

tice. Of course, if the intention of the Government is, as we all suppose, a mere pretense, then, it does not make much difference whether the House votes on this Bill or not; but, if the House intends seriously to legislate upon this grievance of the Manitoba minority, then, the objection raised by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, is a matter of very considerable moment.

Mr. MULLOCK. The Act would be no good.

Mr. LISTER. The Act, as my hon. friend says, would be no good. What do we propose to do? The remedial order is directed to the statutes of 1890 of the province of Manitoba. It is to remove grievances created by the statute of 1890. The statute of 1890 has been repealed by the Act of 1891. So that the remedial order is a nullity, because there is no statute for it to act upon. That seems perfectly clear; and that being the case, you have asked the legislature of Manitoba to repeal a statute that is not in existence at all; and, if this legislation is to be valid and forceful, it is necessary that Manitoba should be requested to repeal the legislation of which the minority complain, which is not the legislation of 1890, at all, and, as my hon. friend suggests, there is no complaint against the other statute. So that, as a matter of fact, there is nothing in the province of Manitoba for this House to act upon. That is the position of the matter, and I think, that, before this House is asked to do anything with regard to the Bill now under consideration, the Minister of Justice should investigate the objection taken by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and satisfy himself that the objection is baseless before we proceed with the Act. Or if he find that there is something in it, that something prevents our going on at all, and it seems useless and profitless work to go on here voting and discussing a question when the whole work has to be done over again. While I am upon my feet,—I will take occasion to advert very briefly to the argument of my hon. friend and the statement he thought proper to make—the statement that the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. McGillivray) made in the speech he delivered a few moments ago. My hon. friend in most vigorous, if not violent terms—

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Not violent.

Mr. LISTER. Vigorous certainly, denied that during the local elections for the present Parliament of Ontario there was any assault made upon the separate school system of that province.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. I said to destroy the separate school system.

Mr. LISTER. Yes; to destroy the separate school system of that province. I take issue with my hon. friend, and I say to him that from his leader down, and it was not Mr. Chief Justice Meredith but Mr. Marter,

Mr. LISTER.

who was the leader when the assault was made upon the separate school system of Ontario.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is misstating the facts. At the time of the general elections, the Chief Justice of Ontario was our leader and Mr. Marter was not. Now take that back.

Mr. LISTER. It does not make any difference whether it was Chief Justice Meredith or not. I believe Chief Justice Meredith was the leader of the party then, because Mr. Marter succeeded him, and in the by-elections Mr. Marter was the leader. Well, the leader of the party did not go as far as that, but his followers went from one end of the country to the other, and made an assault on the separate schools system and called for its total abolition.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. That is not so.

Mr. LISTER. They urged that if the province had control over legislation, the province could repeal it. In other words, that the power which created the Ontario system of education could repeal it. The people were told that they were the source of all power, and that if it was their wish, that legislation could be repealed.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Does the hon. gentleman say that was the position of the leader of the hon. leader of the Opposition?

Mr. LISTER. I say it was.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. It was not or of the party either.

Mr. LISTER. I say, moreover, that never in the history of Ontario was a more bitter fight made by the Conservative party of Ontario than that fight, and that fight was an assault against the Roman Catholic people of Ontario.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. No.

Mr. LISTER. You brought in to the county the notorious Margaret L. Sheppard.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. That is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not see what connection that has with the question before the House.

Mr. LISTER. It is a question of adjourning the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already ruled that in such a case, the discussion must be relevant to the discussion before the House on which the adjournment of the debate is asked.

Mr. LISTER. If you hold it is not relevant, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot discover what Mrs. Sheppard has to do with the Bill before the House.