

tion was effected, thanks to the broad policy of Lord Salisbury in England and the wise, intelligent policy of Mr. DeLacasse in France. Therefore to say that the sojourn of the hon. Minister of Public Works in France was the means of causing discord and antagonism between French and English in Canada is utterly false and not borne out by any words that may have fallen from the lips of that gentleman whom the hon. leader of the opposition has thought proper to attack in this debate. I never try to judge the intentions of any man; and as a young member of parliament I would not attempt to belittle the intentions and purposes of the hon. gentleman. But, as a matter of fact, the words that he uttered the other day, a résumé of which was sent to the *Winnipeg Free Press*, and those he has uttered to-day are just of a character to prejudice people who do not know thoroughly the feelings of the French Canadians of the province of Quebec and to misrepresent the real intentions of those who, on the present occasion, have not thought proper to go as far as the majority of the people of this country, or speaking for myself, as far as the government of the country has thought proper to go. He has no right to attempt, as he has done, to prove that our feelings correspond with those of the French people of France; and I take this occasion to make a statement which is nothing new but which, strange to say, has to be repeated often though it ought to be well known to this country. It would be one of the greatest mistakes made by public man in Canada and a mistake that might be the cause of great misfortune, to think that the feelings which exist between French Canadians and English Canadians in Canada are the same as those which exist between the people of France and the people of England. I do not say this because I am ashamed of my origin or of the country from which my ancestors came, who were first loyal subjects of the king of France and afterwards became as loyal subjects of the king of England. I glory in my French origin, I have no reason to be ashamed of the people who live in old France; but it is utterly false for any one to compare the differences that may exist between the English and French in Europe to those that may exist between English and French Canadians. I do not wish to go at length into this matter but may take another occasion to do so.

As regards the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), who went over the whole story of his life in order to prove that he is not a fanatic or a bigot, let me here say that I do not believe he is either. I believe that the hon. gentleman, whatever may have been his political faults in the past, on which I am not called to pass judgment to-day, is a broad-minded man in those matters. But unfortunately circumstances have

placed him at the head of a party which has based its success too often upon religious and national cries.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not going either to say—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. BOURASSA. No, I shall not. I will prove it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not going to say now—

An hon. MEMBER. Be a gentleman.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not going to say that the Conservative party has had in the past, or has in the present, a monopoly of those appeals to religious and national prejudices. I am free to admit that in some instances, unfortunately, some groups of Liberals also have appealed to national and religious prejudices. I know that in the Conservative party there have been in the past, as there are in the present, among both English and French members of that party, men of good will and broad minds who would be ashamed to appeal to those prejudices; but there is at the same time an element in that party that has very often forced the leaders of that party to make declarations which, left to themselves, they would never have made. But does that excuse them? I must say that the hon. gentleman himself, who leads the opposition, whatever may be the differences between us, is after all one of the most remarkable figures in Canada. He was one of the founders of confederation, he has been one of the noted public men, not only of Canada, but of the British Empire, and I am proud to say it; but it is most unfortunate that that hon. gentleman, for the purpose of securing votes, felt himself compelled to use such language as has been quoted to-day and to make such appeals as he was obliged to resort to in the city of Winnipeg.

The hon. gentleman has tried to-day, and not for the first time, to explain the speech he made in Winnipeg. I quite agree that he might have told the people of Winnipeg that they could just as safely put their confidence in him as in Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that they could just as well rely on the policy of the Conservative party to settle the school question as on that of the Liberal party; but I ask, what was the use of his appealing to the people of Winnipeg on this ground—'I a Protestant and he (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a Catholic'? How did that religious difference affect the question? What did it matter, as regards the policy of either party, if Sir Charles Tupper was