.4

VIANNEY BELANGER
Relieur
1292 Ste-Elisabeth



BIBLIOTHEQVE
SAINT-SVLPICE MONTREAL

9.1
77

WHAT KEEPS US APART?

ABBÉ ARTHUR MAHEUX,
M.A., D.D., O.B.E.,
Member of the Royal Society of Canada,
Professor of Canadian History, Laval University.

Canadian Unity

WHAT KEEPS US APART?

F
S S 42.8
38

QUÉBEC
1944

The author has published :

MESSIRE EDOUARD BÉLANGER, 12 p., Québec, 1932.

NOTES SUR ROUBAUD, 18 p., Québec, 1939.

LE PROBLÈME PROTESTANT, 12 p., Québec, 1940.

PROPOS SUR L'ÉDUCATION, 260 p., Québec, 1941.

TON HISTOIRE EST UNE ÉPOPÉE, Vol. I, NOS DÉBUTS SOUS LE RÉGIME ANGLAIS, 224 p., Québec, 1941.

FRENCH CANADA AND BRITAIN, A New Interpretation, 122 p., Toronto, 1942. (Out of print).

POURQUOI SOMMES-NOUS DIVISÉS?, 220 p., Montréal, 1943

To be published in May 1944 :

PROBLEMS OF CANADIAN UNITY, 224 pages.

Rights reserved February, 1944 Droits réservés.

FC
98
M35
1944

Permis d'imprimer,

CYRILLE GAGNON, P.A., V.G.,
Supérieur du Séminaire de Québec,
Recteur de l'Université Laval.

Québec, 7 février 1944.

TO
MEN OF GOOD WILL

IL A ÉTÉ TIRÉ DE CET OUVRAGE
2,000 EXEMPLAIRES
DONT 1,800 SUR PAPIER EGGSHELL
ET 200 SUR PAPIER JAPON
NUMÉROTÉS ET HORS DE COMMERCE.

PREFATORY NOTE

National Unity, a leit-motiv in most of the discussions between Canadians.

This little book will give you my personal views on the problem. You may have listened to my radio-talks last year? You may be one of the six hundred who wrote me asking for the text of the talks, or one of the thousands who listened in and would like to have the series?

Here it is, offered to your criticisms. Be bold, please, and write me your views: they are welcome.

The AUTHOR.

95399

WHAT KEEPS US APART ?

•

Contents

		Date		Page
1	Introduction	Jan.	10	13
2	Racial Origins	"	17	21
3	Language	"	24	29
4	National Ideals	"	31	37
5	Where Do We Stand Now?	Febr.	7	44
6	Business	"	14	51
7	Religion	"	21	59
8	After Reading 100 Letters	"	28	69
9	Something Is Being Done	March	7	76
10	Get To The Brains	"	14	83
11	Democracy	"	21	91
12	Domination	"	28	99
13	Highlights	April	4	107
14	Survive or Conquer?	"	11	114
15	Teaching of History	"	18	121
16	Our Mother-Countries	"	25	129
17	Mr. Aylmer's Mistake	May	2	137
18	Pilgrim's Progress or Celestial Railroad	"	9	145
19	After Reading 300 Letters	"	16	153
20	About the Bible	"	23	161
21	Conclusion	"	30	169

INTRODUCTION (*)

It is now many years I have given the best of my time to the cause of National Unity, a cause dear to us all, the French-and the English-speaking Canadians. I have endeavoured to " sell " the idea of National Unity to both groups, taking the risk of a few blows from both sides. Still I have received many more flowers than bricks. The cause, I believe, is prospering. Among the French Canadians, the best elements, the vast majority is openly and decidedly in favour of a better understanding with the other racial group of Canada. Of course, from some of us you hear or you read some statements that seem rather wild or distressing. But do not forget, please, that these express only the fear that some of our rights might be overlooked. Those who fundamentally oppose national unity on either side are just a handful and though they make much noise they should not be given too much attention.

Misunderstandings proceed from ignorance of the facts and of the intentions rather than from sheer malice. All that is needed is more light thrown upon the facts and a better interpretation of the intentions, on both sides.

(*) January 10, 1943.

This I had in mind when the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation asked me to give talks on that subject through its French Network. At first, I hesitated much on account of the difficulties created by the war. Public opinion in Canada was so perturbed that any comments about it might just mean throwing oil on the fire. Still, after talking with moderate citizens of both groups I came to the conclusion that trying to enlighten public opinion was the best course to follow. And every week since the beginning of September (1942) I have examined with my French audience the question "*Why should we stay apart*"? What are the obstacles to national unity? Are the obstacles, if any, really serious and immovable? I chose to answer in the negative. The main obstacles might be, in my experience, racial origins, religion, language, national ideals, competition in business, professional activities, democracy, plan of domination, public relations, our mother-countries, the teaching of history, education, standard of living, the school question and so on.

These problems I have examined with my French audience(*). I well knew that most of those problems were delicate and apt to raise passions in the soul of the die-hards. I was fearing that a flow of anonymous letters would fall into my mail box, or that many of my listeners would raise objections to my opinions. At least, and at best it

---

(*) *Vid.* ABBÉ ARTHUR MAHEUX, *Pourquoi Sommes-Nous Divisés?*, 1943, 220 p.

would be a very good test of public opinion in French Canada.

