

questionable whether it should be done) the blame or responsibility, whatever it may be, rests upon the shoulders of the opposition in parliament at that time and not upon the government of that day. Todd says further :—

In 1868 however this wholesome constitutional rule was departed from by common consent for reasons of public convenience and the supplies were voted for the whole fiscal year ending 31st March, 1869, although a dissolution of parliament was agreed upon early in June. The prorogation took place on 31st July, the dissolution in November, and the new parliament met on 10th December, 1868.

Now, even if the whole of the estimates which were laid before parliament had been granted, under the peculiar circumstances in which the government of the day and parliament at that time existed, no great wrong would have arisen therefrom, for this reason ; if my recollection serves me right—I am sorry I have not the estimates here at present—there were no extraordinary sums asked for in connection with any particular work, or the business of the country, other than what was going on under contract. That is my recollection at the present moment, but even when that was refused, then the second proposition was made to which I have referred, and which Todd lays down as the constitutional course to pursue, to ask for a sufficient sum in order to pay the servants of the government and to continue the work which was then under contract. So much for that question of the Governor General's warrants. I should not only be interested, but I am sure this House will be interested, and will listen with a very great deal of attention to the views of the hon. gentleman who now leads the Senate of Canada. We all know that he is an eminent lawyer, that the position he has held at the bar, and as Attorney General in the province of Ontario, for nearly a quarter of a century entitles his opinion to respect upon questions of this kind and all others, and I shall listen with a very great deal of interest to ascertain how the genius of an eminent lawyer can get around the provisions of a statute so plain as this, at least to my mind. My hon. friend also refers to the school question. That is a subject that I think it might be as well not to say much about particularly from his standpoint.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I did not say much about it.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I would have no hesitation in entering into a discussion of that question did I deem it at all advisable at the present moment, but when the hon. gentleman says, as his party continually says, that the late government, who had that question under consideration for some six years, never approached in a friendly way the Manitoba government in order to deal with the question in the interests of the minority, he states what the records show to be incorrect. Take every document issued from the Justice Department during that period—every single despatch and letter that was written to the Manitoba government was couched in the most friendly language, and in language to which no one, having the interests of his country at heart, could object. But, they say, after the last judgment of the Privy Council, the late government issued a mandatory order dictating to the Manitoba government what they should do, and which they termed coercion. Even in connection with that, they were approached in the most friendly manner, and if the opinion of lawyers be of any use to us, or should be a guide to laymen, we had no other course to pursue in order to bring the question within the purview of the Dominion Parliament. I am glad to notice that even the leader of the present government, now Premier, has made the statement in different parts of the country that it is within the power of this parliament to deal with this question, provided the Manitoba government does not come to the rescue and concede the rights to the minority. And he has also stated this, that if they will not do it, he will take the initiative in the House of Commons, and compel them to do it, or in other words coerce them. I deny the correctness of the use of that word "coercion." No coercion was ever attempted on the part of the government towards the people of Manitoba. It is not coercion to say to a man who has taken rights from you, as an individual or as a community, that he must restore them. I can understand the word "coercion" as meaning something exceedingly offensive, and as applied in the manner it has been applied in connection with the school question it is doubly offensive, because it is not true. Sir, I notice the hon. Secretary of State, I think in a speech made not long ago, told the people in this good city of Ottawa, that the better way