

tion. Well, that did not pain my hon. friend very much, because he had never supposed that the hon. member for Labelle had any confidence in him. The hon. member for Labelle, if I infer rightly from the words he uttered, is entirely opposed to the amendment. Still, I believe, though he did not say so in words, that he will vote for the amendment. So it is no use for me to discuss his speech, because, though it was witty and well delivered, its conclusion did not follow from its premises; consequently there is no result to it.

My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), in the very eloquent speech he made in the House in answer to the hon. member for Labelle, spoke of the generosity of those men whom the hon. member for Labelle was ready to asperse. My hon. friend from Peel forgot one thing, however, when he spoke of the generosity of Ontario, he should more properly have spoken of the generosity of the Conservatives of Ontario. My hon. friend said that only lately there was an election in the province of Ontario, and the Prime Minister of the day had said that if he came into power he would see that every nationality and creed would be represented in his government. What did he do when called on to form an administration? He kept his word; he acted like an honourable man and according to the traditions of the Conservative party. Mr. Speaker, who was the man who for the first time, appointed to the upper House of this parliament a French Canadian from the province of Ontario—a man coming from your own city, the Hon. Mr. Casgrain? Sir John A. Macdonald, whom the Liberals in our province have always tried to make a scapegoat of, as a Protestant and a fanatic. Who appointed the first French Canadian senator from the province of Prince Edward Island, in the person of the Hon. Mr. Arsenault, but a Conservative administration? And when that gentleman died, our French Canadian premier replaced him with an English-speaking Canadian. Who appointed Senator Poirier, another French Canadian, from the province of New Brunswick, but a Conservative administration, which also appointed Judge Landry? I am saying this to show that the Conservative party has traditions of which it may well be proud, and that it stands by those traditions. There may be in our party some gentlemen who have ideas different from the others, but the party as a whole has a history of which it may well be proud. We cannot say the same of the other party. We know that if hon. gentlemen opposite have stood upon any platform in the past, it has been only to get into power. Their traditions are all new; they have never been in use yet. In 1896, the Liberal party prevented the Conservative party from doing an act of justice in the settlement of the Manitoba school question. We may be

told that the province of Quebec has sanctioned that. It is true. There are many considerations for that; but it does not deprive the Conservative party of the honour of having done its duty. I heard my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) yesterday saying in a sarcastic way that hon. gentlemen opposite may boast that three appeals have been made to the people since that time, and that the people have sanctioned the position taken by my right hon. friend. What does that prove? It proves only one thing—and I say it with all modesty—that they were believed more than we were believed; but it does not prove that they were right. Sir, when I am speaking about traditions, I want to say this before I resume my seat, that upon all those dangerous questions, national or religious, the Conservative party has always been found in the path of duty, ready to do what was best in the interest of the country. They paid for it dearly sometimes; but history is written, and when that history is read by those who will come later, the young men of the day, whether they are educated in separate schools or in public schools, it will tell them the truth. The Liberal party cannot continue to play double face with each and every one of these questions.

Something has been said, unfortunately, about the hierarchy; and something has been written in the papers against the hierarchy. But it was defended here by gentlemen on both sides, and I was proud to hear gentlemen who do not belong to that creed speaking of the hierarchy in most eulogistic terms. Let me say that, although we have had this measure before the House for over a month, I have never received a letter or word of communication of any kind regarding it from any bishop or priest, and I know a great many. What does that prove? It shows, not that the Catholic clergy are not interested, but that they have too much delicacy and too much sense of their own dignity to undertake, without being requested to do so, to advise a member of parliament as to what course he should follow. Our clergy have been deceived in the past, and if my remarks have been long and tedious, it is because I wish to put on record in 'Hansard' what I consider necessary to enable them to know who are those by whom they have been deceived. We have heard a great deal about petitions, and we have seen a great many petitions presented in this House, but the only petition that I have received from my constituency is one that is signed by fourteen Methodists—whom I know to be most respectable men—in the city of Valleyfield. We have been told of certain petitions which have been sent out in the province of Quebec by the Club Jacques Cartier at the instigation of some members of this House. But that statement was positively denied by my hon.