

province of Quebec to speak so glibly for that province? As has already been pointed out by the Postmaster General, he never had a mandate of any kind from any constituency in the province of Quebec, and yet he comes here and speaks for the whole province.

Does he intend that this revenge on the part of the province of Quebec shall apply to individuals as well as to parties? Is that what we are to understand from him? How about the honourable member for Assiniboia (Hon. Mr. Turriff)? Are we to have the pain of seeing the scalp of the honourable gentleman from Assiniboia, with its silver hair all gory and dedabbled with blood, hanging on the totem pole of the wigwam of the honourable gentleman from De Lorimier?

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: Do not worry.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: How about Hon. Mr. Maclean of that ilk? Is he to be treated in the same way? He has crossed the floor and is sitting in the seat of the would-be mighty. Is he also to be punished because he saw his duty in a certain way at a certain time and did it? Is that what the honourable gentleman means, or is it only revenge against a party and not against individuals?

With whom is the quarrel of Quebec? From whom is the quarrel? Is it from the province of Quebec, or from the Grit party in the province of Quebec which was injured by the 1917 election, if there was any injury? As a result of the election of 1917, what was done to work harm to the province of Quebec? Whatever harm was done was done to the Grit party in the province of Quebec, and as it was fairly successful there, I fail to see how the quarrel might arise. The Grit party outside of the province of Quebec was pretty badly demoralized, but that surely should be the quarrel of the Grit party outside the province of Quebec. I venture to say that my honourable friend has no mandate to speak in this House in regard to this matter except it be from the Grit party in the province of Quebec, which at the present time seems to be fairly strong.

The honourable gentleman says that Quebec did not get a fair deal. In what way did not Quebec get a fair deal? The honourable gentleman failed in every respect to prove his point. The honourable gentleman comes to this House as a sower of discord: he resents any friendly feeling on the part of other provinces toward the province of Quebec: he wishes to make

trouble. I am reminded of a scriptural incident: a leader of Israel caught foxes, tied firebrands to their tails and sent them among the enemy's property to destroy it. Who similarly decorated the honourable gentleman from De Lorimier? Who was the Samson that put the decoration upon him and sent him out, with the firebrands attached, in the same way that the foxes were sent out? I say the man that does that—I would not say he is intentionally disloyal, but his conduct, if he has any success, is as bad as if he were intentionally disloyal. We are two peoples in this country; we are of two races; and it is well, if we are going to make this a great country, that we should dwell together in amity—

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: And for my part, though of English descent, I should be glad to see the two languages taught to every boy and girl in Canada. That is the way I feel. I should like to see the two languages known, understood, and spoken by every man, woman, and child in Canada. If that were so, I think perhaps there would be a better feeling and we should understand each other better. I say that the man or the party who endeavours to raise questions which will bring about discord between the two great races of this country is doing a very great injury to the race from which he comes as well as to the race to which he is opposed.

Now we come to the War-time Elections Act. What complaint has my honourable friend to make with the War-time Elections Act? He says that men who had no interest in the country were given the vote? Who were given the vote? Soldiers who were fighting in the Canadian army for the welfare of the Canadian nation as well as for the welfare of the world. The vote was given to men who thought enough of the world interests at stake to join the Canadian army and risk their lives. Is there anything wrong about that? We did not take the vote away from the men who were working the other way, from the men who were disloyal—and there were disloyal men in Canada, and they were not confined to any particular race. But surely it was not a sin to give the vote to men who were shedding their blood and risking their lives that this country might remain the fine country that it is to-day. The honourable gentleman objects to that. He objects to the