

that there shall be one federal parliament to deal with laws relating to the whole country along certain lines, and that each province shall have its own separate parliament; and the French said, if you give each province its own separate parliament, and lay down the subjects that it may deal with without interference, we will join the confederation. They did join the confederation on these conditions, and agreed to the terms contained in the resolutions part of which I have read. I say that the French people of the province of Quebec stand to lose more than any other people in this country from any interference with the confederation compact, and they should be the most zealous people in this whole Dominion to live up to that compact. If they do not, it will be as one of them said, a rope of sand—this is their own argument—and it may be a rope of sand, too early for them if they insist on breaking down the constitution which they helped to make, and on violating the sacred principle under which they declared they would come into the confederation, and no other. If we commence by interfering with the rights of these two provinces to-day, who will say that they will not invoke the English-speaking element all over the country to interfere with the rights of the province of Quebec to-morrow? Who will say that the people of these two provinces will not petition parliament to interfere with the province of Quebec? Have they not as good a right to do that as the 41,000 people from Quebec to petition it to interfere with the rights of these two new provinces? And who can say that it will not be done? I say this because the French people of the province of Quebec should be the most zealous to support this principle of confederation under which we live to-day; and yet they are trying to break it down. If they succeed in breaking it down, all I can say is that they will destroy that confidence in the confederation compact under which we have lived from 1867 down to the present time. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to detain the House longer. There are many other things I would like to say. I intended to deal with some remarks made by members from the Northwest Territories and to give them some information which I have with respect to that country; but I do not think it would do any good. I will leave them to be dealt with by their own constituents in the future. But I have given my reasons for holding the views I do. I wish to be understood; it is not because I have any antipathy, ill-feeling, or disrespect towards any Roman Catholic in this country that I speak as I do. I have not any feeling of that kind towards them, and never have had. Such is not my nature. I hold no spite against any person; I have too much of the Irish character for that. I can fight with you this minute and shake hands with you the next. I am stating my views and giving the reasons why I

hold them to be sound. It is not because I am at the head of the Orange body. The Orangemen stand for perfect equality before the law, and they are in favour of giving the Roman Catholic minority what the constitution provides they shall have. If the constitution gives them separate schools, we will not quarrel with it. We are not constitution breakers, but constitution supporters; but we want equal rights for all before the law. There is no class of people who are more tolerant, more reasonable and more desirous of conceding to the Roman Catholic people their rights than the Orangemen of this country, who are so much vilified and criticised by those who do not know them. I can readily excuse some hon. members of this House for indulging in criticism of them, because they unfortunately do not know them as well as I do, or they would not be so uncharitable.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), in his address, quoted a few words from the St. John 'Sun' purporting to be a correct translation of an article which appeared in 'Le Canada,' the chief organ of the Prime Minister, on the 10th of June last.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why does the hon. gentleman say it is the chief organ of the premier?

Mr. TAYLOR. That article was translated and published in the St. John 'Sun' of the 13th June. When the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) quoted the editorial article which appeared in 'Le Canada,' the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue and several others said that such an article had never appeared. The hon. the leader of the opposition got the paper and read it in the French language, in which it was published, and sent it across to the Minister of Inland Revenue. That hon. minister, the Solicitor General, the Minister of Justice and several others, scanned it, and I presume the translation which appeared in the St. John 'Sun' was correct in every word, because there has been no contradiction. But the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), who, I presume, is one of these Orangemen to whom my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) referred as having supported this Bill all through, challenged him to show that there was one word in that article reflecting on the Orangemen of this country. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) did not reply. But I, as an Orangeman, feel it my duty to say it is one of the greatest insults cast on the Orangemen of this country. Let me read it to my hon. friend who, I presume, is an Orangeman.

Mr. MILLER. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. He challenged the hon. member for East Grey to show that there was one word in it reflecting on the Orangemen, and therefore I presumed he either