

decision having been given, the case was clear. The Government of this country knew then, if they acted, exactly upon what ground they were acting. Suppose they had acted in the first instance and allowed the appeal, and the case had then gone before the courts and it had been proved that the appeal did not lie in that case. Would that have been a discreet act? Would that have been a wise act? But after the whole ground was cleared, after the decision was given, then the Government heard the appeal. Will my hon. friend count that as an act of indiscretion? If he does, I think the reasonable people of this country will say that that was the only step for the Government to have taken—that as it was best for it to know exactly its powers in this case before it sought to carry them out. So it was necessary when these powers were made known to give the minority their constitutional right to appeal. After that the appeal was heard in due course, and the decision given; and the only criticism my hon. friend has to make upon the decision is that it was dictatorial and not conciliatory. He pointed out that the order had two sides to it. He is wrong: the order is simply the order. It has two sides to it if two people from different standpoints read it and come to different conclusions. It has two sides to it in my hon. friend's own camp. What does "La Patrie" say about it?—that it is peremptory and dictatorial? On the contrary, that it is nerveless and no order at all. What does "L'Electeur" say about it?—that it is dictatorial and peremptory? Not at all. That it is simply the act of a sheriff passing on an execution or something to that effect. What does the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) say about it?—that it is dictatorial or peremptory? No. That the Government simply get down on their knees and make a prayer to Manitoba—why do they not order Manitoba to do so and so? So there are two sides to it amongst my hon. friend's own people. There were not two sides to it in Verchères, where the candidate of my hon. friend went ahead of his leader and made a clear statement where he stood, and implied a rebuke, and I think a well merited rebuke, upon his leader, who in these important contests and on this important question had no word of advice, no suggestion to guide the conduct of his followers who were looking to him for guidance. In one thing I do agree with my hon. friend, that I hope this question will be settled as far away from the heat and bitterness of sectarian and party strife as possible; and to that end I deprecate extended discussions on that question at the present time. On that account I deplore the action of a member of the Manitoba Government of the province of Ontario within the last ten days. What was the case? What is the case to-day? That subject is remitted to the legislature of Manitoba. Call

Mr. FOSTER.

it dictatorial, call it nerveless, look upon it as you please, it is simply this: a decision of the law; and if there is a request implied, it is a request implied by courtesy to the fuller powers which Manitoba has, as compared with this Parliament, to settle the question. The difficulty arose in Manitoba legislation; the difficulty, if it is to be cured completely, can only be cured completely by Manitoba itself, on account of the peculiar and far-reaching powers which Manitoba has in that respect. There it goes; it is there to-day; and when it went there it was considered a grave and serious matter—so grave and serious that outside of all defiant expressions that had formerly been used, the Government and the legislature which had the responsibility did a wise and proper thing, in my view, in taking time to consider the question. In their calm and cool moments they are to deliberate upon it, and come to their conclusion; and by and by they are to formulate their decision. And yet, Sir, we find the Attorney General of that province—one of the Cabinet who is to take this subject into consideration and look over the legal points and peculiar circumstances of the case, and come to a conclusion involving the peace and prosperity not only of that province, but of other parts of this Dominion—we find that gentleman instead of giving it that calm and cool consideration, hieing himself down to Haldimand, going upon the stump, and saying that the Dominion Government has no object in view except to buy votes, and hurling his defiance from every platform in that county. Now, Sir, I think that as political conduct deserves condemnation, and I have no hesitation in saying that I do not know of a single instance in which political indecency has gone further towards outrage than the instance I have just detailed to you. That, Sir, is not the position which my hon. friend takes to-day, and is not the position which any statesman ought to take. Until the 9th of May, when the decision of the Manitoba Government may be come to and the legislature will be convened to hear it, let Manitoba think over that matter with as little passion and as far from strife and bitterness as possible; let her come to her conclusions apart from the heat of fiery and inflammatory declamation; and until that day comes and those conclusions are formulated, I am bound to maintain, as I certainly hope, that she will do her own work as she best can do it, and that she will find a way for making smooth these waters which are now rough and troubled. Now, Sir, I have but one word more to say, and I commence that by thanking my hon. friend for his allusions to our late lamented leader, Sir John Thompson. So hearty and so eloquent a tribute as he paid to Sir John Thompson's memory shows us, and shows us in a most pleasing manner, that whatever may be