

exemplified by the manner in which he discharged the duties pertaining to his position. Afterwards when, on the death of Sir John Abbott, he was called upon to fill the position of Premier, it is universally admitted that he had won the respect and esteem, not alone of those with whom he was politically allied, but also of those of the opposite side of the House. He came here under a disadvantage. There was, unhappily, a prejudice against him, because he had, from a conscientious feeling, adopted another religion. It is gratifying, and a compliment to the people of this country, to say that when they knew Sir John Thompson, they recognized that that should no longer be a barrier to the esteem in which he should be held. They recognized that he was simply obeying his own conscientious conviction, and he lived down any prejudice that had arisen from a hasty conception of his character. Sir John Thompson's name will long live in the history of Canada. His high character; his pure and unsullied life—the reputation he made for himself in serving not alone the Dominion of Canada, but the empire at large, point him out as a model that may be copied by the young men of this country, because it was through his own merits alone that his elevation to the high position he attained was due. The honourable Senator from Pictou has alluded to the circumstances under which Sir John Thompson died, and to the fact that the country ought to consider the position in which the late statesman left his family. We know that Sir John Thompson, with his great abilities, had he chosen to devote them to business pursuits, instead of giving up his life to his country, could have amassed a fortune to protect his family from want in the future. It is very well known that with ample opportunities to become rich he died a poor man, and although some generous friends have already contributed towards the maintenance of his family in the degree of life in which they have for some time lived, yet, I think it would be but fair and reasonable that the country should be called upon to supplement that, in order that they may feel that Canada was not ungrateful to one of her best sons. I do not quite understand the next paragraph in the speech which refers to our treaty with France. That treaty was made on the 6th February, 1893—over two years ago. The

House sat that session until the first of April, and the treaty was discussed to some extent, but was not adopted. Last session the treaty was adopted, and it was understood that it should go into operation forthwith. The delay, I understand, is due to some extent to the claim of France to be put on the same footing as the colonies of the Empire in dealing with Canada. Of course, Canada would not consent to that and whether France has conceded that point, we are not informed in the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne.

The reference to the Manitoba school question is a very non committal one. Hon. gentlemen will remember that it is now over five years since the question became a burning one—over five years since Manitoba passed an act taking away from the minority those rights that they had supposed were secured to them under the treaty made with Canada in 1871—a treaty which was ratified by the Parliament of Canada in the legislation known as the Manitoba Act, and confirmed by an imperial statute. It is unfortunate that this question was not dealt with promptly at the time. I cannot but feel that had it been so disposed of promptly, we should have had no protest whatever on the subject. I cannot take the view that the question of provincial rights arises in this case at all. I just ask hon. gentlemen to consider for a moment what would be thought if the Quebec legislature were to pass an act taking away from the minority of that province the privileges that they have enjoyed, not alone under the British North America Act, but under local legislation passed by the provincial legislature since confederation? Would it have taken five years for the majority of the people of this country to have discovered that a wrong had been done them? I just put that question now to the majority of the people of Canada. Would they have permitted five years to go over when they knew, not alone that the dissentient schools had been abolished, but that the school-houses erected with the money of the minority had been confiscated and the funds placed in the banks by the trustees of the minority had been roped in by the provincial treasurer—what would have been the indignation in all parts of the Dominion? Would any government dare, under such circumstances, to say “you must go to the courts. It is quite true it will take five years