

people. They hold that all men should be equal in rank, in privileges, in right, and in every possible way. This is communism, radicalism and demagogism. (I must say that in its logical consequences the Bill we discuss has that tendency.) The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has argued against the propriety of allowing the French language to be used in the North West, on the ground that at the time of the cession of Canada no such law was inserted in the articles of capitulation, that it was not inserted in the Treaty of 1763, and that it was not in the Quebec Act of 1774, or in the Act giving constitutional government to Canada in 1791. I say that is no argument. If it was not then enacted, the reason is this: there was a tacit understanding that the right of the people to their language should be respected. But my hon. friend has gone further, and has said: Oh, in a new country, where people are beginning to colonize and settle, it is wrong in principle and it is a wrong policy to permit differences of language. But there is no difference between the two cases. In the one case, you find the people in a conquered country attached to their own language, and you all allow them to speak it; in the other case, you are asking people to come from all parts of the world to settle in your country; is it not a wise policy to assure them that when they arrive here, they will find the laws of the country promulgated at least in a language they can understand. This has been the wise policy followed in England. It is true, however, the Equal Rights in this country have had ancestors in England. The Solicitor General in England, in the debate on the Act of 1774, speaks of a Canadian Grand Jury who some years before had returned an indictment against all the Roman Catholics of the country. But Sir, I repeat, it here; the British statesmen have framed a generous and liberal policy for the early government of this country, a policy which has saved this colony for England instead of sending it over to the "Stars and Stripes," or of creating a sort of Ireland here in America. In presence of the noble conduct of these statesmen I say that the policy to foster religious strife or race animosities, whether coming from a Quebec "Nation alist" or a Toronto "Equal Rights" is the greatest enemy of British rule in Canada. More than one hundred years ago, when the English Parliament was meeting on its first measure of justice to the French Canadians, in 1774, an English statesman, defending the Quebec Act, said that no address or eloquence:

"Will succeed in inducing a polished assembly of men to adopt the barbarous principle that the moment a conquest is obtained, it consists with humanity, it consists with wisdom, it consists with common honesty to take away all the laws of the conquered country, and more especially that portion of the laws which regulated the proceedings of the inhabitants in civil matters. Speaking of the rights of conquest, Grotius has these words: *Conquero imperium, civile, eripitur reliqui illis prout sunt leges, constitutiones, omnes leges, omnes mores et magistratus*. Since all authority is snatched from the conquered, leave to them their own laws, their own customs and magistratures which are of advantage regarding private and public matters."

These are the moderate ideas of conquest. Such has been the practice of nations between one another. Is it not extraordinary that, after one hundred years, that celebrated debate can be quoted in a Canadian Assembly in a most appropriate manner. Prejudices from past ages still linger in this

free land of America, but I hope that the vast majority of the citizens of Canada will stamp them out, will prefer peace and prosperity to religious and race strife, will leave to time the settlement of passing difficulties. I confess that the fate of the French language is in your hands, you can crush it out of official life, but I am sure that if the people of Canada rise, through their representatives, in their power and strength, it will be to assert, after the British Parliament, that right stands in their estimation far above might. How differently inspired was Lord Dufferin when he had occasion to mention the French Canadian race and its language. Speaking, at the time of his administration in Canada, at the Canadian Club in London, in 1875, that distinguished Governor General said:

"I may be permitted to remark on the extraordinary ability and intelligence with which the French portion of Her Majesty's subjects in Canada join with their British fellow-countrymen in working and developing the wealth and local privileges with which (thanks to the initiative they were the first to take) their country has been endowed. Our French fellow-countrymen are, in fact, more parliamentary than the English themselves, and in the various fortunes of the colony, there have never been wanting French statesmen of eminence to claim an equal share with their British colleagues in shaping the history of the Dominion. Whatever may be the case elsewhere, in Canada, at all events, the French race has learned the golden rule and the necessity of arriving at practical results by the occasional sacrifice of logical symmetry and to the settlement of disputes, in the spirit of a generous compromise. The spectacle of two peoples, formed from nationalities so diverse, putting forth all their strength, in generous rivalry of each other, to prove their loyalty to their Queen and to the Government, and laboring with concerted action and in perfect harmony for the weal of their common country, will remain one of the most remarkable and pleasing facts in the history of the world, while it will testify to the political wisdom and the magnanimous sentiment which pervade all the members of the great Canadian family."

And in Montreal in 1872, at the inauguration of the Queen's statue, on Victoria Square, Lord Dufferin, speaking of the minority in this Dominion, said:

"Brave and noble race, which was the first to afford Europe the means of bringing civilization to the Continent of America, race valorous and hardy, whose pioneers, in the interior of this continent, gave scope to the industry of Europe to take root not only on the banks of the St. Lawrence, but also in the fertile valleys of the Ohio and of the Mississippi."

I could continue these quotations, but I will not take up the time of the House further by reading them. Sir, I ask myself, what credit, what glory does the hon. gentleman think he will get in craning from the pages of the Statute three inoffensive lines which, when craved, will not add an iota to the power, the success, the supremacy of his race in the North West, whilst, as he well knows, it will be considered as an unprovoked insult, as an attempt at oppression by those against whom his action is directed. No, Sir, the great legislators of the world and my hon. and learned friend is well gifted enough to justify his ambition to be one of them—the great legislators of the world have not gained their fame by such narrow legislation. They have added to the code of humanity enactments in the sense of protection for the weak, of peaceful progress, of enlarged civilisation—in a word, they have added to the true "unity and comity" of nations.

"A wise prince," says Burke, "should study the genius of the nation he is called to rule; he must not contradict them in their customs nor take away their privileges, but