

The Carleton Sentinel Supplement, July 27, 1895.

Dominion Parliament.

On July 16, on motion to go into supply,

Mr McCarthy moved this amendment:—
That this House hears with regret the statements recently made defining the policy of the government respecting the Manitoba school question, and is unwilling by silence to allow it to be assumed that at the session to be held in January, any more than at the present session, it is prepared to pass a law to restore separate schools in Manitoba on the lines of the remedial order of March 21st, 1895.

Mr McCarthy described every step taken by the government on the school matter as unwise. The premier's admission proved that the remedial order had not been passed by the government in a judicial capacity; the government accepted full responsibility. He referred to the haste shown by the government and the inconsistencies of the several reasons advanced. Mr McCarthy stated the three views put forward by the government in different places and on different occasions, that in making the remedial order the government was first simply passing on the order of Her Majesty; second, was simply opening the door of parliament so that the aggrieved minority might get in, and third, that the merits of the case were considered. He did not care which of these views the government adopted, but he would like them to tie themselves down to one. Mr McCarthy spent some time in proving that the last decision of the judicial committee of the Imperial Privy Council was not a mandate to the Canadian government. He quoted both the Lord Chancellor and Hon Edward Blake in the argument to show that after the appeal of the minority was heard the further action of the government would be political and they might grant the appeal in whole or in part or refuse to entertain it at all. Anyway, the government of Canada could not be bound by the opinion of any court. Mr McCarthy buttressed his position by an opinion from Christopher Robinson, Q. C., the eminent conservative counsel. When the appeal was taken at Ottawa the merits of the case should have been considered—the fact that illiteracy prevailed among the children of the minority, and the fact that the object aimed at was not attained.

Mr McCarthy said Manitoba was not fully represented there and he warned the government against tampering on the rights of the province. He said the public money was given to separate schools which were kept open only two days in the week, and the money went to the support of the Roman Catholic church. The accuracy of this assertion was questioned, and Mr McCarthy retorted that if the request of the Manitoba government for a thorough investigation were granted it could be proved. How was it, he asked, separate schools could be dispensed with in British Columbia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and yet be required in Manitoba, where the Roman Catholic proportion of the population was but 13 per cent? Mr McCarthy next referred to the recent declaration of the government that they would call a session next January, and if under this threat Manitoba did not reverse her policy before then, coercive legislation would be enacted. That legislation was to be on the lines of the remedial order, which ordered the re-establishment of the separate schools formerly existing under the control and management of the Roman Catholics. Did this government propose, he asked, to continue to exist for six months longer, solely for the purpose of implementing the remedial order?

If this agitation was dropped in Quebec, the school question, Mr McCarthy asserted, would settle itself in two years.

Sir Hibbert Tupper replied. He began by attacking McCarthy, whose tracks he said were covered with failures. He was insincere or had become insincere since he had become if not a political outcast a political desperado. Tupper declared that McCarthy as a member of the House was ineligible to discuss this question, because he had been the paid counsel of Manitoba in the hearing of the appeal. Dealing with the merits of the case, Tupper quoted the Lord Chancellor to show that in his view there was a complaint with the minority guaranteeing separate schools. He laid stress on the views of the judges of the judicial committee that there was a grievance, and there was an appeal and consequently action. He defended the remedial order as necessarily peremptory. The main thing aimed at was to make its meaning plain. Legislation should follow, but there was some hope held out in Manitoba's answer that renewed negotiations might yet result in settlement. He described himself as an ardent advocate of remedial legislation. When the time came they would act with force. They had called a halt for a time. He wished to sound Manitoba in a friendly spirit. He argued for a separate school system as a compromise system obtaining in Canada. He did not mean that its weakness should be re-established in Manitoba. The draft bill had eliminated some of the weak points. He was prepared to die politically for the policy to which the government were committed. When the time came the government would act with zeal.

On motion to adjourn the debate, Mr McCarthy got up and warmly resented what he termed an unjust attack upon him because he had acted as Manitoba's counsel. He quoted authorities to show that the rule did not apply in his case. He especially resented the attack from a Tupper. The history of Canada had been disgraced by the Tupper family. Sir Hibbert replied and quoted English Hansard to show that his contention was right. Mr Martin quoted the London Times report of the debate, from which Hansard is condensed, in rebuttal, and warmly defended McCarthy.

July 17—Debate on the school question was resumed. Mr Lariviere appealed against

postponing an act of justice to Manitoba another six months.

