

I will answer you by-and-by. The Solicitor General says that I denounced the Prime Minister because he stated that he was British to the core. The Solicitor General never heard me make such an accusation in my life. When I go on the public platform I do not indulge in any such smallness as that. I have heard it said, and it has been published in the newspapers, but I have not said it. What do I care whether he is British to the core or not? My statement here is that I am a British subject and I do not want to be classified as if I were a Frenchman from old France. It is not that I do not respect the French, I am proud of my French origin, but I do say that if you describe the French Canadians as French in a census report, then you are not giving a correct description of men whose ancestors have been living in this country for 250 years. I am a British subject and a Canadian and should be classed as such. I am proud to be a descendant of the French race but I am Canadian first.

Mr. LAPOINTE. (Translation.) Is the hon. member for Beauharnois ashamed to claim his French ancestry?

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) If the hon. gentleman understands English—

Mr. LAPOINTE. (Translation.) Oh! I understand it thoroughly.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Then he must know that I am just after stating in English that I am not ashamed to own up to my French origin. But I don't see why I should be classed among the French in the census reports.

Mr. LAPOINTE. (Translation.) The Census gives the origin of every race of population.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) I contend that the classification is misleading. When a stranger looks over our statistics and beholds a race of population under the heading of French, he is led to believe that they are French emigrants, while they are Canadians whose ancestors came to settle in this country over two centuries ago.

Mr. BOURASSA. I rise to a point of order. This discussion is entirely outside of the clause before the committee.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In view of the fact that the constitution confers no rights in regard to the use of the French language and that a very small French population inhabits the Northwest Territories, I do not think the motion of my hon. friend should be accepted. Not that I am against the dual system; not that I am against the use of the French language; not that I would not be very happy to see the legislature of the Northwest Territories adopt the French language as one of the official languages; but because I know that it is perfectly useless to ask for more than is contained within the

four corners of the constitution. Now, Sir, after the legislature of the Northwest Territories had abolished the French language in 1892, no further action was taken by the parliament of Canada. The parliament of Canada, by adopting the amendment of Sir John Thompson, had pledged itself to confer the principle of local autonomy in the Northwest Territories with regard to the dual system. In those days the leaders representing more especially the French Canadian population—the Hon. Sir Hector Langevin, the Hon. Sir Adolphe Chapleau and the Hon. Sir Adolphe Caron—who had seats in this House, never raised their voice to restore the use of the French language in the Northwest assembly, because at that time there was not one French Canadian member in that assembly, and to-day I believe there are only two, Mr. Prince and Mr. Lambert. I have the evidence of one of the most eminent judges of the Northwest Territories, who, though having an Irish name, is French Canadian at heart, Mr. Justice Prendergast, to the effect that the French language has never been used to his knowledge before the courts of the Territories. I said a moment ago that the Conservative party in 1892 had not moved in the matter at all, although letters and other documents had been sent to Ottawa on the subject. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) must remember a letter of Monseigneur Grandin to the other bishops of Canada, which was sent to the Ottawa government in 1889. In that letter Monseigneur Grandin declared that the federal government was responsible for the persecution arising from the suppression of the separate school system and of the French language in the schools. I also find in the votes and proceedings of 1890 that Mr. Amyot asked the government:

Whether they are aware that the following letter has been addressed by His Grace Monseigneur Grandin to persons occupying a high position in the province of Quebec?

The letter he referred to was the letter of Monseigneur Grandin in which he accused the Conservative government of the day of having favoured the abolition of the French language and the abolition of the separate school system. And yet my hon. friend from Beauharnois did not say a word in protest.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the answer to that? There was an answer?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. BERGERON. What page is that?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Page 34 of the Votes and Proceedings of 1890. It is well known that no answer was made by the government.

Mr. BERGERON. That was only a notice of motion? If there was an answer it would be in 'Hansard'?

Mr. LEMIEUX. At all events, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier comes before