more discussion on this question before the end of the session.

Mr. BELCOURT. As a French Canadian I object to such a slur being cast upon the people of the province of Quebec, as that anybody can go among them and say anything he likes, to pass beyond bounds, and that one can do that from one end of the province to the other. I am very much surprised to hear my hon. friend cast such a slur upon his own countrymen.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend is trying to play the same game. The committee understands what I mean. But on the whole it is true, that in the province of Quebec these gentlemen can go on the stump anywhere and say what they please, and we have to listen to it and to submit to it. But when they find themselves brought up sharp then as a last resort, they bring in the name of the right hon. premier, and then it is all up with us, and we have to sit down.

At six o'clock, Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Before this motion is disposed of, I think it is due to the House that I should give reasons why it cannot be accepted by the government. I venture to express the opinion that when, in a few years from this, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) reviews the events of this day, he will have no cause to rejoice or feel proud of the position he has assumed. The motion he has made, in my estimation, cannot be defended in any way, either on the ground of constitutional rights or usefulness to the race to which he and I belong? The object of this motion is to limit the right of the new provinces in the matter of language and to do for the French language what we have done for the schools. This proposed legislation would crystallize the use of the French language in the provinces, to a large extent at all events, if not absolutely. There is great difference, my hon. friend will admit, between the position given to the French language under the constitution and that given to the schools. My hon. friend has not attempted this afternoon to base his motion upon anything that can be found in the British North America Act. That Act expressly leaves the subject of language to the legislatures, with two exceptions only, namely, the Quebec legislature and this parliament. Section 133 is in these words:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the courts of Quebec. The Acts of the parliament of Canada and of the legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those languages.

The very fact that here the French and English languages are made the official languages in the Dominion parliament and the Quebec legislature, necessarily excludes the other provinces from that provision, and leaves that subject to be dealt with by them as they may see fit in the best interests of the public. With regard to the schools, the matter is very different. There is no use discussing again the provision of the law in that respect, because we have been discussing it for months. But let me repeat, for the purpose of this debate, that the law says in, so many words, that where a separate school system is found to exist in any of the provinces admitted into the union, that system must be perpetuated and be given the privileges provided in section 93. No such privilege, however, exists for the use either of the English or French or any language, in any section of the British North America Act, and I did not understand my hon. friend even to attempt to pretend that the constitutional right which he claims for the French language in the Territories is to be found in the four corners of the British North America Act. Therefore let any such contention as this be discarded. There is nothing in the British North America Act to support the motion made by my hon. friend. Where then is the constitutional right invoked by my hon. friend? He finds it in the Bill of Rights which was presented by the delegates of the Red River colony, when they came to Ottawa in 1870, after the important events of the year before in that distant part of the country. The delegates who came to Ottawa, in my judgment—and I submit it as a fact which belongs to history—did not represent the whole people of Rupert's Land. They represented simply a portion of the people of Rupert's Land. No doubt they claimed to represent the whole people—the people not only of Red River colony, but also of Rupert's Land. It is easy to show in any public document that the people of such and such a place profess to represent the whole country just as the three tailors of Tooley Street said: 'We the people of England.' It was easy for the delegates to say: 'We represent the people of Rupert's Land'; but there was superabundant reason why they could not represent the whole people of that section of country. They represented only the people of the Red River valley, because—and I submit this also as a matter of history—there were no white people then except in the valley of the Red River. There were no white people in the valley of the Saskatchewan. I doubt even if there were any, except a few isolated individuals, anywhere