

to constitutional practice, he should have done? Was it that he had one of those peremptory mandates from the people which he is so fond of talking about? Why, during the election hon. gentlemen opposite were dumb on the school question. Not only that, but in 1901 the Minister of the Interior told this House that one of the reasons why the question of Northwest autonomy could not be taken up at that time was this, that in the absence of the Minister of Finance, they could not consider it, they could not talk about it—in fact, you must not think about it. We know what happened afterwards. The Speaker objected the other night when an hon. member intimated that the premier was paying his political debts. I will not say it in an offensive way; but I will say that the indications are that the premier renewed his promises of 1895 and 1896—renewed the promise which he made to the hierarchy or to the supporters of separate schools in 1896 and again in 1897, and that the new watchword then was: instead of making an agitation throughout the country, keep quiet, work silently and make the proper preparations, and when the time comes for giving autonomy to the west, that vast and fertile region, perhaps the greatest agricultural field in the world, I will be true to you, and will redeem the pledges I made to the House and the country during the debates of 1896. What reason have I for saying that? Well, there is a good deal of reason all along the way. In 1896, we had the various statements made by the right hon. gentleman in moving the six months' hoist. You know the position he took as to that. The position was this: I heard the Conservative party make certain propositions to you; they proposed to pass a remedial order, and now they propose to pass a remedial law, which will be practically useless in face of the fact that there is no means of supplementing it by a money grant in support of the schools; I will move the six months' hoist, because I want my people to get something substantial, and not a shadowy justice. That was the position the right hon. gentleman took at that time; and he got in by that policy, and by villifying the honest policy of the Conservatives of that day—their honest desire to carry out the constitutional rights of this country. The hon. member for North Simcoe taunted me yesterday about having lost my deposit in 1896 in running against his uncle, the late Dalton McCarthy. I did lose my deposit in a triangular fight, but I got the votes of the best men of the Conservative party in that fight, and I fought for what I believed to be the constitutional rights of the people of Canada.

I do not like separate schools but once it had become the duty of the government to give separate schools I for one was not disposed to turn my back upon the constitutional burden of the Dominion

government in that regard. I fought that fight through and I got a good big threshing but I received the support of the best men in North Simcoe at that time. And my hon. friend the late Dalton McCarthy what did he get. He was a clever man but the people recognized that he was not altogether right on that question, that at all events it was a debatable question. That being the case and the fight coming on with a reformer in the field the Reformers said:

We can do better than vote for our candidate. Mr. McCarthy it is true lost nearly one half of his Conservative following but he got nearly half of the Reform following because they said that he could battle against the Conservative government better than their own candidate possibly could. The right hon. gentleman having announced his policy, having gone to the people and having won at the polls found that he was unable to carry out his promise and there was a clamor in Quebec and the hierarchy were as clamorous as any people at that time. There was general dissatisfaction and you will remember that certain representatives were sent to Rome. I do not mean the Minister of Justice who subsequently represented The Forty Associates, but I mean an earlier mission to Rome who paved the way and who represented there that although great concessions were not being obtained they were better than what a Conservative government would give. That mission failed, as has been pointed out in this debate, and there was still dissatisfaction. The premier, as you will remember, went to Quebec and the Minister of Justice went to Toronto and they both received a good hearing. The Minister of Justice explained to the people at Toronto—and one thing for which I give him credit is that he generally speaks out in a manly way—that although they had not got all they were entitled to, they had got an instalment and they would get more. The premier in Quebec explained that they had only got an instalment and they would get more and as Mr. Russell explained in his letter it was the beginning of justice. This brings us to the turning point, to the height of land, because up to that time we cannot say—although I have great doubts myself—whether the premier was honest or sincere or whether he was playing a game, but from that time on, he was climbing down, he was beginning to work on the plan of doing things in the dark, of deceiving people for the time being, as in getting the elections over and introducing this Bill. Something had to be done and I have no doubt the Minister of Justice came to the rescue and it was found necessary for him to go on a mission to Rome. One of the greatest religious institutions the world has ever seen is the Roman Catholic church. Whenever I speak of that great church I want to speak

Mr. LENNOX.