

**THE HERALD**  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1896.  
PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY.  
SUBSCRIPTION—\$1.00 A YEAR.  
JAMES McISAAC,  
Editor & Proprietor.

**The Second Reading Carried.**

As will be seen by reference to our account of parliamentary proceedings, a vote on the second reading of the remedial bill was reached in the House of Commons on Friday evening last after a sitting of about 39 hours. When the vote was taken, there were in the chamber, including Mr. Speaker, 207 of the 215 members that constitute the House of Commons. As the Speaker did not vote, the members on the floor of the House and voting numbered 206. On Mr. Laurier's amendment the vote stood 115, (108 Conservatives and 7 Liberals) against the amendment, and 91, (73 Grits and 18 Conservatives) for the amendment (O'Brien) for the amendment. This gave the Government a majority of 24. On the second division, the second reading of the bill, the Government's majority was 18, the reduction of six votes being caused by Messrs. Hughes, Ross and McGillivray, who voted against Laurier's amendment, voting also against the second reading. The eight members, who did not vote, are thus accounted for: Sir Donald Smith and Mr. Rowland were paired; Hon. Mr. Montague and Messrs. Corby and Denison, Conservatives, are absent through illness, and three constituencies, Pontiac, Soulanges and Missisquoi, formerly held by Government supporters, are vacant. The only Grits that did not vote were Mr. Rowland, who was paired with Sir Donald Smith. Supporting the seven Grits, who voted with the Government, had followed their Leader, still the Government would have had a majority of ten over Grits and dissenting conservatives, on the first division, and a net majority of 4 on the second vote.

It is a source of the highest gratification to all lovers of justice and fair play, all lovers of constitutional and representative government to know that, in spite of the desperate attempts made by the opponents of the Government, to wreck the administration, by fomenting racial and religious discord, the remedial bill passed its second reading by such a respectable majority. What a contrast between the conduct of the Government and that of the opposition. Here was a question arising out of the constitution of the country, forced upon the Government for settlement without desire on their part. As statesmen and as representatives of the people, it was their duty to meet the consequences of themselves, pushed it through to the end, hand Mr. Laurier and his friends, always waiting McCawber-like, for "something to turn up," in the most contemptible manner, worked the question for all it was worth to gain party advantage. They took counsel with the authors of the unjust and tyrannical Manitoba school law, and advised them to hold out no hope of an amicable settlement. The Government relied upon the spirit of justice and fair play prevailing among the Canadian people, and especially among the people's representatives, and they have not been disappointed. Justice has so far triumphed. All honor to the men who have so nobly performed their duty, in the face of the unhallored influences exerted against them.

Although we do not publish the division list, our readers will readily see from a perusal of the names of those who went against their party, how our Island members voted. Messrs. McDonald and McLean, of course, voted against Mr. Laurier's amendment, and for the second reading of the bill. Messrs. Davies, Walsh and Yeo, voted against the Government in both divisions. But what about Perry the "noble"? This was a measure to redress a grievance; to right a wrong from which his compatriots and co-religionists in Manitoba are suffering. Here was an opportunity for him to do something "noble." Surely he did not miss it! Yes he did; we look in vain for his name in the list of those who voted to grant relief to Mr. Perry's countrymen and co-religionists in Manitoba. In his old age, he has thought proper to place himself on record as the oppressor of his countrymen and the contemner of the religion he professes. This is the most "ignoble" act of his political career. Shame!

The speech which the Provincial Government placed in the Lieutenant Governor's hands at the opening of the Legislature is a good deal like a geometrical line. It has length without either breadth or depth.

Word comes from Victoria, B. C., that the capital of the Fiji Islands was destroyed by a hurricane on the 6th inst.

While a country maintains a good volume and value of export trade, the industrial conditions may confidently be considered sound, and the future of the country secure. That is the condition of Canada; and since our neighbors in the United States voted in 1892 for "a change" and got it in 1894, the exports of that country have rapidly declined. For 1895 the domestic exports were \$793,000,000, or \$73,000,000 less than for the previous year, which, in turn, though somewhat higher than for 1893, was \$146,000,000 less than the exports of 1892; that is, since 1892 the annual export trade in United States products has declined by no less than \$222,000,000. During the same year Canada exports show an increase. The contrast is instructive. The United States voted for a change, Canada didn't; and what's more she's not going to do so.—Halifax Herald.

