

onal University of Ireland. Last summer 14 colleges in Ireland gave course in Irish during the months of July and August. In the month of December 1910 it was announced that there were 181 schools in Ireland in which complete courses of study were given in both Irish and English. In Scotland 250,000 speak the Gaelic tongue; and in the Islands there are many schools for the teaching of this language. He cites what is taking place in the Channel Islands, in Malta, in Switzerland, in Austria, in Sweden, in Switzerland especially, where there are three languages—German, French and Italian, which are taught in the schools. But it would take me too long to cite them all.

Dr. Foran has been kind enough to send me an extract of a patriotic article published by Thomas Osborne Davis, a true patriot, uncle of our colleague, Senator Davis, in the Nation, No. 1843, which extract reads as follows:

The language which grows up with a people is conformed to their organs, descriptive of their climate, constitution and manners, mingled inseparably with their history and their soil, fitted above any other language to express their prevalent thoughts in the most natural and efficient way. To impose any other language on such a people is to send their history adrift amongst the accident of translations. A people without a language of its own is only half a nation. A nation should guard its language.

After having made the history of the Irish language, its troubles and struggles, Mr. Davis concludes by the following eloquent words:

The language was so characteristic of the race that the most fearful extremes were resorted to in order to abolish it, because it preserved its history, embalmed their traditions and perpetuated their nationhood.

I am sure that our esteemed colleague thinks and feels on that question as his distinguished uncle did.

Hon. gentlemen, we French people have our faults, which resemble to a great extent those of the Irish; we are a little too quick and impressionable, but we are always ready to sympathize with those who suffer, who are unhappy or ill-treated. We are faithful to our religious and national traditions, and if we were not, we would be justly despised by our English and Irish countrymen. And it has been affirmed by the most eminent men in England that the diversity of nationalities was an element of progress and civilization. We love our maternal language and we want to preserve it, because it is the language which was spoken by the discoverers of this country, by the courageous pioneers who left everywhere glorious traces of their passage through British North America. The fact is that if all the seas, and the lands, the forests and

Hon. Mr. DAVID

the mountains from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from Hudson bay to the waters of the Mississippi, which have been immortalized by the courage, the heroism of our ancestors, had a soul and could speak, they would ask us to preserve the civilized language which first broke the silence of their vast solitude, and their tongue would, in truth, be French. It is the language by which we were taught to adore and pray God, and to cherish British institutions and British liberty; the language spoken by all kings and princes of Europe, by the Royal Family, by all the eminent gentlemen who come from England to govern our country, the language spoken with so much elegance by H. R. H. the Duke of Connaught and his noble family, the language used by the great men who have enriched and adorned the intellectual world with so many literary jewels.

The French Canadians of Ontario know that their ancestors have fought and suffered and have very often shed their blood to transmit to their descendants that most precious part of their heritage, their language. Is it not cruel to ask them to abandon that treasure, to do what they would consider an act of cowardice and of treason?

Let us suppose for a moment that the Quebec Parliament would undertake, whether legally or not, to abolish the teaching of English in the schools of the province of Quebec. What would the British people say? What would they do? Do you think that the people of Ontario would remain indifferent and silent? No, no!

Who would dare in any part of the world deprive English children of their right of being taught in their maternal tongue, of using the language which has been the vehicle through the world of social and political freedom, the language spoken by some of the greatest poets, historians and speakers of the world! Milton, Shakespeare, Macaulay, Chatham, Pitt, Fox, Burke, O'Connell, Gladstone and many others.

Do you not think, hon. gentlemen, that the occasion is favourable to apply the golden rule: "Do not unto others what you would not have others do unto you"! I admit that if it could be alleged and proven that the use and the teaching of the French in the province of Ontario would be detrimental to the efficiency of the scholar system and to its intellectual progress, it would be damageable to our cause, but who can seriously make such an assertion? The public men of Ontario are too intelligent and