

ation to-night and to make just a few amendments in it. First, instead of Ontario legislation, make it Quebec legislation, and instead of the word "French" insert the word "English," and read it. If you are satisfied after perusing only once the regulation so amended—, I will be very much surprised.

Mr. BRODER: Have you any bilingual schools in Quebec?

Mr. LAMARCHE: Yes, sir. We have bilingual schools; we have bilingual statesmen; we have bilingual homes; and we have bilingual justice. Is the abolition of the French language useful, necessary, or desirable in any way in the interest of the welfare of this Dominion? For there must be a reason for gradually abolishing the French language, as is proposed. This reason I will try to find. Is it the French language that is objectionable? I do not believe so. The time would not be well chosen to object to such a language as the French language. At present the whole world is taking its hat off to the French nation. The French language is adaptable, I believe, to the study of literature, of science, of art, of any other subject of study. The French language is spoken the world over. It is spoken in the highest courts of the world. It is recognized as an accomplishment for an educated man to be able to talk French. It is spoken by the King of England; it is spoken in the palace of the King of England; it is spoken at Rideau Hall. We do not need to be ashamed of the French language, Mr. Speaker. At present we are engaged in a great struggle, a war between Germany and her Allies on one side, all speaking different languages, and, on the other side, five or six other nations speaking other languages. I hope that the treaty of peace will be signed shortly. I hope it will be signed in the city of Berlin. But I can assure you that, no matter where it is signed, it is going to be drafted in the French language; and, no matter what adjustments appear in that treaty, those who will have to give something or those who will have to receive something, in either money, property or liberties, will find it, if they know French, in the French language of the treaty. If they do not know French, they will have to wait a few hours until somebody else translates it into some other language. If it is not the French language which is objectionable, is it because in this country French is a

political obstacle?—and in using the word "political" I use it in the large sense of the word, that is, so far as the relations of this country to other countries are concerned. I do not believe so, and I do not need to delay very long in dealing with this aspect of the question. One has only to read the history of British rule in Canada. The French Canadians have always been loyal. They have always been ready to repel the invader. They have always been ready to refuse offers from wealthy neighbours, even when some others were ready to accept them. Mr. Speaker, the children who are asking the Government of Ontario to-day to let them speak their mother tongue, and to let them be educated in their mother tongue, are the sons of a great nation. Without their ancestors—and I state this without fear of contradiction—without their ancestors of French origin, instead of paying our taxes into the Canadian treasury, you and I would be paying taxes into the treasury at Washington.

Mr. HUGH CLARK: Would you have had bilingual schools then?

Mr. LAMARCHE: I can answer the question of my hon. friend. I do not know the laws of the United States, but I have been in certain parts of that country and I know that there they give privileges to the French schools which are denied to-day by the province of Ontario, and that notwithstanding the fact that the French were not the founders of the United States. The authority for the statement I make is not commonly known. The statement came from the lips, or rather from the pen of Sir Guy Carleton, Governor of Canada for many years. He stated that without the French Canadians it would have been utterly impossible to keep this Dominion under the British Crown. Those who have read history know that. It has been written not only in French books, but in all Canadian histories worthy of the name. We pride ourselves upon it. We do not like to brag about it too often; but under circumstances like these I believe it is not only our right but our bounden duty to do so.

Is it to perfect the system of education that the regulation was passed? I always thought that the possession of two languages was an achievement compared with the possession of only one, and until it is proven that to learn French is an absolute obstacle to the acquisition of a knowledge of English I will maintain that the striking