

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: Dear, oh, dear; and yet they were not allowed to teach French. That would not happen in Germany.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY: Would the honourable gentleman allow me to go on? I have not his talent, and I want to follow up my argument.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: I am backing you up.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY: The honourable gentleman is backing me too much. You see how the matter stands. We are willing to try to have the parties come together to discuss this question.

I praise my honourable friend from Halifax (Hon. Mr. Crosby) for the good disposition he has shown at this time. We are willing to confer and try to devise means of reaching an understanding. We are not opposed to the study of English in those French sections. Our own interests require us to learn English. We are not trying to avoid that, the agitation is being kept up by certain people giving the country the impression that we do not want to learn English. We do want to learn English, and we accept any regulation which requires the study of English in those French schools; but what we do not want is the banishment of the French language. We want to retain the language which we have inherited from our mothers. That is a natural sentiment. Cannot we get together and find some means to adopt that proposition? I think we should.

The honourable gentleman from Peel (Hon. Mr. Blain) yesterday said: "You know that in the Toronto House not a voice was heard against those regulations." No, not a voice was heard against those regulations, because they were adopted on the last day of the session, when it was not known that they were coming up. But at the last session what took place?

Hon. Mr. BLAIN: My honourable friend knows that there have been several sessions of the Ontario Legislature since regulation 17 was adopted.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY: I know that.

Hon. Mr. BLAIN: Therefore it could have been done.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY: I am going to answer that immediately, to show the disposition of the Ontario Legislature. At the last session that question came up.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: Before the last session.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY: A Bill was presented, and what did our friends do? They voted against the Bill. Moreover, they introduced an amendment, asking that that law be submitted to the Supreme Court in order that its opinion might be had on the constitutional aspect of it. Nobody listened to that request.

Hon. Mr. BLAIN: My honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Landry) has misquoted me not intentionally. My point was this. I asked why did not my honourable friend use his influence in the Ontario Legislature, which had the power to correct these wrongs, if they were wrongs?

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: He was not there.

Hon. Mr. BLAIN: His friends were.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY: The honourable gentleman asks why I did not use my influence. I wrote to the Prime Minister of Ontario three times. I wrote to honourable Mr. Hearst when he came into power. That was about October, 1914. I have not all the dates here, but I could give them. The first time I wrote Mr. Hearst, his secretary answered that he was away, but that as soon as he returned I should get an answer. I waited a month without receiving an answer; so I wrote the second time, renewing my request. I did not get an answer; so I wrote him the third time.

Hon. Mr. BLAIN: No answer to the letter?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY: No. My letter was acknowledged, but when I say I did not get an answer, I mean I did not get an answer to the request I was making.

Hon. Mr. BLAIN: My honourable friend, of course, would give to the Prime Minister of Ontario the credit of having been courteous in acknowledging the communication?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY: Yes. I am not complaining on that ground, but I say I had no answer to the question I put in the letter. I asked him to fix a date for an interview, in order that we might go to Toronto to see him and discuss the question. I never received an answer to that proposal.

My honourable friend from Grey (Hon. Mr. Sproule) says that this is not a question to bring up here, because it is before the courts. I think my honourable friend does not realize what question is before this House. It is not a question to ask the opinion of this House on the bilingual matter. The situation is this. After the judg-