

look at it, whatever view you take of it, it will be found that the Bill is unworkable. The scheme is not intended to do anything more than to satisfy the sentiment which has been raised in its favour, and to gratify the longing of those who think there ought to be a declaration on the floor of this Parliament in favour of separate schools. I think I might add, Sir,—and then I am done—one further statement. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) is not here; but the ex-Minister of Justice might, perhaps, communicate my question to him. Will that distinguished luminary of the law tell me, by what authority this Parliament ventures to delegate the taxing power of Manitoba to the separate school trustees? Will he tell me, by what authority this Parliament dares to interfere with the authority of the local legislature, which says that everybody shall contribute to the public schools? The appeal to us is under the educational section. The appeal is not under that clause of the constitution which empowers the province to tax. The right to tax given to the trustees, is a delegated power conferred by the province, which the Dominion cannot interfere with, which the Dominion cannot touch. And, while they have baulked at laying violent hands on the legislative school grant, they would have been better advised, if they also paused and hesitated, before they attempted to legislate with respect to the taxing power of the province. So, Sir, for all these reasons; for all the reasons which I have endeavoured feebly to give, I shall vote with pleasure for the six months' hoist—not that I want an inquiry, not for the reasons which have induced the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) who moved it—but because I am satisfied, that no pretense of case has been established to justify the interference of this Parliament, and that His Excellency the Governor General would have been better advised, if he had said he would not interfere. These are the reasons which have induced me to arrive at this conclusion, and, while others may think, that, as Manitoba has called for an inquiry, an inquiry should be made, and, while I do not pretend to say there is not great force in that, when the province demands and challenges investigation, still, Sir, for my part, I am quite willing to accept all the responsibility of saying that this Bill, as it stands, should never receive the assent of this House, and should now receive the six months' hoist.

Mr. HAGGART. At this late hour, Mr. Speaker, I may be pardoned, if I occupy the time of the House for some time in the discussion of this very important question. The hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. McCarthy) prefaced his remarks by an attack upon my hon. friend the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), in reference to the manner in which he made the statement of this case before the House.

He ridiculed the idea of a young man like my hon. friend occupying the proud position of Minister of Justice, and he regretted the manner in which that hon. gentleman addressed the House on this question. I ask you to contrast the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) with the speeches of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and to draw your own conclusions from them. I will not enter into the discussion, as to whether the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was a paid advocate, or not. That branch of the question I shall not touch. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) accused my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) of copying largely from a pamphlet which Mr. Ewart issued on the school question. I may be pardoned, Sir, because I will plead guilty, to some extent, to quoting from Mr. Ewart's pamphlet on this question. There was nothing adduced by the ex-Minister of Justice in defence of the Bill before the House, but what can be found in the pamphlet issued by Mr. Ewart; and for chronological reasons, if none other, it was advantageous for every person arguing the question to make use of that pamphlet. The hon. gentleman says, why should a man who has been Minister of Justice descend to the use of a pamphlet which Mr. Ewart has had published? Mr. Ewart's pamphlet is simply a chronological summary of the different events of this school question. When the hon. gentleman was criticizing the action of my hon. friend from Pictou in regard to that, he fell into the same mistake, because he used the pamphlet of Mr. Wade nearly all the time he spoke.

The hon. gentleman found fault with the statement of the hon. member for Pictou that the question of education was embodied in the British North America Act, and said that there was no compact made with the people of Quebec prior to confederation. He read the debates which took place at the meeting in Prince Edward Island to show that the question of education did not at all enter into the discussion there. The hon. gentleman forgot to state that Mr. Galt was not satisfied because there was not embodied in the British North America Act the provisions he claimed should be inserted in it for the protection of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec. He forgot to tell us that Sir John Macdonald has left us evidence that the question of education was a subject of the debates that led up to confederation. I will take the opportunity of reading what Sir John Macdonald said in a letter to Lord Monck on June 22nd, 1866:

My dear Lord Monck,—The proceedings have arrived at such a stage that success is certain and it is now not a question ever of strategy. It is merely one of tactics. Galt, the representative of the British race in Lower Canada, has taken the best step possible for settling the