

country fully understands that, and, Sir, let the leader of the Opposition fully appreciate where he is being led by the member for North Simcoe. The "Globe," of the 20th October, 1894, reports the hon. member for North Simcoe at Walkerton, as follows:—

Of the North-west school question Mr. McCarthy spoke at considerable length, pointing out that the Parliament at Ottawa had undertaken to say that there should be separate schools and a system of dual language. He (Mr. McCarthy) had objected to the introduction into that Territory of a dual race, which would perpetuate there the evils in Quebec and Ontario to-day by such legislation. At the conquest, the 60,000 French Canadians at that time, had grown into a million and a half.

Sir, I would be glad to see that million and a half of French Canadians trebled. I would be glad to see them increased to any extent, because I know their value to Canada. Sir, I say this, as a Protestant, and as a Canadian. The member for North Simcoe continued:

There was a million and a half so-called British subjects whose boast it was, if trouble should arise between Britain and France, they would be found on the side of their mother country, which was not ours. They could not be both French and British, and he believed it was the determination of the people of Canada that they should remain British. Yet the laws of the country had encouraged and fostered the development of the French nationality, which was more rampant and French now, than it was one hundred years ago.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the policy of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) which the leader of the Opposition has at last put upon its legs, has been, at any rate, honestly and clearly defined by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy), who, whatever his faults may be, will not be so disingenuous or cowardly as to go back on it on this occasion, or to withdraw one single statement in regard to it. And so, Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised to find the leader of the Opposition, in his desperate position, quarrel with the statement made by the Secretary of State (Sir Charles Tupper), that Canada has been happy since confederation. Perhaps the hon. gentleman's remark applies more directly to fiscal discussions, but I will refer him to the language of Sir A. T. Galt, who represented this country in Great Britain, and who, speaking at Edinburgh, in 1883, to eminent men of the mother country, said:

That peace, tranquility and progress had followed confederation in Canada.

I believe that Sir A. T. Galt spoke words of truth when he said that. I believe, Sir, that the Hon. Edward Blake, the late leader of the Opposition, when he charmed a most distinguished audience at Edinburgh, after the celebrated Midlothian campaign, spoke the words of truth, when he told that audience of the grand things that we had done in Canada, claiming, as might be expected, a large share of credit for the Liberal party.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

and, when he pointed to Canada as a country that had solved many of the difficult problems that were perplexing the mother country. I have no doubt, Sir, that the Hon. Edward Blake spoke the words of truth then. And, when Sir Oliver Mowat travelled through the States, and reached Hamilton, in 1893, speaking to young Canada there represented by the Canadian Club, he told them of what Canada had done, and congratulated them on Canada's position among the nations of the world. I have no doubt that he spoke the words of truth. I have no doubt that Sir Oliver Mowat would fiercely combat the position which the leader of the Opposition, on this occasion, felt it necessary to assume. I have not forgotten what the leader of the Opposition himself told our brother Britishers from Australasia. I have not forgotten the eloquent and happy picture he drew of what Canadian confederation had accomplished in British North America, when those distinguished visitors were in the capital of this country. He spoke then with the assent of every man in this House. On the other occasion to which I have referred, he spoke with, certainly, not the hearty assent of any Canadian.

Now, some discussion has occurred—I think it not unwise to refer to it—as to the value of a decision of the Queen's Privy Council. The law is, after all, claimed to be at our back. The majority of the Conservative party—and I believe they form the majority of the people of this country—accept the argument, that, whether the policy be what they want or what they do not want, it is the policy demanded by the law. The law is respected in every portion of the British Empire in the most extraordinary way. Our old parliaments attached tremendous importance to the decisions of the law officers of the Crown in England. Every lawyer knows that it was our custom to refer great questions to them, and loyally, and without dispute, to accept their opinions. And so the great minds of the Canadian legislature, the Blakes and the Macdonalds, saw that there would be something even more satisfactory than the opinions of the law officers of the Crown, in the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Queen's Privy Council. For that reason, the leader of the Opposition could not show that any issue that had arisen in this country—and there will always be burning issues while we are a free and independent people, a vigorous Anglo-Norman race—he could not show that any issue, no matter how exciting or burning at the time, had injured the integrity of Canada up to this day; because the most of these questions are dealt with and settled by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, whether between subject and subject, or between province and province. It is our safety-valve, Mr. Speaker, and so it has been understood. I may be permitted to read here a quotation from a