

ing, as the great council of the British Empire never now ceases to recognize, that they control and have in their hands the destinies and the welfare of multitudes of races and of creeds; governing India, Africa, America, and the hosts of possessions that are proud to acknowledge themselves under British sway. Toleration is the very secret of success, and the secret of the greatness of the Empire; and toleration increases as the years go by. A few years ago it would have been impossible for the Lord Chief Justice to be a Roman Catholic, and sit as Lord Chief Justice in the United Kingdom. He is there to-day by virtue, not only of the growth of that spirit of toleration, but by the very experience that England has had in empire governing. A member of the late Government in England, one of the most distinguished members of the Liberal Administration, was a Roman Catholic, and before that he was Governor General of the Empire of India. All this indicates plainly and unmistakably to us, that the fathers of confederation were wise in their generation. We, in Canada, have led even public opinion in England, in regard to reforms and advancements, as Mr. Blake accurately pointed out in 1885, when speaking in Edinburgh. I pray God, that we may lead them even in the settlement of this question. I hope that we will deal with it, not merely as Canadians, but as British subjects, brought up, as most of our fellow-subjects have been, with the greatest respect and reverence for the decisions of our judicial tribunals. Little did I think, Mr. Speaker, when reading, as I have often read, the language of one of the men who did so much for Canada, and whose life was so unfortunately cut short: little did I think, that his language could be used in regard to the Roman Catholic leader of a political party in this country, and, least of all, did I think that the words of this great man would apply to the present leader of the Opposition. Thomas D'Arcy McGee, having before him this constitution of ours, and speaking in a Protestant centre of Ontario, used the following language, which will fittingly conclude the observations which I have ventured to address to this House:—

When United British America will start on its race with 4,000,000 of a free people in religion they will be about 55 per cent Protestant to 45 per cent Catholics; in some localities the religious minority may be small, and many apprehend local oppression, but the two great masses will be too nearly balanced to suffer any oppression to be long inflicted on the co-religionists of either. Our near equality will be the best guarantee of our mutual tolerance. With one half of the constituent power against him, it is evident that no fanatic, no bigot, troubler of other men's consciences, no insulter of other men's creeds can ever rise to the dimensions of a statesman in British America. The minorities east and west have really nothing to fear beyond what always existed, local irritations produced by ill-disposed individuals. The strong arm and the long arm of the con-

tolerate power will be extended over them: all, and woe be to the wretch on whom that arm shall have to descend in anger for any violation of the federal compact.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would be paying the hon. gentleman who resumed his seat just before recess a very poor compliment if I did not take some notice of the personal attack with which he opened his speech, and which ran, more or less, through his whole address, from beginning to end. I confess, Sir, that, remembering that this same subject was brought up by that hon. gentleman when this question was under discussion in July last, and, remembering, also, that if he did not know what parliamentary practice was before that discussion, he ought afterwards to have realized what it was—if, indeed, he is capable of understanding anything—I was somewhat surprised to find that in the very laboured harangue which we had the pleasure of listening to this afternoon, he made that the burden of his song. Now, Sir, I either am, or am not, violating a rule of this House; I either am or am not entitled to address to you and to all the members of this House such arguments as appear to me to be relevant to the question under discussion; and as I think that, according to our rules, I am not out of order, and as the hon. member does not press the matter so far as to complain that I am out of order, I am unable quite to grasp the importance he attaches to the position I hold. If, indeed, he means to say that I now believe Manitoba should not be coerced because of the position I have occupied as counsel for that province on two different occasions, I can understand his argument. If he does not mean to say that, I fail to appreciate its force. On this personal matter, let me just recapitulate, briefly, the position which I have held, and which I still hold, with reference to this and kindred questions. I am blamed, Sir, because, in 1889, in a speech which I made at Portage la Prairie, I ventured to say that I thought separate schools in the province of Manitoba should be abolished. I thought so then; I think so still; but if I said so in 1889, and if that was my conviction then, I do not know how the fact that in the year 1892 I held a brief for the province of Manitoba in the argument of the legal question before the Privy Council could affect, or has, in any way, affected my opinion. I am bound, Sir, as a professional man, to accept a brief when I am offered it. I have no choice; I am bound by my oath, when a brief is offered to me, to accept it; and if the province of Manitoba thought fit—and that was the first time, in 1892, that I was consulted on this matter—to trust me as one of their counsel with the conduct of the