Mr. GLADU. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman may rest assured that I intend decidedly to vote against that motion. Now, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier flushed with indignation, a few moments ago, in defending the position taken by the hon. member for Labelle. He was recalling, in no smooth terms, what the Solicitor General had said last night—'You are pulling with Dr. Sproule.'

The Solicitor General may have used this expression, and it is hard to make it a crime for him to have used it, but I dare say it may not be so hard to prove that he was perfectly right. There is a way to pull together in two different directions, and if it should be true that extremes meet, then I think I am fairly justified in stating that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and the hon. member for East Grey (Dr. Sproule) are hugging each other pretty closely at times. Coming again to the hon. members for Labelle and Beauharnois, I think it incumbent upon me to take up, as was done a moment ago by the hon. member for Kamouraska, the unwarranted insult hurled at the French-speaking members in this House, when we were charged by them with being cowards and poltroons. He who refuses to perform his duty is undoubtedly a coward and a poltroon, but he also is a coward and a poltroon who does not perform his duty the way he should. To charge the French-speaking members on this side of the House with being cowards and poltroons as did the hon. member for Labelle last night, I think I can fairly be allowed to retort, with all due deference to the chair, that the expression cowardice does not apply to those it was aimed at, but rather to those who uttered it. Why insult the Prime Minister? Can any occasion be pointed out when the right hon. the leader of the government has shown himself to be unworthy of his countrymen? I challenge the hon. member for Labelle to point out to a single action, a mere fact, any circumstance whatever in his lifetime which justifies the insult? I do not know that the Prime Minister was in any way unworthy of his countrymen when in England, where he held out so successfully against Mr. Chamberlain, the most powerful man in Great Britain at that time, and where he the Prime Minister of a British colony, was putting his political career at stake by resisting so vigorously such a mighty statesman. Would this be one of the occasions in which he displayed his lack of courage? I do not believe either that the Hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) deserved to be called a coward by the hon. member for Labelle. Was he acting the part of a coward when he stood firm against one of the most gigantic trusts that ever operated in this country, in order to put a stop to the shameful dealings that had been going on for some years? Surely not.

I meant to make these few remarks on the motion put by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, for the purpose of explaining the vote that I am about to give.

Mr. MILLER. I hesitate to take up the time of the House at this late hour, but I shall detain you only for a few moments. I would not speak at all were it not that our good humoured good natured and able friend the member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) said he would make his appeal largely to the English-speaking members of this House, of whom he said he thought they were perhaps broader-minded than some of his own compatriots. I do claim to be broad-minded; I would rather deserve the reputation of being broad-minded than almost anything else a man can have a reputation for, and, as a broad-minded Canadian, as a broad-minded member of this House, I shall reply to the invitation of my hon. friend in a few words. Before coming to this House I had but a limited knowledge of the French Canadian people, not having had many opportunities to come personally in contact with them. I came here without any prejudice whatever against my French Canadian fellow citizens, either because of their language or because of their religion ; but since coming here, I can say that my greater knowledge of them has certainly not led me to esteem them less highly or appreciate less their value as fellow citizens of this great Dominion. I think we will all admit that the French is a beautiful language. Our sons and daughters are studying that language, and deem their education quite incomplete without a knowledge of it. We, Sir, who are ignorant of the language, who have not been sufficiently able or have not had sufficient opportunity to acquire a knowledge of it, deeply regret our ignorance; but as our children are studying today and acquiring a knowledge of the French language because of its beauty and its place in literature, so are the children of our French Canadian citizens studying and learning the English language because of its utility. They are learning the English language because it is fast becoming the commercial language of the world; because it is the language of the people of Great Britain from whom we buy so largely and to whom we sell so largely; because it is the language of the great American republic to the south of us with whom we so largely deal; and because the English language is the language of the larger portion by far of the people of this Dominion, it seems to me it goes without saying that if in the new provinces there is to be but one official language, it ought to be the English as a matter of convenience and utility. I object to implanting in the new provinces any second language, not because it is French, but because it is a second language, and because only one, it seems to me, is required.

In the first place, I would object to the establishing officially of the French language