ment which we made with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why cannot we hold those two provinces bound by what the Minister of Justice told us was a contract in respect of schools ? We are protecting by another clause the rights of the Hudson Bay Company. Is that in the British North America Act ? My hon. friend knows perfectly well that we would probably have had no grounds for what we are claiming had it not been for the pronouncement by the government that we are not strictly bound by the British North America Act, and that we can go beyond it. My hon. friend the Solicitor General pronounced yesterday an excommunication against the member for Labelle.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What ?

Mr. MONK. The excommunication which my hon. friend pronounced is similar to those which have been pronounced against us by him during the ten years we have been in politics together in Quebec. You begin by 'yellow-dogging' the doctor, and when you have 'yellow-dogged' the doctor, you turn and say to us in your papers in Quebec that we are pulling with Doctor Sproule. That is an anomaly, and I can tell the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that it does not prevent a man from feeling very well.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does my hon. friend pretend that I have written that in 'Le Canada' ?

Mr. MONK. I do not ; but I will say to the Solicitor General that that article shows there is a fate reserved for us in Quebec when we differ from our friends on the other side. We began by hearing all about what I call the 'yellow dogs,' and then we are told : These are the people with whom you are in league. But that will not, I think, go down for all time, and I can tell the committee that there would be no ground for an agitation in my own constituency. My constituency is one which is very evenly divided. I have very many English-speaking electors and many members of the Orange Order, and I am ready, as I have been in the past, to go before these men, who are serious men and whose good opinion I value, and defend before them, as I must do, the attitude I have taken upon this question. I shall say this, that, with the experience I have had in the past with these men, they will understand the argument which has been presented to this committee to-night, and I am perfectly sure that they will ratify what I have done.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, let me say a few words in French in answer to the abuse hurled at the representatives of the French Canadians by the hon. member from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) and the hon. member from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). Strange to say, Mr. Chairman, these champions of the French Canadian nationality seem to think it is unworthy of them to use their native tongue when addressing this House ; although it would be only proper to my mind that they should speak French when advocating, as they claim, the official use of that tongue. It would be much better for him, I think, it would be the part of a true patriot, and highly gratifying to the province of Quebec, if the hon. member from Labelle, for instance, spoke French oftener than he does in this House, especially when he undertakes to vindicate the official use of that tongue in the proceedings of the proposed legislatures of the Northwest. The hon. member for Labelle has not as yet such a considerable following as to oblige him to speak English whenever he addresses them or appeals to them. Since he has but one follower, the member for Montmagny, it seems to me he might speak French without running any risk of not being understood. I can well conceive that the head of a great party, comprising English speaking and French speaking gentlemen, should think it necessary to speak English in order to make himself understood by all, and to express the views of that party made up largely of English speaking gentlemen, but surely no such reason exists for the hon. member from Labelle.

Mr. LAVERGNE. (Translation.) Does the hon. member consider that the 'considerableness' of a party is measured by the 'considerableness' of its members ?

Mr. LAPOINTE. (Translation.) I thank the hon. member from Montmagny for his interruption, as it affords me an opportunity of saying that, if the worth of a party was to be judged by the worth of some of its members, one would be tempted to consider the hon. gentleman's party as of very little worth.

I did not intend to speak, Mr, Chairman, but I feel that it is incumbent upon me to protest in my name and in that of my French colleagues in this House, against the insults lavished upon us by the hon. members for Montmagny and Labelle, yesterday and the day before, in the course of this debate, I protest at the same time against the abuse heaped by the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) on the French speaking representatives of the province of Quebec. I think it is rather a peculiar way of showing one's patriotism to endeavour to belittle in the eyes of the whole country the French Canadian members in this House, as was done by the hon. member from Labelle, who has thought fit to revile those whom the French Canadians have chosen as their standard bearers in this House. The hon. member for Labelle, who poses as the champion of the rights of our nationality, showed himself a poor type of a patriot when he insulted the French Canadian members in connection with the school question, when he