position, and at the very first sitting the few English members which it contained, after having attempted to force on the very great majority a Speaker of their own origin, subsequently refused to nine-tenths of the population of the country the imprescriptible right to their language as the official language. But they were counting without taking into consideration the resolute firmness of which the Canadians of old so often gave proof in the defence of their rights; and I can convey to the honorable members of this House no higher opinion of the lofty sentiments of these great patriots of the olden time, than by quoting the remarks made by one of the members, Mr. DeLotbinière, during the debate in question:—

The second reason, which is to assimilate and attach more promptly the Canadian race to the Mother Country, ought to set aside every other consideration, if we were not certain of the fidelity of the people of this province; but let us do justice to their conduct at all times, and especially let us remember the year 1775. These Canadians, who spoke nothing but French, showed their attachment to their sovereign in a manner which admitted of no doubt being cast upon it. They assisted in the defence of the province. This city, these walls, this very House in which I have the honor to raise my voice, were, in part, saved by their zeal and their courage. We saw them unite with the faithful subjects of His Majesty and repulse the attacks made by people who spoke very good English, upon this town. It is not uniformity of language, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that makes people more faithful or more united among themselves. To convince ourselves of this, let us glance at France at this moment and at all the kingdoms of Europe. No, I repeat, it is not uniformity of language that maintains and ensures the fidelity of a people; it is the certainty of its present good fortune, and of this our people are at present perfectly convinced. They know that they have a good king—the best of kings. They know that they are under a just and liberal government; and, lastly, they know that a change or a revolution would entail certain loss upon them, and they will ever be prepared to oppose any such proceeding with vigor and courage.

Mr. DUFRESNE (Montcalm) — Mr. Speaker, I hope the honorable member for Richelieu will excuse my interrupting him for a moment. I wish to ask a simple question. Will the hon. member inform me what difference there is between a member who reads his speech and another who reads the history of Canada to the House?

Mr. PERRAULT—I reply to the hon. member for Montcalm, that the speech read to us by the hon. member for Montmorency, the other evening, was written out from the first line to the last. Not only did he read to us the passages which he took from history or the quotations which he made from the speeches of other members of this House, but also his own remarks on those extracts. I only read here quotations from authors, which serve as vouchers upon which to base my arguments. If I did not read them, it might be supposed that I only expressed my own private opinions, whereas they are those of a friend of the present Government. Although I coincide in the ideas and opinions which I quote, yet I do not choose to appropriate them as my own, but wish to leave all the merit and the responsibility of them to the author of them.

Mr. DUFRESNE (Montcalm) — The only difference I can discover between the hon. member for Montmorency and the hon. member for Richelieu, is that the former read his own work, and that the latter is rendering himself guilty of plagiarism. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

Mr. PERRAULT — Everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Montcalm has no reason to fear a similar accusation, for the excellent reason that his writings and his speeches are nowhere to be found. At the time when the member for Montcalm interrupted me so very inoffensively, Mr. Speaker, I was quoting a passage from M. De Lotbinière's speech on the subject of the opposition offered to the publication of the proceedings of the House of Assembly in 1791 in French, in order to demonstrate the spirit of exclusiveness which animated the English element from the commencement of our parliamentary system, notwithstanding the insignificant minority in which they were at the time. But that barefaced attempt was unsuccessful, and the amendment proposed, having for its object the proscription of the French language, was refused by two-thirds of the House. It was finally resolved that the minutes of the proceedings of the House should be in both languages, and that the English or the French version should be the text of the Legislative acts according as they related to the English or the French laws. Thus opposition to the French element manifested itself from the commencement of our parliamentary system in this country, by the refusal to adopt the French as the official language. But, thanks to our sturdy resistance, the use of that language has always been one of our privileges, a privilege which has

Digitized by Google