But a big surprise awaited me for I have received only one anonymous French letter and though it is a real masterpiece of malice, it is a fact, that it remained a lone sample of such courageous opinion which means really much in this part of the country and under the actual circumstances. As for the discussion it was of the constructive sort. The mass of the letters I have received, and the conversations I have held in private homes, on the street, on the trains, by telephone, were entirely favorable.

Consequently, I feel sure that the best part of the French Canadian opinion is with me in favor of the cause of national unity. This, my dear fellow-countrymen, you will regard as a result of major importance, as a motive of strong hope for the future of our dear country, Canada.

But, there was the other group, the English-speaking Canadians. What of them ? What of you, my dear friends ? In each of my French talks, when I tried to tackle one problem, I had both groups in my mind and I endeavored to speak plainly to both groups. Still very few among you were listening to my French talks. I say « very few », because in fact there were some, for I have received letters from English-speaking Canadians, who knew the French language enough to listen in. I am sincerely grateful to them for their kind appreciations and encouragement. But these were

very few. And many of my French Canadian friends used to tell me: "Too bad, monsieur l'Abbé, that the other people, the English-speaking Canadians, cannot take their share of your good lessons". I believed they were right and I was trying to solve that problem, when, very fortunately, the officers of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation extended me the invitation of addressing the English-speaking Canadians along the same lines as for the French Canadians. I have accepted the invitation though I find myself seriously handicapped by a very imperfect knowledge of the English language. I wish I could do justice to your beautiful language, my dear fellow-countrymen, but I really cannot. Is it a reason for keeping silent? I do not think so. If we wait, on both sides, the moment we speak perfectly the other people's language, it will forever be impossible to discuss together our common problems. Is it not preferable to be a little bold and to talk together even with offence to the rules of grammar?

I personnally have managed to learn enough of your language to make many friends among you. Your friendship for me makes me more confident in my undertaking. After all, when national unity is at stake it is not literary expression that counts, but understanding, better understanding and friendly relations, it is the language of action and not of literature. This will be my excuse for improper handling of the English grammar.

I have been brought up in that part of the Eastern Townships which we call in French " Les Bois-Francs ". There among my playmates were young Scotch, Irish and English boys ; with them, I took my first lessons in English ; the words, sometimes, came to my ear while a fist would strike my eye ; but I used to give fist for fist and word for word ; this certainly was the language of action. Now, I have learned to give up the use of fist and to rely on the use of words and reason which is of a much better quality and efficacy. I may say, at least, that playing roughly with English-speaking lads gave me the sense of equality and the sense of Canadianism. We never mentioned mother France nor mother England ; all of us we had only one country and that was Canada ; no group would pretend to be superior. That childish view should be our view, the grown-ups' view. Children see no other values than just human values ; the color of blood, the smell of money have no importance in their eyes ; they rate their playmates for their ability in playing the game and this is a lesson for us, from both groups ; we have to play the national game, we have to make Canada a prosperous nation. Since Canada cannot be prosperous without national unity, our main purpose should be to foster national unity ; that is the game to be played.

Such a purpose is really in the mind of a large number of Canadians of both languages in all the Canadian provinces. I feel sure that most of those

who are now listening to me have already chosen national unity as their goal. To have the same purpose is the beginning of unity.

Where we happen to differ, it is about the means to achieve the purpose. But there also I think we are coming, slowly but surely, to an agreement. At least I imagine that it is there that we must throw the light of our research. And, first of all, we should find out what are the obstacles on the road towards unity. Let us examine one by one, the so-called obstacles. Let us look at them coldly, without passion or prejudice ; let us weigh them with a spirit of tolerance ; if we find out that they are worth nothing, let us cast them aside.

So many things must be discarded that be realized the new order which we so ardently desire to become a reality. I know very well, that the English-speaking Canadians are ready for a change. Even old mother England is rapidly changing. I had recently the good fortune of attending the conference on the Pacific relations at Mont Tremblant (1942). Great Britain had sent there a very capable delegation, I may say a brilliant delegation. It has been a great satisfaction to every member of the conference that not the slightest trace of British Pride could be found in the attitude and in the words of the British Delegation. Great Britain is willing to admit the wrongs of the past and to straighten them so as to assure any of her dependencies a full measure of freedom, of autonomy, of independence.

In fact, all the Powers represented at the Conference had the same attitude. A new order is coming to the world with our victory, and even the humblest of the nations will share the benefits of that new order. In such a situation, Canada as a whole, and each Canadian province, will take responsibility ; even each citizen will have to a revise his opinions, and to make them in fuller harmony with the new situation.

What we deem good for small nations elsewhere, for minorities everywhere, we the Canadians, we will have to give it to our minority, I mean the English-speaking minority in Quebec, the French-speaking minority in the other Provinces. This will be the first step towards national unity.

Then we will have to examine the difficulties which we have met in the past and we now face.

Our newspapers, both French and English, have published a number of articles and of letters to the Editor, about National Unity. At least I have gathered a number of clippings, in which I have tried to put some order but not with great success, because the views expressed are fragmentary and sometimes bitter and wild.

Consequently, I am inviting you to a discussion, an open and very frank discussion, a discussion without pride or prejudice. I am hoping for your comments. It is commonly admitted that the French and the English minds do not look at the things and facts from the same angle. I may easily be mistaken about the facts or in my view

of the facts. Your own opinion is of a very great importance to me.

While I think our opinions are not contradictory and even not much different or apart, it will be very practical to try and reconcile them as much as possible.

