

our schools nor in favor of his political adversaries. Nevertheless he was the first to take in hand the question we now consider. Petitions asking for the disallowance and every possible remedy to the legislation of which the Catholics complained, were hardly arrived at Ottawa than Hon. Mr. Blake rose in the Commons to move the following resolutions:

RESOLUTIONS.

"That it is expedient to provide means whereby on solemn occasions touching the exercise of the power of disallowance or the appellate power as to educational legislation, important questions of law or of fact may be referred by the executive to a high judicial tribunal for hearing and consideration, in such mode that the authorities and parties interested may be represented and that a reasoned opinion may be obtained for the information of the executive."

I pray those who accuse us of the responsibility of not having obtained the disallowance to ponder over this resolution and to read carefully the speech by which Mr. Blake supported it. That speech is in Hansard, 1890. As all my readers have not the facility of getting this document, I will make a few short quotations. Mr. Blake says:

"It is now generally agreed that void acts should not be disallowed, but should be left to the action of the court. . . . My own opinion is that wherever in opposition to the continued view of a provincial executive and legislature it is contemplated to disallow a provincial act as ultra vires there ought to be a reference, and also that there ought to be a reference in certain cases where the condition of public opinion renders expedient the solution of legal problem, dissociated from these elements of passion and expediency which are rightly or wrongly often attributed to the actions of political bodies. And again I will recommend such a reference in all cases of educational appeal, cases which necessarily invoke the feelings to which I have alluded, and to one of which I am frank to say my present motion is due. When you act of the appellate educational clauses, as for example, in the case of Manitoba. . . . It is important that the political executive should not more than can be avoided, arrogate to itself judicial powers."

It ought to have the power to call in aid the judicial department in order to arrive at a correct solution. . . . The absolute union of the executive legislative and judicial departments is absolute despotism. I do not say that they can be absolutely and always separated. I by no means propose to withdraw from the executive its duty. My object is . . . to facilitate the better working of them."

All this is perfectly clear. Hon. Mr. Blake moved that in matters of education, as in the Manitoba case, the government should not use the power of disallowing provincial acts, nor even of hearing the appeal against those laws, without having before hand submitted the matter to a high judicial tribunal to receive light and direction that, although it leaves a responsibility upon the executive, may permit it to act more safely, with less passion and thus make less victims of political expediency. It was then a new procedure that was set before the administration.

Sir John A. Macdonald thanked Mr. Blake and insisted on two points: 1. That the recourse to the tribunals, such as moved, be supported on a law whose dispositions would be such as to permit, in any case, an appeal to the privy council. 2. That the opinion asked and received from the high tribunals would be but an advice, in no way lessening the government's responsibility. Again, I pray the reader to consider attentively those important declarations; they had a value in the past and may be useful in the future.

After those explanations of the premier, the motion of Mr. Blake was unanimously voted by both sides of the House, by the right as well as by the left, by the Liberals as well as by the Conservatives, by those who to-day place upon me the responsibility they then assumed, as well as by those who are loyal enough to recognize that the question of disallowance was thus killed in the Commons. I do not know the thoughts of those who voted without speaking, but I know what I thought; what suffered, in learning that, a fortnight after its arrival at Ottawa, our petition asking for disallowance was paralyzed by the unanimous vote of the Commons of Canada. I do not know the ideas of the government, but it might have naturally thought:

"Blake and opposition relieve us of a great anxiety; that resolution can not be law nor be applied before twelve months; the time fixed by the constitution for disallowance will have expired, we will not need to meddle with; this suits us so much the more that the rights of the Catholics are so clear that they cannot be sacrificed."

I do not know either the thought of the opposition, but I see its chief looking complacently and intelligently on his partisans and saying to them silently, "What a fine affair! If the elections bring us into power before a year, we will not be called up to consider this terrible question of disallowance, and you know that this would be my night-mare, but the Conservatives have voted with us on the Blake proposition rendering disallowance virtually impossible in this case."

In Manitoba, both among the Liberals and among the Conservatives, the disallowance was the most unpopular measure, on account of that employed against railroads. As to the schools themselves, it was feared that the disallowance would cause agitation, but the Blake proposition having been unanimously voted it was hoped that an advantageous and different solution would be arrived at. Every one here knows that I did not share entirely such views more than anyone was given by that obstacle to disallowance, but I yet hoped that it would be removed. The possible refusal of disallowance prompted new petitions that could not be affected by that refusal. At once a petition was sent around the country and signed by four thousand some hundred people.