsible in this regard than another, it is the principal organ of the party which the hon. gentleman leads in this House, the *Globe* newspaper.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I did not spare any paper: I condemned the *Globe*.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—I know he did not particularize, but he started by condemn-

ing the reference of the matter to the courts, and deplored the sectarian feelings that were likely to be excited in connection with it, and then he went on and condemned the press. I suppose he intended to condemn all the newspapers in Canada that had dealt with it in the way of stirring up religious feelings and religious strife; but the hon. gentleman himself, in all candour, must admit, as he did admit on the floor of this House last year, that the organ of the Reform party has been the greatest sinner of all papers in Canada in connection with this great and important question. My hon. friend says it is utterly hopeless to get a remedy. I have not lost faith in the sense of right and justice that prevails in the people of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and I am not without a hope that a remedy will be found for this difficulty, and that justice will be done to the minority of Manitoba. A reasonable measure will be enacted by the parliament of Canada which will provide a remedy for this difficulty, and which will not be the means of stirring up a great deal of religious strife. My honourable friend will not deny that the government took a constitutional view of this question. If the opposition generally and the leaders of the party in another place, and those who have been promulgating the views of that party before the people on the public platform and through the press had taken the same course as my hon. friend did last year there would have been no danger of this question stirring the people on sectarian lines all over the country. I am not going to say there have not been those in the ranks of the Liberal-Conservative party who have not taken what was, to my mind, the proper course on the question. We know it is so; but we know that the government and the Premier, the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party, took the strictly constitutional view of this question, being himself in favour of a public school system, nevertheless he believed that the rights of the minority in Manitoba, as guaranteed to them by the constitution of the country, should be respected, and that the constitution should be upheld, as it had been construed by the highest court in the realm. Had my hon. friend's party and its leader been equally outspoken in the view that this question is a constitutional one, and should be settled in a constitutional way, there would have been no danger whatever of the people being