

PAMPHLET No. 3

PRICE : 10 Cents

1917
-8

123

A FRIENDLY
EXCHANGE OF VIEWS
BETWEEN
QUEBEC AND ONTARIO



PUBLISHED UNDER THE AUSPICES
OF THE
UNITY PUBLICITY BUREAU



QUEBEC
THE TELEGRAPH PRINTING CO.

1917

LEADING CONTRIBUTORS

TO THIS

SYMPOSIUM

ED. HARPER WADE, head of the Harper Wade Export Co.,
Quebec.

THE CANADIAN CHURCHMAN, Toronto, (established
1871)—Executive committee: George B. Woods, Esq.,
President;—Thomas Mortimer, Esq., Vice-President;—
J. M. McWhinney, Esq., Treasurer;—Mark Bredin, Esq.,
D. Creighton, Esq., R. W. Allin, Managing Editor.

JUSTICE ALF. W. SAVARY, late Judge of the County
Court, Nova Scotia.

A WORD OF INTRODUCTION

Mr. Wade, whose name occupies a prominent place in the following pages, is an English-born gentleman, who has spent most of his life in Quebec, a man of learning as well as of business. In the present crisis, his versatile and facile pen has largely contributed to the defense of French Canada against its slanderers, through numerous letters to the English press of Montreal and the Daily Telegraph, Quebec. As a sample of terseness and forcibleness of expression and argument, we think that very few writings on the same subject could compete with his remarkable FALLACIES LETTER, which appeared in the Montreal Herald, on the 26th of June last, and which is here reproduced as a fitting preface to this booklet.

FALLACIES

To the Editor of The Herald.

Sir,—It is a fallacy to assert that taking a referendum would delay sending reinforcements to the front. It is admitted that the Government has ample powers to call out and drill men. It is certain such men would not be ready to send overseas before a referendum could be taken.

It is a fallacy to assert voluntary recruiting has failed. Mr. A. Rives Hall, in your Tuesday's issue gave facts and figures exposing this fallacy.

It is a fallacy to regard meetings in the province of Quebec at which resolutions were passed demanding a referendum as non-conscriptionist. I am strongly in favor of selective conscription and if a referendum were taken would do my utmost in favor of conscription, and in case it passed would support its enforcement, but I am altogether against coercing men to serve overseas without a majority of the people authorizing conscription. It is a libel on the loyal Canadian people to suppose that conscription would not pass if submitted to the people by referendum.

It is a fallacy to suppose all provinces are not equally loyal. Because there is bitter feeling between the English-speaking people of Ontario and the French-speaking people of Quebec over a language question, it does not follow that both are not equally loyal to the Dominion and the Empire.

It is no fallacy that a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand.

It is a fallacy to suppose that if the French-Canadians lost their language they would lose their religion. Ireland lost her language without losing her creed.

It is a fallacy to suppose that a common language ensures unity. England found Ireland Irish speaking and set herself to make the people English speaking. It took centuries to do it. Has it led to greater unity? Has a common language brought Ulster and Connaught together? In Switzerland there are three languages. Is there a more united people in Europe? In Belgium there are two languages. Has French inclined the people towards absorption by France, or Flemish led to division over resisting Germany?

It is a fallacy to suppose that everyone favoring a referendum is against selective conscription.

It is a fallacy to suppose Government by the people is a principle that can at any time be set aside for Government of the people without incurring penalties.

ED. HARPER WADE.

Quebec, 21 June, 1917.

* * *

More recently, Mr. Wade had the good luck to find outside Quebec Province people well disposed to chat on his favorite subject, and for some weeks a courteous exchange of views went on between Quebec and Toronto, as hereafter reported for the information of those who may not have had the advantage of following it in the original.

I

MR. WADE TO THE CANADIAN CHURCHMAN

Sir,—"Spectator's" excellent article on the French-Canadian attitude towards conscription, concludes with two very pertinent suggestions: that we should convince them that winning the war is the great consideration just now, and that conscription is a necessary step to that end. I know the French-Canadians well, through having lived amongst them for many years, and from having given employment to many hundreds of them as workmen, and to several in responsible salaried positions. Their deepest attachment is to their language, then to their creed, their province and their race, but with most of them these are all so inextricably mixed up, that anyone attacking one, attacks all.

