

of the financial arrangements and the land question, which are so closely connected as to form one subject, we find that although the hon. gentleman had strong views—and I may say that I think his views are far more correct than those of the government—although he presented his case as ably, as eloquently and as persuasively as he has this afternoon spoken to the House, still, on that point too, the government refused to listen, and so the land and fiscal questions are complicated by the introduction of a principle which, as pointed out by the minister this afternoon, shows that the government, by admitting to the provinces that we should pay for the land, have admitted that the provinces have a right to the land. Again I say that, although he was right in his representations, the government treated them with contemptuous indifference. Then, after making these protestations and after being badly treated, treated with indifference in this way, could one imagine that there was no irony concealed in his remarks when he said in this House that there was no pique when he resigned after this Bill was brought down two days before his arrival? We have heard many details of the hon. gentleman's exploits in the west; many rumours have drifted down to us during the past ten years, but I venture to say that not one of them will be received with less credulity by the country than the statement he made this afternoon as to the causes of his resignation. Just think for a moment the position that he put his colleagues in. Had the ex-minister come out flatly, and bravely said: 'I resign because I refuse to occupy a seat in a cabinet with men who do not understand business,' then we would have understood and the country would have understood. But when we see the pitiable spectacle of ministers bringing down such a Bill, standing up and advocating it in spite of such tremendous objections to it as those which the ex-minister pointed out, and the existence of which they admitted by changing the Bill, what are we to think of the capacity of a cabinet that would plunge the country into all the excitement and turmoil of the past few weeks on a measure to which they have given so little attention as they have given to this?

The hon. gentleman to-day touched on many subjects. There is one subject on which I did not intend to speak, but I shall refer to it in consequence of the remarks of the hon. the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), coupled with what was said a night or two ago by the Prime Minister and also by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Pater-son) last night. When the premier was speaking the other day he pointed out, with regard to the agitation which convulsed this country in 1896, that the Conservative party had undoubtedly misunderstood their position, that at that time Manitoba stood in the same position as Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, and that the Conservative party,

Mr. NORTHROP.

in endeavouring to pass the Remedial Bill dealing with Manitoba which stood on the same footing as Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, had entirely misconceived the position. The right hon. gentleman pointed out that the Privy Council held that there were no separate schools in Manitoba prior to the union, and therefore no rights of Catholics in that province. Therefore, the right hon. gentleman objected to the exercise in this House of the powers of remedial legislation. I refer to this, because his colleague last night repeated the same statement, and I tell the right hon. gentleman, and I tell this House, I tell the Protestant minority in Quebec and the Roman Catholic minority in Ontario, I tell the minorities in every province in this Dominion, that the remedial clause of section 93 of the British North America Act has been practically blotted from the statute by the right hon. gentleman and those who supported him at that time. The Prime Minister, the other evening, gave a very interesting and very accurate account of the circumstances under which the educational clauses of the British North America Act were framed. I entirely agree with every word he uttered on that point, but let me add one or two words to what he said. It is perfectly true that when confederation was about to be formed it was agreed between the politicians of Upper and Lower Canada that two Bills should be introduced to this House, one giving educational privileges to the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, the other giving educational privileges to the Protestant minority in Lower Canada. These Bills were introduced but for reasons which we need not now discuss, they were not passed, and those Bills, not having been passed, and confederation being about to be effected, the whole scheme would have fallen through, because the Protestants of the province of Quebec refused to enter confederation until their educational rights were secured. Then Sir George Etienne Cartier and Sir Hector Langevin, speaking for the Roman Catholics of Quebec, said: If the Protestants of Quebec will consent to going into confederation without this legislation, we pledge our honour that at the first session of the local legislature of the province of Quebec, after confederation has been formed, we will see that the rights you would have secured by the Bill of last session, had it passed, are conferred on you by a statute of the local legislature. Sir Alexander Galt replied: I am perfectly satisfied to take the word of you gentlemen and believe that you will adhere to it, but times are fleeting, lives are uncertain and a day may come when others will control the legislation of Quebec, and in that case what the local legislature gave it can take away, and the minority may be deprived of the privileges granted to them. Then it was that Galt, as the right hon. gentleman said, drew with his own hand his famous clause, that if after confederation any right given to