ORANGE Past Grand Master Robinson, of Manitoba, the other day, in response to a toast touching on the Manitoba schools, said "this gave the Government a majority of 24. On the second division, the second reading of the bill, the Government's majority was 18, the reduction of six votes being caused by Messrs. Hughes, Ross and McGillivray, who voted against Laurier's amendment, voting also against the second reading. The eight members, who did not vote, are thus accounted for: Sir Donald Smith and Mr. Rowland were paired; Hon. Mr. Montague and Messrs. Corby and Denison, Conservatives, are absent through illness, and three constituencies, Pontiac, Soulanges and Missisquoi, formerly held by Government supporters, are vacant. The only Grits that did not vote were Mr. Rowland, who was paired with Sir Donald Smith. Supporting the seven Grits, who voted with the Government, had followed their Leader, still the Government would have had a majority of ten over Grits and dissenting conservatives, on the first division, and a net majority of 4 on the second vote."

As intimated in the House of Commons during the debate on the remedial bill, the Government have sent a delegation to Winnipeg, to negotiate for a settlement of the school question with the Greenway Government. A formal order-in-council appointing Messrs. Dickson and Desjardins and Sir Donald A. Smith commissioners for that purpose, was passed Saturday. The three delegates left for Winnipeg Monday. It is understood that the instructions to the delegates are to negotiate, if possible, a settlement, if possible, as will be satisfactory to the minority. They will, of course be in daily communication with the government, so that the authorities at Ottawa will be kept advised of the progress of the negotiations.

It transpires that the federal opposition have been urging Premier Greenway not to negotiate for a settlement until the remedial bill is withdrawn, but the government cannot accede to a request of this kind. Meantime the committee stage of the bill will be proceeded with.

Montreal Gazette: The Greenway Government came into power in Manitoba at the beginning of 1895. The expenditure in the preceding year was \$520,190. The gross debt in the same time has been increased from \$3,500,000 to very nearly \$5,000,000. Under its administration the Province's debt per head has become the largest of any of the Provinces in Canada, and the expenditure per head the largest of any in British Columbia. As the people of the Province, apparently, approve of the measures which rendered these increases necessary, and as the Government proposes to tax the people of the Province itself for further sums required to meet the growing expenditure, it may not be an outsider's business to be severe in the criticism of the situation. It may be pointed out, however, that the record of the Liberal administration in Manitoba, like the record of every other Liberal Provincial administration, serves to make ridiculous the claim of the Liberal party at Ottawa, that its accession to power would mean any economy in the financial administration of the Dominion. There never has been in Canada a Liberal Government, Federal or Provincial, that has increased the expenditure, or augmented the taxes, or added to the debt. In its financial record the Greenway Government of Manitoba is like every other Liberal administration Canada has ever had.

Our readers will remember that a few months ago we felt called upon to expose the disingenuous statements of a certain Rev. Mr. Thomson, regarding school matters at Bathurst, N. B. On the occasion of his remarks here, Mr. Thomson intimated that he and his brother Orangemen had succeeded in reopening the case, and were about instituting a thorough investigation, from which they hoped for excellent results. Well, the investigation has been concluded and judgment delivered. The case, as has been reported in this country from one end to the other. There are the minorities in other provinces, demanding of you where they shall stand and how they shall be treated if in coming years their time of trial comes, and they will have to appeal to this same high court of parliament and invoke the jurisdiction of the nation. There is the parliament, sir, invested, knowingly, definitely, positively, invested by the fathers of confederation in the constitution, with the jurisdiction to maintain their rights and to restore them if they are taken away. This parliament is asked to decide. It is watched by Canada; it is watched by the world. On grounds of course, on grounds of justice, on grounds of good faith, make your answer to the appeal, make your answer to Canada, who is watching you, and to the world, which will judge of your conduct in history, in this country, in this eventful day. Shall the chapter be a record of nobleness and adequacy, or a record of weakness and inefficiency? Shall we stamp ourselves as a people, a nation, that will be recorded in future ages as magnificent and imperial? Let us take, and pass on that gleaming torch under whose kindly light the fathers of confederation and justice, on many times far more troublesome and far less advanced than these times to-day, into an era of harmony and continued peace. Let us not allow the spirit of our great mother country, whose foundations were laid on the solid granite of good faith, and whose wide and wondrous superstructure has been built up on the same granite of strong and generous toleration. Let us prove ourselves now, in the twentieth year of our existence, as we did under the circumstances of our natal birth, a people, a nation, that will be worthy to rank amongst the best and greatest of nations. (Loud cheers.)

