

largely preponderate in a few years, the French language would soon have dropped out. Frenchmen do not insist on sentimental rights; they do not ask for anything that has not some proper motive for it. They demand this, not as a favor, but as a right. It was not the money question that originated this difficulty. I am told that the whole amount involved in the printing of orders and proceedings was only some four or five hundred dollars; yet for that paltry, contemptible sum this Dominion has been thrown into a state of disturbed and bitter feelings, such as have never prevailed before. I say it does not speak well for the majority in this country. It is a great reflection on the larger numerical element of which this country is composed that so little courtesy is shown to the minority in discussing this question. To my mind, I feel perfectly satisfied that if this question had not been discussed at all, in ten years, with the increasing growth of the North-West, this question of dual language would have died out entirely. The French Canadians might have asked that certain ordinances should be published in their language, and the people of the North-West would have been liberal enough, if left to themselves, not to question it as a right. Do the people of the western States object to the publication of ordinances in Swedish or German? Not at all; it is only in this country, where a few bigots have started an agitation that has roped in some proper-thinking people that such a movement is possible. This question has been threshed out and discussed, over and over again, and at last, for peace sake, the leading men on both sides said: "Let us join hands; let us have peace and harmony and see if we cannot agree on this point." So, in the House of Commons, very properly, the leaders of the two parties came together and said it is best for the people that they should compromise on this question, which they did, I believe, in terms similar to the Bill now under consideration. Whatever were my views before, I am content to set them aside and abide by that compromise. It was a compromise that involved no sacrifice of principle that the gentlemen of Lower Canada entertain. It was another evidence of their generosity and of their desire to sacrifice much for peace sake that they did compromise. I appreciate the spirit in which that compromise was accepted, and

entirely agree with it, and for that reason I am going to support the Bill as it is, and must vote against the motion of my hon. friend from Delanau dière. Otherwise, I should be exceedingly glad to support it. It would have, under ordinary circumstances, my hearty support, but I do not propose to take up and advocate a hopeless question, merely for the sake of momentary effect. That question has been disposed of, and if we carried my hon. friend's proposition to-day it would not meet with any favor from the other House. The leaders on both sides have committed themselves to the compromise, as it is called, and I think it is our duty, in the interests of peace and harmony, to show our concurrence in that compromise. It was arrived at with the best possible motives, and I think it is most unfair now to attempt to disturb it, and for these reasons I shall feel compelled to vote against the proposition of my hon. friend.

HON. MR. PAQUET (in French)—In rising to second the motion of my hon. friend from Delanau dière, I take the opportunity to say with what interest I have followed the discussion on the important question to which it refers. We have in the Senate the good fortune to be able to discuss it dispassionately, and this question of the dual language is really more within the domain of this Chamber, in regard to what appertains to it, than of the House of Commons. The debates, often acrimonious, in the other branch of Parliament and elsewhere, frequently prove unquestionably, by their results, that more is accomplished by gentle means than by violence—that the ostracism of minorities has never conquered the hearts of a people—as, for instance, in the case of Poland, Ireland, Alsace and Lorraine, and a good many others. Let us profit by the example of nations that have preceded us or who are our contemporaries. I hope I shall be permitted to cite one historical fact which bears on this question:—

"In 1862 and 1863 Poland, unfortunate Poland, wounded, disunited and enslaved, considered by the great nations as incapable of self-government, and simply as a country subject to the whip of Russia, raised once more the standard of revolt against despotism, of which the odious persecutions pointed more and more the disadvantage; and three of the great nations of Europe joined in making remonstrances to Russia on her conduct with regard to the Polish people—I dare not say with regard to Poland, but with regard to the Poles. What were these nations? They were England, France and Austria. They made