

part, cannot permit. Let them, in the organization of their municipalities, put in force the same provisions that we have in our code, and I shall not have the least objection; but leave to them the right to use the two languages in the Legislature. This these hon. gentlemen do not appear to wish to maintain, especially in the last part of the clause, and it is there that my hon. friend from Delanaudière and myself, as his seconder, believe we have discovered "the sting in the tail." Therefore, in view of the great lessons of history and of the plighted faith of the country, we would be committing an act of blind and culpable fanaticism in supporting this 32nd clause—that is, its latter part—and I hope for the honor of the Senate, that it will never consent to pass it. I shall, therefore, vote against that part of the Bill.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I was glad to hear from my hon. friend from Ottawa the statement he made of his views on this subject, with his usual energy and vivacity; and I think it is right and proper that those who do not sympathize with the movement against the French language should, if they accept the proviso contained in this Bill, have some explanation given of the reasons why they decline to reject it. The reason is precisely the one which my hon. friend from Ottawa stated, and it is the one which actuates probably nearly every man in this Chamber who votes for the proviso, namely, that by the introduction of the proviso it is intended, not to prolong or increase or renew the agitation on this subject, but, by accepting it, to seek to put an end to the agitation on this subject, because it represents something in the nature of a compromise which has been impliedly entered into and agreed upon by the leaders of all parties in politics in this country—with the exception of this new and small party which has lately sprung up—as a solution of the difficulty which can reasonably be accepted. Probably most of us would have preferred that matters should have been left in *statu quo*, but the solution offered by the proviso may reasonably be expected to satisfy the people generally. For that reason I have thought it best, although it is a somewhat unusual course to follow, to place on record the reason which actuates me, and which I know actuates most of the hon. gentlemen in this House in voting against the

motion of the hon. gentleman from Delanaudière. As this matter has been already sufficiently discussed, I do not propose to address the House any further on the subject, but I hope the House will concur with me in this mode of disposing of my hon. friend's motion, rather than by voting directly against it. This is the motion which I propose, which I make in amendment to the motion in amendment of the hon. gentlemen from Delanaudière.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I rise to a question of order. According to the Rules of the House, that amendment is not in order. It does not follow from the motion I have made, but on a motion for the third reading of the Bill.

THE SPEAKER—I put the motion for the third reading, and waited for the hon. gentleman to move, and was surprised that he did not do so, because I understood that he proposed to put his amendment, and as he did not do so I said "carried." Then, after I had declared the motion "carried," the hon. gentleman got up. It really makes practically no difference, because the hon. gentleman may move his amendment either before the Bill is read the third time, or before the passage of the Bill.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—Except it is a side issue, it cannot be decided in that way; because I may say that nearly every day during all the Sessions that I have been in this House the Speaker has at times put the question and said "carried," and when some hon. gentleman would rise and say: "No, Mr. Speaker, it is not carried," his objection was accepted. I think fair play ought to be extended in this case as in other cases, and if this House does not do so, before the end of the Session I shall call the attention of the House to the fact that the Speaker has said "carried," and shall insist on the motion or amendment so carried being recorded.

HON. MR. POWER—In the first place, to declare that the third reading had been carried would be a sort of snap vote, the appearance of which we ought to avoid. The hon. leader, as soon as he saw the third reading of the Bill was before the House, got up and moved his motion, and I think it would be more regular in every way to allow the hon. gentleman's amendment to come to that motion than to the motion that the Bill do now pass. I have