ance would thereby be abolished if it could only be exercised by the Imperial Government. Such was the construction put upon it by the Provincial Secretary of Quebec, Mr. Gagnon. Here are his own words, when commenting this resolution adopted by the interprovincial conference :

> As worded, this resolution is practically the abolition of the right of disallowance, for we say that this power will only be exercised with respect to the laws possibly affecting the general interests of the Empire, that is to say, we assimilate the position of the provinces to the one now occupied by the Federal Parliament. Now, as we cannot make laws which affect the general interests of the Empire, it follows that the Imperial Government will not have to exercise against us this power of disallowance.

Thus, if we cannot now claim, or rather if we ought not to claim the exercise of the right of disallowance with respect to a question as that which we are now discussing, it is because the whole Liberal party succeeded in rousing the public opinion in every province by exaggerating the right of the provinces to enjoy a full autonomy, and even to escape the right of disallowance conferred by our constitution to the Federal power, in educational matters as well as in any other difficult questions. But I say, moreover, that no motion was brought before this House with the object of censuring the Government for not disallowing such a legislation. I say, moreover, that it is yet time to make such a motion, and I invite those who are fond of motions of censure directed against the Government to bring about such a motion because they have not disallowed Manitoba's legislation as they are blamed from all over the hustings. Therefore, to sum up, we could not exercise the right of disallowance because, as I have just said, it would not have been wise for the Government to do so, and because it was not claimed by the Catholics who took another way to obtain the redress they sought, and finally, because the disallowance weapon was made useless and inefficient by the doings of the Liberal party. Now, there remained an appeal to the courts of justice. After the Manitoba legislation of 1890 had been declared constitutional, the Catholics took an appeal to the Government, and the latter resolved in the first place to cause to be proclaimed or defined their right to interfere, and should the occasion arise, to pass a remedial legislation. Never was a motion brought before the House to blame the Government for their recourse to this mode of proceeding, but they were studiously reproached, in popular meetings, with having taken this means of having the question solved. Nevertheless, this way of proceeding was the only reasonable one ; it was the only one dictated by common political sense and reason. The fact is, with respect to such a question, it was absolutely necessary that we should know whether we had a right to interfere ; it was the main point. Why ? Here is the reason why : Had we immediately passed a law to set aside Manitoba's legislation and had the legislature of that province disputed its constitutionality, in what position would we find ourselves now, had the Privy Council decided as it has contrary to our contentions ? The Government and the Federal Parliament would then have found themselves in the most humiliating position. On the contrary, the Government wisely decided that prior to interfering they should know whether they had a right to interfere ; the Government wanted to know the extent of their rights prior to helping the minority, and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided that they had such a right under the constitution. The Government acted therefore in compliance with the constitution, as explained by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. As regards the mode adopted by the Government nobody can blame them for doing what they did, for it was the mode suggested by the Liberal party itself. Indeed, when the Hon. Mr. Blake brought up his motion in 1890, he had in view that very question of the separate schools in Manitoba. If the Government was not to be bound by this motion of Mr. Blake, then it was useless. We all know that this motion was moved and agreed to by Parliament precisely in view of this Manitoba school question. The Government have passed the remedial Order in Council and they have done right. Mr. Speaker, I think there is no one to be found in this House who will reproach them with this act. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided that we had a right, not only to interfere, but also to remedy an injustice done to the prejudice of the minority in Manitoba ; the Judicial Committee pronounced that we had both the right and the duty to interfere. This Government are the custodians of the rights and privileges of each and every class, and therefore they are in duty bound to protect the minorities. It is for them to say to the persecutors : Cease your persecutions, to say to the infringers of the constitution : Cease to cause the minority to suffer in the exercise of a right which is guaranteed to them by the constitution. It was said somewhere that an interference would not be expedient. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is always expedient to remedy an injustice. There is no middle course to follow, in such matters, one must be either friend or foe. I think any honourable and honest man owes it to duty to remedy an injustice when his duty is clearly laid down. Assuredly now that the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has been delivered, the question is not whether it is favourable to the Protestants or to the Catholics of Manitoba, but our duty is to inquire whether there is any injustice to remedy. The question is whether the oppressed ought to be protected. I say it is