Proceeding, Sir Charles quoted from a speech of Mr. McCarthy to show that he had argued that in the case of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, as regards the bringing of Nova Scotia into union and how he had acted but as

has been evidenced in its harmonious workings for nearly thirty years. There is the case of the minority, small in the area of those who suffer, but large, let me tell you, in the area of those who sympathize with it in this country from one end to the other. There are the minorities in other provinces, demanding of you where they shall stand and how they shall be treated if in coming years their time of trial comes, and they will have to appeal to this same high court of parliament and invoke the jurisdiction of the nation. There is the parliament, sir, invested, knowingly, definitely, positively, invested by the fathers of confederation in the constitution, with the jurisdiction to maintain their rights and to restore them if they are taken away. This parliament is asked to decide. It is watched by Canada; it is watched by the world. On grounds of course, on grounds of justice, on grounds of good faith, make your answer to the appeal, make your answer to Canada, who is watching you, and to the world, which will judge of your conduct in history, in this country, in this eventful day. Shall the chapter be a record of nobleness and adequacy, or a record of weakness and inefficiency? Shall we stamp ourselves as a people, a nation, that will be recorded in future ages as magnificent and imperial? Let us take, and pass on that gleaming torch under whose kindly light the fathers of confederation and justice, on many times far more troublesome and far less advanced than these times to-day, into an era of harmony and continued peace. Let us not allow the spirit of our great mother country, whose foundations were laid on the solid granite of good faith, and whose wide and wondrous superstructure has been built up on the same granite of strong and generous toleration. Let us prove ourselves now, in the twentieth year of our existence, as we did under the circumstances of our natal birth, a people, a nation, that will be worthy to rank amongst the best and greatest of nations. (Loud cheers.)

**Remedial Legislation.**

We have, at present, room for only the prerogative of Mr. Foster's great speech. After proving most conclusively and logically the constitutional right of the Manitoba minority to separate schools, the Minister of Finance concluded thus: "And now, sir, one word to the conservatives." One word, if you please, Mr. Speaker, and that is a word to the conservatives in this house and in the other house. My word to the conservatives is simply this: For eighteen years we have supported a certain policy; we have given to it our energy; we have looked out that policy in the country, and we have during these years searched our full faith in the effects of that policy and its superiority to any other policy. For eighteen years we have seen progress and development in this country under that policy and under the administration of the liberal conservative party, and we believe that continuation on the same lines is the best for the future of this country. You see the compact of 1870 and of 1870, and know how they arose. They are written into the constitution; they are your government as well as ourselves. They would have tested any government that would have been in power. You see the appeal, the decision, the grievance, the power of resumption, the highest tribunal of appeal, the highest court of the land. That highest court has remitted to your government, which you have supported, a policy which was not asked for by them, a something which arises out of the constitution and by circumstances over which they have no control. This policy was thrown upon them for decision. Are there not other parts of the liberal conservative policy of some importance as well as this, which are conserved in this house, and outside of this house, to take a broader, a greater and a wider interest in the consideration of this matter, and at the same time to ask themselves whether it is worth while to accept of a point of well settled sentiment, for a point, which may well be a principle, and on a single position, to go against the party and the policy which they have supported for eighteen years, and which they believe has been the best party and policy for this country? You see the liberal party utterly discomfited in the country. You see that party without any policy which can appeal to the business interests and the solid common sense of the electors of Canada. You see that liberal party today marching up to a test before the people of this country, and their whole hope of victory (I say it earnestly and honestly) is that they may get into power, not because of the strength of their own arms and batteries, but because they hope for some defection from the ranks of their opponents, which shall ally out to their help, and enable them to take the citadel to which they aspire. What answer is it to the country's best interests if we go back to them with a defeated policy, and a defeated government, putting into power a policy and government in which we do not believe, but which we do believe will not be for the best interests of Canada.

