

evidence substantiating the allegation that I am about to make, that, in schools where the two languages are to be taught, and where the rights of the minority—if you call the French the minority—are being enforced, unfortunately the minority will not be satisfied with the management and conduct of the schools in such a way as will enable majority rights to be enjoyed by the majority. Let me give an example. The law provides that in schools where the two classes of children are found, teachers who can teach both languages shall be employed. But in a school where there are French pupils they are not satisfied with the French-English teacher there is in the country, though he may have a certificate from the Normal School or some other school as an evidence of his qualifications. The minority refuse to accept him as capable of teaching the language of the minority. What is the result? They are not satisfied unless the teacher is one whose language is their mother tongue; and when such a teacher is employed, it may be found that he is not sufficiently conversant with the English language to be a competent teacher of English. Therefore, the English pupil in that school is entirely deprived of the right of the majority. That is where the trouble is imported. The provincial minister on this occasion exercised his undoubted right in trying to make regulations which would do no injustice to the minority, but which at the same time would give to the majority the rights which they are entitled to enjoy. That is what has been done by the Minister of Education. Then we have this agitation imported into this House. It is also actually extended to the province of Quebec, where a Bill is brought into the legislature for the purpose of raising money to fight the province of Ontario. Ontario is doing what it has an undoubted right to do, that is, controlling education, and does not desire to interfere with the rights of the minority. These are the troubles with which we are confronted to-day, and I say, from my knowledge of the situation, that the Government of Ontario is honestly desirous of doing, and is trying to do, what is conciliatory, what is generous to give to both the minority and the majority their rights. The province is working out its educational system, as it has the right to do so long as it is not improperly interfering with the rights of the minority as provided for in the British North America Act.

Hon. Mr. SPROULE.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: Will the honourable gentleman allow me to ask him two questions?

Hon. Mr. SPROULE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: The first question is this: will the honourable gentleman admit that it would be within the power of the province of Quebec to enact a regulation similar to No. 17 in that province?

Hon. Mr. SPROULE: I am not sufficiently conversant with the laws of the province of Quebec and the respective rights of the minority and the majority to be able intelligently or wisely to answer that question. Therefore I must decline to do so.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: Is not the honourable gentleman aware that it is the same law, the constitution, which applies to both the provinces of Ontario and Quebec?

Hon. Mr. SPROULE: But the educational system of the province of Quebec is worked out by a Board of Education surrounded by many provisions and restrictions which have a bearing on the subject and which I do not understand.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE: But the constitution is the same for both provinces?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY: If no other honourable gentleman desires to speak on this question, I shall conclude the discussion. My honourable friends from the province of Ontario and the province of Nova Scotia, have put forth a plea, which I accept as the expression of their ideas on this question. They take for granted that the regulation is in favour of the French language being taught in the province of Ontario. That is what they understand. That is what they say. But what are the facts? When you go before a court, the court gives a judicial decision and that decision is binding. The members of the Privy Council in England, in their findings on the case which was brought before them, said that regulation 17 was no doubt enacted to banish the French language from the province of Ontario—or something to that effect; to prevent the French language from being taught in the province as we desire it to be taught.

Hon. Mr. SPROULE: As far as I am aware, there was no such decision given by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The decision was entirely on another subject.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: Read the decision.