

now an extremely difficult and delicate question to settle. I quite appreciate all the surrounding difficulties that have grown up and the prejudices that exist and the utter impossibility of making the great mass of the electorate comprehend the question. We all know that in sentimental questions of that kind, where prejudices arise, we cannot reach the calm judgment of the electorate. They are carried away by the first impulses of their nature, and the impulses follow their prejudices. It is very unfortunate and very unhappy, and I cannot but regret the course which has been pursued by the Government of Manitoba. It has certainly not been that of a judicial body disposed to fairly consider the question. Without even reading the papers they took a high and lofty stand under the impression that they have the power to dictate to the minority and they take their stand on the narrow ground of provincial rights. The Judicial Committee clearly set forth that it is not a question of provincial rights, that the provinces have not the right, under certain circumstances, to legislate on the subject of education. If they had the right they could do as they pleased, but why is it, under the British North America Act and the Manitoba Act, that those powers were taken from the province? They were given control of education under certain circumstances and conditions. When those circumstances or conditions are in any way disturbed or endangered, then the province does not possess the power. There can be no encroachment on provincial rights in such cases. It is not given to the province absolutely to deal with them. The power is reserved. Read all the clauses of the 92nd section of the British North America Act and only on that one subject is the power reserved to the federal authorities. There are one or two subjects on which there are equal powers given to both parties, but there is no other question but that of education on which there is a power reserved to the Federal Government to interfere, and therefore there can be no question of provincial rights in this case. It does not arise, and the decision of the Privy Council is very distinct in that part of the judgment. It would have been more satisfactory if the government had stated what their policy was. This paragraph leaves it just where it was. It has been unfortunate that this subject for five years has been practically hung

up and tossed about from one court to another, and from one government to another, and we are in a very much worse position now than we were five years ago to deal with it.

The next paragraph of the speech admits that the "N. P." is a failure—that it did not stop the depression. There was a time when the hon. gentlemen who draughted this address thought differently—thought that we could be made rich by Act of Parliament—that all we had to do was to reserve Canada for the Canadians and shut out all foreign competition and we should be happy, but I think the admission made in this paragraph seriously conflicts with the prophecies we then had. It certainly has not stopped the exodus, and it has not furnished a home market that is worth very much, nor has it filled up the North-west. These are lamentable failures with which the National Policy has to be charged. The Government admits that even with the National Policy it is possible to have a deficit, and so we are told that this is due somewhat to the lowering of the duties last year. I think, from my standpoint at all events, the question of a deficit, even in the condition in which Canada is now, could have been easily got over if we desire to encroach upon the manufacturers. It would have been very easy to relieve the people of this country from their burdens and yet to have a surplus.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—My hon. friend laughs at this. I could name half a dozen articles which, by reducing the duty on them one-half, would yield a revenue that would more than cover the deficit. There is no doubt about that—all the six millions. Not only that, but you would relieve the people of this country from the payment of thirty or forty millions of dollars that they are paying now to those protected industries. The pinch in Canada to-day is due to the fiscal policy—the absurd proposition of subsidizing about three per cent of the population and compelling the 97 per cent to pay them a part of their earnings. That is practically what we are doing to-day. People do not understand it, and therefore they do not know where the pinch comes in, but if anybody chooses to analyse it, he will readily see that where you force the body of the people