

eral in Council has called upon the legislature to right that wrong, and the legislature has refused. Therefore, under the provision of this constitutional Act, the Parliament of Canada forces the legislature of Manitoba to do justice in the premises. That is what coercion is; any interference by this Parliament, under circumstances of that kind, would be coercion.

We, in Manitoba, do not contend, that this Parliament has no right to coerce us, but we do contend, that, where the constitution has seen fit to give a responsibility of that kind to the Parliament of Canada, this Parliament is not doing justice to itself, nor to Manitoba, if it proceeds to the extremity of coercing that province until every other expedient has been tried. We say the Government have proceeded to coercion without trying every other expedient, without making the slightest attempt to see whether the people of Manitoba were prepared, in view of the decision of the Privy Council, and in view of the position in which they were placed constitutionally, to deal with the question themselves. From what has already fallen from me, it must be clear to the House, that I am in favour of a full investigation of this matter. I favour an investigation and inquiry into the circumstances that existed there, not because it is the policy enunciated by the leader of the Opposition, because I should like to say in this House, as I have said out of it, that this question is with me one that transcends party, and, if the policy of the leader of the Opposition did not meet with my approval, I would feel bound to oppose it in every way until justice was done in this respect to my province. I say, therefore, that I do not adopt the policy of investigation because it is what has been asked by the province which I stand here to represent. When the remedial order was sent to the legislature of Manitoba, after refusing most positively and most definitely to obey the remedial order, this is what the province said:

We believe that when the remedial order was made there was not available then to Your Excellency in Council full and accurate information as to the working of our former system of schools. We also believe there was lacking means of forming a correct judgment as to the effect on the province of the changes indicated in the order. Being impressed with this view, we respectfully submit that it is not yet too late to make full and complete investigation of the whole subject. Should such a course be adopted, we will cheerfully assist in affording the most complete information available. An investigation of such a kind would furnish a substantial basis of fact upon which conclusions could be framed with a reasonable degree of certainty. It is urged most strongly that upon such an important a matter, involving as it does, the religious feelings and convictions of different classes of the people of Canada, and the educational interests of their province, which is expected to become one of the most important in the Dominion, no hasty action should be taken; but that

on the contrary, the greatest care and deliberation should be exercised, and a full and thorough investigation made.

That was the first answer. When this Government, which was bound to pass their remedial order at once—it could not afford time for Manitoba to prepare its case; time was the essence of the contract, and it had to be done at once—ascertained the trend of public opinion, they found time to adjourn the passing of the Remedial Bill from July, 1895, to January, 1896, in order that a second attempt might be made upon the province to see if the provincial government would recede from their position. Again the province of Manitoba made it most clear and distinct, that they were prepared to assist in every way in an investigation. I know the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not desire that the province of Manitoba should settle this matter. He is, probably, the only man in this House who does not wish it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman does not know anything of the kind, and he has no right to say so.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman's own utterances show it. The hon. gentleman said, in this House, that he would be very sorry to have a settlement made by the province of Manitoba; that they did not want a settlement.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Never.

Mr. MARTIN. That they wanted to pass remedial legislation.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I rise to a point of order. I hope the hon. gentleman does not feel bound to give such an interpretation of what I stated on that occasion. I have explained before, that the dropping of one word in the unrevised "Hansard" might have exposed me to that misinterpretation of what I said. I have already explained the matter. I have stated repeatedly, and the country knows it, and no man has said more plainly than I have, that the question should be settled by the legislature, instead of being brought here. I have always said that.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman has been very unfortunate, I must admit.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not so unfortunate as the hon. gentleman thinks.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) did make an explanation, and he said that the word "not" ought to be put in, but the difficulty is, if you put the word "not" in, you have all the other parts of the speech to explain. You have the part of it to explain where he said: That even if we had Mr. Greenway's promise it would not be any good to us, and where he said: We want the Remedial Bill and we want to coerce Manitoba.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) is wrong. The hon. gentleman has