

venture to put in this preamble, and to speak at the Opera House, and because I ventured to claim that the English language should rule in this country, but pass the Bill. The way to pass the Bill is to go to a second reading and then to expunge what is in the preamble. Do not pass the Bill, if it suits your pleasure, but vote the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier. That is honest and straightforward, and that, at all events, we can understand. We can understand the views and the policy of the hon. gentlemen who are absolutely opposed to any change. But hon. gentlemen who wish to get rid of this question by a side issue, who try to do and not to do it, will not, although they may deceive this country. That they may depend upon. I listened to the argument of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), and I listened to the argument of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault), and no more straightforward or honorable statement of the case was given on that side of the House. It contrasted greatly with the statement from the Treasury benches of its compatriots from Quebec; it was arguments, not abuse. It was a reason for us to pause in our course, and was not simply denunciation of those who differ from the views which those hon. gentlemen both take. But I say their view is the correct view. It is this Parliament, and it is this Parliament alone, which has the power to deal with this question. It is this Parliament which put that clause in, uninvited. It is this Parliament which has the authority to take that clause out. Why should we abnegate our duties or our functions on the ground of expediency or to get rid of a temporary difficulty? Will we, in the interest of our country, be doing a service? Will we not be keeping open that running sore of which the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) spoke? We put the trouble on the people of the North-West, but, although we should denude ourselves of our authority and endeavor to get rid of this question for the moment, it will remain a burning question in old Canada and in the new Provinces, more especially, if you postpone the decision of this question until after the next general elections. I am commissioned to read the opinion of a senator who once occupied a seat in this House, and whose voice is now unable to be heard here.

Mr. DAVIN. Name.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Senator Perley. His observations ought to have weight. Writing to me on the 12th February, he says:

"MY DEAR SIR,—Stand firm for your resolution re dual language in the North-West Territories. The North-West is with you. I get letters by every mail strongly urging me to help you in this matter. Davin's amendment if carried might lead to serious results in some of the constituencies, only paralleled by the Hull affair of last night. Particularity might this be the case in those constituencies where it was stated by Mr. Blits, member of the Legislative Assembly, that so few of the people could read in any language and their prejudices so easily excited. I contend it is wrong to submit a question of such a character to the vote of the people. Discussion and electioneering talk on such an issue would tend to disturb the harmony and good-feeling that is fast being obtained between the people of different nationalities and creeds in the North-West Territories. I write this advisedly and with the full knowledge of the responsibility of a representative of the people in the North-West Territories from end to end.

"Yours, &c.,
"W. D. PERLEY."

Is not that reasonable? Is it reasonable, when we have this matter before us now—a matter which has excited, we are told, a great deal of feeling in this chamber, a matter which has excited a good deal of feeling out of doors, having opinions formed one way or the other about it, having a means of knowledge denied to the representatives of the North-West Territories, we, who have this great duty thrown upon us here, should refuse to discharge it and ask the unfortunate people of the North-West to have this bone of contention thrown upon them. That may be right from a party point of view; I venture to say it is not right from a statesman's point of view. This Bill may be wrong, it may be that the Bill ought to be rejected, but there can be no justification for sending it to the people of the North-West to be dealt with. I deny that I have gone back upon any views that I have advocated in regard to provincial rights. If the people of the North-West did not wish to have this measure passed, we might postpone it at the present time, but the people have shown that they are in favor of it, and every newspaper in the North-West—excepting always the *Regina Leader*—has spoken in favor of the abolition of the dual language. I cannot look upon the *Regina Leader* as an authoritative representative of public opinion in the North-West. We know that the *Regina Leader* occupies a peculiar position in regard to the existing state of affairs in the North-West. I am told—I may be wrong—I do not connect it with any hon. member of this House, but I am told that it was owing to the fact that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West insisted upon giving to the *Regina Leader* the printing of that Government at a higher rate than it could be done for elsewhere, that the deadlock was brought about in the North-West Council, that the Lieutenant Governor's advisers refused to agree to that, and then resigned. Of course, the longer the dual language is preserved, the better it is for the publisher of the *Regina Leader*, and, therefore, I do not think that the *Regina Leader* is to be quoted as an authority on this question. Putting the *Regina Leader* aside, we have the unanimous opinion of the press of the North-West, as we have the opinion of the people of the North-West, that they do not want the dual language. Why should we pause? Why should we hesitate? I have done. I have endeavored to make my case as plain as I possibly can. I have endeavored to show why this question should be dealt with at the earliest possible moment. I have endeavored to show that it ought to be dealt with here. I have endeavored to show that, if this resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is passed, that is the end of the Bill, but the end is not accomplished. I have stated that I am prepared, if any hon. gentleman objects to the recital in this Bill, that it shall be stricken out, and every hon. gentleman in this House knows that, when the Bill reaches committee, it can then be debated whether it is for us here or for the North-West to deal with this question; but, if the amendment of the hon. gentleman is carried, it is a way to do this little Bill to death, instead of its becoming the law of the land, which is the desire of the people in the North-West who have taken an interest in this matter, and I am sure is the desire of the great majority of the people of the country. The sooner this question is set at rest,

the bett
disturb
alone a
matter
Bill is d
the ho
Davin)
ber for
any way
that, if
this Bill
certain l
brought
harmony
ent nati
tion her
and do t
in such a
people as
the Nort
political
gentleme
my fate,
I shall c
according
hon. gen
debate o
that hon
judgment