

French-Canadians penned up in Quebec? I cannot think it when we open our doors so freely to all the races of Eastern Europe, when we have for instance thousands of Greeks, Italians, etc., who made their money here and take it home again. Surely the newcomers in any part of the Dominion who will be most welcome will be those who are already Canadian. Moreover, where is the act which depatriated the French-Canadians in Ontario? They were here first; they had already a status, witness Lord Wedderburn, witness Sir Guy Carleton, witness Lord Dorchester. Upper Canada and Detroit formed part of the Canada won by Wolfe and the arms of England. What said Sir John A. Macdonald? We are all British subjects . . . (and supra), in a position of absolute equality having equal rights of . . . language, of religion, of property, and of person.

I am aware that it may be said that all has been settled by the decision of the Privy Council, but I saw a statement at the time of the judgment by a prominent member of the Legislature. That it only needed a change in the law to rectify the minor point on which the French-Canadians were successful. A change could equally be made to rectify the major ruling. However, my object was to bring home to Ontarians points which may have escaped their notice. People in Ontario are pretty thoroughly British, and see only the thing as it is. Surely it was a Britan who invented the first law of thought, whatever is, is!

But there is the practical difficulty, it is urged. Separate schools are already special schools. How can you in a small town have a French school and an English school. It is an important point which I hope to return to later by the courtesy of the Editor. Meanwhile I would point out that still there is hardship even if you admit this plan.

But we do not want French-Canadians, I have heard said. They are unsociable. This, of course, is not an argument. It is a prejudice. And when one considers Toronto and the huge block of it which is given up to Jews (I am saying nothing whatever against Jews, but they are the people par excellence, unsociable and unassimilable), then even the prejudice is not logical. Moreover, there seems to be two sets of French-Canadians: The habitant at home, picturesque, a gold mine to Gilbert Parker, Drummond and others, and the French-Canadian in Ontario, factious and fractious. Might not the one picture blend into the other by knowledge, a closer acquaintance, a better understanding? I have heard it objected that they speak a patois. There are doubtless variations, but I am sure our high school teachers would willingly be able to speak French as well. Can one doubt of the culture potential in the race of Laurier and Bourassa?

It is to the partisans of the bonne entente that I submit these considerations.

Lecteur

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

Letters to the Editor must be written on only one side of the paper, and must be accompanied by the names of the writers, even if the names are not for publication. Anonymous letters will be destroyed. Short letters will be given preference owing to the exigencies of space and the large number of letters received.

THE BILINGUAL QUESTION.

To the Editor of The Globe: There is at present serious disagreement between Quebec and Canada as a whole, which is very much to be regretted, but which cannot be ignored nor the causes of it left to ferment perpetually. One cause as everyone knows is the passivity of Quebec in their views of the duties of the Dominion, a feeling strongly strengthened by the teaching of M. Bourassa, that Canada is in something of the position of a Roman Province, and protection is owed by the directing state of the Empire. This is a matter of argument, and as M. Bourassa is nothing if not logical it is not difficult to present a pretty strong case to the contrary. There is, however, another cause, longstanding and far-reaching in its effect on the French-Canadian mind: the question of language in the schools. I venture to think that if this did not exist the whole of the French-Canadian outlook would be altered, and I would even venture to think that the feeling in Ontario on the matter is determined by immediate and practical considerations, a kind of conservative inertia and possibly in some quarters a resentment

at French-Canadian actions in recent years. But it must be agreed that the unity of Canada must be the paramount consideration. If there is legitimate grievance it must be removed to insure that unity. If there is even a demand reasonable and equitable on the part of French-Canadians it ought to be examined to see if it can be met, again for the same cause. In any case regulation 17 ought to be amended, for how can French-Canadian children be properly educated under it? Solely on condition that the inspectorate wink at the regulation being, in part, a dead letter.

The question decides itself into several heads: (1) The rights of French-Canadians. This has been decided by the Privy Council against them. It may be that legally that is so. It seems to me that the rights of French-Canadians, implicit or explicit, in the statutes of the constitution the existing de jure are prevented from operating de facto by the intervening rights of the Provincial Legislatures. I take it that that is the reason why Sir Wilfrid Laurier takes up the position that what is not due as a right should be conceded in courtesy. I venture to think that not only courtesy but that spirit of equity which is the basis of Liberalism and of the higher traditions of the British spirit, demand the same. There is, I am aware, the doctrine: this is a British Province. Ontario has no doubt proved it in these times of stress, but nevertheless the French-Canadians are also chez eux in Ontario. What said Dr. Ryerson in 1857, he being Chief of Department of Public Instruction in Upper Canada: "As French is the recognized language of the country as well as English . . . It is proper and lawful to allow both languages to be taught in their schools." . . . So we wish to keep the