We all know the effect of a grievance, how it distorts and puts in wrong perspective everything else, and dominates the mind to the destruction of sound judgment. The Irish Nationalists have a grievance that has rendered conscription impossible in Ireland. The British Government is using every possible means to remove that grievance. The French-Canadians have a grievance in the treatment of their language in Ontario, which has prejudiced recruiting in Quebec, and will continue to do so till removed. Nothing has been done towards its removal. Do not suppose a grievance can be minimized by calling it imaginary, for of all grievances an imaginary one is the most difficult to deal with.

Is "Spectator" quite sure that winning the war is the great consideration just now? Is it not rather that the French-Canadian children of Ontario should receive a good education in English, without adequate provision being made for their being taught to speak French fluently, read it readily and write it correctly? Do not winning the war considerations come second to that? Is "Spectator" quite sure that conscription is a necessary step towards winning the war? As matters now stand I am a strong selective conscriptionist, and even believe the Militia Act should have been put into force long ago, but I am well aware that a nation divided against itself cannot stand, and therefore **THE MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION IS TO AVOID DIVISION, IF WE ARE TO STAND AND ASSIST IN WINNING THE WAR.** If conscription were impossible, there are other ways of getting the needed men. **ADEQUATE PAY AND MORE LIBERAL PROVISION FOR WIVES AND DEPENDANTS MIGHT DO MUCH.** The Right Rev. David Williams, Lord Bishop of Huron, in his Synod address referred to the grave injustice of soldiers at the front receiving little over one dollar a day, while many that stay at home are able to make five to ten dollars a day.

Better recruiting methods might do much. Mr. William Power, M.P. for Quebec West, who like myself lives among and understands French-Canadians without being of them, who has three sons and two sons-in-law that have done and are doing good service at the front, and who is a business man quite independent of political considera-

tions, has expressed in the House at Ottawa his opinion that properly organized recruiting methods and procedure would be far more effective than enforced conscription. The removal of the language grievance would do very much, even if regulation 17 and all legislation connected with it were only suspended during the war, but if it is really of such pressing and primary importance to give French-Canadian children in Ontario a good English education, that is beyond discussion.

ED. HARPER WADE.

Quebec, August 15th, 1917.

II

SPECTATOR TO MR. WADE

(*Canadian Churchman*, August 30th, 1917.)

"Spectator" is always extremely glad to have a critique of his writing, such as appeared in the last issue of the "Churchman," from the pen of Mr. Harper Wade, of Quebec. The writer, too, can say that he was born and educated in the province of Quebec, has had the most intimate and satisfactory relationship with the French-Canadians throughout almost his entire life. He values their friendship, their intellectual gifts, their courtesy, their powers of public service, and their national ideals. He feels the THE FRENCH-CANADIAN INFLUENCE HAS LARGELY BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR THAT TYPE OF CANADIAN NATIONHOOD THAT

HAS LIFTED US OUT OF THE "COLONIAL" ATTITUDE OF MIND more or less satisfied to be an adjunct to the British Isles. They have stimulated us to think for ourselves, to assert our rights as a free people, to believe that all the wisdom and virtue of the world was not centred in a United Kingdom in the northern seas. They have done their part and an important part in establishing the conviction that all international relations need not be handled exclusively by mysteriously wiser heads than can be found in this country, or that the officers and soldiers picked up from London and Edinburgh are necessarily superior to those that may come from Montreal or Vancouver. They haven't been responsible for all this, but *they have been a leaven, a wholesome leaven, throughout our strenuous history.* They may be classed as conservatives and reactionaries, if you will, in some things, but *they have shown themselves as progressives in many ways in political ideals.* Despite what may be said and thought to the contrary in Ontario and other provinces of the Dominion, they have been fair and considerate on the whole in their attitude towards the English-speaking minority in Quebec, where their power to act otherwise is unquestioned. There is friction there, of course, from time to time, just as there is friction in municipal and provincial appointments and rights in provinces where the question of race does not enter. These things are inevitable where free men have the right to express and contend for their views. *It is a thousand pities that newspapers and public men should persist in ignoring these things and should continue to sweepingly condemn a race for faults*

that are individual and common to men of all races. It is a fact, however erroneous it may be, that a large section of the Province of Quebec, including many English-speaking people, believe that the real sentiments of Ontario are expressed through the "Orange Sentinel." That paper is probably more frequently quoted in the French-Canadian Press than any other from the whole province. It is only justice to assert these things, for they must be remembered in estimating aright their point of view. To no people in the world does the Church mean more than to these people, and none are more ready to sacrifice themselves for its welfare. Their power as a more or less homogeneous people has given them exceptional power in political affairs. They have been accustomed to ask for things, and they have learned well the art of asking in such a way that there is little doubt about their receiving. Sacrifice for the State where their own interests as a race are not served is not a part of their political creed. National selfishness is inevitably fraught with danger.

