

ing the twenty-four years of the Conservative regime, the Government have disallowed only fifty-three, including North-west ordinances, or an average of two and one-fifth, or about one-half the proportion of the Liberals. So that on this question of coercion, if we are so to style the exercise of the admitted powers of the Government, we are a long way behind the hon. gentlemen. What commission was appointed, what evidence was taken, what negotiations took place in connection with the exercise of these powers by the Grit government between 1874 and 1878? Did they consider the sensitiveness of the Manitoba government? Did they hold out the olive branch previous to disallowance? No. They exercised their powers under the constitution in the most ruthless manner. They did simply as the constitution required them to do.

Now, we have seen how little sympathy the leader of the Opposition has for the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba. I want to show what sympathy he had for the Protestants of Quebec, because that subject has come up. In 1893 he spoke as follows:—

I have quoted to you the law which now prevails in Quebec—the law demanded by the Protestant population of that province, giving them a school board of their own. I have quoted to you the law whereby in 1869 two separate boards of education were organized, a Roman Catholic board and a Protestant board. The Roman Catholic board to-day is composed of seventeen members, nine Catholic laymen and all the Roman Catholic bishops of the province. Now, suppose that to-morrow the legislature of Quebec were to abolish the Protestant School Board. Then, by the effect of that law, the management of the Protestant schools would become vested in the Roman Catholic board of the Council of Education, that is to say, practically in the hands of the Roman Catholic bishops. If such legislation were to be enacted by the legislature of Quebec, is there a man to say that it would not be a most infamous act of tyranny? Sir, if to-morrow such a law were enacted, the first thing that the Protestant population would do would be to come before this Government and ask this Government, in virtue of the powers vested in it by the constitution, to abolish at once the obnoxious and tyrannical legislation. If the Protestant population were to come and represent to the Government that their schools, the Protestant schools, had been placed under the management of the Roman Catholic bishops of the province, I say that every man in this House, be he Protestant or Catholic, would at once call on the Government to abolish the law and to pass the remedial legislation to the Protestant minority.

The hon. member for North Simcoe has also spoken on the subject of minorities. I remember one occasion, when he was not feed, when he was an independent member of this Parliament. I remember his eloquence, which he has certainly never equalled, in connection with the school question, when he considered the Protestant minority of Quebec were being subjected to coercion at

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

the hands of the provincial legislature. In 1880, he said:

I venture, Sir, to ask the House seriously to consider the position in which we stand. The worship of what was called local autonomy which some gentlemen have become addicted to is fraught, I venture to say, with great evils to this Dominion. Our allegiance is due to the Dominion of Canada. The separation into provinces, the right of local self-government which we possess is not to make us less citizens of the Dominion, is not to make us less anxious for the promotion of the welfare of the Dominion; and it is no argument to say that because a certain piece of legislation is within the power of a local parliament, therefore that legislation is not to be disturbed. By the same Act of Parliament, by which power is conferred upon the local legislature the duty and power—because where there is a power there is a corresponding duty—are cast upon the Governor in Council to revise and review the acts of the legislative bodies. If you are to say that because a law has been passed within the legislative authority of the province therefore it must remain, we can easily see, Sir, that before long these provinces, instead of coming nearer together, will go further and further apart. We can see that the only way of making a united Canada and building up a national life and sentiment in the Dominion is by seeing that the laws of one province are not offensive to the laws and institutions, and it may be to the feelings of another. I will go so far as to say that they must be to some extent taken into consideration.

So say we all, except the hon. member for Simcoe, in this case. He was the champion of a minority on another occasion, and he was not feed. The minority in that case was the minority in Ireland, and I recollect, in 1886, the hon. gentleman waxing eloquent in their interest, when he said:

While I am in favour of a fair and reasonable scheme for Home Rule which shall secure the rights of the minority as well as of the majority of the people of Ireland, I am not in favour, and I do not believe that the majority of the people of Canada are in favour, of handing the minority over to the majority.

That is in Ireland, with which he has nothing to do. But we have here a minority with which he has everything to do, as a Canadian, towards which he has a duty to perform, and yet he insists that they shall be handed over to the majority. There was another case in which he acted for a minority, and for which he was paid. It was the case of the Streams Bill, and the minority consisted of only one. There, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman raised his voice loud and long in this House on behalf of federal interference, of coercion, and everything else, so long as it would be to the advantage of his client. I have no doubt he was right on that occasion but still it looks odd to see him linked with the leader of the Opposition now, insisting that interference with the majority is coercion, even if the interference be to prevent the oppression of the minority by that majority. Now, the leader of the Opposition says, that before interference,