Mr McNeill, after defending McCarthy from Sir Hibbert's imputation as to his being improperly influenced, said the amendment did not go far enough; it was a tricky one to catch votes. He expressed himself as desirous of seeing secular teaching interfused with religious instruction, and he believed that the act of 1890 dealt harshly with the minority, but at the same time he would not admit that there should be one rule for Quebec, as in the Jesuits' Estates appeal, and another for Manitoba. Parliament should not be asked to say that the conscientious convictions of the majority should give way to the conscientious convictions of the minority. He would be told that the constitution required them to establish separate schools. In reply to this, Mr McNeill entered into a well conceived argument to show that the constitution required nothing of the kind. He endorsed McCarthy's argument that the judicial committee's decision was confined to allowing the right of appeal, and extended no further. It was true that they gave some expression of opinion which their judgment did not call for. 'What!' exclaimed Mr McNeill, 'are we, the parliament of Canada, to be bound by the obiter of four distinguished, very able, very impartial and very ignorant men—ignorant I mean of the condition of this country and of the circumstances of Manitoba—on a great question such as this?' (Mr Weldon responded Hear, Hear!) Mr McNeill said, 'If Manitoba was approached in a kindly spirit something might be accomplished, but if the province was coerced no man could tell what would happen.'

Mr Wallace approved of the policy of the government to first see if Manitoba would not do something. Adverting to Bishop Gravel's letter he asked Mr Laurier to say what he thought of it, and Mr Laurier replied, 'Ask your colleague.' He made many personal references to McCarthy and was called to order more than once.

Mr Weldon said, referring to the judicial committee of the English Privy Council, their decision did not bind anybody in a case of this sort, which was a mere reference and had no force of law, and it was an impertinence for the judges of the Privy Council in England to attempt to dictate a course for the parliament of Canada to take.

Sir Richard Cartwright—Hear, hear.

Mr Weldon—These judges do not know this country or the history of this country, and it is perfect folly to say that we must be guided by their utterances when they have not the force of a legal decision. I am an ardent Imperialist but I cannot look with idolatry upon any utterance of the judicial committee as a sacred Brahmin would upon some writings of his books. He held that it was nonsense to put the appellate clause in the Manitoba act. It had no meaning. In the debate in parliament on the Manitoba act in 1870, there was not a single reference to separate schools. It was not an issue apparently, and the Roman Catholic majority did not care very much to extend protection to the Protestant minority of 1870. The expectation then was that the settlement on the banks of the Red River would always remain Roman Catholic and French. Let them not shelter themselves behind the ramparts of the constitution when there were no ramparts.

Sir Richard Cartwright cried hear, hear, energetically.

Dr Weldon declared that he broke with the administration because of their declaration of policy last week. He would vote against the amendment because he would give Manitoba an opportunity to settle the question.

Mr Davin thought the remedial order went too far. He had it on the very highest authority at most, that the system in vogue in the Territories would be satisfactory to the minority in Manitoba. As the government said they had reason to believe that Manitoba herself might act, he thought the government policy a wise one.

Several members having spoken against the amendment, Mr Oostigan said this was the first time it had come to a test of any of the guarantees in the constitution. He protested against the idea that this was coercion. He was speaking of a treaty. The minority in Manitoba did not demand the restoration of the defects of the old system of schools. The principle of separate schools had been adopted by the Manitoba Legislature and it was not suggested that they were forcing a new principle upon them. The Roman Catholics would never take up arms for separate schools but would appeal to the sense of justice of the majority. If the constitution failed them, so much the worse for the country.

The debate was in progress at two o'clock in the morning.

Mr Laurier reminded the house that they had heard a great deal of fine spun argument as to the constitution and judgments but, after all, his advice of two years ago to ascertain the facts was valuable advice and the government would have done well for instance, to have obtained an authoritative decision as to the disputed question if the schools of Manitoba were Protestant, which had been asserted and denied in this debate. Then there were geographical questions as to whether certain places could contain separate schools and there were other considerations. He did not want power on this question. He did not feel called on at this moment to deal with the policy of the government. Everybody believed that this question should be and shall be settled by the people of Manitoba themselves. He hoped so, even if difficulties such as the remedial order had been placed in the way. He hoped, at all events, never to live to see the day when parties should be divided into Roman Catholic and Protestant, opposed as it was to his idea of building up a united Canadian people. He would vote against the amendment.

After Colonel O'Brien had supported the amendment, the motion was put and declared

lost. A division was called for by Mr McCarthy. It required five members to enforce the call. Mr McCarthy stood up and was joined by Mr O'Brien, but none save these two would join in the demand and the motion was declared lost.

Dr Landerkin drew attention to a letter he had received from a constituent stating that owing to the drought in the west farmers had to import hay for their stock and very high prices were charged for freight by the railways, and asked if something could not be done, and cited the case of aid for settlers in the Northwest and other instances.

