

of serving the interest of party, is one that is in the highest degree mischievous; and I feel that I best serve the public interest, and especially the interest of the minority, by declining to submit myself for an examination by the hon. gentleman in the various questions which he has proposed, but which are wholly outside of any right that the law of parliament confers upon him.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—If the hon. minister, who has just read his written answer, thinks that I am influenced by political motives, and not by a desire to serve the interest of the minority, he is mistaken. If he thinks his assertion is true, I might say that he opens himself to the same accusation in his answer to me. The answer given cannot come from the Minister of Justice, nor from a minister of the Crown; it is the answer given by a man who puts aside all sentiments of justice and fair play to work in the interest of his own political party. That is what he does to-day in this chamber. And what do we see? The Minister of Justice declares himself unable to ascertain if a speech made by the chief of his party, the Prime Minister of this Dominion, has ever really been delivered to the electorate of this country. He is unable to ascertain if declarations made by his colleague in this House, the hon. Secretary of State, are true or false. He is unable to ascertain if the voice of the Catholic minority in Manitoba has been heard in the councils of the nation. He is unable to ascertain all those things, but what he is willing to find out is what Mr. Taylor, Mr. Wallace and Mr. McLean said in different parts of the country. But why does he not tell us that those three men are precisely those who voted against the Remedial Bill in 1896? The principle of the Remedial Bill was adopted in the House of Commons on the second reading, and those three gentlemen, whose remarks have been quoted by the hon. Minister of Justice, are amongst the Liberals who voted against that measure. They were defeated, defeated with the Liberals who opposed the Conservative policy, and to-day the hon. Minister of Justice brings before this House the sayings of those gentlemen to prove what? Is it to prove that justice has been done? No. What does he want to prove? I fail to see; perhaps he does not see himself, but blinded by the interests of his

party, he comes with quotations which set forth the views of those who were, like the honourable minister's friends, opposing the measure of justice submitted to parliament. But all what said those opponents are not at all satisfactory answer to the question. I claim that my questions are fully in line with all the authorities on the matter. I have alluded to a public question, and the hon minister ought to know or ought to acknowledge, because he knows better, that this Manitoba school question is still before the government. He ought to acknowledge that the government of this country, acting in a judicial manner, rendered a judgment. Has that judgment been complied with? Is that judgment wiped away now? It still remains, and is still an obligation resting on the ministry of the day, and it is their imperative duty to see that the judgment rendered by the judicial committee of their administration should be complied with. They have added themselves to the legislature of Manitoba. Manitoba gave its answer. Manitoba refused on three different occasions to comply with the judgment which has been rendered. That refusal placed the question in the hands of this parliament, and it is now the bounden duty of the ministry to see that the constitution of this country is vindicated—to see that the judgment of the Privy Council, in England, and of their own Privy Council should be executed. They have failed in their duty. They do not want to discharge their duty? True, the hon. Secretary of State told us that the question was settled. Settled by whom? By a compromise that took place between whom? Between the government, which was the judge, and the legislature of Manitoba, one of the parties. But where was the other party? Was the other party asked to assent to that compromise? Never. When the delegation, sent by the former government, left Ottawa, in 1896, and went to Winnipeg, to try and make a compromise which would be acceptable to both parties and acceptable to the minority, they failed in their mission, but their instructions obliged them to consult the minority and to assent to nothing that that minority would not be prepared to accept. Nothing of the kind was done by the present administration. This new government made a compromise, but made a compromise behind the back of the min-