Mr. LEMIEUX. I am paired with the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). Had I voted I would have voted 'nay.'

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved:

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be sent back to Committee of the Whole House with instructions that they have power to add the following paragraph after clause 2 of the Bill:

Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the legislative assembly of the province and in the proceedings of the courts, and both these languages shall be used in the records and journals of such assembly, and all laws made by the legislature shall be printed in both languages: provided, however, that the said legislative assembly may by law or otherwise regulate its proceedings and the manner of recording the publishing the same and the regulations so made shall be embodied in a proclamation which shall be forthwith made and published by the Lieutenant Governor in conformity of the law and thereafter shall have full force and effect.

He said: Just one word of explanation. This is the law of the Territories at the present time, and, under the terms of the Bill, that law would be continued until altered by the provincial legislature. The law was enacted in 1891. Previous to 1891 the scope of the law was wider. The French language had the same status as the English language in the Northwest assembly. This amendment, passed in 1891, permits the assembly of the Territories to regulate its proceedings as it thinks fit and to adopt the English language. It has done so. Under this amendment, if adopted by the House, the legislatures of the two provinces would be free to regulate their own proceedings absolutely and to adopt the English language. The only right that is safeguarded by this amendment is the right to use the French language in the courts and also in the debates if a member of the House sees fit to use that language, and it provides for the translation of the statutes. It maintains to that extent, and to that extent only, the agreement to which I referred at length when I proposed this amendment in the first instance.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) When this question came up for discussion last Friday, I was obliged to be absent; hence my desire to take advantage of this opportunity to say a few words in order to explain the vote that I will be called upon to give upon this amendment. To begin with, I must remark that this proposition coming from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) emanates from a source that we should not and could not have anticipated. In truth, when that hon. member delivered an address on the constitutional question affecting the schools in the new provinces, we did not differ in opinion, and we all were unanimous in recognizing that his speech was evidence that the hon. member had thoroughly studied the question. During the debate on the second reading of this Bill, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier defined the principles that should guide us in the exercise of our powers, as a parliament, regarding the constitution of the new provinces created in the west. At page 3071, the hon. member expressed himself thus:

My interpretation of section 2 of the Imperial Act of 1871, is that that Act clearly gives us the creative power. It enables us to decree the establishment of a province, to constitute it by defining its limits and entering into other details which are absolutely necessary for the purpose of such creation, but the moment that act has been performed our power is exhausted and the new province comes under the control of the different clauses of the Act of 1867, and these clauses apply in their entirety to it.

The hon. member therefore stated that, in his opinion, this parliament has not the right to change the provisions of the constitution, nor to alter it in any way, when we apply it to these western territories; all that which we could do, to his mind, was merely to create those provinces, to define and limit their powers, and that from the moment we have defined their powers, the federal parliament has exhausted its own legislative power. Such is the theory advocated by the hon. gentleman. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier decided to vote for clause 16, such as proposed by the government, it is because that principle was consecrated and recognized by the constitution as the one constructed by the hon. gentleman himself, and that he considered it opportune to remove all doubts. But the hon. gentleman is not the only one to claim that this parliament had not the right to limit the powers of the new provinces. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) followed in his footsteps, and at page 3496, I read the following in his speech of March 30 last:

In speaking of the position taken by my leader, I wish to say openly that, to my mind, he made an admirable speech to which nobody can take exception. We may not all share the conclusions to which he came, but every man on this side, and I believe on the other side as well is convinced that the leader of the opposition spoke in all sincertity without any bias, and influenced solely by a desire for the welfare of Canada. So much is that the case, that if in that amendment of his, ten words were struck off at the end, I would be disposed to support it. And in doing so I would be standing on a good principle, namely, provincial autonomy and provincial rights; and in my opinion clause 93 of the British North America Act would give the new provinces the school system they have to-day. But as a doubt has been expressed by the Minister of Justice, I would have clause 16.

As will be seen, the hon. member for Beauharnois did affirm the very principle formulated by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). As I said a moment ago, there is ground for surprise at seeing