

ment and the British aristocrats? No country has ever been more justly treated than was French Canada under the British government. Here is another extract that will show the conduct of the British government:

The impolitic desire of the home government to preserve the French element distinct from the British, as a safeguard against future revolution, completely destroyed this prospect—

Referring to the amalgamation of the two peoples.

—and precipitated the consequences it sought to avoid, aside from preventing the gradual amalgamation of the two races. For a brief space, however, the British inhabitants were lulled into security by the moderation of the French Canadians.

So, it was the British government themselves who first insisted upon these people taking an active part in the management of their own affairs.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) lost sight of the little rebellion that took place in Upper Canada?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have not come near the rebellion in Upper Canada yet, or near the rebellion in Lower Canada either, but I am gradually coming to it.

But no sooner had the French Canadian leaders become fully aware of the nature of the power with which they had been invested, than they gradually excluded persons of British origin from the House, until only some three or four remained.

And this was under the progenitor of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). And that hon. gentleman has the hardihood to stand up in this House and preach about the tolerance of the French Canadian people. Thank fortune that they have been tolerant. But it does not belong to the Liberal party or the family of Papineau to boast of tolerance.

The French, instead of the English, now became altogether the dominant language, and assumed the aggressive in the most decided manner. If a person of British origin aspired to political influence, he had to cast aside every predilection of birth and education, connect himself wholly with the French Canadians, and also learn their language.

This, Sir, under the rule and management of the progenitor of the hon. member for Labelle. Yet that hon. gentleman will get up and prate about the tolerance shown by the French Canadian people. As I have said, French Canadians are a tolerant people, but the family of Papineau has no share or part in that tolerance.

Prior to the formation of the Papineau party, no systematic attempt had been made to excite the prejudices of the masses against the natives of British origin.

Another factor against the hon. gentleman. And further on:

Nor is there any ground whatever for the supposition that the conduct of the French Canadians during the war with the United States arose from a feeling of loyalty to Great Britain.

Now, I just want to make it clear that the hon. gentleman is a pure agitator and that he has not given this House or this country in his addresses, from one end of it to the other, the facts of the conduct of a certain wing of the Liberal party of Lower Canada towards the English-speaking people of this country:

But, although the French Canadians were apparently the Liberal party of Lower Canada, owing to the manner in which they advocated reforms in question of a purely British character, while at the same time they clung tenaciously to almost every abuse of French origin, the citizens of the other race were the real reformers. The very constitution itself, the first great measure of reform was the result of their solicitation—

So these Britishers could not have been so bad. They had to force these liberties upon the French Canadian people.

—and the fact of the province having been divided was not owing to them, as the able protest, at the bar of the House of Commons, of Lymburner clearly shows, but to the blind infatuation of the imperial government. They were foremost in all great public measures of utility, in the building of steamboats, in commerce, in agricultural improvements, in liberal educational measures—

And yet, the hon. member for Labelle contended that the British government had kept these people in subjection and in ignorance, when the facts show that the British government had to force educational measures upon them.

—in the social elevation of the industrial classes, and thus kept full pace with the progressive spirit of the age. The great majority of the French Canadian population, on the other hand, clung to ancient prejudices, to ancient customs, to ancient laws, with the unreasoning tenacity of an uneducated and non-progressive people.

These are the words of the historian I have quoted and they cannot be contradicted or gainsaid. I want to point out that what the province of Quebec has always wanted was a free man, a man who would stand to the front and lead that magnificent province and that splendid people and let them know the facts as to the splendid treatment meted out to them by the British government in the days gone by.

This was under the regime of Papineau, the grandfather, I believe, of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). Speaking of toleration, the writer says:

In order to check the settlement of the eastern townships by British immigration, it was persistently refused to make grants for roads therein, for the administration of justice, for registry offices, or even to permit of their parliamentary representation.