I extend the same invitation to my French-speaking friends. Many of them, I feel sure, will like to listen to the talks of the English series. I will appreciate their comments. Let us try and make a kind of forum about national unity, a forum opened to all Canadians of good will !

RACIAL ORIGINS (*)

Canada, our country, is divided by unfortunate strifes, which weaken our efforts on the road to prosperity. Is it certain that the two main groups do all that is required to ensure peaceful relations ? Some accept the quarrels as a sort of necessity : others go so far as to provoke new disputes or to pour oil on the old ones. Are we not going against the law of the Christians, against the Gospel, in which we read that any country divided against itself shall perish ?

Other nations, in the course of History, have been divided and have perished, or would have perished unless Providence had caused peace-makers to rise for preaching peace. Some of these Peace-makers are famed and their life ought to be published again, to serve as an example in our much troubled times(†). We really need an army of such men, in both groups. There is only a handful of them, and their voice is too weak to fight the false rumors, the bitter discussions and the ill-considered accusations. Without pretending to assume the function of the most famed Peace-makers, I can at least take them as an example

---

(*) January 17, 1943.

(†) See the Bollandists' *Lives of Saints*.

to be followed in preaching conciliation and concord. In spite of war, of factions, let us stop a minute and concentrate our minds on our difficulties, in order to find their causes, for knowing the cause of one's ailments is a long step towards getting rid of them, at least for people of good will.

A primary problem is the presence in our Country of peoples of different racial origins. The Indians are the first stratum. Then came the French, the only settlers for a hundred and fifty years. With the end of the Seven Years' war came the English and the Scots, those of the army of Wolfe. After came the Irish, and the Loyalists, and, much later, people from all parts of Europe. The main difficulty, however, is between the French-speaking and the English-speaking groups. I mean about the racial origins, because there are still people who think along the lines of blood, so being Hitlerites without knowing it. For instance they would not hesitate to say that there is a great difference between the French "race" and the Anglo-saxon "race", and would, of course, give superiority to the one over the other. But, is there really such a great difference ? For my part I do not believe it.

People of France and people of Great Britain are not different in blood. None of them could claim purity of origin. Various strains of blood are to be found in the veins of both : Latin, Celtic, Saxon, Norman, to mention only the main strains. Migrations, wars, revolutions have contributed in

the course of centuries to mix the bloods of the people inhabiting both sides of the channel.

These facts are well known to educated Canadians. I mention them for the benefit of the public at large. If any in my audience would like to learn more on that subject they will find in the public libraries a good many books, such as Mac Curdy's *Human Origins*, Ripley's *Races of Europe*.

Our scholars should make it their duty to use the various periodicals for giving to our people at least the substance of these books. If we did so, much trouble would be avoided.

It is certain, for instance, that the French people is a mixture of different bloods ; the Gaul, the Briton, the Roman, the Norman each gave their share. The same is true with the English people, the Celt, the Briton, the Roman, the Saxon, the Dane, the Norman each gave their share of blood. It is easy to see that the elements are about the same and in about the same proportions in each of these two nations. Both are close relatives by blood from the very beginning of their national existences. And both Canadian groups have the same close kinship. This can be ascertained in any History of France or of England.

But there is more than that. The French and the English nations have mingled in the course of centuries.

The Normans had settled in France as well as in England. When the Normans of France invaded

the British Isles they found there people having Norman blood in their veins. For two centuries the Normans of France stayed in England and married there, thus putting more of their blood in the already 'normanised' blood of the British. Inversely the British invaded France and for a century held in their possession nearly two thirds of the French territory, thus mingling their own blood with that of the Frenchmen. Hence the French and the British became still closer relatives.

But what of us, the Canadians? Well, we came out of that same common blood. French or English Canadians we are close relatives in our origins. And we can say more than that.

For instance did you ever consider the origins of the French Canadians? Most of them are of Norman blood. Any French Canadian can trace his ancestry to the tenth, the eleventh, the twelfth generation, back to those daring colonists who left France in the seventeenth century to settle in New France. It means that they can find the name, the place of origin of from 500 to 1000 forefathers. In most cases the proportion of Norman ancestors varies from 60% to 80%. So there is no exaggeration in saying that the French Canadians are mostly Normans(*).

And you, my dear fellow countrymen, you, the English Canadians, if you would care to trace your

---

(*) Vid. TANGUAY, *Dictionnaire Généalogique*, 7 vols., and many other similar works.

genealogy, you would probably find the same amount of Norman blood in your veins. Not long ago I was reading the magazine *Americana* ; as usual there was the story of an American family with a genealogical table ; amongst the ancestors I found eight or possibly ten with a French-Norman name. How many English Canadians are in the same position ! The Mayos who are now in North America came from French Normandie as I do myself ; this can be ascertained by the Rolls of Cambridge and Oxford, which I read at the Boston Public Library.

Hence the Norman blood, at least, is a real link between our two groups. Indeed our disputes about blood or racial origins are futile. Or, shall we say that we have in Canada holders of the Hitlerian so-called philosophy of Race ? If so, why are we at war ? Is it to fight in Europe against theories which we foster here in Canada ? On both sides our believers in the Racial theory or in the virtues of blood or in the merits of racial origins lead only to one result : an excess of " British Pride " on one side and an excess of " fierté française " on the other ; and this indeed is a danger to National Unity, because such extreme attitudes tend to set the two groups apart and to make them stay apart. Let us avoid that danger by teaching our schoolboys and schoolgirls that they are relatives by blood.

