

ever heard in the courts of law because I am happy to say the French do not go to the courts of law and do not require to use their language there. On what principle or what language can it be said that the French people in the North-West Territories have a right to the privilege of having that language implanted in the constitution, that their language shall be there for ever. My hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) this afternoon asked a question as to whether parliament had not the right to implant the French language in the new province. Sir I answer my hon. friend that I do not recognize that parliament has that right to implant the French language in those new Territories. Parliament may have the power to do so, but I deny that it has the right. Parliament has the power to do everything, but I deprecate the day when the French people of this country shall ask parliament to do anything that they have the power to do if they have not at the same time the right to do it. These are the reasons for which I ask that this motion shall not be granted. These are the reasons why I say in the presence of friends and foes, in the hearing of the people in all parts of Canada, and especially in the province of Quebec, that if we should grant this motion we would be granting the worst measure that could be granted for the protection even of the very people whom it intends to serve."

The Provinces Decide on Language Questions.

The vote on the above motion was taken on July 5th, 1905, and immediately before the taking of the vote, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as reported on pages 8852, 8853 and 8854, of Hansard, spoke in French, of which the following is a translation:—

"I am very much pleased to hear that statement; in the heat of the debate the hon. member (Bourassa) seems to have gone beyond what he intended to say.

At any rate, if, in this House, we have the right to use both languages, it is not simply a theoretical right. It is because the great majority of the province of Quebec send French Canadian representatives to parliament.

"I am now coming to the principle expressed by the hon. member for Labelle (Bourassa) and I trust that he will recognize it as I do on all occasions—and that is that the rights of the provinces are absolute within the limits of the constitution, and that among these rights there is the freedom to legislate as regards the language to be used in the courts and the legislative assembly.

"Now, if the House agreed to that amendment, as desired by the hon. member for Labelle (Bourassa), and if we inserted it in the constitution which we are enacting for the province of Alberta and for that of Saskatchewan, we would be interfering thereby with one of the rights of these provinces, that of deciding in what language the proceedings will be carried on in the legislatures.

"There is one other thing which he will recognize. In the constitutions which we are giving to Alberta and Saskatchewan, we have deliberately restricted the rights, of the provinces to legislate on educational matters. We have done so under the authority granted by section 93 of the constitution. For, in matters of education, the rights of the provinces are not absolute; they are restricted by the powers of interference of the Dominion parliament. We have done so with a view to remaining faithful to the principle laid down, whereby in matters of education the fundamental right of the provinces is limited, in order to safeguard separate schools. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that we had refrained from dealing with the French language question, on account of the commotion which the discussion on separate schools had given rise to. Does my hon. friend