

In Quebec both languages have equal standing in the courts, in the legislature and in commerce. But it is entirely different in Ontario. There English is the language of the courts, of commerce, and of the legislature. The people of the province of Ontario feel that it is desirable for every child who goes through their schools to get a knowledge of the English language that will equip him to take his proper place in that province when he grows up. We have no desire to suppress the French language. I consider it a great accomplishment. I am paying to have three of my children taught in that language; I have no objection at all to it. My honourable friend argues that Regulation 17 was passed in order to suppress the French language. It was passed in order to give French a legal standing in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY: It has not had that effect.

Hon. Mr. DONNELLY: Well, that was the intention. My honourable friend tells us it was passed for political effect. I dissent entirely from that view. This agitation was started two or three years ago around Ottawa for political effect. The Liberal party, feeling that they had got into power in 1896 on the school question, thought they would be able to put themselves again into power on that question, and the agitation was started for that purpose; but having started it, they find that it is growing to such a size that they are unable to control it, and it has created a great deal of dissention between the two parties in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I want to say a few words in answer to my honourable friend before moving the adjournment of the debate. He says that no person in Ontario desires to eradicate the French language from that province—that on the contrary, they are desirous of developing the use and teaching of the French language, and that regulation 17 was passed in order to give legal standing to the French language in Ontario and promote its teaching and development. Well, the way in which that regulation was carried out was very unfortunate; for if the intention was kindly, as my honourable friend states, it has produced the very contrary effect upon the very people who stood to be benefited by that legislation. As a matter of fact, I think that the Act and all that preceded the passing of the regulation occurred on somewhat different lines from those which my honourable friend has stated, and I

will simply tell him the impressions I have received from reading what took place when regulation 17 was projected. That regulation came into life upon the assertion that the English-French schools did not teach sufficient English, that the children who came out from those schools did not sufficiently know the English language; and my reading of the events which surrounded the passing of regulation 17 is that the regulation was made for the avowed purpose of strengthening the teaching of English in the French-English schools. Now, if that regulation had been carried out in a way not to offend or hurt the French Canadians in their innermost feelings, I would have said amen, and so would everybody. Everyone in the province of Ontario would say amen if the Ontario legislature should enact regulations to the end that every child in every school of Ontario should learn English. It is in the interest of every man to learn a second language, and all the more so in a country where that second language is the tongue of the vast majority. That stands to reason. No one will for a moment dispute that affirmation. If we are all agreed upon the very great importance to Canada of our children learning the English language—I am not speaking for the moment of the French language—and if that was the intention, and the sole intention, of the Ontario Legislature, they were very unfortunate in the method of carrying out of their intention.

Hon. Mr. DONNELLY: Is it not a fact that regulation 17 provides that where French has been the language of the school, in the higher classes, if the parent of the child desires, one hour shall be given in each school day to the teaching of the French language? And is not one hour in the six sufficient to give to any subject?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY: Not in all the schools.

Hon. Mr. DONNELLY: I said in the French schools.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The effect of the regulation is that French may be allowed for one hour as the language of communication for the children in the first and second forms when it is found that they do not understand the English language sufficiently to make any progress. This is how I view it. In order that the honourable gentleman may understand the feeling of the French minority in Ontario, I would