

tution which we are enacting for the province of Alberta and for that of Saskatchewan, we would be interfering thereby with one of the rights of these provinces, that of deciding in what language the proceedings will be carried on in the legislatures.

There is one other thing which he will recognize. In the constitutions which we are giving to Alberta and Saskatchewan, we have deliberately restricted the rights of the provinces to legislate on educational matters. We have done so under the authority granted by section 93 of the constitution. For, in matters of education, the rights of the provinces are not absolute; they are restricted by the powers of interference of the Dominion parliament. We have done so with a view to remaining faithful to the principle laid down, whereby in matters of education the fundamental right of the provinces is limited, in order to safeguard separate schools. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that we had refrained from dealing with the French language question, on account of the commotion which the discussion on separate schools had given rise to. Does my hon. friend think that the excitement has now subsided? Is he of opinion that the agitation is about to cease, and that he may safely to-day do what he considered unadvisable two or three months ago? I ask him, is he any more justified in taking that stand just now than he would have been a few weeks ago? No; we would have been grievously amiss if we had given further cause to the agitation already on foot.

If my hon. friend were able to point out in the constitution a single clause stating that the French language shall have official recognition in every province, I would be ready to agree with him. But he will seek in vain in the whole British North America Act a provision dealing with the French language in the same way as schools are dealt with. Schools have been put on a different footing. Exception has been made for them; but no such exception has been made as regards the French language.

I need not tell my hon. friend of Labelle that I am as proud of my tongue as he himself may be, that I am as proud of my race as he is, and that I am anxious to see it respected in the other provinces. If the French Canadians, however, are desirous that their rights be respected in the other provinces, they, should always be the first to abide by the constitution.

As a matter of fact, I do not at all agree with my hon. friend for Jacques Cartier (Mr Monk) as to the guarantee which he claims to find in the Bill of Rights. But another question comes up here: Is not that merely an illusory right? Of what use would it be, following on the enactment of 1890? According to the member for Labelle, parliament committed a wrong, in 1890. In my opinion, parliament did not do anything of the sort. If there had been a number of

French-speaking members in the Northwest legislature in 1890, if there were a number of these French-speaking members in that legislature to-day, he would have no reason to fear the emergency he refers to. But I need not recall to the hon. member for Labelle that the hopes he entertains regarding the development of the French idiom in the Northwest will not materialize.

I remember—I was not here then, but it is an historical fact—that Sir George Cartier speaking from the very seat which I occupy at present, stated, in 1870, that the province of Manitoba, which was then being created, would be a second Quebec. Sir John A. Macdonald made a similar statement, but these hopes have not materialized; the tide of French Canadian emigration did not flow towards that province, as was then expected.

In 1890, two Acts were passed by the Manitoba legislature, one abolishing separate schools, and the other abolishing the official use of the French language. Enormous efforts were made to prevent the abolition of separate schools, but as regards the French language, what steps have been taken? Sir John Thompson stated in a memorandum, that the Act doing away with the official use of the French language was entirely ultra vires. Nevertheless, no steps were taken to have it repealed. Why? Because the French-speaking people out there did not care to undertake the fight, being too weak, and, I imagine, realizing that there was no need for the use of that language in the legislature. Well, to-day, in these territories where French Canadians are so few, of what avail would it be to grant a right which would limit the power of the legislature on that point.

I regret that it should be so, but I for one intend to vote against these amendments. I am not ignorant of the consequences which may result therefrom; but even in face of these, I do not hesitate to say that I trust French Canadians will be the first on this occasion, as on any other of the same kind, to respect the constitution which guarantees their rights in the province of Quebec.

House divided on the amendment to the amendment.—(Mr. Bourassa.)

YEAS.

Messieurs

Bergeron,	Monk,
Bourassa,	Morin,
Lavergne (Montmagny),	Paquet.—7.
Léonard,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adamson,	Lamont,
Alcorn,	Lapointe,
Archambault,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Barker,	Laurier (L'Assomption),
Barr,	Lavergne
Beauparlant,	(Drummond & Ath.),