

was one or there were many in his constituency who supported him.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Allow me to say—

Mr. TAYLOR. If my hon. friend wants to reply he will have an opportunity to do so, but I will take no interruption from him here or elsewhere. He has a habit of interrupting without even rising from his seat, and when hon. gentlemen on this side treat hon. gentlemen opposite, when speaking, with the greatest courtesy and respect, we have the right to demand similar treatment from them. Let me now read the article I referred to; and when I have read it let the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) tell the Orangemen in his constituency that there is not a word in the chief Liberal organ in this country reflecting on them. In its issue of the 10th June, 'Le Canada' says editorially:

Yellow dog is a term too polite to designate the people under the command of Dr. Sproule—

Who are the people under the command of Dr. Sproule but the Orangemen of this country.

Mr. D. D. MACKENZIE. Not at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. Le 'Canada' says:

Yellow dog is a term too polite to designate the people under the command of Dr. Sproule, who stirs up the dust of sectarian passion. The dog is generally clean. The friends and performers of the base work of Dr. Sproule and his chief Mr. R. L. Borden, are too dirty individuals to be compared with dogs, even yellow dogs.

Now I ask the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) to go home and call the Orangemen together who supported him, and read to them that article and say there is not a word in it reflecting on them. It is a disgrace to any paper supporting this government, or even supporting the hon. member for Labelle, to publish such trash as that. What the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said regarding the Orangemen of this country is perfectly correct. They have no antipathy to the French race or the Roman Catholic creed. It is their duty to uphold, and they do and will uphold, the constitution of this country. We are willing to apply the constitution of this country to the new provinces whether it gives separate schools or not. If the constitution gives them separate schools, they are entitled to them, but we are opposed to the mutilation of the constitution and will fight for that constitution to the last ditch. We do not believe that the constitution of this country should be mutilated or departed from one jot or tittle. I simply rose for the purpose of bringing this matter to the attention of the hon. member for South Grey and to ask him when he goes home to read in 'Hansard' what he said in reply to the hon. member for East Grey, Grand Master

Mr. TAYLOR.

of the Orangemen, and this article which the hon. member for East Grey quoted, and then say there is not a word in it reflecting on that order. I challenge any hon. gentleman who has 'Le Canada' of the 10th June in his hand, published in French, to say that the translation given by the St. John 'Sun' is not correct in every particular.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Let me give the hon. gentleman a definition which is not to be found in any French publication but in the Imperial Dictionary, which is the standard dictionary of the English language. That is why I read it, for I would not publish it even in 'Le Canada'; but I just read it to show that my hon. friend's indignation against that French paper would be more properly vented against the dictionary of his own language. I find that the Imperial Dictionary thus defines the word Orangeman:

(In honour of William Third of England, Prince of Orange). A member of a secret society instituted in Ireland in 1795 to uphold the Protestant religion and ascendancy, and to oppose the Catholic religion and influence. It has lodges in many parts of the British empire and her colonies, but the membership is now pretty much confined to the lower classes of Protestant Irishmen.

Mr. MILLER. In reply to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who has told you that I am an Orangeman, I may say that I am not, but I may add that I am equally charged, on just as good ground, with being a Roman Catholic. The other day I received a letter written from my own constituency by one of my own constituents, in which he said he did not know what my creed was, but that after reading my speech he supposed I was a Roman Catholic. Let me say that I am neither a Roman Catholic nor an Orangeman. I have no use myself for people who use extreme or abusive language regarding Roman Catholics or Orangemen or any other class, and that is the reason I am at issue with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I do not like to hear extreme or abusive language applied to any section of our Canadian people. I have nothing whatever against the Orangemen, but I do say again, after listening to the hon. member for East Grey to-night, that I do not see in the article he read any reference whatever to the Orange society. The article refers to the people commanded by Dr. Sproule. When you speak of the Orangemen of this country, however, you are speaking of a very large body of men, most of whom are very respectable and loyal citizens of this country. But when you refer to those commanded by Dr. Sproule, you are referring to a very small number.

Mr. SPROULE. Who does the hon. gentleman think the article referred to?

Mr. MILLAR. To a very small coterie of extreme persons such as the hon. member