

the views of private individuals among Roman Catholics, it is well known that one of the bases of the Roman Catholic religion, so far as teaching is concerned, is that the Catholic idea should permeate the whole system of education; and when you deprive Catholics of the teaching of history in their own way, you deprive them of one of the essential rights of separation.

The provision with regard to the teaching of language was also changed. In the preceding ordinances, even in 1888, Sir John Thompson pointed to one of the clauses as being unwantonly complained against by the minority. That clause was to the effect that the teaching in English was imperative in the schools. On that point I share the opinion of Sir John Thompson. There was no harm in that. French Canadians do not object to it. We all wish to learn English. I may say, without boasting, that, so far as the study of the dual language is concerned, we are far in advance of any of the English-speaking provinces. Take, for instance, only this House, and I ask what is the proportion of English members who have taken the trouble to learn French compared with the number of French-speaking members who speak English? In this country, where one-third of the population is French Canadian, where the whole system of our constitution is based on a fair understanding between the two races, it should be the duty of every provincial government to insert in its education laws the provision that both languages should be taught in its schools. Let those gentlemen who are often so ready to give lessons in loyalty go to the mother country, and they will find that no man in England considers his education complete unless he learns the French tongue. Here in this country, where the French is the mother tongue of one-third of the population, why should so many of our English-speaking fellow-citizens show that blind inexplicable hatred against the teaching of French in our schools? Make the teaching of English imperative if you like, but give the French Canadians the right to impart the most important part of our teaching in French. That I maintain is perfectly just. But under the ordinance of 1892 the teaching of French was prohibited in the Territories, and it became imperative that all matters should be taught in the English language. Why, at a banquet given at Prince Albert some years ago, at which I was present, I heard one of the oldest school inspectors telling the audience, in the presence of Mr. Haultain, that their educational system, in so far as the teaching of languages was concerned, was absurd, unjust and criminal. He ridiculed the idea of forcing small children of five or six years of age to study geography, history and arithmetic in a foreign tongue. What happened after the adoption of the law of 1892? Inspectors were sent by Mr. Haultain to examine the schools. These inspectors questioned the

children on all matters taught in the schools in a language which they had never learnt at their homes, and the inspectors reported to the Department of Education in Regina that the nuns and friars were not fit to teach, because the children could not reply properly to the questions put to them.

I admit that under the law which is still on the statute-book of the Northwest Territories, under which the teaching of French is prohibited in the schools, you are allowed to give a primary course in French to small children of five to eight years of age. But you have not the right in a school that you pay for with your own money, where you have teachers paid by yourselves, to insist that your children shall acquire a perfect knowledge of their mother tongue. As far as that is concerned, I may quote to my hon. friends on the other side of the House language which will perhaps bring them back to a better understanding of this question. We are now told that we should adopt as the basic law of education for these provinces a law which stamps out the language of one-third of the people of this country as an uncivilized language. What were the remarks made by the late Sir John Macdonald upon this point? When opposing a Bill introduced into this House by the late Dalton McCarthy, Sir John Macdonald said:

The reason why I oppose the Bill of my hon friend to-day is the same, because that Bill, a small Bill—I might almost call it an insignificant Bill in its enacting clause—is based on the purpose of doing away with the French language, of discarding the French language, at all events, and depriving the French Canadian people of the solace of the language they learned at the feet of their mothers. Why, Mr. Speaker, if there is one act of oppression more than another which would come home to a man's breast, it is that he should be deprived of the consolation of hearing and speaking and reading the language that his mother taught him. It is cruel. It is seething the kid in its mother's milk.

I want to make my French Canadian friends in this House understand that in accepting this as our honourable compromise, in voting for this in a spirit of conciliation, they are voting for what has been denounced by Sir John Macdonald as one of the most infamous acts of oppression that could be charged to any man.

Mr. LALOR. The hon. gentleman says that he is addressing these remarks to this side of the House. May I ask him if that proposal does not come from his own side of the House?

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly, I am addressing it to the other side.

Mr. LALOR. Apply it to both.

Mr. BOURASSA. I apply it to both fully, and if the hon. gentleman listens to me he will see that I am not trying to make any party politics out of this question. If