

can find why this is not stated, is that these gentlemen in the different provinces, speaking at different places and in different parts of the country, have different policies; but now that they have got together, they cannot agree upon one single policy, nor upon one single plank of that policy, nor upon one single principle of politics.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When will your convention be held?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Very soon; in time to beat you at the next general elections. Now, let me refer to the fifth paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which, to my mind, is a most important one:

Immediate steps will be taken to effect the settlement of the Manitoba school question, and I have every confidence that when Parliament next assembles this important controversy will have been adjusted satisfactorily.

I am not going to weary the House at any length with this question, which has been fully debated, not only in the last session of the House, but also for many sessions. But it seems to me that I may call attention to the manner in which this question is treated in the Speech from the Throne, so as to show the divergence of opinion which exists between the views which were held by the hon. gentlemen when in Opposition, and the views they hold now that they sit on the Ministerial benches. This paragraph was supplemented by the declaration made by the leader of the House on the first day of the session, and also on the 20th inst. in his speech in this House, when he told us that the Attorney General of Manitoba had been invited to come down, how far we do not know, but to come down as far as Ottawa, at all events—and that a satisfactory settlement is in view, and further dependent saith not. That is all we know about the question, that is all we can gather, either from the Speech from the Throne or from the declarations of the hon. the leader of the House. Now, Sir, let us contrast this policy for a few moments and these declarations of the First Minister, with his declarations and his policy when he was in Opposition, and not only announced in this House, but also in the province of Quebec, and particularly in Quebec district. In 1894, I believe it was, I had not then the honour of being a member of this House, but, being a member of the Executive Council of my province, I had the honour of occupying a seat upon the floor of this House. At that time the school question came up, and I heard my hon. friend the leader of the House distinctly state here that if these schools were Protestant schools, and if Catholic children were obliged to go to these schools, it was an outrage against which he would protest, not only in this chamber, not only in every county, but in every district in the Dominion. Now, Sir, has he found out since Parliament met that these schools are not Protestant schools? We

have not heard that any commission has been appointed to inquire into this matter. He must have found out, at all events, that there was a grievance, because if he had not found out that there was a grievance, he would not have invited the Attorney General to come down here to meet him in conference on this question, and to try and come to some settlement. But, Sir, during the elections it was stated, especially in the province of Quebec, it was stated as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) mentioned a few minutes ago, it was stated all over the province, that as soon as the hon. gentleman became Premier he would appoint a commission to inquire into the grievances of the Catholic minority of Manitoba, and he was to devise a way by which to settle this question and redress the grievances from which these people suffered. Now, it was held all through the province of Quebec that one of the principal reasons why we should accept this commission was that it was to be headed by Sir Oliver Mowat, who had been held up to us as the great defender of separate schools in the province of Ontario. But, Sir, what was the declaration of my hon. friend the leader of the Government in his own constituency in Quebec. Here again he advocated the appointment of this commission, he told the people that within six months he would settle this question by the appointment of a commission, headed by Sir Oliver Mowat. He said: I will try the sunny ways of peace. I will try conciliation. But he went a step further and said: If conciliation does not succeed in restoring to those people the rights which they have under the constitution, then I will take the means provided by the constitution, and will use those means to the utmost. Those were his declarations to his constituents in St. Rochs. Sir, these declarations of my hon. friend the leader of the House were implemented to a great extent by the declarations made by his supporters all through the province of Quebec. In almost every county in the province where the majority was Catholic, a pledge was distinctly given to the electors, the promise was absolutely made, that every man of them would vote for a Remedial Bill. That I may not be accused of exaggeration in this matter, let me call the attention of the House to what was said by my opponent in the county of Montmorency. My opponent, the Hon. Charles Langelier, is a bosom friend of the leader of the House, is one of his henchmen, a gentleman who has accompanied him in many meetings, speaking side by side with him upon the hustings in Quebec. Sir, what did Mr. Langelier write over his signature to the electors of the county of Montmorency?

If I am elected, as I am sure I will be,—

There is many a slip between the cup and the lip.