But there is another attitude, equally dangerous. I mean the 'melting pot' theory. The ad-

herents of that theory understand *Unity* as a complete *fusion* of all the racial elements now present in Canada. Let us give them a name and call them "fusionists". They are ready to use every means, the School, the Press, social activities with the purpose of eliminating all differentiating traits. Very rare are the French Canadians who would openly favor such a theory; still there are some of them. The English-speaking partisans are more numerous, though I met none amongst the better educated.

Fusionism is really detestable to the vast majority of French Canadians. They will never accept it. The idea of assimilating them dates back to the cession of New France to England in 1763. Still, not all the new rulers would have thought of it. James Murray and Carleton, the first two governors and many of the administrative officers, in Canada and in England, wanted the new subjects to stay French; the very idea of a melting pot was in their mind an absurdity. But a small minority, a very zealous one indeed, would have used every means possible to make of the French Canadians not only Britishers but Englishmen to all ends and purposes. The Earl of Durham was the first, I think, to give an historical background to fusionism, in his Report of 1839. Looking at Louisiana with its French population, and at the State of New York with the Dutch, Durham declared that the fate of the French Canadians was sealed just as in Louisiana and in New York the

French and the Dutch were doomed to perfect assimilation. Such a view is surprising in a man who, as a British statesman, had always been on the side of the small nations in Europe.

But Durham was mistaken. He did not see the great forces which were on the side of the French Canadians : their religion, their clergy, their schools, their colleges, their parishes, their newspapers, and above all their strong determination to survive. And they have survived in spite of all efforts to the contrary. The chances of having them assimilated were at their best after the uprising of 1837-1838 and with the Union Act of 1840. Still they resisted all attempts when they were only half a million and not much more numerous than the English-speaking population. Now they are three million and their religious, social and educational institutions are much stronger than they were a century ago. Even if Canada were flooded with immigrants the French Canadians would stand as a distinct group. Their determination is stronger than ever. It is so strong that they even have an assimilative power, which worked in their favor right from the beginning of the British rule in Canada. They have turned good Scots, Irish and English into good French Canadians ; their family name is still Saxon or Celtic, but the language is French, the ways of living are French Canadian. It is a miracle, if you like, but they did it, they are still doing it, and, no doubt, they will do it again in the future.

Consequently the « fusionists » had better abandon their dream. Canada must achieve National Unity, but not at the expense of casting aside the French group. Both the French and the English-speaking groups are the component elements of one single nation. They are close enough relatives to live together in concord, but they are different enough to preserve their own identity.

One could easily imagine National Unity as the kind of union realized in marriage, where the husband stays a man and the wife stays a woman. Each of them brings to the community his or her share of work. Each contributes to the welfare of the home, and each in his or her own way. This is my view of the Confederation, a marriage which took place at Westminster in 1867, with the Queen of England as a notary. Some, here and there, will question this or another clause of the contract, but the union stays and stands between two human beings different in nature but united in purpose.

The sooner this view is accepted by all Canadians, the better it will be for the welfare of our Country. So, let us cast aside the sterile disputes about racial origins and blood. Or, if those must be an issue let us build up a nation, dual in culture and language, as a nation strong physically, mentally, morally.

Destiny itself wanted it to be so.

LANGUAGE (*)

Two languages mainly are in use in Canada, the French and the English, and we all know this is a cause of disputes between the two groups.

The problem is not new. It dates back to the very day that followed the Capitulation of Québec in 1759 ; and became more evident after the Capitulation of Montréal in 1760, still more with the Treaty of Paris in 1763 and the birth of the civil government. It grew more complicated with the Constitution of 1791 and the Legislative Assembly. It became acute when the Union Act of 1840 suppressed the French language as an official language ; it settled down with the righting of that wrong in the following years. It should have been definitely settled with the Confederation in 1867, at least in principle, but it appeared again with accrued bitterness each time the spirit of the Confederation pact was forgotten or ignored.

The problem has its deep roots in the opposition of our Norman tenacity on the one hand and an excess of British Pride on the other hand. Neither the French nor the English Canadian will abandon his own language. Each group holds, and with

---

(*) January 24, 1943.

good reasons, that these two languages are the expression of the two most brilliant modern civilisations.

Consequently both these languages must stay in Canada and they must live together, side by side, according to a *modus vivendi*. Such a solution must be in accordance with our historical background, and any unbiased mind will admit that the question of bilingualism was settled in 1759 with the occupation of Québec by James Murray and the English Army, and in 1760 with the Capitulation of Montréal.

At that time the generals of the English troops had full authority for prohibiting the use of the French language. The British had previously imposed their tongue upon the Irish in Ireland and upon the Dutch in the Colony of New York. In their new conquest, Canada, the British had the military and the civil power and there was nothing, in the international law of that time, to prevent them from enforcing both these powers. They were free to write in the margins of both Capitulations a clause, forbidding the use of the French language, but they did nothing of the sort. Amongst the thousand soldiers and officers in the English army many could be found who knew enough of the French language to deal conveniently with the new subjects, until the day when the latter could learn the tongue of their new masters. The three military governors, at Québec, at Montréal and at Trois-Rivières could

easily have taken advantage of the situation to ban the use of the French tongue, at least in the official contacts with the new subjects. Still they did not avail themselves of that opportunity. Nothing, in the correspondence of James Murray at least, can lead us to believe that the British authorities in Canada or in England wanted to impose the English language upon the French Canadians. The one thing they wanted, was that the new subjects should stay in the Colony and become loyal subjects of the British Crown.

