

turing people for deeds they never committed, accusing them of having used words which they never uttered, painting them in colours that they never assumed. That was the kind of argument which was used by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue against me to-night. It cannot harm me, but I would rather receive a blow straight in the face in regard to something that I had done than that mild and polite insinuations should be made in regard to something that I have never done. I will never try to pose as a man of moderate views, as a man of great balance of mind when out of my own province, leaving to my organs the task of doing the demagogic campaign that I dare not do myself; nor will I try to shelter myself by saying that the English-speaking majority are not courageous enough to stand by the measure of justice which the government is granting.

And now, Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to detain the committee longer. I beg pardon if I may have been somewhat out of order, but the fact is that for the past two days the greater part of the discussion has been out of order. As I am about alone in my own party except for my good and loyal friend from Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) I am sometimes obliged to say a little more for myself than if I had some devoted followers who would be always ready to take up my defence. For the consolation of my good friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, I shall quote an article which was published in 'Le Canada' on the 9th of June, 1905. I could follow up the files of that journal and find many more articles like it, because I distinctly remember one to which I replied stating: You are calumniating the English-speaking members of the House of Commons, for I feel sure that if the question were put straight to them they would be ready to support the government in any measure of justice. Here is the article from 'Le Canada' which I will read in French first and then translate into English:

Il n'y avait donc que deux alternatives; tenir ferme et se faire battre à la Chambre des Communes; puis voir le gouvernement Laurier remplacé, comme le disait carrément l'hon. M. Fielding, par un gouvernement tory, exclusivement protestant.

Ou bien accepter l'amendement Sifton comme un compromis, nous garantissant un minimum de droits, qui est le maximum de ce que les députés libéraux anglais consentent à nous accorder.

Et pourtant, aujourd'hui, ceux qui lisent les comptes rendus des discours prononcés pendant la campagne électorale qui fait rage à London et à Oxford Nord, peuvent constater deux choses:

10. Que l'article 16 originaire n'aurait pas été accepté par le parti conservateur ni même par la majorité des libéraux. Parmi les collègues même de Sir Wilfrid, il y a eu une défection sensationnelle, celle de M. Sifton, qui entraîne avec lui probablement tous les députés libéraux de l'Ouest.

Mr. BOURASSA.

I translate.

There were only two alternatives: be firm and be beaten in the House of Commons and see the Laurier government put aside and as squarely stated by the Hon. Mr. Fielding, a Tory government, exclusively Protestant, taking its place. Or, accept the Sifton amendment as a compromise granting the minimum of rights which is the maximum that the English Liberal members are consenting to grant us.

There is another paragraph which says:

The first clause 16 was not accepted by the Conservative party, not even by a majority of the Liberals; among the colleagues of Sir Wilfrid Laurier there was a sensational defection, that is, Mr. Sifton who probably would have carried with him all the Liberal members of the west.

Now, Sir, as I stated last night the only effect of the second clause 16 is to guarantee the existence of so-called Catholic schools where the Catholics are in the minority. It grants nothing where the Catholics are in a majority. This point has been admitted by the Minister of Justice, it has been admitted by the Prime Minister; it was published by me without contradiction—there was some contradiction at first but afterwards it was admitted I was right—'Le Canada' for one month had heard its leaders admitting that this amendment deprived the Catholics of their rights so far as 150 out of their 160 schools in the Northwest is concerned, but 'Le Canada' still tried to create the impression on the people of the province of Quebec that the English members of this House of Commons would not grant justice to these 150 schools as well as to the other nine schools. This is what I have denounced, perhaps I did not express it in as strong and heated language as I might use—but I certainly have denounced it as more apt to raise a feeling in the province of Quebec against the English population of this country than anything I can say here. It was represented that although it were demonstrated to the English Liberal members of the House of Commons that they were as a matter of fact sacrificing the rights of nine-tenths of the Catholics of the Northwest, they would still exact their pound of flesh and refuse justice to nine-tenths of the Catholic population. I have denounced that contention in Montreal, I reiterated my denunciation here last night. These are the only two speeches of mine upon which the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Solicitor General can build up their virtuous appeal in favour of their moderation and against my demagoguery. I have stated in Montreal, as I have stated here, that I did not entertain such an opinion of my English-speaking colleagues in this House, and I said that I was convinced that if the government would show them that the effect of the amendment would be to deprive nine-tenths of the Catholics of the Northwest of the rights promised them—I do not refer to first clause 16 but to the second, it is my deep conviction that the