providing for and contemplating an appeal, did protect the rights given after the union, and secured, of course, substantially—he used the word "absolutely"—to the minority of those provinces the right to separate schools. It became, as he said, a vested right. On pages 7 and 8 of the Brophy case, and page 74 of his argument in the Barrett case, as printed before Parliament, you will see he admits that if this appeal clause in the Manitoba Act is a substantive clause, as it is decided to be in the Brophy case, he admitted—which no lawyer, constitutional or otherwise, had ever before 1889 contradicted—that by it the rights became vested and were secured to the minority wherever the schools were established. Does any one think that a novel idea? Take the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). In 1875, in discussing the New Brunswick case, I find him stating:

> The British North America Act provides that any province having separate schools before confederation should have them for all time, and also that any province not having them at the time of the union, but conceding them at any future time, shall concede them as a right which can never be taken away.
>
> If the minority carried their point——

He went on to say later in his speech, if the minority once got separate schools they, to use his language exactly—

> —they would possess these rights and privileges for all time.

To show you, Mr. Speaker, how awkward it is for us to have to deal with the hon. member for North Simcoe, I wish to point out, without desire to offend him, but without fear of him or terror of his indignation, that, if he was not embarrassed with his professional connection with the government of Manitoba there is hardly a man who could have enlightened us upon this subject better than the hon. gentleman. I freely admit that. But suppose the leader of the Opposition had a retainer from Mr. Greenway. The leader of the Opposition is a distinguished member of the bar of Quebec. Supppose that he sat there having argued the case with the hon. member for Simcoe. How many men in this House would pay attention to what he said in debate? Or suppose that Mr. Blake, a late distinguished member of this House, who accepted a retainer from the Canadian Pacific Railway in regard to the award, had dared to lead the Opposition and to find fault with the Government in regard to questions arising out of that matter and to ask why that award was not promptly paid or why some other action was not taken about it, what would have been the feelings, the proper feelings, of every member of this House? To show the extraordinary position of the hon. member for Simcoe, I point out some of the inconsistent views he has expressed in regard to this question which he would not have expressed had he not been legislator and counsellor as well in regard to the same subject. He was of opinion, as shown in a very interesting article in Mr. Ewart's book, that the Barrett case precluded any right on the part of the minority to appeal. But the Brophy case decided that subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act had the same effect in their case as subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, in regard to the minorities in other province—it decided it to be a parliamentary compact. Now, then, the counsel for Manitoba, who argued in 1892 in the Barrett case, before the law lords of the Privy Council of England that, if these were substantive sections granting an appeal, they constituted on the part of an established separate school system a vested right—or in connection with the separate school system, to be more accurate—a vested right that could not be taken away—this same gentleman came before the committee of the Canadian Privy Council in 1895, and with the Brophy case staring him in the face, argued that neither the merits nor the rights of the minority were to be considered: argued that we had dealt only with the political aspect, argued that the appeal clause was practically a dead letter, and only in one extraordinary case could he conceive of its being used at all. If that does not put him out of court, it ought to put him out of Parliament, or at least prevent him having the slightest influence in Parliament in regard to this matter.

In regard to coercion, I desire to deal, in all fairness, with a statement of the hon. leader of the Opposition. He referred to the Manitoba Cattle Quarantine Act, the Act relating to public companies, the Act abolishing the French language and the Schools Act. The two former were disallowed, and the others were not. The hon. gentleman would not accept the challenge of the Minister of Finance and express his opinion as to whether the course of the Government in this matter was right or wrong. It was his duty either to express his own opinion or not to condemn the action of the Government in taking the course it did in regard to the matter. But let us see what is the record of the two parties in regard to everriding and annulling the Acts of the local legislatures. I find, for instance, that the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member, the Mackenzie Administration, disallowed an Act to define the privileges, immunities and powers of the legislative assembly and the legislative council of Manitoba. They disallowed the Act to incorporate the Winnipeg Board of Trade. They disallowed the Act regarding the construction of the bridge over the Assiniboine River, between the city of Winnipeg and St. Boniface, and they disallowed chapter 43 of 46 Vic., known as the Half-breed Manitoba Protection Act. During the five years of their term they disallowed twenty-one provincial statutes, or an average of four and one-fifth each year, while dur-