

passant" in Quebec, if you take the fact that every gentleman who was elected to support the hon. leader of the Government was pledged to at least do as much for the minority of Manitoba as we were, and pledged, as a rule, to remedial legislation, if local legislation did not remedy the evil—and you will find that the verdict of the people, on this matter, has been in favour of that policy of which we were the honest exponents.

Now, it may be asked how the Liberal leader obtained the support of the people on the trade question as well as on the school question. I am not going into that inquiry. He got their support, and, having obtained that support to carry out a protective policy, I am bound in honour to give him all the support I can, in order to carry out that policy. I do not know what the tariff may be. In my own opinion, looking forward, I would be surprised if it did not turn out to be strongly protective, and, so far as I am concerned, in that respect it would be quite acceptable to me.

With regard to the Manitoba School question, I must say at once that I had hoped that the policy of the Government would have been more in accord with what I consider has been the verdict in favour of the policy we adopted, and that a reasonable settlement would have grown out of it. That brings me to the paragraph in the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, in which we are asked to say that we are pleased to learn that after negotiations, a satisfactory settlement has been made. Standing in my place here, entertaining the views I have always entertained, with the record I have made for myself, for consistency at least, in a humble sphere, I could not subscribe to the statement that that was a satisfactory settlement, nor can I subscribe to the assertion that the Manitoba school question is buried. Not at all. There is no funeral, and if it would delight hon. gentlemen to attend the funeral of that question, it will have to be a mock funeral, for there will be no corpse. That funeral cannot take place yet. That question is not settled. There has been no reference in the settlement that I can see to the grievances declared to exist by the Privy Council. There has been no reference in it to the reasonable demands of the minority, and therefore it is a very great mistake for hon. gentlemen on

either side to say that this question is dead and buried. You might as well say that the constitution of the country is dead and buried. That question to-day, instead of being dead and buried, is in its full force and vigour. That question to-day is as much alive as the British North American Act itself. That question to-day, so far as the rights of the people are affected, is just as much alive as the constitution itself, and it will last as long if not reasonably disposed of. There is but one way to bury it, so long as the minority are not restored their rights, and that is by burying the guarantees given by the constitution to minorities. There is but one way to bury the guarantees given to minorities, and that is to erase them from the Constitutional Act. How can that be done? By the vote of this Parliament? No, thank God. You cannot do it by the vote of this Parliament. It can only be done by the powers that passed that Act. If any portion of the people have reason to think to-day that the fathers of confederation made a mistake when they gave these guarantees in good faith, when they pledged the honour of the country to the minorities of this country—at the demand of the Protestant majority, happily, for the Catholic minority—if they wish to say to-day that the constitution is wrong in that respect, does that give them any right to ignore the constitution? No, it does not. The constitution must be obeyed and ought to be respected while it lasts. If there is any part of the constitution that is inimical to the interests of Canada, then ask for the amendment of the constitution; and if there be good reasons for having it amended, the Imperial Parliament, no doubt, will make the amendment. Otherwise, I am sure it will not. I speak plainly on this subject because I want it clearly understood, from my point of view. There may be a number of gentlemen who differ very widely from me, but if I understand the constitution under which we live, when that little minority was deprived of its rights, when faith was broken with it, when it appealed to Parliament and its attention was called to the constitutional means by which redress should be sought, when it followed, step by step, those constitutional methods which were pointed out, when it went to the Ju-