

have too much experience not to be able to give satisfaction to the French people without impairing their schools.

And is it necessary to demonstrate that the use and teaching of two languages instead of being an element of weakness for a province or a country, is rather an element of progress, of intellectual development? Who will deny the advantage for a man or a people of having at his disposal, in order to develop his intelligence, the scientific, literary and poetical treasures of two great nations? Has the bi-lingual school system been detrimental to the moral and intellectual progress of the Belgians, that people of heroes? Not only in war but also in mechanics, industrial and fine arts, they have proved that they were inferior to no nation.

It has been said that the French spoken and taught in the province of Quebec and generally in Canada was bad and broken French. Alas! how many extravagant things have been said on both sides, and who would be entitled to throw the first stone, but to repel that assertion I have only to remark that if it were true the books and the speeches of our poets, writers and orators would not be appreciated and praised as they are in France. I could name a number of them. But I do not think it is necessary. Let me recall only that three or four years ago a great demonstration took place in France to celebrate the erection of a monument to Montcalm. Great speakers were heard, but it was acknowledged by the audience that the best speech had been made by a French Canadian our colleague, Hon. Mr. Dandurand. And lately at the immense demonstration which took place at Notre Dame de Lourdes in France, the two most admired and applauded speakers were two French Canadians, Mgr. Gauthier and Henri Bourassa.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—He was not a Nationalist then.

Hon. Mr. DAVID—I cannot deny his ability, although I do not approve of all the opinions he expresses.

Where did those eminent writers and orators receive their formation? In our schools, in our colleges. As to the illiterate population, it has been acknowledged by eminent French writers that if the accent is rude and hard the French is good, better than it is in several departments of France.

The Canada of Montreal has published a few days ago, the views expressed by Mr. Faguet, one of the most brilliant French

writers of France, on the question of nationalities. I call the attention of my hon. colleagues to the following extract from that remarkable production:

Nations are particular, special, original organisms, which will prosper and thrive only in so far as their autonomy is respected and safeguarded.

It would not be well for Europe to be dominated by the English or the Russian or even the French nation. The European spirit should no doubt exist, but it would precisely be the respect of the English spirit, the Russian spirit, or the French spirit and of their differences, that is to say, of their liberties.

The first word of General Joffre to the Alsacians was: "We will respect your traditions." He spoke, when speaking thus, a truly philosophical language, a language inspired by the philosophy of history. No nation, not even the Roman nation, has imposed its yoke without extinguishing original civilizations, which not only had the right to live but had to live in the general interest of humanity. A nation is a torch. It is important that there should be several luminous centres in the world. If the German spirit were to dominate, twenty national spirits would be extinguished and destroyed. I am at a loss to see how Europe and humanity would benefit thereby.

If humanity is with us, it is because it instinctively feels that several of its vitals are at stake and would be annihilated in the event of German supremacy being established. Indeed Germany wants to put out several eyes of humanity and replace them by one eye of cyclops.

Well, using the language of Mr. Faguet, I say that we have in Canada two lights, two great national lights and that we cannot extinguish the one or the other without affecting seriously the progress and the future of our country.

I do not think it improper to recall that in 1888, speaking in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec on the question of nationalities, I concluded my speech by the following words:

I have no hesitation in declaring that even if it were in my power to abolish the English nationality in the province of Quebec I would refuse to do it, because I would not like to assume the responsibility of extinguishing one of the lights of Canada and of the whole world.

You see, hon. gentlemen, that my views on that question are not new. It is because the great statesmen of England have put into practice those views in all the British possessions that we see thousands of people running from all parts of the British Empire, even from South Africa, to the battle-fields of Europe in order to help the Mother Country. Do you think that we would contemplate such a display of loyalty if everywhere, in all the British Empire, national rights and traditions were not respected? Justice, fair play, and toleration are the