III

JUDGE SAVARY STEPS IN

(*The Canadian Churchman*, September 6th, 1917.)

Sir,—I am gratified at the letter of Mr. E. Harper Wade in your last week's issue. I have looked into the matter of the bilingual controversy in Ontario, and came to the firm conclusion that the French minority in that Province are asking

no more than English people similarly situated would expect, and insist on, and no doubt get, for the illiberality that would refuse it to them is not part of the French national character. Even if the French were asking a little more than their strict legal or normal right, it would be wise policy to give it to them. They should be treated with generosity. Last year I ventured to express my views in a letter to the Toronto "Daily News," and was twitted by an opponent who had something to do with administering the educational law of that Province, with having been an anti-confederate in 1867 and perhaps still actuated by a hidden wish to "smash" Confederation, my critic being utterly indifferent to the fact that the great menace to the continued success of confederation today is the bitter feeling between the English and French-speaking elements of our population on this most irritating question. Neither the "News" nor the "Globe" would publish my rejoinder, the editors of both papers declaring that I was ignorant of the fact that Regulation 17 did not have the effect of shutting out French from schools opened after 1912; that a new school had recently been opened under the "Mowat Law." I then asked why not repeal a regulation so obnoxious on the face of it, if it is to remain in practice inoperative. But a few weeks ago another Nova Scotian asked the "Daily News" if it were not true that in a school district of Windsor, in which 75 per cent. of the pupils were French, no French was allowed, because the school had come into existence after Rule 17, and the editor replied that English was the prevailing language of Windsor and therefore no French could be allowed in any such school

either before or since Rule 17. How would the English in the city of Quebec feel, if, because French is the prevailing language in that city no English were allowed in a school of which three-fourths of the pupils were English? Two stock arguments are thrown at any one who tries to reason with an Ontarian on this subject: First, it would be a terrible nuisance to have two languages used in the legislature of the Province. But the French are not asking for anything of the kind. They simply ask that the concessions to their language in Regulation 17 be not defined as limited (by the word "hitherto") to schools in existence before the enactment of the regulation; and that the years during which French may be the language of instruction, be raised. The practice in Nova Scotia on this point, for years, would probably amply satisfy them. They wish to be taught English, but not under conditions that compel them to lose their own language.

The second argument is equally inapposite and absurd: That if we grant this linguistic privilege to the French, we must grant it also to the Germans, Ruthenians and other races who came here to enjoy our hospitality and better their conditions from their squalid surroundings in their less favoured native regions. To use this argument to a French-Canadian is simply to add insult to injury. But yet, to my surprise and pain, I find it used by no less an authority than Rev. Professor Wrong in his contribution to the "New Era" (p. 258). If men of his position, character, learning and influence take such a view of the matter, there is little hope for the restoration of

the harmony and good feeling that once prevailed between the two great races, of whom the Dominion is a common heritage. He knows that the language of these newcomers have no claims whatever on the schools, legal, moral or historic, but he also knows that the French language is the natural language of three millions of our population, handed down through successive generations from the first settlers; he points out impressively that it was the first European language spoken either in the East or West of the Dominion; that it is in common with English the official Federal language, a fact which alone gives the right to some instruction in the proper use of it. It is, moreover, the language of a native Canadian literature as creditable as the English. In these days when the cordial unity of all our people is of such paramount necessity, it is criminal for the great Province of Ontario to keep open such a sore as this bilingual question has created, and for the sake of a mere sentiment, and that, to say the least of it, an illiberal and an ungenerous one; for it would do not the slightest injury to a single English-Canadian, or to the Provincial commonwealth as a whole, to give the French, in the matter of education, all the privileges their more moderate protagonists ask for. It is the sense of smarting under this grievance that has made recruiting in Quebec impossible; but to repeal the obnoxious regulation for the period of the war only, as Mr. Wade suggests, would be worse than useless. We want justice, and peace, and harmony established among us for all generations. In Nova Scotia we are only too happy to see our French taking a greater interest in the cultivation

of their own language, and do all we reasonably can to help them, believing it a sign of more elevated sentiment and a promise of more useful citizenship.

