

we have heard from him to-day. We heard from him then the declaration that in this matter the sovereignty of Parliament was abridged, that Parliament was not a free agent, but was forced to lay violent hands upon the school legislation of Manitoba and restore the Roman Catholic separate schools. Nay more, we heard also the hon. gentleman state, in deep and solemn tones, that he was ready to die, if his death were necessary, to procure for the minority the justice to which they were entitled. Such was the language we heard from him last session, but it would appear that all that is now a thing of the past. It would appear that this policy of stern adherence to the constitution, this magnanimous policy of devotion to the minority is no more. There is an election going on to-day in the good riding of North Grey, and there we have the authority of the whip of the party (Mr. Taylor) that he was sent by the hon. gentleman himself, as a missionary, to tell the staunch Tories of that riding that remedial legislation is no longer part and parcel of the programme of the Conservative party. Now, it appears, Parliament is again a free agent, now the sovereignty of this Parliament is not abridged, and this Parliament is no longer obliged by the letter of the law and the judgment of the Privy Council to lay violent hands upon the legislation of Manitoba, and is no longer obliged to restore to the minority their separate schools. The hon. gentleman is no longer ready to lay down his life, even though to die were necessary in order to obtain justice for the minority. Here are the words which the chief whip of the party pronounced yesterday at Owen Sound in the north riding of Grey:

Mr. Taylor said that the circumstances of this campaign were different from the last, as the Remedial Bill was no longer a part of the Conservative policy. Sir Charles Tupper had sent word by him to this effect to the electors of North Grey; that good feeling had now been restored between Sir Charles and N. Clarke Wallace and the other anti-remedial Conservatives. He said it was an insult to the intelligence of North Grey for Mr. Laurier to attempt to palm off in this riding a Minister who was defeated at home, and who did not own a cent here. A vote for Mr. Paterson would mean a vote for the domination of Quebec.

What is the meaning of this? What did the hon. gentleman mean when on the floor of this House, not yet five or six months ago, he told the people of this country that Parliament was bound—bound by the terms of the law—to interfere in this matter, bound to lay violent hands upon the legislation of Manitoba, bound to restore separate schools, and bound to die, if necessary, for the maintenance of the constitution. What was his meaning? What was his object? Was he simply playing a game in order to obtain the twenty votes of a majority in the province of Quebec which he expected? And now, what is his meaning to-day when he sent the whip of his party to the good riding

of North Grey to tell them that this is no longer the policy of the Conservative party, and that the Conservative party no longer intend to lay violent hands upon the legislation of Manitoba. When the hon. gentleman appeals, by the mouth of the whip of his party, against French domination and Quebec rule what does he mean? His meaning is the same as it ever was—a double game and a double policy. When you, Mr. Speaker, took your seat, the only criticism which the hon. gentleman had to offer to your nomination was that you had not the honour and the privilege of belonging to the French race. Sir, your nomination is an instance of the French domination which we intend to have, and which will be nothing more and nothing less than to select good men for every position, whether they be English, French, German, Irish or Scotch. But this is not the language which we hear to-day in the riding of North Grey. The language which is heard in that riding is an appeal to what sectional feeling there may be in the hearts of its electors by raising the cry of French domination and Quebec rule. Now, I do not care to carry this further. The hon. gentleman wants to know what is the policy of the Government and he has a right to know it, and I will tell him. We have always taken the ground that this question of the Manitoba schools has been bungled, from first to last, by hon. gentlemen opposite. They first exhausted every subterfuge, which they had under the law in order not to act, and when they determined to act, they acted on perfectly untenable grounds. We have a most peculiar constitution, and in that peculiar constitution there is a feature which seems to be altogether at variance with its very spirit. Of all the clauses which cemented these provinces together, the one perhaps which was the most potent and effective was that which expressed the desire of all classes of the community that every section of the community represented by a province should be independent and supreme within the sphere of the powers allotted to it. But, strange to say, although the subject of education is one of the powers referred to the provinces, yet there is a right of appeal given by the constitution to any minority whenever in any province there was existing a system of separate schools. If the minority in such province is dissatisfied it is given an appeal to this Parliament. This is altogether in contradiction to the spirit of the constitution, but let that pass. When the appeal is given let us consider for the moment to whom it was given. First of all, it is manifest that if an appeal was given, the right of the province to legislate upon the subject is thereby acknowledged, and this is a subject which is no longer in dispute. The appeal is given, not to a court. If it were, the court would only have to inquire whether or not the legislature had acted within its rights. The appeal, however, is