

ment in reference to the same matter and which they would no doubt like to forget.

Now, it is my opinion, and I say it believing it from the bottom of my heart, that it will be more than ten years, when many of us who are now in this House will have reached the chloroform stage, before this question will be satisfactorily settled by the Bill which was introduced a short time ago. Again, the Minister of Militia said:

My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) might have gone further than he did in his statement because it will not only be the last man who was able to exercise the franchise of that time but his children and his grandchildren will have to pass away before the memory of that unjust Act is effaced from the minds of the people of Nova Scotia. . . . When we think that we are about to pass a system of laws upon the subject of education which is exclusively a provincial right, and that we are going to impose upon a great province this law for all time, no matter how the circumstances may change, or how the population may change, or how desirable they may be to make a change in that matter, when we think that for ever that law, by our act here, is to be fastened upon that unwilling province, surely it ought to cause us to pause.

Again, he said, that nine-tenths of the people were known to be opposed to that legislation, just as the vast majority of the people of Canada to-day are known to be opposed to the Bill which these hon. gentlemen are now trying to force through this House. Further he says:

And I dare say it is fitting that the hon. gentleman who so successfully bull-dozed the legislation of Nova Scotia in 1867 could carry confederation through the House against the well understood wishes of the people of that province, should be brought here to coerce this House into passing legislation which the majority of the people are opposed to and which is inimical to the interest of the province of Manitoba and the interest of the Dominion at large. . . . We hear a great deal about the rights of minority. I believe in preserving and conserving the right of minority, but, Sir, we are here under a system of responsible government, and the very foundation stone of responsible government is to govern in the interest of the majority with a view to the greatest good of the greatest number.

That is a noble and very old and tried sentiment.

It is most gratifying to us on this side of the House, whose policy has favoured this course from the first, because my hon. friend the leader of the opposition long ago laid down the policy of investigation and the policy of conciliation as opposed to the policy of blind coercion.

And I want to say that if anybody reads the speech then delivered by the then Mr. Laurier, now the right hon. leader of this House, he will find that the very core of his argument, the silver thread that ran through it from beginning to end, was the argument

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

of investigation. Now, it has not been shown to us that the First Minister took any great pains to make an investigation before introducing his own Bill; he did not even consult the members of his own cabinet.

What possible good can be served by proceeding with this Bill until we know what becomes of these negotiations. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman who leads this House has conducted himself in such a way as to give every indication of the strongest desire to annoy the government and the people of Manitoba to the utmost extent of his ability. . . . Well, Sir, I leave it to the hon. members of the House to judge who are mainly responsible if these fires have been kindled in this Dominion—whether it is those hon. gentlemen who rush madly into this offensive course toward the province of Manitoba, or whether it is my hon. friend here, the leader of the opposition, who has always counselled moderation, who has always counselled conciliation, who asks only that all the facts of the case be ascertained and the fullest information be secured before this tremendous step is taken.

The right hon. gentleman said something to-day about creeds. I want to ask right here, who is responsible if we have any trouble with creed, race and religion in connection with this Bill? Upon whom must this House and this country place the responsibility if it is not upon the right hon. gentleman and his cabinet who have introduced these unnecessary clauses into this Bill? The hon. Minister of Militia went on:

Was the hon. gentleman able by himself to make up his mind what alterations should be made in the tariff?

He is asking when the great fiscal policy was introduced into this country by the great party which I have no hesitation in saying has introduced nearly all the great policies of this Dominion. I admit that these policies have been followed by our friends on the other side. They may not be very good introducers of policies, but they are first-class mimics. I am very thankful that in their fiscal policy they have come so near to adopting those rules and directions that were laid down by the members of the great Conservative party. The hon. gentleman said:

Was the hon. gentleman able by himself to make up his mind what alterations should be made in the tariff? No, Sir, he took his two assistants, the Comptroller of Inland Revenue and the Comptroller of Customs with him and he went all over the country and called into his counsel people who are going to be affected by the legislation which he proposed—that is, some of the people. But at any rate he laid down this principle that he was going to enact legislation which affected the rights and might affect prosperity of the people of this country, and that it was his duty to consult or confer with those people who are to be affected by the legislation which he proposed to enact.

Now, there is no use in saying that we have rumours. The rumours are regrettable,