If we have nothing to place against that, other than this question, upon which we hold remedial beliefs may be put, we can not to some extent subordinate these opinions for the greater good, the larger policy, the more valuable and the more precious interests of the whole? What will it have profited us, even if we gain a point of sentiment or of principle in this regard; what will it have profited us, if we lose the progressive policy which is it to the country's best interests? After six years, sir, we come here under circumstances such as I have detailed. What is it, then, for this parliament to do? On the one hand, there is a well founded repugnance to do what, even though clearly within our right to do, the province can easily and far better do to ourselves? There is along with that a lot of subordinate considerations, ranging from principle through personal consideration and party consideration, that have brought some to vote against this bill as a just administrative of affairs. On the other hand, what is there in the genius and the spirit of the constitution of this country? There is the splendid lesson of toleration and compromise which has been carried out in that constitution, and which to you in that constitution, and which to

the union at any time would become a dead right. Yes in regard to Manitoba, by reason of his connection with the case as counsel, he argued the very opposite. (Hear, hear.) Before the privy council in 1882, he argued the appeal clauses of the act was practically a dead letter, while previous to this he had expressed the opposite view. (Cheers.) The conservatives were charged with coercion. If all the exercise of the admitted power of parliament was coercion, then the liberals had a worse record than the conservatives. During the Mackenzie regime an average of four and a half provincial statutes had been disallowed per year, while during the rule of the conservatives the yearly average was only two. And in every case the liberals had acted without commission of enquiry or investigation. (Cheers.) While Mr. McCarthy was an independent member of the house, and not drawing fees from interested parties, he had waxed eloquent about the rights of minorities and the duty of protecting them. History, sir, is making the government had afforded Manitoba abundant opportunities to present all the facts in their possession, and had used every endeavor to get the province to accept of the Manitoba school law. It was worthy to say, as Mr. Martin and others had to the Protestants of Quebec: You need not be afraid your rights are guaranteed by the anti-union compact. The Manitoba minority has not the same protection and is, therefore, more exposed to the protection of the parliament. He concluded by urging the adoption of the bill on the broad basis of toleration and justice, a method which had always been favored by the Privy Council in the cases which built up and sustained the empire.

The debate was continued on the 18th by Mr. Mills of Bothwell, who gave the house a review of the historical and constitutional aspect of the case. He held that the question of separate schools was not an issue, and should be decided on the merits of the merits of the minority was not taken to determine whether separate schools were a good or bad thing. Only the rights of the province were given by it by the constitution. In certain cases the federal parliament had the power to supervise provincial legislation and so long as the federal parliament acted within the sphere of its authority it could do as it pleased. As to interference with the rights of the province. Parliament was given trusts to guard and the duty of parliament was to see that they were not impaired. The question of separate schools had attached great importance to the keeping of good faith with the minorities, and so introduced a saving clause with respect to the educational legislation of all the provinces. Before exercise of the power it should be determined whether there was a grievance, its extent and operation, and on these points in the Manitoba school case further light was necessary. The census showed that in two hundred and twenty school sections of France and England were less than 100. If it were possible to establish them at all. What evidence had the government there a sufficient number of qualified teachers in Manitoba, having knowledge of the English language, after access Mr. Mills continued his speech. In his opinion the two fundamental principles of the constitution were thoroughly consistent. In England the judgment of the privy council on the case was invariably accepted, but for the house here to throw aside the judgment of the privy council was to leave the field of administration to go into the field of revolution. (Cheers.) The government had not approached Manitoba in a proper spirit and so the remedial bill was not proper before the house. It should not have been introduced until every means of conciliation had been exhausted.

Sir C. H. Tupper resumed the debate on the remedial bill, on the 17th, and quickly got after Clark Wallace and Dalton McCarthy. He said that Mr. Wallace became a member of the Government and from time to time as such he made the solemn declarations of the remedial bill, on the 17th, and quickly got after Clark Wallace and Dalton McCarthy. He said that Mr. Wallace became a member of the Government and from time to time as such he made the solemn declarations of the remedial bill, on the 17th, and quickly got after Clark Wallace and Dalton McCarthy. He said that Mr. Wallace became a member of the Government and from time to time as such he made the solemn declarations of the remedial bill, on the 17th, and quickly got after Clark Wallace and Dalton McCarthy.

Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., expressed satisfaction at Mr. Wall's speech, which he entirely supported, and commended the government on the question and refuted the arguments of other liberals and Mr. McCarthy. He had agreed with the government's stand on the question at issue, but it was not a question of maintaining the constitution. Moreover, Mr. Mills had proved the duty of the action on the part of the government had been created and imposed, and that interference on the lines specified in the constitution as to this case was not coercion. After defining three moral hours to the vindication of the position of the government Mr. Mills had abandoned the principles for which he had spoken, taken up the political side of the question and taken exception to the government's methods in dealing with the question. In view of the importance of the question before the house he (Sir Charles) would refer to some of the speeches delivered against the bill, on which the Government had staked its existence. He just dealt with Mr. Laurier's speech, which he characterized as a mass of contradictions. Reading between the lines one could see he spoke in favor of the stand of the government which he denounced. He had been following a new and desperate policy to obtain the alliance of McCarthy a man whom he had denounced as unpatriotic in the country. Forgetting what was due to his race, his religion and our common country, Mr. Laurier formulated a policy calculated to make a happy combination with McCarthy. How desperate his purpose? How truly does misfortune make strange bed-fellows? (Cheers) Only one statement of his own Mr. Laurier had contradicted. He said there was a page of confederation by (Sir Charles) had forgotten to read, and that was how he could be so bold as to make such a statement. Perhaps Mr. Laurier had been misled by misinformation. Proceeding, he reviewed his connection with the bringing of Nova Scotia into union and how he had acted but as

the fathers of confederation, had proposed, and had so acted themselves. (Cheers.) An interruption by Mr. Martin the member from Winnipeg, led to his being called upon by the speaker. Continuing, Sir Charles said it was true that in the interests of the country that both nationalities, French and English, should dwell together in harmony. Mr. McCarthy was responsible for fighting the torch of discord in this country, but it was gratifying to know that his efforts had been impotent. (Cheers.) It was doing gross injustice to the Protestants of this country if any one supposed that they shrunk from rendering justice to the weak minority in this country. He appealed to the people of Canada, independent of race and religion, to those ardent Protestants, who felt keenly on this subject, not to put themselves on record as opposed to standing by the constitution. In conclusion he said: "I would a thousand times rather fall in defence of the admitted rights of a weak minority of a race and religion not my own, than ride rough shod over the power of the rule of the constitution of my country and the denial of the just claims of a minority at the behest of a majority of my race and faith who were trampling their dearest rights under their feet." (Loud cheers.)

Dr. Weldon followed Sir Charles Tupper, and made a lengthy speech in opposition to the bill. He was followed by Mr. Easton, who made an admirable argument in favor of remedial legislation, and administered a severe castigation to Weldon. He said he had often heard of peace and union existing in New Brunswick. He desired to say, however, that the rights of the Catholics in New Brunswick had been taken away as ruthlessly as those of the minority in Manitoba, but in New Brunswick they had submitted to the law. After an altercation with Dr. Weldon, Hon. Mr. Costigan continued his argument in favor of the bill, and closed with an appeal for justice to the Manitoba Catholics. Mr. Costigan was followed by Mr. Edwards in opposition to the bill. Then followed Mr. Prior, Sir James Grant, Metcalf, Davis and several others in French and English for and against.

It had been agreed upon between the leaders on both sides of the House that the debate should close during the sitting that commenced at 3 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon. As quite a number of members who wished to express their opinion had not yet spoken, it was evident that the sitting would be a unusually long one. So it proved, as the vote was not taken till 5 o'clock on Friday morning, the adjournment taking place an hour later. Thus the House sat continuously for 30 hours, one of the longest sittings in the history of the Dominion Parliament. As is usual during such protracted sittings, considerable levity was indulged in towards the close. Speakers on both sides regarded the division as a question of the House was taken, Sir Donald Smith arose and a profound bell toll on the chamber. He said he would not deal with the merits of the case, but would express opinions in view of his long and intimate connection with Manitoba affairs, especially at the time of union. He was appointed special commissioner and given more power than other commissioners, the letter of instruction to him from the government practically being a copy of the settlement of his judgment. The settlers had got misgivings as to the treatment they would receive from the dominion government, and at the convention which took place, and before the division in the rights and privileges would be protected and justice done to them in every respect. At the time there were Catholic and Protestant schools in existence, and the government of the country gave a grant of money and land to each. If there was but little discussion on the schools at the convention with the delegates representing the settlers, it was because they thought themselves unnecessary. (Applause.) They were exceedingly simple minded people and when word was pledged they considered it as good as a written agreement. Evidence of this was the fact that when making the transfers of land they simply went to the agents of the Dominion Bay Co., who kept the land register, and made a verbal statement of the transfer to him. The settlers felt sure all their privileges would be preserved, the evidence that they considered separate schools among those rights was the separate school bill of 1871 passed by the Manitoba legislature, many members of which had been delegates at the conference with the dominion commissioners. When passing the bill they were looking to what had taken place in the conference. The majority then, who are the minority now, were entitled to all the privileges, at least the majority now had and faith should be kept with them. (Applause.) He had gone to Winnipeg, not at the request of the government, but at the suggestion of the governor general, who was sincerely desirous of seeing the question amicably settled. By his conference with the Manitoba government he gathered that Mr. Greenway was disposed to do what was right, and he had great hopes that a conference with the dominion would result. In conclusion, he would like to see the second reading of the bill carried by acclamation. He did not think there would be any necessity for a third reading.

