

abroad, ruined his commerce, shut the gates to his wealth, and so diminished the means to check their rapacity and their spirit of domination."

Was he disloyal when he ordered his priests to teach their parishioners gratitude and fidelity to the crown? Was he disloyal and selfish the noble priest who preached the sermon on the Thanksgiving Day appointed by the Bishop, and who chose for his text the significant words "*Deus tuus Dominus in cunctis inimicis*." "It is thy hand, O Lord, that struck the enemy." Adding these words:

"Does it not seem to you a cruel thing to call 'an enemy' a country to which this colony owes its origin, a nation which was so long united to us by the strong ties of race, of friendship, of language, of religion; a country that has given us fathers, protectors, pastors, models of all virtues, beloved sovereigns, whose wise and moderate government made us happy, whilst they deserved our affections and gratitude."

Who, after mentioning the generosity of the King, of England adds:

"What return must you give for so many favors? A deep feeling of thankfulness towards Great Britain, a sincere desire to remain under that protection, a full conviction that our interests are dependent of the mother country, and that our happiness is interwoven with that of the Empire."

Are these the words of disloyal men? And can a man in his senses find an excuse for saying that those loyal appeals were not sincere? That noble priest, Mr. Spenker, became, very soon after, a prelate of our church, Bishop Plessis, one of the most eloquent, one of the most illustrious, one of the most loyal bishops of the Province of Quebec, who fought for the rights and liberties of his countrymen, and who was afterwards favored with the friendship of the first statesman in England, and who received from the British Crown an acknowledgment of the services that he had rendered, both to his fellow-countrymen and to the British Empire. Wrongly informed by the books he read, the hon. member for North Simcoe said that the insurrection in 1837 was a war of races and not the result of misgovernment. I am at a loss to know in what book the hon. gentleman has read the history of Canada. First, he forgets that the insurrection was not limited to Lower Canada, that Upper Canada had its share of it; then, that several prominent Englishmen of the Province of Quebec took part in the Rebellion. Does he not know also that the principles upon which the constitutional battle was fought from 1791 to 1837 were those for which the English had been fighting for more than a century—in fact, for the articles of the Magna Charta—for the pure, prompt and impartial administration of justice, for the control by the people of the expenditure of public money, for the redress of abuses and shocking favoritism for the personal and tyrannical chief of the Executive. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and his friends—for, after all, we must take them together, because they have a plan of campaign, they have entered upon an agitation which has been carried throughout the country—these gentlemen submit three reasons in support of the Bill now before the House. These are: First, that the North-West has been rapidly filled by Anglo-Saxon immigration, and that the number of people speaking the French language is so small in the Territories that the expenditure involved in the use of a second language in official proceedings is a waste of money. Second, a dual language is a source of contention and division, and should never be allowed in the

framing of the constitution of a new country. Third, the use of the French language was not allowed to the first inhabitants of the country after it fell into British hands; that it has always been a source of division and discord in this country, that it is inconsistent with true British loyalty; and that the sooner it disappears the better. I have endeavored to give answers to the two last reasons. But let us face squarely the argument with regard to the Territories themselves. What is the reason given for objecting to the dual language in the North-West Territories? The hon. gentleman has said that the Act amending the first North-West Territories Act was passed at a time when there were no people in the Territories to assent or consent to it. But the hon. gentleman should remember that there was a population there at that time; and they were people who, with their ancestors, had occupied the country for nearly a century. The North Saskatchewan, Lac la Poudre, Prince Albert, Edmonton and Battleford were settled. The Territories had a population in 1877, although it was not a teeming population. And why was it that the French language was allowed to those people? It was because at that time the great majority of the people of those Territories was French. Time has passed, and the country has been conquered peacefully by another race. Do hon. gentlemen imagine that we French Canadians of another Province find fault with that result? No; I speak here the sentiments of my fellow-countrymen when I say that the greater the Anglo-Saxon immigration is into those Territories the better for the Territories and for the country at large. They have put their money and their energies into that country. They have shown themselves good settlers, and they are now a large majority in those Territories. I am not sorry of it. I speak of it without any feeling or without any prejudice. As I have stated on many occasions, I have invited English to be spoken in my home, and the peace of that home has not been disturbed by the difference of language in our prayers to the Almighty. I do not envy my neighbor because he succeeds in the path of life, with another language, another creed than mine. The sun shines for all, and I leave him his right as I want him to leave me mine. We find from the census returns, which no one will controvert, that the French and French half-breed population in the Territories is in the proportion of 13 per cent.—that is to say, that one-seventh, or a little more, of the population, is French, as to the language, in the North-West Territories. Now, in the Province of Quebec about one-sixth of the population is English, but nobody has ever dreamed of denying them the use of their language. My hon. friend may say you could not take from them the use of their language, because the constitution of the Province of Quebec would prevent you; nor could you do it, in view of the importance of the Anglo-Saxon race, their industry, their energy and the capital they have in the Province of Quebec. I will admit all that, but I say, and I speak for my countrymen when I say so, that, leaving those reasons aside, and considering only the paramount right of minorities, if a measure were proposed in the Province of Quebec to abolish the use of the English language, I would be the first to denounce it and I am sure the immense majority of my fellow-countrymen would