

out of one of the two languages, instead of perfecting the system of education, is handicapping it. I will go further. It is a well known principle of pedagogy that in order to get the best results in a school it is not sufficient to pour instruction into the mind of a pupil. Some other things must be done. The teacher must first ascertain the adaptability of that child to receive instruction, and the adaptability of the child to receive instruction is always found in following the law of nature, in following racial inclinations. That principle has been laid down by men of experience and of world-wide fame. It is interesting to read a page from the works of perhaps one of the greatest philosophers of the world, and surely one of the greatest philosophers of the English nation—Herbert Spencer. I do not think that Herbert Spencer could be prejudiced by this school question. He was dead long before this by-law was passed. Here is what he says:

The education of the child must accord both in mode and arrangement with the education of mankind as considered historically; or in other words, the genesis of knowledge in the individual must follow the same course as the genesis of knowledge in the race. In support of this doctrine two reasons may be assigned, either of them sufficient to establish it. One is deducible from the law of hereditary transmission as considered in its wider consequences. For if it be true that men exhibit likeness to ancestry both in aspect and character,—if, passing from individual cases in which the traits of many dead ancestors mixing with those of a few living ones greatly obscure the law, we turn to national types, and remark how the contrasts between them are persistent from age to age—if we remember that these respective types came from a common stock, and that hence the present marked differences between them must have arisen from the action of modifying circumstances upon successive generations who severally transmitted the accumulated effects to their descendants—if we find the differences to be now organic, so that the French child grows into a French man even when brought up among strangers—and if the general fact thus illustrated is true of the whole nature, Intellect inclusive; then it follows that if there be an order in which the human race has mastered its various kinds of knowledge, there will arise in every child an aptitude to acquire these kinds of knowledge in the same order. So that even were the order intrinsically indifferent, it would facilitate education to lead the individual mind through the steps traversed by the general mind. But the order is not intrinsically indifferent; and hence the fundamental reason why education should be a repetition of civilisation in little. It is alike previsible that the historical sequence was, in its main outlines, a necessary one; and that the causes which determined it apply to the child as to the race.

At six o'clock House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

**Mr. LAMARCHE:** Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was trying to demonstrate that any attempt to abolish the French language, gradually or otherwise, could not be justified on the ground that the language itself is objectionable; furthermore, that its abolition could not be urged because it is a political obstacle in this country, and also that such a policy could not be invoked in the interest of making the system of education more perfect. Is assimilation in the interest of harmony in any country in the world and, in particular, in this country? International law has no fixed code but we find its principles in the different authors, in the reports of different conferences, and in the meetings of great men from different nations who from time to time gather around the same table and discuss dispassionately the causes of international trouble and also the means of preventing it. The last movement in that respect emanates from The Hague and it was inaugurated not before but since the war began. I have received, in my capacity of secretary of the Canadian branch of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, several documents of great importance. The last that I have received is a document entitled:

Durable Peace—Official Commentaries on the Minimum Programme.

I believe some explanations are necessary to indicate to this House what the purpose of this association is. Since the beginning of the war, many peace articles have appeared in the press and in the Parliaments of belligerent nations, as well as in those of neutral nations, talks about peace have been heard. We have also read reports of discussions as to what should be the treaty of peace at the end of this war. The members of this Association are representative of most of the civilized nations of the earth. I will tell you what nationalities are represented officially or otherwise, on the International Board of this Association. There are the United States of America, Germany, Russia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Spain, France, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Italy, Mexico, Norway, the Netherlands, Portugal, Roumania, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uruguay and Venezuela. I am translating because this document is written in French, that being the diplomatic language of the world. These people got together and worked out what is called the "Programme Minimum" containing five different propositions. These people