Mr Foster, while regretting the report and promising consideration, expressed pleasure that this was the last time that Dr Landerkin would have an opportunity of drawing attention to anything. Dr Landerkin retorted that he had full confidence in his riding again returning him to Parliament and he did not, like Mr Foster, have to climb into another country by means of a bridge.

July 18th—Sir Richard Cartwright moved the adjournment in order to a discussion of what he termed a thing unprecedented, the proposal to hold a sixth session and to the fact that a junior member of the administration, the controller of customs, had, from his place, dissented from and denounced the policy of the government. It was utterly unknown in British practice that he should continue to remain a member of the administration or else the premier demands his resignation. This was a crucial test of the sincerity of the government, and they had a right to inquire of the leader of the house, who represents the premier, what course he intended to pursue.

After considerable discussion and the Secretary of State having stated he was not prepared to express an opinion and wanted more time Sir Richard withdrew his motion.

July 20—A thing unprecedented in Canada happened this afternoon. Both houses of Parliament were notified that the Governor General would come down in state at 5 30 this afternoon and prorogue Parliament, but, after all, Parliament was not prorogued. This happened because of the introduction of a bill respecting the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company, formerly the Hudson's Bay Railway company.

In introducing the bill in the house this morning, Mr Haggard explained that the object of the legislation was to enable the company to change their starting point so as to start from Gladstone or Portage la Prairie and build to Saskatchewan. The principal object of the scheme was to enable the company to earn half of their subsidy of \$80,000 a year on completion of one-half of the road.

Mr White, of Cardwell, brought up the question of the operation of the road during the twenty years the subsidy ran, and contended that the \$40,000 should be made contingent on the operation of the road for full twenty years. He expressed a fear that both in this and Long Lake road the government would have an experience and the government of Canada might be paying out \$40,000 a year and the road not in operation. He thought the subsidy too large any way for a colonization road.

Mr Haggard said there was no provision made for the company operating the road for thirty years. The only condition would be for the government to use the road.

Mr Mills, of Bithwell, took the point of order that a bill amending a private bill could not be introduced as a government measure.

The Speaker held point good and ruled out section three.

This left the bill authorizing the dividing up of the subsidy aid of \$80,000 a year for 20 years into two halves, one for each half of the road and extending the time for the completion until 1898, three years from now.

Mr Laurier offered an amendment depriving the company of the subsidy if they ceased to operate the road.

This was lost, and the bill passed and went to the Senate at 4 15 o'clock.

In the Upper House, Senator McInnes, Hamilton, a Conservative, moved the three months hoist.

Senator Scott said it was reported, but he would not believe truly, that the proposed loan of \$2,500,000 was to have been shared by the government for election purposes.

Premier Bowell sprang up and indignantly repudiated any such boodling, and characterized Senator Scott strongly for daring to mention it.

At 5 30, the hour His Excellency had set for proroguing Parliament, the debate was still in progress, and ministers from the House of Commons came over and a sort of cabinet council was held in the cloak room.

A message was sent to Rideau hall asking the Governor General not to come up until 6 o'clock.

The military officers, aides, guard of honor, the general public and all the accessories of prorogation were on hand at 6 o'clock, when Premier Bowell, who was very much put out, announced that the government had decided not to prorogue, and soldiers and citizens went away feeling that they had been fooled.

The Senate met again in the evening and, after further debate, McInnes's hoist was defeated by 7 to 11, only 18 Senators voting. A few absented themselves.

The motion for the first reading was carried, and the second reading will be moved on Monday.

July 22—The Senate met to-day and the debate on the Hudson's Railway bill continued. A dispute arose over the clause changing the route, which made the bill a private one as ruled by the Commons' Speaker.

In respect of the extension of time Senator Ferguson moved an amendment that brought up the question of whether or not it was not a government measure, but the senator afterwards withdrew his motion.

The bill was finally passed.

The House of Commons met but adjourned. It was prorogued, after concurring in the Hudson's bay bill.

June 1st, 1895.

NEW DRESS GOODS

In all the Latest Colorings, Weaves and Designs,

ROCK :: BOTTOM :: PRICES.

McMANUS BROS.

Thousands
Of Ladies

Wanted to Come and See Our Goods !

We have the very latest in HAIR PINS, SIDE COMBS, BELT PINS, STICK PINS, HAT PINS, &c. All the New Fashion Books for August Toilets, Delineator and Standard Delineator; Sheet Music, Music Folios and Instruction Books constantly on hand.

Everett's Book Store.

FREDERICTON LETTER.

Temperance Anniversary — A Flourishing Lodge—Temperance Work

FREDERICTON, July 23 1895.—The fifth anniversary of Prohibition Lodge, No 8, Loyal Orange Temperance Association, was held on the 18th instant. The meeting was thrown open to friends of members. After the transaction of business a good programme of entertainment, consisting of music recitations and speeches, was carried out.

