

Why, I am satisfied that half of our French Canadian fellow-countrymen before me never knew that such tyranny had been practised towards the English people in the province of Quebec by the ancestor of the hon. member for Labelle. They did not know that it was possible that men who now go round prating of tolerance could have had any connection with such tyrannical acts.

While Papineau and his followers were claiming against the tyranny of being taxed without representation, they deliberately disfranchised for years 80,000 English-speaking settlers in the Eastern Townships region, lying between Salmon River and Lake Memphremagog; and who, until 1830, had no voice whatever in making the laws by which they were governed or in expending the taxes which they paid. And when parliamentary representation was at last reluctantly conceded them, it was so hedged about by restriction and adverse conditions as to be of little comparative value. In some cases when English-speaking electors could not be otherwise obstructed in the exercise of their franchise, polling places were established at distances ranging from thirty to fifty miles from their settlements.

So an elector had to travel, under the benign rule of these gentlemen, from thirty to fifty miles in order to record his vote. Is there a French Canadian before me who knew that such exactions were practised upon the British people of Quebec? I trust that when the hon. member for Labelle again traverses the province of Quebec, seeking to inflame the honest peasantry of that province, he will be met by honest French Canadians themselves who will tell him that he is not taking the proper course, who will tell him to go back home and remain there and give up his demagogueism. Another point:

They made immigration from the British Islands—

Mark you, that is the Papineau party, the party of toleration.

They made immigration from the British Islands a standing grievance, maintained that they alone had the right to the soil, continued their wretched mode of agriculture, save in the limited area where the example and success of good Scotch farming had led them to make some improvements, disliked all nations but France, and, as a safeguard against the innovations and language of neighbouring Anglo-Saxon people, would, were it possible, surround themselves with a Chinese wall of exclusiveness.

The conduct of the hon. member for Labelle to-day shows that he is a direct lineal descendant of his ancestor. Now, Sir, I find here a description of Papineau, and in many respects it resembles the hon. member for Labelle to-day:

It is evident that Papineau, the great master spirit of the crisis, had never carefully gauged the probable results. He was a brilliant orator, but no statesman; a clever partisan leader, but a miserable general officer; a braggart in the forum, a coward in the field. He excited a

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

storm which he neither knew how to allay nor direct. Nor had Papineau the excuse of youth to plead in extenuation of his folly. In 1837 he was 38 years of age, a period of life when the intellect stands at its meridian. In height he was of the middle size; a man of good presence; with features of a Hebrew caste; while his heavy dark eyebrows shaded, in a higher arch than usual, a keen lustrous eye of quick and penetrating glance. He appeared to be formed by nature for the eloquent agitator, but not for the wise or prudent legislator; to act upon the passions and prejudices of his ignorant or unreflecting countrymen, not to make them happier, wiser or better. Familiar with French literature and all the old lore of La Nouvelle France, he appealed to the feelings and prejudices of his countrymen with irresistible effect, and completely carried them captive by the force of his oratorical and conversational powers. But while Papineau thoroughly understood the people of his own province he knew very little of the people of Upper Canada; and appeared to be wholly ignorant of the feeling of loyalty to the Queen and constitution which then ran like a deep undercurrent beneath their political squabbles.

There we have a description of the province of Quebec under the rule and subject to the agitation of the great Papineau family. I trust we will never again see in the province of Quebec, or in the Dominion of Canada, other agitations started by these gentlemen. The hon. member for Labelle has inflamed the minds of the people in the province of Quebec, and has attempted to justify himself by preaching the same stuff in other provinces. He recently spoke in the city of Toronto, and I was asked by a gentleman who heard him if it was not scandalous that such things could have been allowed in the province of Quebec as had been described by the hon. member for Labelle; he really believed the statements that the member for Labelle had been making. I want the people of this country to know what the facts were under a Liberal agitation in the province of Quebec, and that, in place of their having any just complaint against our English-speaking fellow-countrymen, the reverse was the case under the agitation carried on by Liberal leaders in the province of Quebec in the old days. I trust these days will never return.

Now, Sir, I have disposed pretty well of the various points which it was my intention to discuss. I have endeavoured to show that the people of Ontario are tolerant. I have shown that the government practically admit now that they have no case under the constitution for their school clauses of the Autonomy Bill, that they are simply governed by policy. I have shown that by putting this law on the statute-book without these educational clauses inserted the separate school law of 1875 will remain the law in the new provinces. Then if, as the Prime Minister asserts, the constitution gives them the right to separate schools, that law must remain on the statute-book; but if the constitution does not demand that separate schools shall be per-