

public atten-
bishops and
understand
interfere with
Parliament in
duties or to
know any-
religion,
ous thing to
that church

a man who
reh alone he
ecclesiastical
om him the
e it to be a
tell any man
mber of Par-
to the elect-
vise, that if
I declare you
olle. I have
ut out a few
very serious

Catholics in
ention it, and
e of creating
it may make
Roman Catho-
I should not,
g of it. But
the sentiments
the Opposition
ntleman said:
d revere my
urch, yet in
as a Liberal
the principles
ated, known
Reformers of
to be control-
y even by my
the first duty
o do his duty
a unwilling to
church, I bet-
ter than they
nsive because
in doing so;
er objects for
Father La-
ssionary—I do
ance, because
ght, and doing
duty—declared
this Remedial
Catholic. He

you do not be-
cede to our just
ment, which is
I law, be beaten
rm to the end of
regret, that the
ed to the clergy,
may have fallen

St. Boniface
e words:

that the Catholics
ours is to settle

the school question. No, the Catholic hierarchy—you know it, and I can say it plainly—the Catholic hierarchy leads the Catholics in their religious conviction, and all those who do not follow the hierarchy are not Catholics.

And he has instructed them that this was clearly their duty, because the church instructed them in their line of conscience, by telling them that it was their duty to support the Bill which gives back these rights to the church.

When the hierarchy has spoken there is no use for any Catholic to say to the contrary, for if he does he is no longer a Catholic. Such a man may carry the title, but I declare this as a bishop: I say to-night, and I say it with plain authority, a Catholic who does not follow the hierarchy on the school question is no more a Catholic, and who will be the one to entitle such a one to the name of Catholic? Where is the society or government who will give him the right to call himself a Catholic when I in my authority as a Catholic bishop, declare that such a man has no right to 'he name.

Then, I say, the bishop is putting them outside the pale of the church, and that is a very serious matter for Catholics. Sir, I regard that as a most unfortunate thing, because it is interfering with what most people in this country look upon as the right of every member of Parliament to do, namely, to follow the dictates of his own judgment in matters where the state must control, and where the state must be above the church and above religion, and where members believe that they know the condition of things better than the men who are attempting to give advice. I do not blame the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church for doing so. I do not blame them for bringing every influence they can bear upon the church to do so, but I think it is unfortunate that that influence should be brought to bear. A man who has the courage of his convictions, and who has the manhood and the integrity to say: In the face of all that, I regard my duty to the state as so and so, and I shall carry it out, notwithstanding the fact that I may be buried under the anathema of the church, and notwithstanding that the whole church shall be arrayed against me, and support the party opposed to me; I say that the man who has the moral courage to say that will be endorsed by the people of this country. They will regard him with respect and honour, and they will look upon him as a greater statesman than they did before. This is one of the features of this contest which makes me to-day go very strongly against this Bill. We are told that if we do not legislate in this case, Quebec may take away the rights from the Protestants of that province. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) speak in the generous and manly tone he did this afternoon, when he said that whether the minority in Manitoba got their rights or not, Quebec would never descend to any principle so low. I always

had a high opinion of the French-Canadian people, I always regarded them as chivalrous, as honourable, and as disposed to do right to the minority down there. But above and beyond all that, I say that whether we legislate or do not legislate, the rights of the minority are not in danger in that province. There was a solemn compact entered into with the province of Quebec in this matter, and I believe that no person would dare to break up the original contract which was entered into between the two Canadas before confederation, and embodied in the Confederation Act of 1867. And should the people down in that country wish to legislate upon that question, and if they felt as strongly on it as do the people of Manitoba, would the people of Manitoba be disposed to interfere with their rights? I think they would not. And if the people of Quebec came to this House would they be inclined to regard with quietness and courtesy any effort that was made to interfere with their rights. I think they would not. They would be the very strongest to create an agitation that would be large in its proportions, and dangerous in its results, if they were not allowed to control their rights, as they were allowed in the Jesuits' Estates case. They would tell us that any legislation against them was an interference with the rights belonging to their province, and they would not brook any interference. Now what should the Government do with this question at the present time? I say they should leave it to the people of the province of Manitoba to deal with as in their judgment they think best. That was what they should have done in the first place. While the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council said to the minority: You have the right to appeal, what did that mean? Some say that the Government are now only carrying out the judgment of the Privy Council. I do not so understand it. Although that was very fiercely contended a few months ago, no member of the Cabinet to-day will say that the Government is obliged to take this course because of the judgment of the Privy Council. That judgment of the Privy Council was an opinion in the nature of advice to the Governor in Council here. It told them that the minority had the right to appeal to them for a hearing of their case. That was all. They heard that case, and according to their judgment and wisdom they could say either "yes," or "no," you have a grievance and we will change that law, or we will not change it. It was equally their right to say: we will not interfere with Manitoba, or we will interfere. It was the right of this Government to say: if the circumstances are such that we ought to interfere, then we can interfere with it; or, if the condition of things are such in Manitoba that they cannot successfully carry on two educational systems, we shall not interfere with it. But, Sir, this Government were equally at liberty to say either one