A. W. SAVARY.

Annapolis Royal, N.S.

IV

**A LADY INTERVENES WITH PREVALENT
ONTARIO MISAPPREHENSIONS
REQUIRING CORRECTIONS**

(The Canadian Churchman, August 20th, 1917.)

Sir,—Surely Judge Savary does not expect his letter in the "Canadian Churchman" of September 6th to have weight in Ontario. Canada is a British possession and one would expect the English language to be spoken by the people, but with its usual generosity to a conquered foe, Britain granted liberal concessions to the French of Quebec. They still enjoy those privileges and there has been no effort made to deprive them of them. The unreasonableness of the French-Canadians is that they expect to overflow into the other Provinces and have the same privileges as they are given in their own Province. They are trying to force their language not only in Ontario, but in other Provinces and pretend to be injured because it is not fully granted, giving this as an excuse for the French-Canadians not enlisting. They say they love the French language. One would think they would love old France better and would rush to her rescue, when she

is straining every nerve, assisted by her Allies, Britain and her colonies being foremost, to overcome the enemy. The deadness of the French-Canadians when the world is in such trouble is hard to understand.

AN ONTARIO WOMAN.

V

**MR. WADE POLITELY, BUT FORCIBLY
RETORTS**

Sir,—The letter of “An Ontario Woman” is specially valuable as embodying and stating with admirable brevity and clearness, views that are commonly held, not only in Ontario, but by many English-speaking Canadians throughout the Dominion. I trust she will pardon me if I correct some inexactitudes or inaccuracies into which she has inadvertently fallen.

Canada is not a British possession. Whatever may have been the position of the Provinces, of which it is composed, prior to Confederation, Canada has now been for half a century a self-governing Dominion, and an integral portion of the British Empire. If Canada at any time declared her independence, there would be no attempt on the part of the United Kingdom to coerce her by force of arms. India is a British possession, and if she attempted to gain independence, any such attempt would be forcibly met and suppressed. India, being a possession, is not self-governing. Therein lies the difference between a dominion and a possession.

There is no reason why anyone should expect the English language to be spoken by the people of any British possession. Not only is it not so spoken in India and many similar possessions, but in Wales itself, a considerable proportion of the people speak only Welsh. In the Union of South Africa the language of the Dutch population was not interfered with, the wisdom of the British Government prevailing over foolish efforts to the contrary. If it had been, there would have been no British South Africa to-day. General Smuts in a speech that rang through Europe and re-echoed throughout the entire civilized world, said in effect: "that even those nations that have fought against you must feel *that their language is as safe and secure under the British flag, as that of the children of your own household and your own blood.*" This idea of one language only, and that English, is certainly not British. It has filtered into Canada from across the border, and is an attempt to Americanize our institutions.

The conditions and exact extent of the language concessions granted at the conquest, have been a matter of much debate. Whatever they were, it is certain that they extended to the whole of what was then known as Canada, and were not limited to what is now the Province of Quebec. It is very probable that legislation prejudicial to the French language would have been enforced, had not British statesmen foreseen the necessity of making secure the willing allegiance of the French-Canadian people, for it must never be forgotten that every inducement was held out to them to join the English-speaking rebels, and that to their

loyalty and courage we are everlastingly indebted for our flag being the Triple Cross and not the Stars and Stripes.

It may be unreasonable for French-Canadians to overflow Quebec boundaries, but seeing Confederation made all Canada as much their country as it is that of other Canadians, it is not surprising. They have obeyed the earliest recorded Divine command: "Increase and multiply," and if Ontario cannot replenish the province and build up her waste places, surely it is better for other Canadians than for strangers to do it.

They have made no attempt to force their language on anyone in Ontario or the other provinces. They are most anxious that their children should receive a good English education, but they are not willing to part with their mother tongue in exchange. All they ask is that, in addition to English, such instruction in French shall be given as will enable the children to speak it fluently, read it readily and write it correctly, and this only when there is sufficient number of French-speaking children in the school to justify it. Next to reading, writing and arithmetic, the knowledge of a second language is the most essential part of a good education. We have sent no less than seven fighting generals to the front, from Quebec, all equally proficient in English and French.

