

ing). It is, as I stated last night, that the Catholics of this country have rights; they have moral rights because of their number and because of the necessity of living in harmony with them, that in any province where they have no legal rights they have received separate schools, but in the Northwest Territories, where they have legal rights, they will not receive separate schools; and therefore the Dominion government is entitled to the support of the Protestants of this country, because, breaking its pledges, breaking its moral and constitutional obligations, the Liberal government has abandoned the clause which secured separate schools, and is now enacting a new clause which gives separate schools in name and public schools in fact. I have asked the hon. leader of the Conservative party if he thought that he was working for the good of the country by adopting the position which he has assumed, under some legal opinion which I respect, but which I think that hon. gentleman would never have entertained if he had not been forced to adopt this attitude by the wing of the party—I will not say yellow dogs, in the words of the government organs to which I have referred, but I will simply say, in demagogic language, by the members of the Orange wing of the Tory party. I have made my statement against the Conservative party, and now I make my statement against the Liberal party. I say that the Liberal party has not fulfilled its duty by bowing to that campaign which has been raised by the Tory party, or by apologizing for the position it has taken. The spectacle of one party apologizing to the other and trying to give the least possible measure of justice to the minority because of its opponents being able to take advantage of it, is not one which is apt to produce that conciliation and harmony which the right hon. Prime Minister sincerely has been trying to bring about in this country for the last thirty years. That was the only kind of denunciation that I uttered against the Liberal party, and I still adhere to it. I admit it puts me in this strange position, that one day I am against one party and another day I am against the other party. I admit that it is a dangerous position, that it is a position which opens the door to the narrow and small argument, which has been used by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, that I want to pose as a virtuous man. Last night my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) was trying to build a pedestal of virtue to his party and the government, because he said it stood between the hon. member for East Grey and the hon. member for Labelle. But a moment later the government were voting with the hon. member for East Grey, and the Solicitor General and the member for East Grey were joining in a tender embrace. I might follow in the footsteps of my hon. friend the Solicitor General and build a

pedestal to myself between this demagogic government and those demagogic people who voted with them. I could stand in the middle as the only virtuous man in this parliament. But I am not doing that, and if my hon. friends had spared their insinuations and their accusations—their false accusations against me—if they had contented themselves with defending their position against my argument, if they had contented themselves with proving the falsity of my argument, I would have contented myself with trying to make my position as good as possible. But the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Solicitor General know what my position towards the government is. They know that I have been a Liberal as long as they have. They know that I have fought for the Liberal party, they know that I have never received—nor do I expect to receive—a favour from the Liberal party, they know that I have conducted all my elections at my own expense, and that I have not received a cent for making speeches in support of that party. While I am ready to stand for the principles of the Liberal party as long as the Liberal party is true to its principles, I am Liberal enough and attached enough to the traditions of my party not to sacrifice the views which commend themselves to my judgment because any small mob may try to frighten me. My hon. friend the Solicitor General has gone back to past history. I will not follow him in those steps. I will not trace him back to the history of his ancestors, I will not even trace him back in his own history, but why he should pose as a moderate man and charge me with being a French extremist and the representative of the minority of extremists in the province of Quebec, is something that I cannot understand. I have always been the same kind of a man. I have always stood for the policy of conciliation, which the hon. gentleman spoke of last night; I have always stood for the policy of maintaining British institutions, and while I have not been given to making loyal speeches, speeches in exaltation of the British Crown, I have never tried to get applause in any French Canadian city by making speeches in favour of the independence of Canada. I have never been in the habit of holding conferences at the Club National for the justification of Nihilism, as the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue did.

Mr. BRODEUR. I deny that entirely. If my hon. friend wants to go into ancient history, we can do the same, too.

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly, I am ready. I have nothing to protect but myself, and I find myself so small that it is very easy to protect myself. My hon. friend professes to be insulted. Well, of course, I admit that my way of putting things is perhaps harder than his words are. I do not proceed by that kind of insinuation which consists of standing upon a pedestal of virtue and lec-