

Mr. LAPOINTE. (Translation.) For all the reasons which have been given here to-night and which my hon. friend from Laval would have grasped no doubt had he been present.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I have been here all the time.

Mr. LAPOINTE. (Translation.) I do not deem it necessary to speak at greater length. I must thank my hon. friend from Montmagny for the highly complimentary certificate which he has given to his colleagues in this House. If I had any desire of being ironical towards him, I might suggest that a good many of those who he brands as cowards are the very people who helped most to bring about his election in Montmagny.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to reply to the hon. member for Kamouraska, beyond saying that to-morrow the government newspapers in the province of Quebec will proclaim that he delivered this evening the finest, the greatest and the most eloquent of speeches.

Mr. GLADU. (Yamaska.) (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, following the example of the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) I wish to give my reasons for voting against the motion introduced by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

I must first draw attention to the fact that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier who has constituted himself the champion of the rights of the French language is the same hon. gentleman who, ten years ago, in this House moved the abolition of that same French language.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I deny it emphatically.

Mr. GLADU. (Translation.) I think I am in a position to prove what I say. If, Mr. Chairman, you will refer to the 'Hansard' for the second session of 1896, at page 2214, you will find that a proposal was made to cut down certain expenditure; and that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier expressed himself as follows:

Mr. MONK. There is an item of nearly \$2,000 here for the translation of statistics into French. I do not deny that that may be necessary, but it seems to me that in future some scheme might be devised by which that expense should be avoided. The statistics are perfectly well understood in English, just as well as in French by the members in the province of Quebec, and it seems to me that something might be done—say if it were placed in the hands of a committee of French members to prevent this expenditure. Most of the expressions used in our province with reference to the statistics are English expressions, and this would consequently appear to be an absolute waste of money.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Does not the hon. member think that \$2,000 is rather ex-

cessive expenditure for that amount of work?

Mr. GLADU. (Translation.) In my turn I shall ask the hon. member for Jacques Cartier whether, when he decided to introduce the motion which is now before the House, he had in mind the one he moved in 1896? He contends that the amount was excessive, but if that was truly the motive which urged the hon. gentleman to act on that occasion, I may be allowed to inquire whether he might not have attained his object otherwise than by asking as he did that the French translation be done away with. That is direct evidence that the motion introduced by the hon. gentleman is not the outcome of a desire to promote the French language, but has an entirely different object. We all know in the province of Quebec that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is a most distinguished jurist, an eminent lawyer, a highly considered professor of Laval University; and it is that hon. gentleman who now brings in a proposal which, as he himself stated a moment ago, is absolutely without any meaning. In fact, what does the hon. member ask for? He is quite willing that provision be made for the official use of both English and French, in the new Western provinces; but he wishes, at the same time, that this right be a matter left to the free will of the legislatures of the new provinces, whose members will be at liberty to do away with it whenever they think fit. If the hon. gentleman had been in earnest, he would have struck out the latter part of his motion, in the way suggested a moment ago by the hon. member for Labelle.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why did the hon. member add that second part to his motion? For a very simple reason. I do not wish to be unfair or to unduly impute motives, but at the same time we should endeavour to find out the true motive of his action. Why has the hon. member added to his motion the last clause whereby he asks that this right be dependent on the consent of the legislature? It is in order that, in the province of Quebec, the hon. gentleman and his friends may be in a position to say: we have asked that in the Territories, provision be made for the use of the French language. And these gentlemen will also be free to add: the Liberal members from the province of Quebec have voted against that motion. On the other hand, the latter part of the motion meets the requirements of the province of Ontario. Then these gentlemen may state to their friends in Ontario: True, we made such a proposal, but it had no meaning since its carrying out was left entirely in the hands of the legislature.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I see that my hon. friend intends supporting the amendment moved by the member for Labelle.