What Ontario record compares with this? It would be worth an immense sum to the Allies and Empire if Lloyd George had the knowledge of French which he endeavoured to acquire in his boyhood. The Germans forbade the use of French in Berlin, only to find there was no other

tongue in which they could communicate with their Turkish ally's ambassadors. What a false position a judge of the Supreme Court, or a member of the Ottawa House is in, if he cannot understand both languages. The French have never said they love the French language. No one says anyone loves his right hand or his eyes, yet all would bitterly resent and persistently resist the fullest use of either being curtailed or forbidden. The great complaint against French-Canadians forty-five years ago, was that they loved France too much, now the complaint is that their affection is too greatly centred in Canada. We in Quebec know who ploughed the ground, who paid for the ploughing and who sowed the seed. That a nation divided against itself cannot stand is Divine teaching, confirmed by all history. We are now divided as never before, province from provinces, and in the provinces class from class. Can nothing be done before it is too late?

A number of meetings were held in the Province of Quebec immediately on the declaration of conscription as the Government policy. At all these meetings a loyal readiness was shown, by the resolutions adopted, to submit to and concur in that policy if the Government could show that they had a majority of the electors with it, that majority to include the boys at the front. *They were called anti-conscription, but were really pro-referendum.* Since then nearly four months have passed away, and absolutely not one man has been called out. I am not only a strong selective conscriptionist under present conditions, though not against the will of the people, but think the Militia

Act should have been put into force long ago. It might have been amended in a week, if amendment was necessary. However, I have nothing to do with party politics, only political principles, and I am prepared to accept the bribe of good government in accordance with those principles from any party, for it is a time to put party politics aside and vote in accordance with convictions.

Colonel Arthur Mignault's letter to the Prime Minister, dated July, (1) fully explains the question of French-Canadian recruiting. It was largely quoted from in the Senate on August 3. One of the main deterrents was that French-Canadian battalions, recruited and organized as French, were broken up and distributed amongst English-speaking battalions under English-speaking officers. The men wrote home what had happened and the effect was just what might have been expected. Anyone who wants to understand the question should read Colonel Mignault's letter if he or she can get a copy in Ontario.

ED. HARPER WADE.

Quebec, September 22, 1917.

(1) Colonel Mignault's letter will be found at the end of this booklet.

VI

MR. WADE TO SPECTATOR

(*The Canadian Churchman*, September 20th, 1917.)

Sir,—“Spectator” is entitled to an acknowledgment of his pleasant and courteous reference to my letter, and the thanks of all readers of the “Canadian Churchman” and many others, are due to him for the kindly appreciation of our French-Canadian fellow-countrymen expressed in the first portion of his recent article. It is specially valuable as being published in a Toronto paper of Dominion-wide circulation, and as coming from one who knows both provinces and their peoples. The French Canadians have as a people certain racial characteristics, some admirable, others regrettable. In this they certainly are not singular, for there is no other people, of which the same might not truly be said, and any comparison would not be, on the whole, unfavorable to them.

I have not yet found time to thoroughly study and analyse all the Senate and House of Commons’ speeches from Hansard, much less all that has been said by irresponsible speakers elsewhere. Some of these were made by Liberals and some by Nationalists, so the arguments may well be contradictory, for between these two parties there is a great gulf fixed, which is impassable. Dr. Michael Clark testified that for six years Laurier fought Bourassa like a demon, and it is on record that Bourassa called Laurier the most nefarious man in Canada. The Nationalists oppose participation in European wars. The Liberals insist

on the participation of Canada in the present war to the end, and on all Canadian resources of men, money and production being used to assist in achieving a final and decisive victory. They oppose conscription being enforced without the expressed approval of a majority of the electorate, including all on service out of Canada, seeing it was not even considered till more than half a year after the mandate of the present Parliament expired. The relative representative value of the two parties is shown by the fact that there is not one Nationalist in the Quebec Legislative Assembly elected during the war. French and English-speaking Canadians fought side by side to destroy their political power. *The friendly relations between the two races in the Province of Quebec have never been so good as at present.*

We have recently heard much about the influence of the Roman Catholic Church and of the political leaders of the people not having been sufficiently or properly exercised. It is strange that in view of what has happened since Confederation it should not be recognized that the French-Canadian people use their own judgment in political matters and act in accordance with the conclusions they themselves come to. They idolized Mercier, yet rejected him decisively when he forfeited their esteem and respect. The power of the Church was used in quite an exceptional manner in connection with the Manitoba School Question. A mandate was read in every Roman Catholic Church in the Province without the slightest effect. The people respectfully listened, then in defiance of its words, voted for Laurier.

