

THE REMEDIAL ACT (MANITOBA).

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for second reading of Bill (No. 58), the Remedial Act (Manitoba), and the proposed motion (six months' hoist) of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the very important question which has now for some time been before this Parliament, I venture to express the opinion that those who follow the discussion and those who are interested in a speedy settlement of this vexed question must experience gratification in observing that, exciting though the question has been, important as it is, there is less disturbance in this country or in this Parliament over it, than has occurred in the consideration hitherto of any of the great questions that have come before the Canadian people to be dealt with. For instance, I am not afraid to admit that in regard to that great proposition for a company construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway by the aid of enormous legislative grants, or in regard to the Jesuits' Estate Act, there was intense and dangerous excitement confined to no province in Canada. Those questions perturbed and disturbed the people of Canada generally, and in my humble judgment they were in their day far more difficult of a satisfactory and peaceful solution than the question, great as it is, important as it undoubtedly is, that is now under the consideration of this, the great council of the nation. Why was it that angry feelings and dangerous feelings on those occasions could come to the surface. I venture to say that the great reason was, as distinguished from the case with which we have now to deal, that no Government, no party, no men in the dispute could call to aid or could rally behind the judgment of the Queen's Privy Council. I believe that in the solution of this question the Government of the day enjoys a great and important advantage, because in the minds of the people, whether Catholics or Protestants, in regard to this question, which might otherwise, as I can quite conceive, and readily admit, evoke the most dangerous passions that could be aroused, they have called to their aid, and I believe they are warranted in calling to their aid, the general principle of the law, the law of the land, the law of the Empire, the judgment of the Queen's Privy Council. For that reason, I consider there has been, and I congratulate this House and this country upon the fact, no thoroughly popular agitation against the remedial legislation, no spontaneous, fervent, earnest declaration against the proposed action of the Canadian Parliament in respect to this matter.

There have been meetings, there have been large congregations of people. They have met in Toronto, in London, chiefly in

Mr. LAURIER.

Ontario; but at this late day, at this very day when we are considering what the action shall be, I delight in remembering that these agitations whether in one place or in another, have been engineered, have been promoted and have been led by two men, signally by two men who, of all those in Canada have absolutely destroyed whatever power they might otherwise have possessed of leading any independent and impartial opinion in this country. Who are those two men? One was my late colleague, the Grand Master of the Orange Association of Canada. And what is his position as a leader against the policy of this Government? I desire to call your attention to the important fact that this gentleman, one of the professed exponents of the opinion adverse to the policy of the Government, became a member of the Government, remained a member of the Government after the solemn declaration of the leader of the Government that in dealing with this question he would be guided by the judgment of the Privy Council, whether it was for or against the rights of the Catholic minority in Manitoba. That gentleman became his ally and associate in the Government, and remained in it, doing all he was loyally bound to do to assist and strengthen the Government while it was committed to that policy; and, after that leader's death, he continued on, he remained a member of the present Government, under the leadership of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, and when that Government, not only adopted the remedial order of March last, but out of the mouth of the Prime Minister said they would, in adopting that order, take the responsibility of the policy that order indicated, that gentleman dared to remain, was willing to remain a member of that Government down to November, 1895, doing all he could, as, under the constitution he was bound to do, to strengthen and fortify the Government committed to a policy of remedial legislation. Well, Mr. Speaker, that gentleman, I believe, is presiding over a meeting to-night, or he has been presiding over and attending meetings called ostensibly for the purpose of denouncing the policy of this Government. Can we, members on one side of you, Mr. Speaker, or on the other, attach any great importance to the action or movements of a gentleman of that ilk and that style? I say he represents no honest, sincere, or outspoken opinion in the country. He can explain his position, but whatever the explanation may be, whatever his ingenuity may amount to, he can never be a representative of a sentiment in this country entitled to great consideration at the hands of Parliament. Now, who is his colleague, who is his associate, who is the other grand name who is called on as against the policy of the Government in favour of remedial legislation? The paid counsel, the paid attorney, the paid adviser of the Manitoba government, forsooth. He, and none other. He who was at the throat of the other gen-