

there was bound to be a struggle—a fight to a finish—

It goes on to ask the Protestants to unite and destroy Rome and Quebec. Now, Sir, is not that language an appeal to racial prejudices? Is it not an appeal to religious prejudices? Is it not designed to set race against race, creed against creed? Sir, we saw in the paper which is the organ of the organization of which the hon. member for East Grey is the Grand Master, language such as I have quoted, and am I not right therefore in saying that the hon. gentleman, if not in this House, at least in his paper, has made appeals to racial and religious prejudices.

Mr. SPROULE. I never had any interest in the 'Orange Sentinel' to the value of one cent, and I have no more relationship to it except as a member of the Orange order, than the hon. gentleman himself. Does the hon. gentleman think it proper and fair to hold the member for East Grey responsible for the sentiments of every one who writes in the 'Orange Sentinel'? The hon. gentleman made a personal charge against me.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. He first made a charge against me, now he has transferred it to some one else. May I ask the hon. member for East Grey if he, as Grand Master of all the Orange lodges of Canada, has repudiated their organ, the 'Orange Sentinel'? Is not the 'Orange Sentinel' the written expression of the deliberations of the Orange lodges of the Dominion of Canada? Is not the 'Orange Sentinel' the organ of the Grand Master of the Orange organization as well as the organ of private members? I did not know that it had been repudiated by the Grand Master, and I want to know if the grand master repudiates it to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he and his friends have repudiated the course of the Toronto 'Globe' lately in regard to the Autonomy Bill?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I repudiate it entirely. My hon. friend has no right to answer one question by asking another. I have answered the hon. gentleman frankly and clearly, and I ask him to answer me in the same manner. I said I repudiated the course of the 'Globe,' and I want the hon. member for East Grey to say with equal frankness if he repudiates the 'Orange Sentinel.'

Mr. SPROULE. The member for East Grey is not attacking the 'Sentinel' for what it said.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I cannot know whether the yellow pope speaks *ex cathedra* or not. Well, Sir, not only are we the subjects of racial appeals, but we are called upon to remember that we were vanquished in 1759. When I was reading the history of Canada not long ago I came across the

Mr. A. LAVERGNE.

story of a French Canadian, Du Calvet, who was arrested in Quebec in 1781, and was imprisoned without a trial. When I was reading his words I was reminded of the course of the 'Orange Sentinel' in taunting the French Canadians with having been vanquished in 1759. Here are the words of Du Calvet, written in London in 1781:

How sad it was to be vanquished! If it only cost the blood which is shed on the battle field, the wound would be very deep, very sore, it would bleed many years, but time could cure it. But to be condemned to feel perpetually the hand of the conqueror pounding on your shoulder, but to be perpetually a slave, under the power of the most constitutional sovereign, of the freest people on earth, it is too much.

Sir, that is the position in which hon. gentleman on the other side wish to place us to-day. That is the position in which their yellow papers wish to place us to-day. But I want to remind hon. members opposite that in this compact of confederation we are not slaves but partners. In the compact of confederation we took our part, and in that compact the French Canadians are treated as partners. We have been loyal to British institutions and we have been loyal to the Canadian constitution. We claim the right to be treated as fellow-citizens, as compatriots.

Mr. SPROULE. We have no desire to treat you otherwise.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. The hon. member for North Toronto said that when this law was passed war would begin in the Northwest. These hon. gentlemen are always ready to accept the opinion of the majority when that opinion is against separate schools, but when that opinion is in favour of separate schools then they talk of war and rebellion against the sovereign authority of this parliament. I say that if separate schools were withheld from the people of the Northwest it would be an injustice done against the Catholics of the Dominion, an injustice which is not deserved by the Catholics and French Canadians of this Dominion.

But, Sir, what can we do then? We can make a constitutional fight. You never heard the members from Quebec of the hierarchy, or the priests of Quebec talking of war and rebellion. You have never heard from the pulpits of our churches the speeches which have been made in other churches or in lodges. We submit to the law. We may oppose the law, we may conduct a constitutional agitation against it, but you never heard on our side talk of war or rebellion because the majority was against us. We respect the majority, but it is strange to observe the attitude of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. When they have the majority with them they claim that the majority has every right, but when the majority is against them they say that they will make war against the