

will just draw attention to this one thing, and I am only doing it for one purpose.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And that is that it is quite idle for hon. gentlemen to think that because any hon. gentleman happens to come from Quebec nothing can be said against him without the charge coming from that side of the House that we are endeavouring to create disunion between the provinces. The situation is an intolerable one. Was the Gazette article written to injure Quebec? My right hon. leader in his speech on the Address merely referred to the editorial in *Le Soleil* and read it without comment, and, because he read an editorial of a leading French paper without comment, the Prime Minister assumed one of his severe oratorical expressions—he can be severe—and warned my hon. friend that he had better be careful how he proceeded with this kind of thing. Does it come to this, that a French newspaper cannot, loyally to Canada, be read west of the Ottawa river? I would not have thought so.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Who says so?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will ask my hon. friend a question. What was said by my right hon. leader on this most deplorable question beyond reading that reference? That is all he did. If the mere reading of it caused that outbreak from the Prime Minister, is there any need for my hon. friend to ask that question? There ought not to be, and he knows there is none. I point to this merely for the purpose of showing that my leader can have no reason for following the course that, without the slightest possible foundation of fact, has been ascribed to him. You know, Mr. Speaker, it all started in an imaginary speech referred to in the *Globe*, and supposed to have been delivered by the leader of the Opposition. That was copied in all parts of Canada; and the very moment that it came to the attention of the leader of the Opposition, he denounced categorically ever having made the speech, and he asked the *Globe* to give the reference. He has asked for it many times; but although that information was asked for a year and a half ago, the information has never been given. The speech was never made. There is a controversy going on in Ontario at the present time between the *Globe* and the *Farmers' Sun*. The issue seems to be as to who is the worse liar, and I do not think they have

yet settled it to their satisfaction. It may be that they both win; but I am quite sure that the *Globe* will make the *Farmers' Sun* work hard. This party has not that enmity to Quebec which is suggested. Was the campaign run upon that line? Everybody knows that it was not. But, with some people, any old thing will do, and the great problem of the Government at the present time, as disclosed by the speech made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), is to kill politically the leader of the Opposition. I would like to tell my hon. friends opposite that they cannot do it.

The Minister of Justice confuses what was said by the leader of the Opposition in his references to him. He seems to object to references to himself. Why, that was mentioned in the speech of the member for Pictou as evidence of ill-feeling, bad blood, on the part of the leader of the Opposition. The leader of the Opposition picks out for reference the most prominent men connected with the campaign. He has referred often enough to the Prime Minister, but simply because he happened to refer to the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell) and to the Minister of Justice, why, of course, it was insult to Quebec that he meant. My hon. friend knows that is ridiculous; everybody knows it is ridiculous; but I suppose it will continue. The hon. member, however, mistook the object of my right hon. friend's remarks. My right hon. friend was not attacking the Minister of Justice; he believes in the statement made by the Minister of Justice; he believes that the stand taken by the Minister of Justice is correct. He still believes, what he has always preached and preached just the same everywhere, that this country requires protection. Was that an attack made upon Quebec by the hon. member for Marquette, when he dealt with the same question and at greater length than my right hon. friend did? He was attacking a policy of the Minister of Justice. My leader is not attacking the fiscal policy of the minister. I think it may well be said that while my leader went down to defeat, the principles for which he fought were principles which were, in the large, endorsed by the majority of the people of this country. Why, what is said by the Minister of Justice might just as well appear in our platform. He believes in proper protection for the boot and shoe industry, and I think he is right in that be-