

guaranteed to them by the Constitution, and in that peculiar sense of duty which is a characteristic of their teachings.

"Do you not think that we are on the verge, right here in Ontario to-day, of up-rooting one of the sources of that loyalty? Are we not running the great risk of effacing that feeling of gratitude and that sentiment of confidence in those who administer the provisions of that Constitution, in the hearts of that same people? Reflect upon it from that point of view. Is it in the interests of Canada, or is it in the greater interests of the Empire that ought should be done to weaken, even in the slightest manner, that bond of union which makes for solidarity and harmony?"

"My questions need only to be asked; I do not require to dwell upon the obvious reply. If a point is to be strained in any direction, should it not be in favour of drawing tighter bonds of union between all elements in Canada—for the mutual prosperity of every section of this Dominion, and for the greater stability of the whole Empire. Think it over: is it not worth while so acting that Canada may be enabled to set another column in the grand Temple of Empire—a column that no Samson of prejudice or intolerance can ever shake?"

It is this sentiment so well expressed by Dr. Foran it seems to me that underlies the whole issue.

There is in the learned doctor's words a strong plea for unity, for loyalty, and for patriotism—unity of our people, loyalty to our Sovereign, and patriotism to our country. What magic there is in that word "patriotism!" Praise it as you will, you cannot go beyond its deserts, for is it not it that impels our young men at the present time to endure the hardships and face the dangers of this terrible war, doing all this for the freedom of mankind and the glory of their country?

I have to differ with those who would treat this as a religious question. I do not see it as such, it is purely bi-lingual or national to both.

I have treated it as a matter concerning the family, the family being the very foundation of society—a father's and a mother's affair.

The child should be taught so that on his return home from school he may be able to explain to his parents in their own language the progress he has made.

There may be difficulties in the way; I am free to admit that, there are serious difficulties, but who will deny that unrest exists—unrest that should be removed. Under these circumstances are we to be stopped by difficulties when it is incumbent on us to reach the goal?

Since this resolution was placed on the Order Paper of this hon. House, I have seen a good deal concerning it in the press. Men of great respectability, high standing and learned, have written on it, some on

one side and some on the other. I have every respect for the opinions of both, so long as I believe those opinions are honestly held, but there is another class of writers for whom I cannot say as much, that is the anonymous quill driver. I have received some such letters. I saw one in a local paper in my own town, signed "Anglo Saxon," charging inconsistency in my attitude on this question, and on the Manitoba School Bill of 1896. I plead not guilty to the charge. On the Manitoba School Bill, I asked for investigation, conciliation, and generous treatment for the minority, and that is my appeal to-day on this resolution.

"Justice" and "Truth" are other gentlemen who have done me the honour of letting me know what they think of my action on this question. Let me just say that Anglo-Saxon, justice and truth are all names for which I have the greatest of respect; but for those who make of them a harbour of refuge behind which to conceal their identity, when making attacks, for such people I have very little respect. Let me say to such, pull off the mask of concealment, then we will know what weight to give to your opinions.

I am aware that in certain districts friction exists between the teaching of French and English in the schools; this is to be regretted, and let me say here again that this is another strong reason why we should make an honest effort to solve the problem.

It has been stated in some quarters that bi-lingual or French teaching will be detrimental to teaching of English in our public and separate schools.

This should not, and must not be permitted. I say this in behalf of the English-speaking people of the province of Ontario.

Let me now say that if the French-Canadian minority of that province have rights in regard to their language, these rights should be respected. I think that under the British North America Act they have rights, but I am not discussing this from a legal standpoint. I know they have a much stronger right, the right of conscience. This is a right that no man should be asked, much less compelled to do violence to.

It was the force of the plea for freedom of conscience that prevailed when the Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada were granted separate schools.

I remember the fears that were expressed and the cries that were raised during that struggle. One argument used was, that if you separated the children in their school