

name of the constitution and of the minority, not to go beyond this with the Bill before the House. The constitution and the interests of the minority constitute the very reasons which have impelled the Government to bring down this legislation. So upon that ground it is quite impossible for us to agree. But the hon. gentleman said we were compelled to bring down the measure. The Secretary of State, he said, "was brought back to Canada to force the Bill down the throats of Canadians." Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman is so anxious to have a hit at the Secretary of State that he and his friends hit wildly in place and out of place. The leader of the Opposition knows well that long before the Secretary of State came from England the policy of the Government on the school question had been definitely settled; and it was because the hon. gentleman viewed that question in accordance with the settled policy, as enunciated by the leader of the Government and by the then leader of this House, that he accepted a seat in the Government whose fixed policy was to bring remedial legislation before Parliament and to stake its existence as a government on the settlement of that question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman, as he and hon. gentlemen opposite have acted in all debates in which they have taken part, gave a painful description, which no doubt will be circulated abroad, of the strife, trouble and dissension which exist in Canada. I am not aware of all this strife, trouble and dissension. The little trouble which exists at the present moment in Manitoba is exactly what we are trying to settle and remove from the national life of Canada, and we wish to remove it from the national life of Canada because we desire to bring out to our vast prairies and to the great province of British Columbia the surplus population of the old country. By what means can you induce the surplus population to come and settle in a country when it is divided by religious and sectional strife and dissension? Let me say to the hon. gentleman that as a Canadian I feel that to call special attention to trouble, dissension and strife as existing, is hurtful to the interests of this Dominion, and I deeply regret it. But if it does exist, it may be due to the fact that the hon. gentleman and his friends have been preaching it so long that outside people have begun to believe it exists in Canada.

"In 1870, by the power vested in it," the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) said, "the Manitoba legislature abolished separate schools." As I understand the Barrett case, and I speak after having studied it, and I believe I understand it, it was decided by the court that the legislature of Manitoba had the right to pass a law changing their system of schools. In the Brophy case it

was decided by the Privy Council that rights had been taken away from the minority, and that this minority had the right under the constitution to call upon the Federal Government to restore those rights, to appeal to the Governor General in Council to apply a remedy as regards the removal of those rights. The hon. gentleman said "in 1890,"—and he made quite a point of these words, and hon. gentlemen opposite evidently thought that it was a strong point, for they applauded very much—"four Acts came before the Government; one, to abolish the French language; two, respecting the quarantine of cattle; three, with respect to joint stock companies; four, the School Act," and, he continued, "of all those Bills the only one that was not vetoed by the Government was the School Act."

Mr. LANGELIER. There were two.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, there were two, the other being that to abolish the French language. Does the hon. gentleman not see any distinction between a cattle quarantine Bill and a Bill affecting the rights of the minority of Manitoba? Mr. Blake framed a resolution for the purpose of removing from the political arena a question that he supposed and we supposed was going to prove an irritating one to the people of Canada, and this resolution was unanimously adopted by this House. Does not the hon. leader of the Opposition see a difference between that resolution and a cattle quarantine Bill? The reason why the School Bill was not vetoed was because, acting upon the resolution proposed by Mr. Blake and adopted by this House unanimously as regards this question, we appealed to the legal tribunals, instead of vetoing the Bill, and I think we were right in doing so. The hon. gentleman made another point about evidence not having been submitted, and he referred to affidavits which were published in the blue-books, and which were withdrawn when the argument was made before the Privy Council. Well, Sir, Mr. Ewart did not rest his case upon these affidavits. He rested his case upon the facts, as explained in the petitions of the minority. He rested his case upon the judgment of the Privy Council, and the reason why these affidavits were put in the blue-book after being withdrawn is simply because we thought the record would not be complete without them. We thought it was due to Parliament that we should show Parliament all the proceedings which had taken place before the committee of the Canadian Privy Council, sitting as a judicial tribunal, and these affidavits were published so as to make the record absolutely complete. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) wishes to investigate, first, if schools had been promised the Catholic minority; second, if the existing schools are against the conscience of the minority, and, third, if they are Protestant schools. Well, Sir, as to separat