A few minutes after five o'clock, Friday morning the division bells were set a ringing, and from Mr. Speaker were heard the welcome command, "Call in the members." Ten minutes after five o'clock, Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., entered the chamber and was greeted with prolonged and hearty applause. Five minutes later the whips entered. The speaker then put the question on Mr. Laurier's motion in amendment, with

the union at any time would become a dead right. Yes in regard to Manitoba, by reason of his connection with the case as counsel, he argued the very opposite. (Hear, hear.) Before the privy council in 1882, he argued the appeal clauses of the act was practically a dead letter, while previous to this he had expressed the opposite view. (Cheers.) The conservatives were charged with coercion. If all the exercise of the admitted power of parliament was coercion, then the liberals had a worse record than the conservatives. During the Mackenzie regime an average of four and a half provincial statutes had been disallowed per year, while during the rule of the conservatives the yearly average was only two. And in every case the liberals had acted without commission of enquiry or investigation. (Cheers.) While Mr. McCarthy was an independent member of the house, and not drawing fees from interested parties, he had waxed eloquent about the rights of minorities and the duty of protecting them. History, sir, is making the government had afforded Manitoba abundant opportunities to present all the facts in their possession, and had used every endeavor to get the province to accept of the Manitoba school law. It was worthy to say, as Mr. Martin and others had to the Protestants of Quebec: You need not be afraid your rights are guaranteed by the anti-union compact. The Manitoba minority has not the same protection and is, therefore, more exposed to the protection of the parliament. He concluded by urging the adoption of the bill on the broad basis of toleration and justice, a method which had always been favored by the Privy Council in the cases which built up and sustained the empire.

The debate was continued on the 18th by Mr. Mills of Bothwell, who gave the house a review of the historical and constitutional aspect of the case. He held that the question of separate schools was not an issue, and should be decided on the merits of the merits of the minority was not taken to determine whether separate schools were a good or bad thing. Only the rights of the province were given by it by the constitution. In certain cases the federal parliament had the power to supervise provincial legislation and so long as the federal parliament acted within the sphere of its authority it could do as it pleased. As to interference with the rights of the province. Parliament was given trusts to guard and the duty of parliament was to see that they were not impaired. The question of separate schools had attached great importance to the keeping of good faith with the minorities, and so introduced a saving clause with respect to the educational legislation of all the provinces. Before exercise of the power it should be determined whether there was a grievance, its extent and operation, and on these points in the Manitoba school case further light was necessary. The census showed that in two hundred and twenty school sections of France and England were less than 100. If it were possible to establish them at all. What evidence had the government there a sufficient number of qualified teachers in Manitoba, having knowledge of the English language, after access Mr. Mills continued his speech. In his opinion the two fundamental principles of the constitution were thoroughly consistent. In England the judgment of the privy council on the case was invariably accepted, but for the house here to throw aside the judgment of the privy council was to leave the field of administration to go into the field of revolution. (Cheers.) The government had not approached Manitoba in a proper spirit and so the remedial bill was not proper before the house. It should not have been introduced until every means of conciliation had been exhausted.

Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., expressed satisfaction at Mr. Wall's speech, which he entirely supported, and commended the government on the question and refuted the arguments of other liberals and Mr. McCarthy. He had agreed with the government's stand on the question at issue, but it was not a question of maintaining the constitution. Moreover, Mr. Mills had proved the duty of the action on the part of the government had been created and imposed, and that interference on the lines specified in the constitution as to this case was not coercion. After defining three moral hours to the vindication of the position of the government Mr. Mills had abandoned the principles for which he had spoken, taken up the political side of the question and taken exception to the government's methods in dealing with the question. In view of the importance of the question before the house he (Sir Charles) would refer to some of the speeches delivered against the bill, on which the Government had staked its existence. He just dealt with Mr. Laurier's speech, which he characterized as a mass of contradictions. Reading between the lines one could see he spoke in favor of the stand of the government which he denounced. He had been following a new and desperate policy to obtain the alliance of McCarthy a man whom he had denounced as unpatriotic in the country. Forgetting what was due to his race, his religion and our common country, Mr. Laurier formulated a policy calculated to make a happy combination with McCarthy. How desperate his purpose? How truly does misfortune make strange bed-fellows? (Cheers) Only one statement of his own Mr. Laurier had contradicted. He said there was a page of confederation by (Sir Charles) had forgotten to read, and that was how he could be so bold as to make such a statement. Perhaps Mr. Laurier had been misled by misinformation. Proceeding, he reviewed his connection with the bringing of Nova Scotia into union and how he had acted but as

