

Athens that he had devised a great scheme for the good of his country, but that he could not inform his audience of it. He begged of them to point him out a person to whom he could communicate his plan. Socrates was the person selected. Socrates, being informed of it, returned to the Greeks and told them that nothing would be more useful than the project in question, but he added that nothing could be more unjust. The people, then, with one voice, refused at once to be a party to the scheme. Their example should be a guide for us. It is regrettable that public men should have to pronounce upon delicate matters that touch their national pride and dignity. I, therefore, consider that this motion, under the circumstances, is inopportune.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA. (Labelle.) (Translation.) Before moving an amendment to the amendment, moved by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier—that is to say before making the same motion that I made on Friday—I wish to offer a few remarks in reply to my hon. friend the member for St. John and Iberville. (Mr. Demers), I congratulate the hon. gentleman on the language that he has used, which contrasts happily with the stump-speech wherewith another hon. gentleman honoured me last Friday on the same subject. No more to-day than last week do I propose replying to that language, but I will take the liberty of saying that I was surprised at the applause with which certain French Canadian members, so-called Liberals, received those passages in the speech of the member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) which insulted the memory of a man whom the Liberal party had long claimed as its founder and as the most illustrious of its leaders.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) Who?

Mr. BOURASSA. (Papineau.) (Translation.) It is scarcely necessary that I should strive to refute an old time calumny long known to be false, not only by the disciples and admirers of Papineau, but even by his opponents. To that colleague who deemed it fit to unearth that calumny and to those who cheered him, I will simply recall the words used by a great French writer in reply to the insult launched by an obscure calumniator against the memory of an illustrious man. 'A filthy insect may soil his statue; but the wind that blows carries off the insect and the stain, and the marble remains intact in its imperishable beauty.'

The first argument brought forward by the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers), and that upon which he most depended to oppose the motion of the member for Jacques Cartier, is that no one here—referred to the maintaining of the French language, during the debate that preceded the second reading of this Bill. I agree that from the standpoint of narrow logic, that argument might have some weight; but I do not think I shall have much trouble in

reputing it and in explaining why I did not deal with this question, at the beginning of the discussion. It is needless to recall to the House the explosion of fanaticism that greeted the attitude taken, in the first place, by the government in connection with the educational clause. From the outset of the debate, the leader of the opposition laid down a proposition that narrowed the discussion to the consideration of the principle of the interference of the federal power in educational matters. When I spoke during that debate, I squarely opposed the proposition of the leader of the opposition and the policy of his party on that subject, and gave a loyal support to the position taken by the government. I did not then think it wise to introduce into the discussion the consideration of the subject which we are now dealing with. I had, however, decided to move an amendment similar to that of the member for Jacques Cartier, or rather to move the amendment that I submitted to the House on Friday, and that in a moment I will repeat. I have, moreover, no fault to find with my colleague who has got ahead of me, and I do not hesitate in any way to give him my support, while yet proposing to impart a more complete scope to his amendment.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier is accused of seeking to make political capital out of this question. It is strange that the government members and newspapers should so treat the hon. member. When he supported the policy of the government, the 'Herald' and the organs of the cabinet could not find language sufficiently eulogious to sing the praises of his patriotism. To-day, when he is not in harmony with them, but while he continues to uphold the rights of the Catholic and French minority in the west, of which the Liberal party pretends to be the champion, they have only insults to heap upon him. As to me, I am in accord with him on this question which affects our national honour, as I was in accord with him on the school question, the solution of which affects to such a degree the minority of the west and the prosperity of the whole country. I decided from the very start, to take in all these questions a stand in conformity with my convictions, without any regard for the interests and the intrigues of the cliques.

I was sufficiently liberal to consider all propositions submitted to this House according to their intrinsic merits, and to give them my support, no matter from whom they emanate, if I find them in accord with my principles and convictions. This, perhaps, is in what my liberalism differs from that of a number of my colleagues on the right.

Upon the constitutional ground, whereon the hon. member for St. John and Iberville, based his second line of defence, he will allow me to tell him that he entrenches himself too easily behind the general and absolute proposition that the Prime Minister