the minority, unsupported by evidence, without having made any investigation—are we to be told that the laws of the majority are to be set aside ? Sir, if you tell me this, then I say it was a mere mockery to give to the province of Manitoba the right to legislate upon this question. It is true, hon. gentlemen say, that they stand upon the constitution. I take issue with them. I stand also upon the constitution, and I rest the case on the judgment of every Canadian, of all men who believe that above the constitution, nay, not above the constitution, but in it, incorporated in every word and syllable of it, there are to be found those laws of eternal truth and justice on which alone nations can be founded.

The right hon. gentleman goes on to propound the proposition that the legislature of Manitoba, having power to legislate and create separate schools and then having the power to abolish them, was not subject to coercive interference from this parliament ; and I see in the present circumstances no difference under that grand and burning principle for which the right hon. gentleman so eloquently contends in his speech, from the situation at that time. The right hon. gentleman said, at page 2737 :

The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is aware—more than anybody else, perhaps, he ought to be aware—that, in a community with a free government, in a free country like this, upon any question involving different conceptions of what is right or wrong, different standards of what is just or unjust, it is the part of statesmanship not to force the views of any section, but to endeavour to bring them all to a uniform standard and a uniform conception of what is right.

Then the right hon. gentleman proceeded to discuss the attitude of the former leader of the government, Sir Charles Tupper, with regard to the bringing into confederation of the province of Nova Scotia. In that connection he used these words, which will be found on page 2738 of the 'Hansard' of 1896 :

Instead of applying himself to persuading his own fellow countrymen of the grandeur of this Act of confederation, he forced the project down the throats of the people of Nova Scotia by the brute force of a mechanical majority in a moribund parliament. And, Sir, the hon. gentleman must to-day bear the responsibility and the stigma that for a whole generation the great idea of confederation was to the people of Nova Scotia synonymous with oppression and coercion.

Again, at page 2742, the right hon. gentleman said :

It seems also essential that all the legislatures should be absolutely free of each other and free from supervision.

Experience has taught us that this remedy of interference with local legislation has never been applied and probably never can be applied without friction, disturbance and discontent ; that you cannot apply that remedy without causing as much dissatisfaction as satisfaction.

That same principle has been enunciated by others for whom the right hon. gentleman must have great respect. In the correspondence which was carried on between the government of Canada and the Earl of Carnarvon, in the year 1875, regarding the power of the Governor General to veto provincial legislation and the responsibility of ministers in connection with that veto, there are some very interesting statements concerning the supervisory power by the Dominion over provincial institutions. At page 561 of Todd's 'Parliamentary Government in the Colonies,' I find that the Supreme Court of New Brunswick expressed itself as follows :

For the British North America Act is distributive merely in respect to powers of legislation exercisable by the Dominion parliament and by the local legislatures respectively ; and the Dominion parliament may not intrench upon property and civil rights, which are under the guardianship and subject to the power of the local legislatures, except to that extent that may be required to enable parliament to work out the legislation upon the particular subjects specially delegated to it.

At page 512, the same author says :

Moreover, in the precedents which illustrate this portion of our inquiry, we observe repeated instances wherein appeals have been made, as well by the Dominion as by the provincial authorities in Canada, to Her Majesty's government to interfere for the promotion of harmony, or for the settlement of disputes between conflicting jurisdictions. But in all such cases the principle is affirmed, that no interposition to the detriment, in any degree, of the established principle of self-government in matters of local concern would be permitted or approved, whether on the part of the imperial or Dominion governments, in their several and appropriate spheres of action, in matters within the acknowledged competency of either tribunal.

And, at page 448, he says :

Mr. Blake, moreover, contended that inasmuch as by the British North America Act the power of disallowing provincial enactments is expressly vested in the Governor General in Council in substitution for the jurisdiction which was exercised by the Crown over legislation in the same provinces, when they were directly subordinate to the Queen in Council, it follows that the Canadian ministers must be directly and exclusively responsible to the Dominion parliament for the action taken by the governor in any and every such case.

This gives some light through the then Minister of Justice (Mr. Blake) on a question as to what are the relative powers of the federal and provincial parliaments. The Secretary of State on June 1, 1876, suggested a reference of the question under consideration, namely, the power to veto, to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and he suggested certain differences in the powers of the Governor General and the Governor General in Council. That having been referred to the Minister of Justice, upon his report a minute was passed and approved, dated 19th September, 1876, which contains the following: