

John Thompson as an argument why we should make the French language official, I say it is not a strong argument at all, because the same remark would apply to the Doukhobors, the Galicians, the Finns, the Poles and the Italians.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. That is putting the French Canadians on the same footing as the Doukhobors, Galicians and Poles.

Mr. SPROULE. No, I am not making any comparison at all. The French Canadians may be as far superior to these other nationalities as day is to night or light to darkness. I am only discussing the question whether it is or is not a great hardship or a great wrong to a man to be tried in a court of justice where he does not understand the language that is spoken—that is all. It is done in every country in the world to-day. The history of every country in the world is a history of change, to suit changed conditions. France is an illustration of it, Spain is an illustration of it. The hon. gentleman referred to Alsace and Lorraine. A gentleman who travelled in those provinces told me last year that when they were taken over by Germany, nearly everybody there spoke French, but that you would be surprised to-day to find nearly everybody speaking German, and the strange thing is that there is no complaint about it, although the change was compulsory. I do not go so far as that, because I think we ought to be more generous; but in that case, though the change was made by law, no great hardship has resulted. Nor will it be so in the Northwest any more than it has been in Alsace and Lorraine. We are told that unification is an impossible task, that it is a Utopia, and that therefore we must keep up two languages.

My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier said, why shall we not be allowed to speak our mother tongue? I understand at one time that the hon. gentleman was half Scotch and half French, but I am told that he is half English and half French; what would be his mother tongue?

I am told that in Glengarry there were a lot of Scotchmen who married into the French Canadian race; which language would be the mother tongue of their children? Are we going to perpetuate it by law? Let the law of the survival of the fittest be the law that will determine that. We need not trouble ourselves with it at all. The hon. gentleman says it is hard to deprive people of the right to speak their mother tongue. Nobody wants to deprive them of the right to speak their mother tongue; let them speak it as long as they like. I was interested in one statement that was made by the Solicitor General. He said, why are you demanding this privilege for the Northwest? Have you had a single petition from the French there asking that it should be done? He thought that was a strong reason why it should not

be done. I ask, is there a single petition from either the French or the Roman Catholics of that country asking that separate schools be forced on the people?

Mr. SCOTT. There is a petition from the legislature. The Haultain draft Bill asked for separate schools.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all. The legislature passed two resolutions asking parliament to repeal the law. The hon. gentleman will wish he had not spoken, because he has only put his foot in it. The only expression we have from the legislature as a legislature was the two requests which they made that the right should be done away with.

Mr. SCOTT. Those two memorials of which the hon. gentleman speaks were passed before the ordinances of 1892 were passed. Since the change was made in the ordinances there has been no complaint on the part of any person in the Northwest against the existing separate schools.

Mr. SPROULE. Has there been any request from the legislature that you compel them to have separate schools for ever?

Mr. SCOTT. I say that the Haultain draft Bill contains that request, and I challenge the hon. member to ask his leader to deny it. The Haultain Bill certainly asked for the perpetuation of separate schools.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If my hon. friend asks my opinion I say it does nothing of the kind.

Mr. SCOTT. I would call the attention of the leader of the opposition to an expression he used on May 10, when he said that he coincided entirely in the opinion of the Minister of Justice that section 93 would not only perpetuate existing separate schools, but would secure to the Northwest minority what is termed full justice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think the hon. gentleman will find that I said that. If I am so represented, I was wholly misrepresented, but I have not seen it in 'Hansard' and I do not think it is there; I have expressed an exactly opposite opinion.

Mr. SPROULE. If section 93 provided for all that, why was there any necessity for clause 16 and the amended 16?

Mr. SCOTT. For the very purpose that 16 was put in, to modify section 93.

Mr. SPROULE. Because clause 16 in the Haultain Bill was the same as in this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. What is out of order?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. My hon. friend is speaking to a motion dealing with the question of language, but he is now discussing separate schools.