

if that were not the case? I would ask my hon. friend who has drawn attention to the movement of our people, from what stock did he himself spring? Had his father not been an old countryman, possibly he never would have come to Canada, to grace the halls of this illustrious assembly. And so it is with half of those about me; so it was with my own family. My father thought there was a better field in other portions of the British Empire outside of England, in which he could bring up his family, and that the prospects would be better in the western world than the locality in which he was born. So it is with the Canadians, and with the Americans who sprang from the same stock, and so it will continue to be so long as the race exists. It is gratifying however, to know that the hon. gentleman has such an exalted opinion of the capabilities of the country in which he lives, and the very fact of that becoming known has led to an influx of population to a greater extent than ever before from the republic to the south of us, many of whose inhabitants are now enjoying comfortable homes in the North-west. Let me hope that they may increase. When we speak of the low prices of the products of the farm, we should not forget that there are other great producing countries of the world. There was a time when Canada and the United States were almost the sole sources of supply for the consuming portion of Great Britain. That monopoly no longer exists. Since the hon. gentleman has grown to manhood the Argentine Republic has sprung into existence, and Egypt, Russia and different portions of the British Empire, including the colonies of Australia, are pouring the products of the farm, not only the cereals, but meat and dairy products, into the British market. Our own North-west has produced during the last year from fifty to sixty million bushels of surplus grain of various kinds and qualities, and as that production increases, so in proportion must the prices fall; but if the price of the articles which they consume fall proportionately, and money can be obtained at low rates of interest in order to improve their farms and carry on business on a larger scale, there will be nothing to complain of. That is another important element to be considered when you talk about low prices and the want of

progress that apparently exists in the country. The hon. gentleman referred to the excess of imports over exports. What deduction he desired the House to draw from that I cannot perceive; but I know it is the theory of the free-trader, and it is the theory of the party with which the hon. gentleman is now allied, that an excess of imports over exports is no evidence whatever of a deterioration either in the trade or in the prosperity of the country. I am not prepared myself to admit, except in theory, what is argued by the free-traders and the economists of that particular stripe. I prefer to take practical results rather than theories. The hon. gentleman again referred to the—I say it in all sincerity—unfortunate school question which is agitating the country. If seems to me if there are any deductions to be drawn from the statements and arguments which he advances, that his remarks are a justification of the course which the government has pursued. The hon. gentleman laid down this principle first, that we should not have the power of appealing to the Privy Council, that we should settle all these matters in our own courts. Where would my hon. friend's minority be to-day if his theory had obtained? The highest court in Canada decided that the Manitoba School Act of 1890 was *ultra vires*. Had there been no appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that would have left the minority in precisely the same position that they occupied prior to 1890. But the province appealed to England and the hon. gentleman objects to that. It was not the government of Canada, whom he holds responsible, that appealed to the Privy Council; it was the people of Manitoba through their legislature, and that court decided that the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada was not correct, that the law was *intra vires*. Then we have another appeal, resulting in a declaration that though the law passed by the legislature of Manitoba was *intra vires*, still the minority had a grievance, which should be redressed by this Parliament. When the Privy Council declared that the legislation of Manitoba was *intra vires*, that the law should not be interfered with, then the minority of Manitoba appealed under the provisions of the constitution to ascertain whether they had a grievance or not. The Supreme Court declared they had no grievance. If it had re-