Daniel Jordan, Q. C. was the first speaker. He spoke on the great advantage of having a temperance society in every home. He spoke hopefully of the anti-liquor work now being done by the city Council. He did not sympathize with very violent temperance agitation.

Duncan Thomas, keeper of the almshouse fully believed in the efficiency of the Scott Act. There is no reason why it should not be enforced. Sympathy for liquor dealers is entirely misplaced. The victims of the traffic deserve all the sympathy we can spare.

Henry Harvey Stuart said that the aim of the lodge should be effective work. Every lodge should be to some extent a political society. Every temperance man or woman should bring all the influence possible to the polls to elect for cities, counties, provinces, and for the Dominion parliament, only men who are known to be thoroughly consistent temperance advocates. Every Christian should be a temperance man as a matter of course. Every other person should be one, too, for the sake of his health and pocket book, if for no higher reason. He spoke of the valuable work being done in the schools by teaching the truths of the new temperance text books. He urged immediate political organization on the part of all who desire to see the prohibition of the liquor traffic.

Albeman W. H. Anderson gave the closing address. He reviewed the history of the lodge, in a very favorable light. He defended his position in the city Council, stating that he had always worked for the temperance cause; and now that for the first time in Fredericton's history the majority of the aldermen were on the temperance side, he was confident that the act could be enforced.

After the speeches came a supper, after which the gathering dispersed.

The L. O. T. A. in Fredericton is a flourishing society, and has done much good during its five years of existence.

CORRESPONDENT.

Circular Letter.

To Circles of the International Order of the King's Daughters and Sons, in the Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island:—

St. John, N. B., July, 1895.

DEAR MEMBERS.—The St. John Branch of the order has issued an invitation to the members throughout the above named provinces to meet in Maritime Convention at St. John on the 25th, 26th and 27th days of September, 1895.

Three members of the Central Council, viz., Mrs. Bottome, Mrs. Dickinson and Mrs. Davis, have accepted invitations to be present, and it is to be hoped that we may have with us Mrs. Frank Gibbs, of Port Arthur; Mrs. W. B. Lindsey, Quebec provincial secretary, and Mrs. Charles Arrol, of H. H. U. fax, president of the Maritime W. O. T. U.

This convention is not especially for the transaction of business but for the purpose of arousing fresh interest, a heartier enthusiasm and a renewed consecration among the members as well as to enlighten the public in regard to the work of the order.

Circles are expected to bring two minutes reports of work.

The basis of representation is one delegate to every ten (10) members, smaller circles being allowed one delegate each. Entertainment will be hospitably provided accordingly. All delegates who expect to attend the

convention should send the names and addresses as early as date as possible to Mrs. Helen L. Barker, 215 Gormain St., and state whether they will stay with friends or would like to accept hospitality.

Rates: As the convention is to be held during the Exhibition de exates will be able to avail themselves of excursion rates.

In order to meet the expenses the roles and in individual members are asked for a voluntary contribution, the same to be sent to Miss Barker.

A most interesting program is in course of preparation and any who attend will be fully repaid.

Pray that God's blessing may rest upon the preparations, upon all plans, meetings and conferences and that the close of the convention may find us with higher aims, purer hearts, deeper love and wider spiritual insights even with a new vision of our King in His beauty.

In His Name,
HELEN L. BARKER.
Provincial Secretary for N. B.
Pro tem. for N. S.

For Fibre Chamis the newest thing out always go to Hugh Hay's.



VERY LITTLE ICE

—Is necessary for the—

GEM FREEZER

Likewise very little money. In fact, very little money is needed when you come to our store, anyway.

Beginning with this Ice Cream Freezer we have everything that calls itself

HARDWARE

down to a Carpet Tack.

And all good substantial ware, too. You can rely upon it. Hardware is a necessity not a luxury therefore it should be what is claimed for it. Ours is both in price and quality away beyond our competitors. If you don't believe it, give us a call and we will convince you.

LAWN MOWERS.

We have in stock this season several new kinds. They are bought direct from the manufacturers and we sell them right. Call and look them over.

W. F. Dibblee & Son.

Farm for Sale.

IN RICHMOND, CARLETON COUNTY.
BIG Bargains will be given to any person who will purchase 175 acres of unimproved land, well wooded with Spruce, Cedar and Hardwood; about 25 acres under cultivation, is eating good hay now; is well fenced and watered; it is well known as part of the James Ryan farm. Other information will be given on application to

GASPER RYAN.
May 11 1895 3mo-pd-20 Devec Car. Co.