

within these provinces? I think not. It is nothing or it is a constitutional provision. It is not only a Dominion matter but it is an imperial matter in a certain sense, and the moment would be badly chosen in my estimation, Mr. Chairman, when we are the witnesses to the carrying out by the King of England of a policy of entente cordiale, of a policy of conciliation which has been carried out between the two great ruling nations of England and France, to tear asunder an agreement arrived at with that small colony of settlers, if you like, but British subjects of Her late Majesty, the mother of the present King in 1870.

Mr. Chairman, I am no believer, and I have often so stated, in what Mr. McCarthy, in 1890, termed the unification of the Canadian people by the sacrifice of race, religion or anything of that sort. It is an impossible and Eutopian task anyway. No man has yet invented the secret of causing a nation worthy of the name, a nationality with all its distinctive characteristics and traits to disappear or to be merged into another nationality. Nor, are these conditions, as might be supposed, general even in the United States. I think that in four states of the Union there are two or more languages that are official or legal. In autocratic Russia, the government, certainly not a liberal one, tolerates the legal use of a hundred different languages. There are only four countries in Europe where there is one language absolutely and those are Italy, Portugal, Denmark and Greece. The policy of the British government has been one of unsurpassed unequalled tolerance as regards language and in that great empire, the greatest that the world has ever known, there are to-day forty-seven different languages. It does not in any way interfere with, but on the contrary it helps the autonomous and Liberal government of that great empire. Under these circumstances, Sir, there is great justification for the amendment I have moved. To carry it into effect will cause little expense and inconvenience, and it clearly maintains not only the honour of this parliament and this government, but the honour of the British Crown itself, which is something worth being maintained to British subjects. It would have been extremely regrettable had this matter not been brought to the notice of this parliament. I will do my English speaking colleagues the justice of saying that I feel perfectly convinced that if this matter had been one particularly committed to their care, not one of them would have failed in his duty of bringing it to the attention of parliament. I require no justification I am sure, from the French speaking members of this House, for having, I think in moderate language placed this question before the parliament of our country. I have been severely criticised by certain newspapers for having done so, but my conscience is easy on that point for I feel

that I have only discharged a simple duty. Before I resume my seat I wish to refer very briefly to a newspaper article published in the Montreal 'Sunday Sun' in which I am taken to task in the most venomous manner for having ventured to express my determination to move this amendment. There is a despatch in that newspaper which I will not take up the time of the House to read, purporting to come from Ottawa but which I am sure has been fabricated in an office in Montreal which attributes very unworthy motives to me. That newspaper has been sent under cover to the members of this House and perhaps circulated elsewhere or I would take no notice of it. I suppose I ought to say that I deny the allegations contained in that article, and perhaps I may add that I have very little consideration for the 'alligators.' I think that any one who reads that article and who afterwards takes cognizance of what I have reasonably presented to the House, will come to the conclusion that I have simply discharged my duty, and, standing on that vantage ground the attacks of these people directed against me for some years back—low, scurrilous and mendacious as they are—will never reach me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have read the article to which the hon. member (Mr. Monk) has just referred, and as my name is mentioned in that despatch purporting to be sent from Ottawa, I may say to the House that from the beginning to the end the article is a tissue of falsehoods. It is there alleged that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has enjoyed my hospitality with the view of coming into the true fold, and placing himself in the ranks of the Liberal party. It is my great privilege to be a friend, a true friend, of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), but let me assure the House that there has never been between us any compact with a view of bringing that hon. gentleman over to the Liberal party. And if there had been the attitude taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) on this question to-day would show conclusively that he intends to remain in the Conservative party. His speech, a very able speech, is a most seductive one, especially to the province of Quebec. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) reminds me of a certain statesman in England who, having been selected to lead the forces of a great party against the government of the day; seeing no cloud on the horizon; seeing all round him the prosperity of Great Britain; seeing there was no chance for his party to attain power, asked his friends what he should do to educate the people of the country to support the views of his party. And one of his friends answered: Sir, you have only one thing to do, you must advertise for a grievance. I suppose that my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and the gallant little