Hence the governors appointed Swiss or French Huguenots as secretaries. Murray went farther, for he hired a number of French Canadians as administrative officers, clerks and so forth (*) Such a policy might, of course, have been regarded as provisional and good for the years between the Capitulation and the final Treaty of Peace in 1763. But that Treaty did not even mention the question of language : one notices the same silence in the Royal Proclamation (October 1763), in the Governor's Commission given to James Murray (November 1763), in the official Instructions despatched to him (December 1763).

With all these official documents in his hands James Murray could frame his policy towards the new subjects ; it might be a new policy — one of tyranny — or it might be the continuation of the

---

(*) Vid. ABBÉ ARTHUR MAHEUX. *French Canada and Britain. A new Interpretation*, or the same in French, *Ton Histoire est une Epopée*, vol. I.

policy he had followed during the 4 years from September 1759 to september 1763, the policy of conciliation. Murray had witnessed the courage of the French Canadians on the battlefields ; the census he took in 1761 and 1762 made him acquainted with their numerical strength, about 60,000, their solid social and religious organisation ; they had, indeed, achieved a homogeneity rarely found in many other nations, as is so well explained in Riddell's book, the *Rise of Ecclesiastical Control in Quebec*. Being intelligent, James Murray saw, from the very beginning, that nothing could ever crush the French Canadians. If these had been linguistically divided into many groups the British authorities might have played one group against the other and, by this means, imposed finally the English language. But homogeneity had also been reached in language and the ban on the French tongue would have affected each of the 60,000 French Canadians, and the British authorities considered such a ban utterly impossible.

And there was another force, in favor of the French language in Canada, I mean the high esteem in which was held the French tongue in the 18th century : all the European élite would speak French, even in England or Scotland, even in Germany. Was it really possible and desirable to try to eradicate from the throat of 60 000 Canadians a language that was at that time the official international language ? It would have

been a very strange dream. And James Murray was not a dreamer ; he was a realistic man facing an obvious reality, I mean the fact that 60,000 good new subjects spoke one language and, at that, the language considered by the whole of civilised Europe to be the most cultured and the most brilliant. So he used that language in his private or official contacts with the new subjects ; he did it under his civil government as he had done under the military rule.

When James Murray left Québec in 1766 the question of bilingualism was settled forever in Canada. The French Canadians had been for seven full years in the habit of using their tongue in their official and in their private communications with the local British authorities. It had become a custom, a custom which in the light of British usage was the equivalent of a law. Any attempt made against that custom, that unwritten law, or that privilege if you prefer, has been frustrated, and it will ever be so, because unilingualism is not a feature of the British Empire or of the British Commonwealth, and because of the quite firm determination of the French Canadians to use their own language.

The partisans of the slogan " One language " secretly hope that the present condition of France will weaken the French Canadian resistance, but they lack either information or psychology. Firstly, France will recover her former rank amongst the great nations. Secondly, even if

France should stay politically weak, French civilisation at least will stay as a powerful light for humanity, as a strong help for the French Canadians, through its Literature, its Science and its Arts. Thirdly, let us imagine things at their worst. Let us suppose that France should not be of any help to the French Canadians. Would such a condition prevent them from remaining French in their minds and in their language? Surely not. The French Canadians' determination would stand as firm as ever.

Let us now examine the question from the other side. Are there any French Canadians who would like to see the English Canadians abandon their language? Not a single one, I think. Of course there is a small group of a sort of abstentionists, who regard the study of the English language as not useful or as dangerous. Some of them (they are indeed very few) go even so far as to dream of a separate French State in Canada, where, of course, the study of the English language would be reduced to a strict minimum. Let us suppose that their dream should come true. Do these people forget that even in such a French State the study of the English language would be necessary to a large extent, since the subjects of that State would be obliged to keep close relations with their English-speaking neighbors, in trade, in industry, in social and intellectual matters, which would force the majority of the nation to learn the English language. So the conditions which prevail

now would not be very different from those of the dreamed of future.

Well, then, discarding impossible dreams, what should we do? Only one thing, it is that both groups learn both languages. All the elementary schools should give their pupils a proper initiation in the second language. In the High Schools the students should, in four years, acquire a working knowledge of the second language, so as to be able to speak with their fellow citizens.

However, the school could do nothing practical without the help of the family. It is the duty of all Canadian families to teach respect for the two official languages of the country and to provide for their children conditions favorable to the learning of both languages, in the schools themselves and through such Societies as the Visites Interprovinciales.

The English Canadians take pleasure in praising the French Canadians for their facility in learning the English language ; but such facility is only apparent and not hereditary ; it is rather the result of will and determination. We would like to find the same determination in a greater number of our fellow-countrymen. They often say : 'I wish I could speak French'. But such a desire is not enough ; we invite them to act and to take the necessary steps so that at least their children will learn to speak French while our children will learn to speak English.

We do not expect them to reach a peak of perfection. Let them discard the myth of Parisian French. We would like very much to discuss with them in either language our common problems, in the home, in the hotel, on trains, ships and airplanes. We should read each other's newspapers. We should be able to exchange correspondence in both languages.

Great is the number of the French Canadians who learn to speak English. On the other side the number is increasing of the English Canadians who are learning the French language, mostly the scholars, the educated, the University professors, and even some of the businessmen. With them an understanding is already possible ; it actually exists, it is progressing everywhere.

