

had the union of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec on what might be termed a federal basis. They formed one parliament, and the fact was that the religions were so nearly equal that there was a constant fight and religious factions had much more sway than they have had since that time and the confederation decentralized that. Let the province of Ontario or Quebec, the province of Manitoba and all the provinces carry out their local and provincial laws as they think best among themselves, and I feel convinced that after an experience of 27 years that it will be found to be the soundest basis upon which we can nationalize our people and our country. We should respect the constitutional autonomy of the provinces, and the provinces should respect and support the prestige and dignity of the national government if we wish to develop the sound principles of the British constitution on Canadian soil, and, through a unity of purpose, advance Canada to the dignity of a nation commensurate with its size and influence on this continent. I do not wish to imply for one moment that the leader of the government or the government adopted this policy with the end in view I referred to, but I wish to point out what is the effect and what might be the further effect of such a policy, if this was accepted as a precedent and was allowed to go without a protest. I think that where we have undertaken the government of this great country, which stretches from the Atlantic to the Pacific, upon the principles of self government, and to maintain it harmonious in its working, that it is utterly impossible for the people of Nova Scotia or Quebec to know exactly what are the principles that govern the province of Manitoba or British Columbia in their local laws or legislation, or *vice versa*. We are an extensive country with diversified interests and we must allow those diversified interests to be projected under local authority under the specified lines of the constitution as has been laid down and to that extent I agree with the remarks made by the hon. member from Prince Edward Island and feel that it is fair criticism to make, although possibly as I said before when it was adopted that end was not foreseen and probably that end was not in view. Now the hon. the leader of the government has referred very slightly to the school question and in fact he followed out the dictates of the speech which says very little, and he said very little either on the tariff or upon the school question. In so far as it gave him an opportunity to say something more with regard to the constitution and the formation and character of the Senate, I do not know that on the present occasion we have anything particularly to regret. We can wait with patience to know what is the outcome of the school question, which formed such a prominent feature in the elections which have just gone by. So far as the school question is concerned, I am sure it will be a cause of great gratification to every one if it is found that the question will be settled without any reference to this parliament. The question has been discussed thoroughly, but I do not know that it has been thoroughly understood. I have always taken the ground in this House, and I think it is quite proper to re-state the position I took in this House, so far as the facts of the case from 1869 down to the present time are present in my mind, and that is that the parliament of Canada has no constitutional power to annihilate or control the laws of Manitoba. They have no power to enforce any legislation they may put upon the statute-book for that purpose. Of course they have the power to put it on the statute-book, but when it is there it requires a legal power to force itself, and to make it available and as the constitutional laws of Manitoba constitutionally passed cannot be interfered with by the Dominion parliament, that legal force was wanting under the Remedial Bill of the late government. I think that is a foregone conclusion and cannot be gainsaid. I do not know that the question was put clearly before the people of Canada in the late election. The question was I fear rather kept in the foreground as a political question because it was a convenient question to rouse the minds and political ideas of the people upon; but that is the constitutional position from my standpoint. The Privy Council have stated that there was a grievance, and that grievance justifies an appeal to parliament. That appeal has been made and I think the limit of that grievance or the extent of that grievance should fairly be ascertained by an inquiry or by any other method before parliament can intelligently deal with it; it is within the power of the parliament of Canada to remove it, but to remove it without interference with the constitutional laws of the province. If it is removed by the