

"Now, sir," said the hon. member, "the minority of Manitoba thought they had a grievance, owing to the passage of that Act of 1890; and I don't care whether they had or had not such a grievance; if they thought they had, then they had! (laughter). The Privy Council decided that these people had a right to appeal, and had a grievance. I don't see, sir, how the Council could have come to any other decision. I am bound to say that I regret that such a provision was included in the Act in the first place, but I am not prepared to repudiate a solemn covenant agreed upon by our predecessors; and I am ready to support that Act. Let us, with the fairness that characterizes British subjects, live up to this covenant. If our fathers made a mistake, we must, nevertheless, stand by it; stand by the fathers of Confederation. If this minority are suffering from injustice, let us not refuse to see that grievance righted. I am not satisfied with the remedial bill as at present drafted. I think the first step towards a solution of the difficulty is to allow both parties a fair opportunity of presenting their case before the Governor-General-in-Council, and then to introduce such legislation, if a grievance is found to exist, as will rectify that grievance. I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for South Toronto in his contention that this is a judicial and not a political question, and I think if the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition at Ottawa, would have agreed to meet and settle this matter outside of politics altogether, that it could have been done. Religion should not be treated as a political football; it is an unwise thing to do; and in conclusion, I wish to say that it is my belief that as soon as a grievance is proved to exist, the majority in Manitoba will of itself, rise up to remedy it. Therefore I support the amendment of the hon. the Attorney-General."

Dr. W. W. MEACHAM (Lennox) confessed that his views had been somewhat changed by the speech of the hon. leader of the Government. He was satisfied that there was a grievance existing, and that it ought to be removed. Further, that Manitoba ought to remove it; but at this point he was compelled to differ from the hon. minister. If after five years of careful study, Manitoba did not know what that grievance was then she would never know it. But again, if Sir Oliver Mowat were, as an ardent supporter had dubbed him, "the best man in North America," could he not use his influence to some purpose by stepping in at once, and calling upon Manitoba to settle the question herself immediately. But if the grievance existed and was still unremedied, the hon. gentleman would state that his whole sympathy was with the Government at Ottawa.

Mr. GURD (Lambton) referred with much well-directed sarcasm to the utterances of the hon. member for Welland, who had denounced the members of the Opposition as afraid to define their policy with respect to remedial legislation, but whose own brave heart failed him when the opportunity presented itself of entering his protest against a system he condemned by supporting the resolution of the member for west Toronto.

"I am opposed, sir, to the whole theory and system of Separate Schools," said the hon. member. "Separate a stream at its source and you can not expect that it will flow together later on. I believe the Legislature of Manitoba made strenuous attempts to make their schools non-sectarian. I admit that if the Catholics had a grievance they were right to appeal to a higher court. I admit that the right to consider which

was granted by the judgment of that court may imply the right to do more, but I deny the contention that the right to consider may imply the compulsion to do more. It is a monstrous injustice to force Separate Schools upon the Province of Manitoba; but I feel that nothing can be accomplished by any utterances on the question upon the floor of this House.

Mr. LANGFORD (Muskoka) was chiefly inaudible, but it was understood that he desired to place himself on record along the lines of the motion of the member for west Toronto. The hon. gentleman concluded his speech by asserting that there was no agitation in Manitoba, and that Catholics of that Province when asked for their opinion expressed themselves as being in favour of the National School system at present in force.

(The lateness of the hour probably prevented any member from taking upon himself the challenge of this astounding statement, but the writer, having but lately come from that province is in a position to declare emphatically that although there is very little agitation in Manitoba upon the question, yet Catholics are by no means satisfied with the existing system. There is no need to comment upon the matter. It is sufficient to merely state the fact, and to impress upon the hon. member for Lambton the advisability of his being more accurate in his statements, and more searching in the derivation of his stock of information.)

Mr. KERN (Halton) remarked that he could not support the amendment of the hon. the Attorney-General. It was skillfully drawn up, but was more calculated to benefit the party than the policy, and he should therefore support the motion of the hon. member for Toronto west.

At 11 o'clock Mr. Crawford, the mover of the resolution rose to make a few remarks concerning the statements of some of the hon. gentlemen who had preceded him. He thought he had worded his motion as mildly and faultlessly as it could be done, and it was gratifying to find that the hon. the Attorney-General could find no serious flaw in the construction or sense of the clauses. The hon. gentleman was sorry that the hon. leader of the House could not see his way clear to adopt his motion as it stood. However, he found no fault with the course adopted by the hon. gentlemen who had spoken against his motion. He was pleased with the honest and fair criticism that it had evoked, and he thought that good might come of it.