The strongest recruiting appeal made during the war was undoubtedly contained in the speech in which Laurier told his people that whatever injustice they felt they suffered from, they must still do their duty. He used every possible argument in favor of enlisting. They listened and applauded, but did not otherwise respond, because the Ontario School Question, like a grim spectre, barred the path of active service and nullified his efforts. What the heads of the Roman Catholic Church and Canada have done is on record to their historic credit, but it must be remembered that parish priests and their congregations are free men in political matters, and the authority of the Church does not extend beyond faith, morals, Church discipline and matters connected with these.

The Ontario bilingual school question has been put forward as a cause of deficient recruiting, not as a justification of it. During the Napoleonic struggle the captain of an English man-of-war ruled over his crew with great strictness and severity. He was an excellent commander, but a martinet. When a French frigate was sighted, the crew stripped for action and manned the guns but instead of returning the fire of the enemy, stood with folded arms while their vessel was destroyed and they themselves slaughtered. Their action was unjustifiable, but was there not a cause? They were neither slackers nor cowards, only men with a grievance.

The French-Canadian grievance is not merely an actual one, it is much more than that. It is also a sentimental one, and in every human heart

sentiment dominates actuality and even reason. It would be easy to show this is the case if space permitted, but a simple illustration will suffice. A wedding ring has no intrinsic, legal or religious, value beyond the gold it contains, but it has a sentimental one. Any wife could part with her wedding ring and replace it with another without anything but sentiment being affected, but what actual money payment would induce a true wife to do so? Yet many thoughtlessly talk of mere sentiment.

Nothing is more certain than that under present legislation, the French language in course of time will become in Ontario, exactly what Erse now is in Ireland. There has never yet been, in the history of the world, a bilingual people, and the only possibility of any section of a population becoming bilingual is through both languages being efficiently taught in the schools. Switzerland has three languages, and Belgium two, but the great majority of the people in both countries speak only one tongue.

It might have been difficult for the Ontario Government to have suspended Regulation 17 and all action in connection with it during the war, but not more so than for mothers to part with their sons and wives with their husbands, with more than a possibility of never seeing them again. This they did because they made winning the war the first thing, which Ontario did not do. At the commencement of the war Regulation 17 was only a regulation and might have been withdrawn or suspended at any time by departmental action. I do not think with Judge Savary that the suspension of the regulation would have been

useless, but rather question if it would ever have been again enforced after the war. However, possibly, as an English-born Canadian, I have not quite shaken off the English weakness for compromise. An eminent man once said that Englishmen were so given to compromise, that if one found a mob preparing to unjustly cut off a man's head, he would try to compromise by cutting off the victim's feet. There is no note of compromise in the Judge's letter, with which I otherwise entirely concur.

Allow me to quote Lloyd George on such matters: "If anybody promotes national disunion at this time, he is helping the enemy and hurting his native land. And it makes no difference if he is for or against the war. IF YOU SOW DISTRUST, DISCONTENT OR DISUNION IN THE NATION, WE SHALL REAP DEFEAT. IF ON THE OTHER HAND WE SOW THE SEEDS OF PATIENCE, CONFIDENCE AND UNITY, WE SHALL GARNER IN VICTORY AND ITS FRUITS."

ED. HARPER WADE.

Quebec, September 8, 1917.

VII

SPECTATOR TO MR. WADE

(*The Canadian Churchman*, September 27th, 1917.)

Mr. Harper Wade's second excellent and timely letter in the "Canadian Churchman." requires no further comment from "Spectator" beyond

this, that he would strongly advise his readers TO CAREFULLY REREAD AND SERIOUSLY MEDITATE UPON WHAT MR. WADE SO LUCIDLY STATES. "Spectator's" defence of the Ontario position, so far as it goes is on the assumption that the one thing aimed at in the bilingual school regulation, is merely to secure an adequate knowledge of English by every child brought up in that Province. It would appear that anything less would rightly condemn the Government on the charge of inefficiency and lack of foresight in the preparation of children for the duties of adequate citizenship. Since his first article on the subject appeared, *a prominent Ontario lawyer referred to it, and his comment was that the letter of the law is in the sense referred to, but the spirit back of the administrators is to eliminate French from Ontario. If that be the case then, their aspirations are both unjust and foolish.* The knowledge of two or more languages is an undoubted aid to culture, to clear and graceful expression, to a broadened outlook on life. Nevertheless, this, in our judgment, is not an issue that ought to be made an excuse for abstaining from a plain duty at the present time.