A bilingual weekly paper could do good along these lines. And the Radio also. The National and the private stations should use both languages throughout Canada in order to give to our people the best of English and of French Civilisation. There may be at first a certain amount of grumbling here and there, but, after all, grumblers are a sort of necessity. Let us exert every means in order to train a large bilingual élite, which will serve as leaders for the country.

NATIONAL IDEALS (*)

The Canadians must study their national problems with the determination of finding clear decisions, if possible, or a fair compromise at least. Could we do so when it comes to national ideals? I think it is possible, if we only care to read again and to examine three famous documents : the Magna Charta, the Declaration of Independence of the United States, and the Atlantic Charter.

While the Magna Charta is very old it has even now an exceptional value in the eyes of the Anglo-Saxon people wherever they may live. They believe in the spirit of the Charta. They think that the liberal laws and constitutions of the Anglo-saxon nations have been and are still permeated with the liberal spirit of the Magna Charta, and that the modern nations should put the same liberal spirit in the laws they are making nowadays.

By virtue of the Charta John Lackland was forced to assure individual liberty, good administration of justice and protection against abuse of power. Those should also apply in our difficulties. I consider, for instance, that individual liberty

---

(*) January 31, 1943.

contains in itself, as the fruit is in the flower, the liberty of using, the liberty of studying any of the two official languages in any Canadian school, the liberty, for each of the two Canadian groups, of studying its own culture and civilisation in any of the Canadian provinces.

Protection against abuse of power applied, in ancient times, to the absolute kings, but it applies, quite logically also, to the absolutism of the majority in democratic nations. It is well known that a majority can easily use its numerical strength to abuse a minority under the cover of legality. But, that would be a disgrace as well as a lack of logic. If the text of the Magna Charta was posted on the walls of each of the Canadian schools, if it were interpreted to the pupils and students there would be a great opportunity for our youth to imbibe with a true liberal mind (*).

There are also very good lessons to draw from the Declaration of Independence of the United States. Those who have subscribed it were the sons and grandsons of the British Settlers. Still they speak of the people of Great Britain as being their « brothers ». In our own Canadian History the English-speaking Canadians have, occasionally at least, taken their inspiration from the American Declaration when they wanted to speak their grievances. As a matter of fact one can find in

---

(*) A firm of Toronto, the S. K. F., has published posters reproducing the text of each of the three documents, Magna Charta, Declaration of Independence, Atlantic Charter.

that document principles of policy very practical for our own situation. The grievances of the Colonies were adressed to the King of England and to the subjects of that King ; but it is easy to see that the object of the Declaration was tyranny itself, abuse of power and a power which used to shut its ears to the claims of the colonists. The Declaration considers as the essential rights of the citizen, Life, Freedom, pursuit of Happiness ; it says that the main duty of a government is to assure to all citizens such essential rights. It says that the nation can choose, as a government, the one that *seems* the more apt to assure security and happiness. It says that the government must maintain internal peace against the abuse of power or against bad administration.

But, then, what are the abuses protested against by the Colonies ? There is a long list of them, but let us take only the more important. They complain that the exercise of the authority at the time was a long sequence of outrages, injustices and usurpations ; they deplore that sanction was denied to laws passed for the welfare of the people; they blame favoritism which created a multitude of functions and the spending of the people's money to pay unnecessary civil servants ; they condemn the imposition of taxes without the people's consent ; they also condemn the abolition of laws regarded by the people as being important.

If we care to re-read the History of Canada under the light of such complaints, let us ask our-

selves whether or not the majority have not endorsed similar abuses, and even whether or not such abuses are still to be deplored in our own country.

If so, time has come when we should think of John Lackland, when we should recreate the atmosphere of Runnymede and the spirit of the Magna Charta. Just like John Lackland the barons of our majorities should examine the grievances and accept to redress them. Each of the provincial Legislative Assemblies should become a new Runnymede where justice should be made, where no law should come into contradiction with the Magna Charta.

As for the Declaration of Independence, it was signed by the Thirteen Colonies in the name of the whole North American continent, and we, the Canadians, we should find in that Declaration principles of better understanding and of National Unity. No one of the two groups should try to dominate the other and to impose its own views about race, religion, language and culture. Each of the two groups has a right to its own views in the pursuit of happiness. Each of the two groups has the duty of preventing and of quelling internal dissensions. These rights and these duties are the real and the only *terrain d'entente* between the two groups.

One striking feature of the same Declaration is one special remark addressed to the people of Great Britain ; it reads : « We have appealed to

their native justice and magnanimity and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow their usurpations . . . They have been deaf to the voice of justice ». Is there not a light to throw on our Canadian problems ? When a minority appeals to its brethren of the majority, these should listen to the voice, not of numbers, but of justice, of magnanimity. If that golden rule had been followed in our national policies, National Unity would now be a reality in Canada.

But we can find also strong motives for Unity in a more recent document, the Atlantic Charter, signed by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt, and accepted by the whole Anglo-saxon world and even by thirty other democratic nations. The French Canadians, of course, are much interested in that Charter. They do not think of any territorial extension, since they know they are at home in any part of Canada. They want to have with their English-speaking fellow-countrymen access to the raw materials and to the trade in their country and in the world. They want to enjoy security for their own individuality as a people. They want to feel free in the country they have inhabited for more than three centuries. They also oppose the use of force and violence. They are ready to take their full share of co-operation for the welfare of the working classes. The only thing the French Canadians regret about the Atlantic Charter, it is the absence of the properly spiritual values, of Religion, of God. But

they are determined, like the other Canadians, to take all that is good in the Atlantic Charter. They even will go farther in completing the charter by a sane social philosophy, by a careful sociology, by a fervent practice of their religion, by the fulfilment of the duties that God prescribed to Humanity.

