

of defiance against this highest authority. I do not wish to go back and refer again to the time of the cession of Canada to the British Empire and bring up the report of General Murray, the first Governor General of Canada after the cession, in which he stated that the English of the time were causing all the trouble, because they were trying to deprive the French Canadians, who were then in a large majority, of their rights and to prevent them from holding any public office or even from sitting on juries. We all remember that General Murray stated that the then few English residents were the most immoral collection of men in the country; that they had their fortunes to make, and few of them were solicitous about the means when the end could be attained. Later on it was such people who attempted to burn the parliament buildings because the Governor General was going to sign a Bill which had been passed by Parliament to give justice to those to whom justice was due. In that instance again, you do not find the French Canadians defying the law or throwing rotten eggs at the Governor. No; it was the English people, who then were signing petitions for annexation to the United States. You have never heard of the French Canadians doing that.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: I do not see why the honourable gentleman is mentioning all these things, which are not relevant to the present discussion. I think the honourable gentleman should confine his remarks to the subject of the motion made by the honourable member for Stadacona (Hon. Mr. Landry). It is not necessary to say anything injurious to anybody in the discussion of that question.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE: With reference to the motion asking for disallowance, I was going to say that this Act of the Ontario legislature ought to be disallowed, because it has been passed in defiance of the decision of the highest tribunal of the Empire, the Privy Council.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL: That is merely the honourable gentleman's statement. It is not correct.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE: The facts are there. The facts are that a law has been re-enacted after a similar law passed by the same legislature had been declared unconstitutional, ultra vires, by the Privy Council. Now they are defying the judgment of the highest court in the land. These facts cannot be denied, and it would seem to be customary

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE.

in Ontario to do such things. Not later than last week there was read in the Railway Committee a telegram from the mayor of Toronto; I am glad to say it has since been withdrawn; but the mayor of Toronto telegraphed to the committee not to pass a certain law; that if any such law were passed he would defy it; he was prepared to call out the whole police force of Toronto, and if necessary the militia, in order to prevent those who had rights under the law from doing any work in the streets of Toronto.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Order. I repeat my warning that the honourable gentleman has no right to depart from the question before the House.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE: I am only speaking of defiance of the law and have been citing all these bad examples given by loyal Ontario, and I claim that these instances have a bearing upon the motion which is now before the House, that these Acts of the Ontario legislature be disallowed.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: The motion itself covers two pages. Surely that is enough for my honourable friend.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE: I think that if the honourable gentleman would take the trouble to read the motion again, he would see—

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: These questions are not referred to in the motion.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE: At any rate, this Act ought to be disallowed, because it is in defiance of the decision of the highest tribunal in the land. I will go further: I say that in passing that law, in depriving men who are paying taxes from the right to be represented on the Board of school trustees of Ottawa, we are going back to the dark times when those who paid taxes had no representation. We know that many battles have been fought in every country, especially in England and in this country, to obtain representation for those who pay taxes. The slogan has been, "No taxation (without representation)." Now, what is the effect of the law which the petitioners are asking to have disallowed? It is a law which takes from the taxpayers of Ottawa the right to elect their own representatives. Those persons belonging to a certain class, and paying taxes in this city, had the right