"Spectator" can fully confirm Mr. Wade's statement of the independence of the French-Canadians in regard to the Church, when they are stirred by a real issue that appeals to them. We fancy that many people in Ontario regarded, and still regard, the settlement of the Jesuit estates question, some twenty-five years ago, as a servile concession to the Church of Rome in Quebec. As a matter of fact it was settled by the Hon. Honoré

Mercier in spite of the Church. It is true that many Protestants in Quebec, resented it, and the "Equal Rights" movement, of brief existence, had a large following in Ontario, but, in spite of opposition from both sides, Mercier pressed it through as the most equitable solution of a troublesome problem, and he was supported by the mass of the people. It may not be generally known that the establishment of a papal Ablegate at Ottawa, some years ago, by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was resisted and resented by the Church. The fact was that Sir Wilfrid wearied of the constant appeals of various Bishops on questions of ecclesiastical interest. He found that these dignitaries were not all of one mind on public matters, and insisted that a representative of the papal authority should be established at Ottawa, so that these differences should be composed before they came to his official notice. The Canadian prelates were far from pleased at the setting up of this ecclesiastical prince, who acted in the double capacity of "shock absorber" and extinguisher, and at the same time, more or less overshadowed Canadian dignitaries. The well-known formula in Quebec, when a subject has gripped the people is, "in spiritual matters we obey the Church without question, but in political affairs we shall follow our own judgment." The writer, of course, doesn't for a moment deny that the Church has a very great influence in political matters, but what Protestant communion does not aspire to influence in the public life of the country?

APPENDIX

COL. MIGNAULT'S LETTER

HERE IS THE FULL TEXT OF COL. MIGNAULT'S LETTER TO THE PRIME MINISTER, REFERRED TO IN THE FOREGOING CORRESPONDENCE.

(From the *Montreal Gazette*, July 16th, 1917.)

Montreal, July 7th, 1917.

*To the Right Honorable Sir Robert Borden, G.C.M.G.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Ottawa.*

My dear Mr. Premier.—

There are some aspects of the situation in Quebec, as far as recruiting is concerned, it seems to me advisable to emphasize at the present time. In the whole discussion, both in and out of Parliament, over recruiting in Quebec, certain very important facts have been almost completely lost sight of; facts which if more generally known and appreciated would, I am sure, make a great many people think quite differently of the Province of Quebec, and the part the French-Canadians have played, and are still playing, in furthering the cause of the Allies in the great war. It is to these facts that I would now respectfully draw your attention.

In writing you this letter, my dear Mr. Premier, I am doing so, I may say, solely as a military man who has had some experience with recruiting in Quebec, and as a French-Canadian citizen who is anxious that common justice should at least be

done his compatriots. With party politics or party interests I have no concern. I desire to deal with facts alone. Nor shall I indulge in sentiment, no doubt good in its place, or with vain recriminations and fault-finding, at what has been said, a procedure that would serve no good purpose. Facts and facts alone shall have my consideration.

First, as to French-Canadian enlistments at the beginning of the war. As soon as the Valcartier Camp was opened, at least 1,500 French-Canadians joined the colors, a fair response to the call at that time. You are aware Mr. Premier, that towards the end of August, 1914, that is to say, only a few weeks after war was declared, an offer was made to the Government to raise and organize the 22nd French-Canadian Battalion. There was the usual delay in obtaining the necessary authorization from Ottawa. but in about a month's time that authorization was obtained, and by the beginning of November, 1914, that is to say, within a comparatively short period, the battalion was organized and at full strength.

That the French-Canadians were not backward in recognizing their duty and in doing it, is shown by the fact that there were over 5,000 applications to join the ranks, and as only 1,100 were required for the 22nd, authorization was then asked to raise and organize another battalion, namely, the 41st French-Canadian, as a support to the 22nd Battalion. Authorization having been obtained the 41st was organized and was at full strength in a few weeks. Another French-Canadian battalion, the 69th, was organised in the early spring of 1915, and was filled up at once. Subsequently,

as you are aware, with the Government's authorization and approval, what became known as No. 8 French-Canadian Hospital, was organized in a few days. The 22nd Battalion and the hospital unit were all overseas by May, 1915; the 41st and the 69th battalions followed in due time. It will thus be seen that there was no lack of enthusiasm or devotedness on the part of the French-Canadians at the beginning of the war, as the rapid organization and quick despatch of the various units I have mentioned amply prove.