the fathers of confederation, had proposed, and had so acted themselves. (Cheers.) An interruption by Mr. Martin the member from Winnipeg, led to his being called upon by the speaker. Continuing, Sir Charles said it was true that in the interests of the country that both nationalities, French and English, should dwell together in harmony. Mr. McCarthy was responsible for fighting the torch of discord in this country, but it was gratifying to know that his efforts had been impotent. (Cheers.) It was doing gross injustice to the Protestants of this country if any one supposed that they shrunk from rendering justice to the weak minority in this country. He appealed to the people of Canada, independent of race and religion, to those ardent Protestants, who felt keenly on this subject, not to put themselves on record as opposed to standing by the constitution. In conclusion he said: "I would a thousand times rather fall in defence of the admitted rights of a weak minority of a race and religion not my own, than ride rough shod over the power of the rule of the constitution of my country and the denial of the just claims of a minority at the behest of a majority of my race and faith who were trampling their dearest rights under their feet." (Loud cheers.)

Dr. Weldon followed Sir Charles Tupper, and made a lengthy speech in opposition to the bill. He was followed by Mr. Easton, who made an admirable argument in favor of remedial legislation, and administered a severe castigation to Weldon. He said he had often heard of peace and union existing in New Brunswick. He desired to say, however, that the rights of the Catholics in New Brunswick had been taken away as ruthlessly as those of the minority in Manitoba, but in New Brunswick they had submitted to the law. After an altercation with Dr. Weldon, Hon. Mr. Costigan continued his argument in favor of the bill, and closed with an appeal for justice to the Manitoba Catholics. Mr. Costigan was followed by Mr. Edwards in opposition to the bill. Then followed Mr. Prior, Sir James Grant, Metcalf, Davis and several others in French and English for and against.

It had been agreed upon between the leaders on both sides of the House that the debate should close during the sitting that commenced at 3 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon. As quite a number of members who wished to express their opinion had not yet spoken, it was evident that the sitting would be a unusually long one. So it proved, as the vote was not taken till 5 o'clock on Friday morning, the adjournment taking place an hour later. Thus the House sat continuously for 30 hours, one of the longest sittings in the history of the Dominion Parliament. As is usual during such protracted sittings, considerable levity was indulged in towards the close. Speakers on both sides regarded the division as a question of the House was taken, Sir Donald Smith arose and a profound bell toll on the chamber. He said he would not deal with the merits of the case, but would express opinions in view of his long and intimate connection with Manitoba affairs, especially at the time of union. He was appointed special commissioner and given more power than other commissioners, the letter of instruction to him from the government practically being a copy of the settlement of his judgment. The settlers had got misgivings as to the treatment they would receive from the dominion government, and at the convention which took place, and before the division in the rights and privileges would be protected and justice done to them in every respect. At the time there were Catholic and Protestant schools in existence, and the government of the country gave a grant of money and land to each. If there was but little discussion on the schools at the convention with the delegates representing the settlers, it was because they thought themselves unnecessary. (Applause.) They were exceedingly simple minded people and when word was pledged they considered it as good as a written agreement. Evidence of this was the fact that when making the transfers of land they simply went to the agents of the Dominion Bay Co., who kept the land register, and made a verbal statement of the transfer to him. The settlers felt sure all their privileges would be preserved, the evidence that they considered separate schools among those rights was the separate school bill of 1871 passed by the Manitoba legislature, many members of which had been delegates at the conference with the dominion commissioners. When passing the bill they were looking to what had taken place in the conference. The majority then, who are the minority now, were entitled to all the privileges, at least the majority now had and faith should be kept with them. (Applause.) He had gone to Winnipeg, not at the request of the government, but at the suggestion of the governor general, who was sincerely desirous of seeing the question amicably settled. By his conference with the Manitoba government he gathered that Mr. Greenway was disposed to do what was right, and he had great hopes that a conference with the dominion would result. In conclusion, he would like to see the second reading of the bill carried by acclamation. He did not think there would be any necessity for a third reading.

