

divided on creed questions throughout the country. We would have had this question settled in a reasonable way, taking no extreme position on either side, but doing simple justice to the minority in Manitoba, and then we would have been able to go forward and deal with the other important questions which agitate the people of this country, and with respect to which it is so important we should constantly keep our eyes open. I do protest in this House, as I do on every occasion where I have a voice and hearing, that whatever trouble is to come out of this question, whatever difficulty is to arise, the responsibility must largely rest on the leader of the opposition, the Hon. Mr. Laurier, and the party associated with him in public life for not having risen, as Mr. Blake did in 1890, above making the question one of a party character.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE—It may not be the province of the leader of the opposition to make such statements as those referred to by the member of the government who has just resumed his seat; but it may belong to me, who began war on this question in 1872, to say what I believe on this question of disallowance. I could not reproach the late Sir John Thompson, or the late Sir John Abbott, severely, for not having asked for the disallowance of the Manitoba legislation; because they had a precedent, which would certainly have placed them in a very bad position. The school question must be discussed in its proper shape. You have to go back to 1872, because the first precedent was there established which forced Sir John Thompson to go to the courts, and forced Mr. Blake to ask in England for an interpretation, you may say, of the British North America Act. I was then a member of the Commons, and I was the only one from the province of Quebec who dared to stand up and oppose the government on that question. True the hon. gentleman who spoke a few moments ago, Mr. Masson, made a few remarks after me, but when I made the attack I knew not whether he or any other would back me up. What did I say? My speech was not reported at the time, Parliament had then no official reports of its debates; but as it was an important question, I took the trouble to write my remarks in order that I might use them later, and I read my written speech. The paper is very

old indeed, but I have it still; I knew and predicted that in after years we would have trouble on that question, when the government did not settle it the first time it arose. In every part of the world where there is a mixed population, all religious or educational questions make trouble, unless they are thoroughly settled. In 1872 I dealt with this subject in the other House. Our present Premier was there then and knows those facts. What did I say? I showed that the government were wrong. At confederation Sir John Macdonald had laid down the principles under which the veto should be exercised. He said his government would never meddle with a province except in two cases—first, if the legislature of the province should go beyond their jurisdiction, and second, in case the legislation of the province though *intra vires*, should be recognized as legislation calculated to disturb the public peace. Knowing that educational and religious questions would create trouble throughout the world, consequently on the principles laid down by himself he was wrong, and I declared that I should separate from him for ever, if he did not take the question in his own hands and settle it at once. Since that time, though I have always remained a conservative, I have been quite independent of governments, and I have lost all confidence in public men. Before giving my confidence to any government now, I wait to see their work and judge them by their acts. But as far as this question of the veto is concerned the old man, Sir John A. Macdonald, is the only man responsible for its abuse. So that if the objection taken by the leader of the opposition is not quite correct the answer of the minister who has just taken his seat (Hon. Mr. Ferguson) is quite incorrect. As to the Premier, I congratulate him on the stand he has taken on this very great issue and on the way that he has spoken. Ever since the death of Sir John A. Macdonald, at the time Sir John Abbott was called to the head of the cabinet, and later when Sir John Thompson was called to succeed him, I never hesitated to state that a better choice would have been made had Sir Mackenzie Bowell been selected because he was the best man for the time. I now see by the way that he has acted since then that I was right, and that my judgment, so far as the premiership is con-