

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I understand my hon. friend very well. I am quite sure the majority would take care of itself, but it is not the majority I am speaking of. It is the minority in a French section where they speak nothing but the French language. What provision is there in these regulations that the children of Protestants attending that school shall be taught the English language? That is what I desire to point out. Perhaps I was not sufficiently clear.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Would the hon. gentleman read that 10th paragraph again?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL (again reads the paragraph)—That provides for the teaching of French in addition to English in the case of ten French children being in the school. In a further section of this agreement where it provides for religious teaching, it provides for the employment of a Roman Catholic teacher or a Protestant teacher. It is duplicated. It is made applicable to both classes of people, but in this section it is only made applicable to one and there can be but one answer to it; I speak under correction when I refer to it. I do not desire to draw improper conclusions from the reading of this 10th paragraph. If the Manitoba school law provides absolutely for the teaching of English in all schools, then, of course, my objection is answered; if not, then the deduction which I draw from this 10th paragraph must be correct—there is no provision where there is a minority of ten Protestants in a French settlement for teaching of the English language. If the people who are interested in that agreement are willing to accept it as carrying out the provisions of the constitution, it is not for me, and those who think with me, to take exception to it. I again repeat my repudiation of the charge that has been laid against the late government of having treated the Manitoba government with discourtesy in any respect, directly or indirectly. I repeat that it is a matter of very little consequence to me, taking the position that I hold, and believing it to be the position which every statesman and every public man should hold, whether the whole province of Quebec or any other province should vote acceptance of that agreement. If the papal legate who is now in this country, advises the people to accept a settle-

ment, it is a matter for themselves. But if the question comes up as to recording my vote in favour of the rights, as I understand them, of the minority in Manitoba, notwithstanding the Pope should say himself that it was satisfactory to him, I should vote for the enactment of a law which would give to the minority that which I believe they are entitled. The next paragraph is perhaps one more congenial to my feelings—one with which I could deal with less reserve. My hon. friend who moved the address expressed pretty strong views in reference to the trade question and the tariff. He pointed to the fact that millions of dollars had been invested, and that vested interests should not be interfered with. When one reflects upon the past, and what has taken place during the 17 or 18 years in which the protective policy of the government has been in force, and then reads the utterances of the leaders of the Liberal party of to-day, if one could only blot out the names of those who utter them and read them without knowing who gave expression to those views, one would say they come from the veriest Tories in the land. I congratulate my hon. friends upon their conversion. They have been denouncing in the bitterest possible terms the national policy for the past 17 years. They have told us, only place them in power and they would remove the incubus which has weighed down the country during the last 18 years, and driven the people abroad and made us all miserably poor. The farmers were ruined; they were literally under burdens which they could not possibly carry. Now, these same gentlemen tell us that we must not interfere with rights that have grown up under the protective policy, because they are vested rights. Why all this change? I have not heard my hon. friend from Bothwell give utterance to any expressions of that kind. I believe that he is too ardent a free trader, and moreover that he is too honest to give expression to similar views to those which have fallen from hon. gentlemen with whom he has been acting. Let me say, parenthetically, that I agreed with the leader of this House when he passed the glowing eulogy he did upon my hon. friend from Bothwell. I have watched that hon. gentleman with a good deal of interest during his political career. I have received from him very much information, and it was a marvel to me that a