

probably will never be, in all respects similar; hence the necessity of using for the one a method of teaching that does not correspond with the needs and desire of the other. Each one, for a full educational development, requires methods and means in some respects different from the other. . . .

"The problem cannot be solved by the application of the rules of government by majority. That rule, fair enough in civil matters, becomes wholly unacceptable when dealing with concerns of the intellectual order of that conscience. Long ago, moreover, has this principle been recognized and applied in the teaching domain of this province, by the creation and maintenance under the authority and with the sanction of the law, and with the aid of the public treasury, of the separate schools, both for Catholics and for Protestants, and even for the colored race. . . .

"It seems quite obvious that every system of teaching and education should afford every citizen the best means to attain his full intellectual and moral development, in accordance with his aptitudes, his temperament and his desires, and to exercise in their fullness all the rights that the Constitution of the country allows him as well as to perform all the duties that it imposes on him. It appears equally evident that this end will never be attained in Ontario as long as the French-Canadians will not there have at their disposal the entire use of the means most effective in and most suited to their intellectual, moral and social formation—which means, I repeat, is that of the mother tongue. . . .

"We desire to claim the right to make use of the French language as the indispensable auxiliary in the educational formation of our children. . . .

"I have said already, and I repeat it, that we entertain no prejudice against the language of the large majority of the Canadian people; we are not so blind as not to see all the importance and all the necessity for ourselves and ours to know well and to speak the English language, nor are we so prejudiced as to entertain the slightest objection in its maintenance and propagation. It is and will likely always be the language of the large majority in Canada. All the French-Canadians in Ontario have learned it and all our children are now learning it. Our English-speaking fellow citizens even admit that we speak it as well, they sometimes say better, than they do themselves. . . .

"Is it because we chant the national anthem of the British Empire in our national language, as well as in the language of the majority, that we should become worse subjects of that Empire? Is it because, in both French and English, we speak everywhere, here, in England, in France, and foreign lands, of our unshaken attachment to British institutions, that we should have a narrower conception of our obligations towards Canada and Great Britain and lesser desire to fulfil them in the most complete manner? Why then should we be refused the pleasure and the advantage of knowing well and of speaking, our children and ourselves, the language to which our mothers initiated us, the language in which we have learned to think, to pray, and in which we can better express the most noble, inspiring sentiments of the heart,—affection, love, charity; the language in which we first learned the traditions that our fathers handed down to us and that glorious epic of our country's early history, as well as the heroic deeds of our ancestors on this American soil? . . .

"Again, I ask if a man is not educated in a two-fold degree when he knows both the language of Shakespeare, Byron and Scott, and that of Bossuet, Madame de Sevigné and Racine; is he not better equipped for the battle of life and the fulfillment of his duties towards his family, his fellow citizens, and society? . . .

"How many there are in Canada for whom the knowledge of the two languages, while affording them a double source of intellectual enjoyment, has