

Yet the hon. First Minister says the Bill gave no exemption from taxation. The present settlement gave, he says, organization, legislative grants, and exemption from taxation, and, therefore, separate schools. This is a burlesque, I humbly submit, on the Bill of the Manitoba Government. The hon. Premier said in Hull on March 16th :

When he entered office, he entered into negotiations with the Government of Manitoba and obtained from them concessions which gave the French Catholics of Manitoba religious teaching in their schools and the protection of their language. As a result, the French language will now be taught in the schools of Manitoba. Are you satisfied? (Cries of "Yes, yes.") He appealed to the good sense of all reasonable men, if this was not a satisfactory settlement. I want the two languages taught in all the schools. I speak French because it is the language of my mother, of the historic nation from which I have sprung, but I also speak English because it is the language of business. This double teaching will enable the children of Manitoba to earn their living as they could not otherwise do.

It was a misstatement, the hon. gentleman will permit me to say, to say that the French language "will now be taught in all the schools," as intended in the above, when all that the Bill provides, is that when there are ten pupils whose mother tongue is French the bi-lingual system of teaching shall prevail. But, this aside, the pretense that this is a concession obtained by the hon. Premier, is, in my opinion, absurd. It is a proposal of Mr. McCarthy, as a matter of fact, and was accepted by the late Government and made a part of the Remedial Bill. It is in the interests of Protestants as well as of Catholics, and this principle generally obtains the world over to-day. And yet the hon. gentleman, at Hull, took credit for having himself been the author and originator of the idea, and excited a good deal of enthusiasm, and I have no doubt obtained a large amount of support from this very delusive statement. The hon. Premier in addressing the House in August, 1896, said :

I have every reason to hope, every reason to believe, that, when again this Parliament assembles, this question will have been settled satisfactorily to all parties concerned.

And at Quebec in October, 1896, the hon. gentleman said :

I have only one word to say. During the fight I have often declared that, with the aid of Sir Oliver Mowat, I would settle that question in six months. I am not in a position to-night to discuss our recent arrangement. But I am happy to say that now, before six months, it will be settled by giving to the Catholics rights of conscience, and those who believe in religion in schools, will be satisfied. We obtained from the delegates of Manitoba all the concessions which men in honour could make.

I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to this statement that he had obtained all the concessions that men in honour could make. And yet when face to face with the electors

of Wright in Hull, the hon. gentleman made the following confession :—

I know I have not got as much as I wanted, but I have got as much as I could.

Does he mean to say that he wanted more than men in honour could give? He would hardly like to take that position, and yet that is the conclusion at which one must inevitably arrive if he takes the hon. gentleman's statements as made. The "Star" continues, in reporting the hon. Premier at Hull :

Amidst loud applause, Mr. Laurier quoted Hon. Edward Blake's opinion that the settlement was far more advantageous to the minority than any Remedial Bill that Parliament could pass.

The whole force of this is in the suggestion that this was the opinion of the counsel for the minority. But Mr. Blake's fee was long since earned, and he is in a position to give either legal or political opinions now irrespective of his old clients. If his opinion is examined, it will be found that Mr. Blake writes as a lawyer on a question not now in dispute, respecting the legal effect of the decision of the Privy Council and the powers of the Governor in Council. He traces the history of this dispute till it becomes (after judgment, Order in Council and Remedial Bill), a political question. The passage relied on from Mr. Blake's opinion is in no sense stronger than language used by other leaders of the Liberal party, nor are they in any sense supported by the Catholic minority of Manitoba, certainly not those congregated in the district of St. Boniface. But it is important to observe that this opinion relates to the political phase of the question. I draw the attention of the First Minister to the fact that the act of the Manitoba legislature does not restore any of the privileges that were taken away. This question arose from the decision of the Privy Council that the rights of the minority in Manitoba had been taken away, and that the duty of restoring them devolved upon the Government of Canada. The hon. the Premier boasts of the settlement he has effected, but I ask him to read the judgment of the Judicial Committee, and, for the purpose of refreshing his memory, I will quote a single clause of it which deals with the subject :

Contrast the position of the Roman Catholics prior and subsequent to the Acts from which they appeal. Before these passed into law there existed denominational schools, of which the control and management were in the hands of Roman Catholics, who could select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious teaching. These schools received their proportionate share of the money contributed for school purposes out of the general taxation of the province, and the money raised for these purposes by a local assessment was, so far as it fell upon Catholics, applied only towards the support of Catholic schools. What is the position of the Roman Catholic minority under the