Such dispositions being Christian are the most favorable atmosphere for a real understanding between the two Canadian groups.

We have, on both sides, our Pharisees, quite unable to strike humbly their chest and to admit their wrong. Such Pharisees are always busy in checking the other party's mistakes and shortcomings, and in keeping the list up to date ; they do it with a spirit of revenge, and all that under the cover of a so-called Christian religion. No one of them will pardon his enemy, which makes them more pagan than all other pagans.

But, fortunately, there are other Canadians, the honest and the moderate Canadians ; they are disgusted with mean quarrels, with misunderstandings. They want each group's national identity to be maintained, but they know this can be done without throwing outrage and slanders in the face of the other people. They want neither hatred nor prejudice. They want equality and partnership.

These Canadians of moderate opinion must face their duty ; they must take their share of leadership in this Country. They have to teach the

mass of the people lessons of tolerance and of self-control.

There are lots of problems to be settled between the two groups ; there will always be some difficulties varying with circumstances. Since this is inevitable it is better for all Canadians to learn right now the best methods of discussion, those that become gentlemen, and to teach them even to the common people by all means possible.

We can find in the Magna Charta, in the Declaration of Independence, in the Atlantic Charter, and other similar documents all that is necessary to agree between gentlemen and to build Canada as a Country of a dual culture, a dual language, a country able with its dual civilisation to resist foreign infiltrations. British and French Cultures in Canada must help each other, not fight each other.

Canadians of either language, let us get together, let us bury the quarrels of the past, let us have mutual respect, let us work together, with united hearts, to realize national ideal enriched with the best of two great civilisations, enriched also with the special contributions each group can individually give to those two great western civilisations, the French as well as the English.

WHERE DO WE STAND NOW ? (*)

Where do we stand now ? Can we report progress ? or are we at a stand-still ? I have very good reasons to say that the cause of National Unity is making progress, and I feel you will like to know my reasons for being optimistic.

First, what about French Canadian opinion ? Some of you have raised the question in your letters and it is only fair that I should give you an answer. Well, I think the French Canadians have reacted most favorably to the call for National Unity. Permit me to explain again that I have given twenty-two radio talks on that subject over the CBC French network from September to January. It is necessary to repeat it, for a few at least of my English-speaking correspondents think that these talks should be given to the French Canadians. Curiously enough some of the French-speaking listeners told me the same thing : 'Preach your sermons to the English speaking Canadians'. I must make the same answer to both groups, and say that in each talk I addressed both groups equally. The first thing to do is not to strike the other fellow's chest, but one's own. This requires a certain amount of humility on both sides. Let us give up the excess of French

---

(*) February 7th, 1943.

Pride and of British Pride ; let us be just good Canadians.

The letters I have received from the French Canadian listeners are inspired with that very same spirit, the true spirit of being just good Canadians. They are understanding and constructive. My people, with only a few exceptions, are endeavouring to find the real causes of disunity and they are ready to apply the remedies. They are even ready to organize Committees for promoting National Unity. In three letters received last week I find proposals to that end. So I surely did not talk to idle listeners ; from farmers and workers to Members of the House of Commons and of the Senate, there are numbers of French Canadians ready to meet the English-speaking Canadians half-way, to shake hands with them.

This information I give to my listeners to-day and I know they will receive it with pleasure and with enthusiasm. For I have found the same good intentions in the very numerous letters I have received from my English-speaking listeners. Their letters also are clearly sympathetic ; they are constructive ; they also are trying to find the causes of disunity and the remedies to it. In these letters there is no trace of pessimism or defeatism. They are not overoptimistic, they are not overconfident, but they express a deep faith in the future of Canada as a country of a dual culture. My English-speaking correspondents range from Halifax to Victoria. Some of them say they have

been working for years in order to promote a better understanding between the two groups in their locality. Others are newly converted to the idea of National Unity established on the principle of a dual culture and dual language in Canada.

Race and Blood they do not consider as a serious obstacle. They accept my view that there are no sufficient racial differences to prevent understanding and co-operation. They say that the question of language is not and should never have been an obstacle to National Unity. They agree with me that both languages should be taught in all Canadian schools, from Charlottetown to Vancouver, from Kindergarten to University.

My English-speaking correspondents admit, quite openly, that both groups can and should find in the spirit of the Magna Charta, and in the spirit of the Atlantic Charter common grounds for Entente and for Unity. All these good letters, the French and the English, I keep in file as an evidence of a great social and national evolution in the Canadian mind. The movement of National Unity is gaining momentum at a quick tempo. The Canadian nation is gaining maturity, with the consciousness of having inherited the best of two great civilisations, the French as well as the English. The scope of the movement is even being enlarged every day. Various Committees are working to promote better understanding between Canada and the United States. Such are, for instance, the Canadian Institute of Interna-

tional Affairs, the Institute of Pacific Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. An impressive quantity of books and pamphlets have been printed on the subject ; numerous meetings have been and are still being held for the purpose of fostering a clear understanding of our common problems.

