

English and of the French languages thus obligatory, implies that in the spirit, if not in the wording, of the Constitution the teaching of both was intended to be left free and untrammelled.

The English speaking members of this House and the French speaking members of the Quebec Legislature may find it sometimes unnecessary to thus have all records and journals printed in both English and French, yet you may be sure that the English minority in Quebec is as jealous as we are here of the privilege.

Section 133 says further: "and either of those languages (English and French) may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this Act and in or from all or any of the courts of Quebec."

You are aware that under section 101 of the British North America Act, power is given to the Parliament of Canada to provide from time to time for the constitution, maintenance and operation of a general Court of Appeal for Canada, and for the establishment of any additional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada.

So far two courts only have been established by this Parliament, the Supreme Court of Canada, having an appellate civil and criminal jurisdiction within and throughout Canada, and the Exchequer Court of Canada having original jurisdiction all over Canada in many matters of very great importance.

Other courts may be established with like jurisdiction throughout Canada, such as an Admiralty Court—(under chapter 141 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. Admiralty jurisdiction is given to the Exchequer Court)—commercial courts, bankruptcy and insolvency courts, etc.

In all these courts of law, whether sitting in the province of Ontario or in any other province, it is and it shall remain the constitutional right and privilege of any person to cause processes of law to be issued in the French or in the English language, at his own discretion, and to use either of these languages in addressing the courts.

Extraordinary as these privileges may appear to-day to certain persons, when granted, at the time of the Confederation, they did not give rise to any discussion. Everybody seemed to be agreed that as a matter of natural and plain jus-

tice to the two races concerned and in the best interest of Canada the perpetuation of both languages should be guaranteed.

Both French and English did great things for this part of the North American continent. The French were its first pioneers throughout the length and breadth of the land. They introduced here Christianity and civilization, and after passing under the English Crown, they helped in defending, maintaining and developing British institutions. You English-speaking people brought in here these British institutions of which we are all equally jealous and proud. With the religious and moral sense which characterizes your race, you created and maintained that great modern power, public opinion, which is so invaluable for the peace, good government and progress of any country.

It is no wonder that at the time of Confederation, when the foundation of a great Canadian nation was laid, it was deemed fair and proper to guarantee to the descendants of both races, the free use of their respective language.

As to the grounds of complaint, it will be sufficient for me to refer to the unanimous report of the six inspectors, three English and three French, appointed by the Department of Education of the province of Ontario to carry out Regulation 17:

The inspectors agree that regulation XVII has not been effective for the following reasons:

"It was taken to mean that French could not be used as a language of instruction and communication. It was regarded as an attempt to gradually eliminate the French language from the English-French schools.

"Inspectors furthermore agree that the limitation to one hour of the teacher's time for French as a subject of study does not adequately meet the conditions."

I have before me an eloquent appeal made on the question by our late esteemed colleague, Sir Richard W. Scott, not long before his death. It was embodied in a letter dated the 8th of October, 1912, and published in the Toronto Globe of the 15th of the same month. In his letter he took very strong ground against Regulation 17 as seriously interfering with the application of the law in connection with separate schools. The whole letter is well worth quoting. It is as follows:

The main object of the Separate School Act of 1863 was to give the Catholic parent the right to educate his child according to his own views and to combine religious with secular education. It had no reference to nationality, and even at that time there were French schools

Hon. Mr. BEIQUÉ.