Of the record of these units I need hardly speak, as it is known to all who know anything about the war. Your very generous action on behalf of the Canadian Parliament and people, in contributing hospital units to the amount of two thousand beds to the French Army was, I assure you, most deeply appreciated and the services rendered by these units at the battles of Champagne, Verdun and the Somme were recognized as invaluable, in affording greatly needed assistance to the French Army when it was overwhelmed with wounded. The services rendered by those French-Canadian hospital units will, in fact, never be forgotten in France, and not only from the aid which they gave to the wounded, but for the closer and sympathetic relations which they will lead to between France and Canada for all time, your action was a most beneficial and important one. The President of France has, in fact, expressed the view that the sending of French-Canadian units to France would always be most welcome.

From May, 1915, to November, 1916, that is to

say, for a period of eighteen months, I was absent at the front, and therefore entirely out of touch with what was being done in the way of recruiting. On my return to Canada, in December, 1916, I was asked by the Government to take charge of recruiting in the Province of Quebec. I soon began to realize that there had been a marked change since the first campaign. It was soon apparent that material was not near so plentiful. What was the reason? The explanation is simple. No sooner had the campaign started when it was found that large advertisements had appeared for months previously in the leading French-Canadian newspapers calling for munition workers, offering the most attractive inducements in the way of wages, etc., and emphasizing the important services that could be rendered in this way to the cause of the Allies, who, at that time, you will recall, were in urgent need of munitions. As the result of that campaign, a most beneficial and patriotic one, let it be understood, thousands and thousands of French-Canadians were drawn from all parts of the Province of Quebec to the munition factories, where the greater number of them still continue to work.

The demand for munition workers was incessant; in fact, the time came when sufficient men could not be obtained. The Province of Quebec was literally combed clean of available men. I recall one occasion when I visited a prominent munition manufacturer, an English-speaking Canadian, and asked him to let me have one hundred of his 1,400 French-Canadians for overseas service. "It is impossible," was his reply. "I want one hundred

more myself, to enable me to fill my contracts." And, knowing the needs of the Allies as I did, from what I had seen while in Europe, I was forced to agree with him that the work the men were doing in the munition factories was as vital as the need of men for overseas service. This aspect of the situation has been almost entirely lost sight of in the discussion over the part played by French-Canadians in the war. I do not know whether you are aware of it, my dear Mr. Premier, but it is a fact that can be corroborated, if need be, that there are at the present time one hundred thousand French-Canadians working in munition factories and war employment in Canada. My personal belief is that that is a very conservative estimate, but it makes, you will, I am sure, admit, a very impressive showing. Now, my dear Mr. Premier, what I desire to emphasize is that these one hundred thousand or more French-Canadians who are working in the munitions factories were led to believe, and do believe, that they are rendering as important and vital a service to the cause of the Allies as the men who have enlisted for overseas service. In common fairness, therefore, they should be regarded as part of Quebec's contribution to the war, just as much as the men who are actually at the front. You must know that at a time when the need of munitions was most urgent, men were brought from the front to England and France and placed at making munitions, and that every man at work in a munition factory in England, as well as in the other Allied countries, is regarded as just as important a factor in the war as the soldier at the front. No one would dream of calling such a man a "slacker" or a "shirker,"

or of reproaching him with not having enlisted. In fact, the distinctive button which he wears to denote that he is a munition worker, is regarded as a badge of honor.

What I have stated is regard to the campaign for munition workers which began early in 1915, explains to a large extent the falling off in the number of men presenting themselves for enlistment under the voluntary system. If French-Canadians now engaged in the making of munitions were available for overseas service, there would not be the least difficulty in raising and organizing units, as was done during the first year of the war, when the French-Canadians, in large numbers, asked the privilege of their own accord, of enlisting for overseas service, but would not do more than they did, because the Government, as you know, only allowed a certain quota to Quebec.

I have drawn your attention to these few important facts, my dear Mr. Premier, in the hope that they will help to make clearer to you and to the Canadian public, the real situation in the Province of Quebec. With the latter object in view, I am furnishing a copy of this letter to the press, my desire being that it should be recognized that the Province of Quebec, in common with the other provinces of the Dominion, has done, and is doing, its share for the success of the cause we all have at heart.

I have the honor to remain, my dear Mr. Premier,

Yours very respectfully,

ARTHUR MIGNAULT.