

or the other. There is no judgment of the Privy Council telling this Government to interfere or not to interfere.

Now, we are told that if this Bill is passed the fight will be over. Well, Sir, if I believed that, I would be inclined to go a long way. I would be disposed to do many things I would not otherwise wish to do, if I thought that the passing of this Bill would be a finality in this matter. But, Sir, can I shut my eyes to the agitation going on in the country to-day? Can I shut my eyes to the unanimity of sentiment in Manitoba, where three elections have been run on that question, and where there has been a majority in favour of the rights of the province every time. Can I shut my eyes to the fact, as we are told, that at least 85 per cent of the people of Manitoba are in favour of allowing that province to work out her own destinies according to the law she has placed upon the statute-book? Can I shut my eyes to the fact that all over the country there is no defence of the action of the Government by the press of the country who gauge and educate public sentiment? Can I shut my eyes to the fact that there has been scarcely a gathering all over this Dominion, which says to this Government: Go on and do what you are doing to-day. No, Sir, it is the very reverse. I therefore say that I have no right to assume that the passage of this Bill would be the end of this contest. I do not believe that the heartburnings and the strife that is raised to-day, would all die out in a few months if we force Manitoba to do as she is not inclined to do. I believe that the sentiment of the country does not justify any interference with the province of Manitoba in this matter. I believe that public sentiment of the country is, that there shall be no interference.

Now then, what will be the result to the present Government if they persist in pressing this Bill. It must in my judgment inevitably result either in their defeat in this House, or in their defeat in the country. It may be said that the country has not spoken. We have often asked them of late to appeal to the country, and we have said, that although we believe public sentiment is against you, yet if you appeal to the country, and if the voice of the country says, pass that law, you will be justified in doing it. But they have not appealed to the country, nor given the electorate an opportunity to speak. If they are defeated in this House they must appeal to the country, and if then the judgment of the electorate is that the Government shall go on with the measure, then they will be justified. The Government will be fortified with public opinion behind them, and they will be fortified with the support of many friends in this House who are opposing them to-day. Sir, if I know anything about the public sentiment of the country, I say it is all adverse to the policy of the Government in this matter. Mr. Speaker,

I can only express regret, as I did at the beginning of this debate, that I am obliged to place myself in opposition to the Government of the day. However, I do not believe that I am in opposition to the sentiment of the Conservative party of this country when I oppose the Government. I believe that the Government is against public opinion, and that I am with public opinion in doing as I am doing now. I believe I am in harmony with the sentiments of the people of Ontario to-day, when I am standing as I am against the Government on this question. I believe that I am also in harmony with the sentiments of the people of Manitoba when I stand up here to oppose the Government on this occasion. I believe, too, that I am in harmony with the people of the North-west Territories, because the same difficulty is looming up there, and that is another reason which leads me to think that this fight will not be ended soon. If we are successful in forcing Manitoba to-day, the next thing will be to force us to repeal the law which gave national schools to the North-west Territories. The Catholics regard themselves as having a grievance there the same as in Manitoba. Archbishop Langevin said so at Edmonton, I believe. He said: We are not reconciled to the laws which have been put on the statute-book of the North-west Territories; the national schools there do not satisfy us any more than the national schools in Manitoba. Therefore, I say that if the parties who are forcing on this remedial legislation succeed in getting it, the fight will commence in the North-west Territories as soon as the Bill is passed. The school Bill passed in the North-west Assembly has been held in abeyance, and has not yet received the assent of the Lieutenant-Governor. Why is it held in abeyance? Because the clergy do not approve of it. Now, I would venture to ask this Government, as the authority either to veto that law or to allow it to go into operation, what they intend to do with it? Do they intend to give the people of the North-west Territories the right to control education, or do they intend to veto that law? And if they veto it, will they start the fight there which they started on behalf of the minority in Manitoba? Will they continue that fight also for five years, until they secure in the North-west Territories what they wish to secure in Manitoba to-day. I say that this justifies us in believing that the fight will not be ended by this Bill; but that the passage of this Bill would be only the commencement of the fight. The fight must go on, though this Parliament must go to the country, and though dozens of members who support the Bill to-day may be left at home by an exasperated electorate. As John Sandfield Macdonald said at the time of the birth of confederation, if you take from the majority the right to control education, you do not settle the question for ever. It will

loom
not o
the f
inter
peopl
to en
they
them
may
conte
conse
know
Mani
hark
in the
we fe
sults
try, I
to de
say, I
this g
peopl
ditiou
condi
of Q
they
sulted
and c
will, s
injust
these
Bill.
agains
voting
tunate
we do
positio