Mr. St. JOHN (York west) paid an unnecessary but not undeserved tribute to the political honesty of the member for Toronto west. He described the attitude of the Government as suspiciously smacking of hedging, and accused the hon. the Attorney-General of playing into Mr. Laurier's hands, and moulding his policy in accordance with that of the Liberal leader at Ottawa. The hon. gentleman denounced the resolution offered in amendment by the Attorney-General as dishonest. It was not, he said, a genuine resolution, and it was impossible to gather from the utterances of the members of the Government whether they were in favour of Remedial Legislation or not. The hon. gentleman expressed himself as being fully in accord with the resolution of the hon. member for Dundas, and believed that if that House would deal only with matters that concerned it, it would be the better for the efficiency of the administration. It would be a boon to Canada if there were no sectarian schools in the land, and if they were prepared to lay down upon the altar of public interest—of social and family interest all questions of race and creed.

Mr. HAGGERTY (Hastings) considered that this Government had no right to interfere at all in the affairs of Manitoba. "I think," said the hon. gentleman, "that I shall have to adopt the resolution of the hon. member for Dundas."

Mr. MARTER (Toronto north) closed the debate in a dignified manner with a few well-chosen words. He had been a member of that House for ten years, and it had never been imputed to him that he was afraid to state his position on any question of public interest, either upon the floor of that House or upon the country hustings. He would not be afraid to state his opinions upon the point at issue when the proper time arrived.

"Upon this side of the House, sir," said the hon. gentleman, "we pride ourselves upon an independence of thought. We do not go, as do our friends on the other side, solidly for the benefit of party. Personally, I think the Dominion Government are doing right on this question. I want to say that I think the member for West Toronto had a perfect right to introduce the motion which he believed in, although I think he will see later on that he has merely assisted our friends on the opposite side of this House to throw a little more of a halo round the Liberal leader at Ottawa. (Hear, Hear, from the Government supporters.) I consider, sir, that the amendment of my hon. friend, the member for Dundas, is entirely in the right direction, and will be a credit to him in the years to come. (Hear, hear.)"

The division was then taken on Mr. Whitney's amendment, as follows:—

Yeas—Beatty (Leeds), Bush, Carnegie, Fallis, Haggerty (Liberal), Howland, Magwood, Marter, Matheson, Meacham, Preston, Ryerson, St. John, Whitney, Willoughby—16.

Nays—Barr, Baxter, Bennett, Biggar, Bleazard, Bronson, Brower, Burt, Campbell, Carpenter, Caven, Chapple, Charlton, Cleland, Conmee, Craig, Crawford, Currie, Dana, Davis, Dickenson, Dryden, Dynes, Evanturel, Farwell, Ferguson, Field, Flatt, Gamey, Garrow, German, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gurd, Harcourt, Hardy, Harty, Haycock, Hobbs, Kerns, Kidd, Langford, Little, Loughrin, McCallum, McDonald, McKay (Oxford), McKay (Victoria), McKee, McLaren, McLean, McNaughton, McNeil, McNichol, McNish, McPherson, Middleton, Moore, Mowat, Mutrie, O'Keefe, Pardo, Reid (Addington), Reid (Durham), Richardson, Robertson, Robillard, Shore, Stratton, Taylor, Truax, Tucker—72.

Paired—Mr. Miscampbell and Mr. Ross; Mr. Beatty (Parry Sound) and Mr. Smith.

Sir Oliver Mowat's amendment was then put and carried on the following division:—

Yeas—Barr, Baxter, Bennett (P.), Biggar, Bleazard, Bronson, Burt, Campbell, Carpenter, Chapple, Charlton, Cleland, Conmee, Craig, Dana, Davis, Dickenson, Dryden, Evanturel, Farwell, Ferguson, Field, Flatt, Garrow, German, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Harcourt, Hardy, Harty, Haycock (P.), Hobbs, Loughrin, McKay (Oxford), McKay (Victoria), McKee, McLean, McNish, McPherson (P.), Middleton, Moore, Mowat, Mutrie, O'Keefe, Pardo, Richardson, Robertson, Robillard, Stratton, Taylor, Truax—51.

Nays—Beatty (Leeds), Brower, Bush, Carnegie, Caven, Crawford, Currie, Dynes, Fallis, Gamey, Gurd, Haggerty, Hiscott, Howland, Kerns, Kidd, Langford, Little, McCallum, McDonald, McLaren, McNaughton, McNeil, McNichol, Magwood, Marter, Matheson, Meacham, Preston, Reid (Addington), Reid (Durham), Ryerson, St. John, Shore, Tucker, Whitney, Willoughby—37.

The resolution, as amended, was carried with the same vote, and the House adjourned.