

REC
APR 24 1917
Int. Ag. Dist.

The Journal of Commerce

Vol. XLIII., No. 17

MONTREAL, TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 1917

Price, 10 Cents

The Journal of Commerce

Devoted to
CANADIAN INDUSTRY, COMMERCE AND
FINANCE.

Published every Tuesday Morning by
The Journal of Commerce Publishing Company,
Limited.

Head Office: 35-45 St. Alexander Street, Montreal.
Telephone: Main 2662.
Toronto Office: 263 Adelaide St. West, Toronto.
Telephone: Adelaide 917.

HON. W. S. FIELDING,
President and Editor-in-Chief.

Subscription price, \$3.00 a year.
Advertising rates on application.

MONTREAL, TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 1917.

Special Articles

Thrift and the Standard of Living.
By J. W. Macmillan.

Canada's Participation in United States' Loans.
By H. M. P. Eckardt.

Conditions in the West.
By Miss E. Cora Hind.

Banking and Business Affairs in the United States.
By Elmer H. Youngman.

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

Editorials:	Page
"Truck and Trade".....	1
Bilingualism Again.....	1
The Much Abused Politicians.....	2
Committed for Contempt.....	2
Profiting by Example.....	2
Interest on Loans.....	2
Thrift and the Standard of Living.....	3
Canada's Participation in United States' Loan to the Allies.....	3
Britain Still a Great Creditor Nation.....	4
Banking and Business Affairs in the United States.....	5
Public Opinion.....	6
Mentioned in Despatches.....	7
Reciprocity in Wheat, Flour, Etc.....	8
Among the Companies.....	9
Canadian Bank Clearings.....	11
Montreal Stock Exchange.....	12
News of the Week.....	13
Business Competition.....	15
The Exporters' Field.....	18
The Victor Talking Machine Division.....	19
Conditions in the West.....	20
Commodity Markets.....	21-23

"Truck and Trade"

WHEREAS this, and because of that, and inasmuch as the other, and in consideration of something else, and for divers other reasons, equally clear and comprehensible, it is ordained that what Canada most needs is much more truck and trade with the Yankees. What a queer world it is!

Bilingualism Again

THERE is a revival of the bilingual school question in Ontario. This may surprise some people who had imagined that the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London had settled the question. But while the Privy Council judgment did settle certain disputed points, it left the main question as before. That was because the main question was really not one of law, but one that needed the application of common sense and mutual goodwill. The legal battle in London resulted in a draw. The Ontario Government were to a certain extent the winners, for the right of the Ontario Legislature to control the school affairs of the Province was upheld. The French Canadian minority won a part of their case, for the court stamped as illegal the Commission which the Ontario Government had appointed to supersede the Ottawa Separate School Board when the latter resisted the departmental regulations. Now the Ontario Government have carried legislation to cure the defects in the former proceedings and to authorize the appointment of another Ottawa School Commission, in event of the Ottawa trustees again refusing to comply with the Ontario regulations. The chairman of the Ottawa trustees has publicly announced that he and his associates will refuse to obey Regulation 17. Thus the old fight is on again. It is not likely to be made milder by the fact that, in the passing of the new legislation at Toronto, there was a sharp racial cleavage, English Conservatives and Liberals joining in supporting the measure, while the French Canadian members recorded their votes against it.

A remarkable thing about this unhappy quarrel is that, if the reasonable men on both sides are to be taken at their words, there is really nothing to quarrel about. On both sides, it is true, there are extremists who are ready to quarrel, perhaps anxious to quarrel. But on both sides the views of these extremists should be discounted and more regard paid to the views of moderate men, who, we are sure, must sincerely desire to promote that harmony and goodwill without which there can be neither an efficient system of education nor any of the other things which make for good

citizenship. It should be easily possible for half a dozen of such men, including some experienced educationists, to frame a basis of agreement which would put an end to the present unhappy state of affairs.

As we have said, according to the sentiments of moderate men on both sides of the dispute, there is really no ground for quarrel. On the English side it is claimed that the chief purpose of the school laws is to ensure an education in the English language for all the children of Ontario. On the French side this purpose is admitted to be a primary one; the intelligent French Canadian citizen clearly sees that his children, if they have no knowledge of the English language, are handicapped in the battle of life in a country where English is the language of nearly three-fourths of the population. So far then there is no conflict. On the French side, it is claimed that the French Canadian desires his children to learn their mother tongue, as well as English. This is an entirely reasonable desire on the part of the French, and deserves the commendation rather than the disapproval of reasonable English speaking citizens. The Ontario school authorities say they acknowledge the propriety of this desire on the part of the French Canadian citizens and are prepared to facilitate such instruction, as far as this can be done without interference with the acquisition of the English language. There is then no conflict here. Both sides agree that English must be taught, with a certain amount of French as well. How much French can be taught along with English in the bilingual schools? The Ontario Government say they have answered this in their Regulation 17. The French citizens claim that the instruction in French contemplated by the regulation is insufficient. Here the problem is reduced to a simple form, and removed entirely from the field of lawyers and judges. No law suits in Canada or in England will settle the matter. But a few men of each side, sincerely desiring to carry out objects which both sides profess to believe in, should have no difficulty in finding a solution. If, while keeping in mind the principle for which the Ontario Legislature stands respecting the teaching of English, a better regulation than No. 17 can be devised for the teaching of French, what reasonable Canadian would not heartily welcome it? Let a few practical men, aided by experienced educationists, sit down at a table and honestly endeavor to frame such amendments to Regulation 17 as will accomplish the purposes which both sides claim to have—the giving of an efficient English education to all the children and the giving at the same time, in the bilingual schools, of adequate instruction in the French language to the children of French Canadian parents. The problem which has already caused so much strife and bids fair to cause more can be solved if it is approached on both sides in the right spirit.