A few minutes after five o'clock, Friday morning the division bells were set a ringing, and from Mr. Speaker were heard the welcome command, "Call in the members." Ten minutes after five o'clock, Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., entered the chamber and was greeted with prolonged and hearty applause. Five minutes later the whips entered. The speaker then put the question on Mr. Laurier's motion in amendment, with

Our Great BARGAIN OFFER IN DRESS GOODS.

Order Samples By Mail.

We have placed on our Front Counter 35 to 40 pieces of fashionable Black and Colored Dress Goods, worth from 50 cents to 70 cents per yard, for the wonderful low price of

39¢ per yard.

IF YOU CANT Come and see for yourself, order samples by mail.

STANLEY BROS

BROWN'S BLOCK.

(Mention this paper.)

GRO GR GROW GROWI GROWING

Our business is growing. It's not the New Store & Co.—the FURNITURE and the PRICES.

Medium Furniture

FOR—

People of Small Means.

CHAIRS, 28 cents each.

BEDSTEADS, \$1.50.

LOUNGES, \$4.00.

Mark Wright & Co., Ltd. Mark Wright & Co., Ltd.

Who sell at Selling Prices Who sell at Selling Prices.

Millmen's Hardware.

Rotary Saws, Belts, Lace Leather, Swages, and all Mill Tools and Oils.

Farmers Hardware.

Axes, Shovels, Nails and all small Hardware.

Sporting Hardware.

Gunpowder, Shot, Caps, &c., &c.

Painters Hardware.

Paints and Oils, and all kinds of Gold Leaf, Bronze, and Campbell's Stock of Brushes.

House Keepers Hardware.

Jewel Stoves and Everything wanted in the kitchen.

All the public admit that our prices are below all others.

To save money you must trade with us.

R. B. NORTON & CO.

City Hardware Store, Charlottetown.

Men's Suits

AND

Spring Overcoats

OVERALLS and

Waterproof Coats,

AT—

JAS. PATON & CO'S.

the result that majority was two later side the for Laurier's six months, McCarthy, Neill, Cockburn, McLean, (East Y. Craig, Wilton, Rosemond, Cartwright, total of sixteen out of McCarthy and he voted against the vote, Fremont, Ba McLeese, Angers, Sir Donald Smith, McLean, Denison, were absent. The and three Conservatives, Fontaine, Soulanges are vacant. When second reading was Tupper and Mr. La carried on the several members with the result that year. The majority is majority 18. The Government's majority the previous vote of three Conservatives and McGillivray and O'Brien) for the amendment. This gave the Government a majority of 24. On the second division, the second reading of the bill, the Government's majority was 18, the reduction of six votes being caused by Messrs. Hughes, Ross and McGillivray, who voted against Laurier's amendment, voting also against the second reading. The eight members, who did not vote, are thus accounted for: Sir Donald Smith and Mr. Rowland were paired; Hon. Mr. Montague and Messrs. Corby and Denison, Conservatives, are absent through illness, and three constituencies, Pontiac, Soulanges and Missisquoi, formerly held by Government supporters, are vacant. The only Grits that did not vote were Mr. Rowland, who was paired with Sir Donald Smith. Supporting the seven Grits, who voted with the Government, had followed their Leader, still the Government would have had a majority of ten over Grits and dissenting conservatives, on the first division, and a net majority of 4 on the second vote.

Eastern

Owing to the mild season, it is feared that the stock of wool will be "rough and ready" and the price of farm produce low, yet their purchases at any time in the of the falling index. The Dominion Government is the Eastern. The Dominion Government is the Eastern. The Dominion Government is the Eastern.

We have Cheaper We have Good We have New We have

For the last have been howling Boreas made you away in the future

Every useful Every desirable Every bang up

We will sell you a good honest Flat Top 27-5 inch wide width gear. And a dandy Oxford. We will sell you a And a striped Bed The Covers we are And our Rival Corset Our 65 cent Corset. We have a few wide and good quality ing for you, but our

PATON & CO.

PATON & CO.

Thousands of yards of OILCLOTH

AND

New Carpets

JAS. PATON & CO.

PATON & CO.

PATON & CO.