

378 EXAMINATION REFUSED

sometimes wonder why Quebec suffers from wounds which they cannot discern.

At present it is sufficient to say that efforts to cause the Convention to be informed of the real situation were unavailing. The main facts could only be communicated to a small body of Ontario delegates in face of the implacable hostility of those who had become responsible for the movement, and who prevented the following resolution being considered:—

That this Convention, recognizing that a feeling of disquiet, with regard to the position of the French language in Canada, has contributed to a certain unrest in connection with the war, and realizing that the elimination of controversy from the relations of the two principal foundation stocks of the nation would promote the unity which is essential to the most effective prosecution of the war, and the future contentment and prosperity of our country, requests the joint Chairmen to nominate a Commission whose duty it shall be to make a thorough survey of the historical and actual conditions surrounding the question, and to present to the country at large, suggestions looking to the solution of the national problem inherent in the duality of language, which distinguishes the proceedings of both Houses of Parliament and the Federal Courts.

Why was this resolution of faith-keeping with Quebec destroyed? Responsibility has since been taken for it on the ground that, because Quebec was opposed to conscription, her views about the language aspect of national unity must be ruled out of consideration. Nothing on this matter was discussed by an English-speaking delegate in the Convention.

A history of what followed the Montreal Convention would show that though the Montreal Convention was believed to have founded a permanent organization to promote national unity, faith was again broken in Ontario, whence, indeed, the device arose which produced the spectacle, during the general election of December, 1917, of soldiers from other provinces being induced to vote in Quebec on the pretence that they could not say where they had formerly lived. It would show that when an appeal was made for action against the impend-