

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE: Yes; quite the contrary. I understand that some people in Ontario—my honourable friend may be one of them—have good intentions; but the law is there.

Hon. Mr. BLAIN: The Prime Minister, who introduced the law, made the statement clearly and distinctly to the legislature and to the people generally that regulation 17 was enacted for the express purpose of assisting the French people.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE: It may have been done with the best of intentions, but as I said, hell is paved with good intentions. If what my honourable friend says is so, the effect of this law is contrary to the intention, and when the law was declared to be ultra vires, what was the reason for re-enacting it?

Hon. Mr. BLAIN: Regulation 17 was carried to the highest court in the Empire, and that court has declared that the Provincial Government had the right to enact such a regulation.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE: Yes, I remember the two judgments, but they were not as my honourable friend says. My honourable friend says nobody in Ontario opposed this law. But is it not a fact that there are four or five French members in the Ontario House, Liberals and Tories, all of whom spoke and voted against it? I am sure that if the French members in the Ontario Legislature had believed for one moment that this law was good for them they would not have opposed it. Is that not sufficient to show how absurd it is to pretend that the law was passed for the good of the French people? As I have said, the French people wish to learn English, but they also wish to retain their French language, and all who have spoken on the subject in Quebec and Ontario have said that this ought to be so. I believe that the fair-minded and honest men of Ontario wish no harm to the French people; but the French people are not satisfied with this law, and if it was a present, as my honourable friend said a moment ago, it was a bad one. Suppose you make a present to a man, and he says: "I don't want it; it is no good to me; it is bad;" would you still persist in pressing it on him? If this law was a present to the French people from the Ontario House for their benefit, they would be very foolish not to accept it; but they fought it because it was against their interest. There would be a revolution in Quebec if a law like that were passed

by the Government of Sir Lomer Gouin. It was said by Judge McCorkill that the French people of Ontario would not make a revolution, but they ask for justice as long as they do not get it. The French Canadians are the best judges of that matter, and they say that regulation deprives them of their rights to their language. They have fought a very hard battle in every way, being even ready to go to jail; but do you believe for a moment that if it was to their interest, as has been foolishly said, they would do that? My honourable friend may think it; but Dr. Merchant, the High School Inspector of Ontario, made a report that contradicted the good intentions of my honourable friend. So I conclude that the French Canadians are not satisfied; they are suffering from this law; they appealed to the courts to repeal it; yet in spite of all that my honourable friends and the Ontario Government persist in imposing and re-enacting it.

Well, I will bring another proof. There is a man in Quebec of the name of Mr. John Boyd, a well-known journalist, author of the Life of Sir George Cartier. He is a good Tory, but a clever and educated man, and he speaks good French. He has been in Ontario especially to study this legislation. He looked over all the statutes, and came back to Montreal and wrote an article entitled, "A Plea or Argument in favour of the French Canadians." It was published in the Montreal Gazette, and was written in answer to an article sent to the New York Times by a journalist of Montreal, whom we all know, who is supposed to be friendly to the French, but who is a hypocrite, abusing the French people in New York papers. Mr. John Boyd, who knows well what he is talking about, wrote that article on the French question and the war, and his conclusions are to the very same effect as those drawn by the Hon. Mr. McCorkill and by Mr. Bullock. This article is too long to be read here, but I will just cite the following extract:

French Canadians, as a matter of fact, do not object to learn English. They fully realize the importance in their own interest of knowing that language. It is taught in their schools, and the great mass of the French Canadian people know English. The best proof of this is the far greater number of English Canadians who are able to speak English than there are English-speaking Canadians who can speak French, which to the mass of the English-speaking people of the Dominion is practically a dead language. What French Canadians do object to is that their children should be deprived of having instruction in their mother tongue, which it must be remembered has been recognized in Canada since the Cession and was specifically