

**Mr. CHARBONNEAU.** (Translation.) Call me to order if you please; this contempt is not for a law that has been adopted; it applies to a measure under discussion, to a miserable rag of paper, which has been dragged over the land from one bishop's palace to another, begging for a blessing. I can add that the blessing has not yet been given; and it will not likely be for a while, after the statements made before this House. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in raising the point I now submit to the House, my position will not be interpreted as showing ill-will on my part towards the Manitoba minority, or as meaning a refusal to render justice to them. I do not deem it necessary, under the circumstances, having to deal with this unconstitutional measure, to make any declaration of sympathies in this relation. However, I may say that if I can by my vote, my influence or my words, help in the slightest way, the Manitoba minority to be reintegrated into its rights I will always be happy to do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

**Mr. CHARBONNEAU.** (Translation.) My professions are fully worth those of the hon. members who shout oh, oh, on the other side of the House. I will not undertake to show how inefficient, how impracticable and how injurious to the French Canadian minority in Manitoba this Bill is. I only wish to explain the particular reason which prevents me from voting in favour of the Bill now before us. In order to give the hon. Minister of Justice and the Government the opportunity to consider the point which I have just submitted to the House, I move seconded by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. McInnes) that the debate be now adjourned.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I must oppose the adjournment of the debate. The leaders on both sides know why this debate ought not to be adjourned. An understanding was arrived at between them, that this sitting should end this debate. I simply leave the matter to the good sense of the House.

**Mr. MULOCK.** Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has made a motion to adjourn the debate to enable the Government to consider a point of law. I am not myself familiar with the details of the understanding alluded to by the Minister of Finance, but I am under the impression, that that arrangement had in view the conclusion of the debate at this sitting, and, therefore, I quite agree with him, that, unless by common consent, it might not be regarded as a strict adherence to that arrangement, if the motion were pressed. But the making of the motion enables the members, at all events, to discuss the point of law raised by the hon. member; and, if there is anything in that point, the opportunity should be given for its discussion. However, with regard to the point made by the Minister of Finance, if it were

seriously pressed, I think that even at this late hour, the arrangement should be cancelled. Circumstances have arisen which, I think, would warrant all parties in acquiescing in that proposition. I do not see the whip of our side present, but I am informed that, when the arrangement to conclude the debate at Wednesday's sitting was arrived at, a list of the speakers on the Government side was submitted, and, on the expectation that that list was a complete list, the arrangement was arrived at. Immediately thereafter, members on the Government side, whose names were not on that list, at great length addressed the House. Is that correct?

**Mr. FOSTER.** No, it is not correct, as you state it.

**Mr. MULOCK.** I have not any knowledge of the matter myself, but I understand from our own whip, that that is the case. However, the point taken by the hon. member is one worthy of consideration.

**Mr. DICKEY.** Would the hon. gentleman state it.

**Mr. MULOCK.** As I understand the point, it is this. The Manitoba Act allows an appeal to this House, on certain formulas being complied with, namely, where a minority complains of having a grievance, the Government can issue a remedial order, calling upon the provincial legislature to legislate in a certain way, and, in default, jurisdiction accrues to this Parliament. It appears that the Act complained of was a statute of 1890. That Act, the hon. gentleman says, was repealed by the legislature of Manitoba; the petition on which the Government issued the remedial order was not presented to the Government until the 26th of November, 1892; and you have issued a remedial order, calling upon the Manitoba government to reinstate a repealed Act, instead of amending something on the statute-book. Your remedial order, he contends, is a nullity, and, being a nullity, no legislation can be founded upon it. Of course, any mistake in a Bill is amendable, but, if the order itself is a nullity, there can be no legislation, and there cannot be jurisdiction in this House unless there is a valid remedial order. That is the point raised by the hon. gentleman on the motion to adjourn, and the motion of adjournment is, I presume, made to enable gentlemen to address themselves to this point, not to depart from the agreement arrived at.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

**Mr. LISTER.** It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to call "question," but the point raised by the hon. gentleman is a very important one, and goes to the very foundation of the right of this House to interfere with the legislation of Manitoba. It is a point which, I think, should receive proper consideration at the hands of the Minister of Jus-