

separate schools in Manitoba were good schools and the teachers were good teachers. In most cases, the people not having the means to pay teachers, the parish priests were the teachers, and we know that they are men of education. My hon. friend from Brandon knows that politics had a great deal more to do with the abolition of those schools than the question of their efficiency. There was some railway business which put the government into a very bad position, and something was needed to divert public opinion from the deeds of the ministers. Our friend Mr. Dalton McCarthy had gone on a tour through the province of Manitoba. He was dissatisfied because Sir John Thompson had been chosen as Minister of Justice. He had hopes of being offered that position, although he might have refused it, and he went to Manitoba and inflamed the passions of the people. He told them that something should be done to deliver them from the influence of the hierarchy. It was there that he commenced his fight against the hierarchy, and questions of that sort will always greatly inflame public opinion. In a short time the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), who was at the head of the Manitoba government, and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) deprived the minority of that province of what they were entitled to. We have been told that the question in Manitoba was not the same question that we are discussing to-day—that in Manitoba, the provincial government had given separate schools and that the provincial government withdrew separate schools and the official use of the French language; and that was provincial rights. The minority complained. I need not give the whole history of the case. The question came before parliament; and I may say in passing that the Northwest ordinance was passed while we were in the midst of that turmoil. The question was before the Privy Council and before the courts. We were taunted on the stump everywhere because the Conservative government had not disallowed the Act of the legislature of Manitoba. My right hon. friend the leader of the government was sitting on this side of the House at that time, when the Hon. Edward Blake moved a resolution declaring that it would be wise for the Dominion government not to use the right of veto in cases involving religion or nationality, and that resolution was looked upon as such a wise one that Sir John A. Macdonald, sitting where my right hon. friend does now, rose and said: 'This is a motion which should have the unanimous support of the House'; and it had. This is why that Act was not vetoed. At that time my right hon. friend and his friends in the province of Quebec said that the government did not act because it was under the heel of the Orangemen of the province of Ontario.

And it was said in Ontario that the government was under the heel of the hierarchy in the province of Quebec. This lasted from

Mr. BERGERON.

1890 to 1896. The constitutionality of the Act of the Manitoba legislature abolishing the separate schools had gone before the Supreme Court of Canada and the Privy Council, and the Privy Council in its first judgment declared that the Act was *intra vires* the Manitoba legislature. Again there was an appeal to the Privy Council, and that court declared that although the Manitoba legislature had the right to pass a law taking away the schools of the minority in that province, the minority had a grievance, and it was within the rights and the powers of the Dominion government to come to its rescue and remove that grievance. Then we had the Remedial Bill submitted to the Dominion parliament, and we all know what happened. When my right hon. friend moved the six months hoist, we were at the end of the session. But when the second reading of that Bill was proposed and carried by a majority of the House, who were the members that voted for it? Who were those who voted to do justice to the minority of Manitoba and to stand upon the rock of the constitution? It was, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative party which took that stand. And I say it to the honour of the Protestants and the Orangemen of Ontario and the maritime provinces, that they voted to do justice to the Catholic minority. I remember well Mr. Fairbairn, an old representative of the province of Ontario, declaring in this House, that although he was an old Orangeman he was going to vote in favour of the Catholic minority because he had sworn to be a defender always of minorities, whether Catholic or Protestant. I am reminding the House of these facts in order that, in these days, when we read so much in the newspapers about the intolerance on this side of the House, I may give my testimony on behalf of the Conservative English Protestants of this Dominion. In my opinion, the newspapers are in many instances doing more harm than good and inflaming passions and prejudices where it should be their endeavour to allay them. I have seen caricatures published of my right hon. friend which did not at all meet my approval and I have also seen caricatures of some of my hon. friends on this side which I think were altogether out of place. I regret these methods. I regret this holding up of our public men to undeserved ridicule and obloquy, because it cannot fail to have a mischievous effect on the people. I can sympathize with my right hon. friend in his present position. I can appreciate the difficulty in which he found himself, when the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) came back and took him by the throat and possibly threatened to inflame public opinion, I can well understand that my right hon. friend then found himself between two fires. On the one side was the persistent Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who stuck, and rightly stuck, to his clause. On the other was the Minister of the Interior (Mr.