

the French shore question settled before the colony came into Canada, if it so happens that the colony be united with us. The hon. gentleman thought that that question should be settled with Great Britain and France. There is a treaty, there is the plain wording of the treaty, there are the rights which France claims under the treaty, there are the rights which so far as the English contention is concerned, she sometimes exercises but which are claimed not to be within the four corners of the treaty, and on these matters long negotiations and repeated negotiations have been going on and they have assumed—I think I may say without violating any confidence, because the blue-books have been already published—they have assumed a position at the present time, where we may fairly say, that with agreement between the Newfoundland Government and the Home Government, legislation is likely to be passed at the coming session of the Newfoundland legislature which will settle that question agreeably to the government of Newfoundland and to the government of Great Britain on a basis which will be accepted by France. So much with reference to that question. I desire to say a word, and but a word with reference to the last allusion but one, of my hon. friend, and that was his reference to what is known as the remedial order and the Manitoba school question. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) touched that very gingerly. He stated that the Ministers, some of them at least, had been making very decided utterances in different parts of the country, and that they had been talking a great deal. Evidently that criticism does not apply to my hon. friend for he has been making no very decided utterances about this question and he has not been talking much about it. In fact, it is a matter which is somewhat significant and somewhat unusual, that in a series of election contests undertaken in different parts of the country, in constituencies of different temperaments and different complexions, after the passage of the remedial order and after the Government's decision, it is remarkable I say, that four contests should take place and that in two of the constituencies the leader of a great party did not put candidates in the field. My hon. friend says that he looked upon it as a family quarrel down in Haldimand. A family quarrel in Haldimand! Left to the Liberal-Conservatives alone, in a county which has been the closed home, the castle of the Liberal party for many and many a year, and the hon. gentleman has allowed the Liberal-Conservatives to go into his own home, his own castle, and without a word from him to settle a family quarrel between themselves! I am afraid that that excuse is not sufficiently strong to base my hon. friend's conduct upon before the electors of this country. I would not go further in reference to this question were it not that the hon. gentleman had stated that the Government

had been guilty of indiscretion all the way through. Now that is one of those broad statements that I do not think can be sustained, and I shall present two or three considerations to the House to show why it cannot be sustained. My hon. friend says the Government has shown a lamentable lack of discretion all through this matter. In what respect, let me ask him? Manitoba, a province having exclusive rights limited by certain restrictions under the constitution, having dealt with a certain matter relating to education, passed a law and the law came for revision, as provincial laws do come, to the Minister of Justice for the Dominion of Canada. The Dominion took the ground, well established—does my hon. friend controvert that ground or will his party controvert that ground—the Dominion Government took the ground that that Act passed on such a question with such powers behind it ought not to be disallowed, that it ought to be left to its fulfilment and the courts would very soon say whether it was ultra vires or not. The Dominion Government, therefore, did not disallow the Act. Does my hon. friend count that as one of the indiscretions? I do not think he will say so. Well, Sir, after that legislation had gone before the tribunals, and the first decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was given with reference to the Barrett case, our friends in the minority in the province of Manitoba having loyally accepted the decision of the Government not to disallow, having then had recourse to the courts, as they were told they had, and as they knew they had, having fought out that matter in the courts, and had a certain decision which satisfied them, at least as to the law on one point, they have availed themselves of—what? Of the constitution of this country—of their own constitutional act, as every minority has a right to do. They availed themselves of its express provisions in their petition to the Dominion Government. Now, Sir, that was perfectly right. The action of the Government upon that was simply this: it is better to be sure than sorry—is this a matter which comes under the right of appeal—under that provision of the Manitoba Act or the British North America Act? It was best that that should be decided by the courts under a law which was introduced by the leader of the party opposite, the predecessor of my hon. friend, and acquiesced in on both sides of the House. Under that they proceeded, and under that the Government of this country made them this answer: We will defer the hearing of the appeal until every difficulty is settled and the clear legal answer is given, the clear legal ground is shown. Was that in the opinion of my hon. friend an act of indiscretion? The minority in Manitoba loyally accepted that; they took their case to the Privy Council; they argued it there, and they got their decision. That