At the same time other Committees are trying to interpret Great Britain and the United States the one to the other. Here are two great nations who could lead the world along the peaceful road of Democracy if only they were well united. But they are not entirely united, because they do not know each other well enough. The British farmer and the American farmer, the American worker and the British worker are still suspicious the one of the other.

Did you read the *New York Times Magazine* of February 7th. ? If not, please do so. You will find right on the first page a « Letter from an ordinary Englishman » to an ordinary American. It is an admirable letter and a « unique contribution to Anglo-American understanding » as the Editor puts it in a prefatory note. In that letter the man from England explains his views very tactfully. He says he is not gloomy or downcast. He admits, very humbly, England's shortcomings; " our British faults, he writes, are snobbery, insularity, laziness, overoptimism, scorn of intelligence ".

Such a confession is the very first step towards eliminating international suspicion. It makes us all more ready to acknowledge the real virtues of the English people, which the writer says are fair play, kindliness, quiet and collective tolerance, trust in one another, calm and humorous skepticism, horror of squabbles, of confused thinking and of petty vanities.

I feel much inclined to think that the real English-speaking Canadian possesses the same virtues ; I easily infer it from the letters I have received from my listeners. There is nothing of the quarrelling spirit in those letters.

Yet I know there are quarrelsome minds in Canada and in both groups. Do these people speak in the name of the mass of the Canadian groups? I do not think so. We may apply to our fanatics what my Englishman writes to his American friend in the *New York Times* : " You must not judge us wholly by those who speak to you in our name . . . We, the common people of England, . . . are seldom truly represented in your country. There are too many self-appointed mouthpieces . . . They are not always typical to us . . . Too often they have an axe to grind or a bone to pick or an excessive sense of their own importance ". Well, my dear friends, is it not true even here in Canada? The French Canadian common people are seldom truly represented to you, as one may see by the most regrettable article of the American magazine *LIFE* (Nov.)

and even by Canadian papers. The English-speaking common people of Canada are seldom truly represented to our French people. In each of our two groups there are too many self-appointed mouthpieces who say or print loose talk about the other group.

I know personally many English-speaking Canadians who have discarded their prejudices against the French Canadians after a stay of a few weeks or even a few days in the province of Québec. I know also many French Canadians who have got rid of false opinions after a visit in Ontario or in other provinces.

No, the good common people, in both Canadian groups, have no axe to grind, they have no bone to pick, they do not have an excessive sense of their own importance. They believe they are good Canadians. I am confident they are willing to become more and more Canadian, and better Canadians.

Between Great Britain and the United States, between Great Britain and the members of the Commonwealth, between the United States and Canada, between the two main groups of Canadians, there is a strong urge for a better understanding ; there is a determination to remove the obstacles to peaceful agreements. All the various elements are ready to make sacrifices to promote a new World Order ; they are ready " to give till it hurts ", so as to ensure a more comfortable life in the future.

The Great Powers are even willing to abandon a part of their Sovereignty in order to establish collective security. Great Britain is ready to give more and more autonomy and independence to her Dominions and to her Colonies and Dependencies.

Will Canada do less than the Great Powers, than Great Britain ? Surely not. Canada is willing to take her full responsibilities, outside the country of course, but also inside the country. Canada's first responsibility is to create National Unity by the removal of the obstacles that have grown or that have been deliberately imposed on the way. Anything against Christian Charity, anything against Justice, anything against the British sense of fair play, anything against English kindliness must be removed ; any prejudices drawn from a wrong interpretation of the past must be wiped out. Peaceful relations must prevail between the French- and the English-speaking Canadians.

So let us continue here in common our study of the difficulties which prevent understanding. I have done my share with my French-speaking fellow-countrymen and they have shown their good will. I am now doing my share with you, my dear English-speaking fellow-countrymen, and your very kind letters give me the assurance that you are also equally willing to promote National Unity. Most Canadians are on the right path. Let us find other ones and try to build a strongly united Nation !

BUSINESS (*)

Business means competition, and a competition pushed so far that good relations may be seriously affected. Even, if we can, between Canadians of either language, come to an understanding about such important matters as Race, Religion, Language, National Ideals, still a failure is quite possible in the field of business relations.

And why ? Because, I fear, we entertain on both sides illusions, and I mean illusions that are very far from realities.

It is commonly accepted by the French Canadians that the British have been endowed with a high sense of business. I am ready to admit it, but not without some reserve ; the English, as we are all aware, have their full share of failures and bankrupcies. Amongst them also are to be seen families that had established very prosperous trades which have been ruined by sons less prudent then their fathers ; well established trades have passed from English to French hands, as well as the reverse. The Jews, sometimes, have better success in business than the English have, when they are not outwitted by the Scots !

Our English-speaking friends, I suppose, take their best smile and even have a good laugh, when

---

(*) February 14, 1943.

they see the French Canadians gasping with awe about their supposed superiority in business.

There are even some French Canadians who think that their people are born idealists and deprived of the talents required for business, for trade, for industry. It is often said, for instance, that the French Canadian is a born farmer, a pioneer good for colonisation, and not a business-man, not an industrialist. Is that true ? I believe it is not true, and the evidence is to be found in the quality of the settlers who came from France in the seventeenth and in the eighteenth century.

A part of them were seamen ; they came from the western coast of France, they were rude mariners, and they were here in sufficient numbers to introduce into our French language a fair number of words belonging to the maritime technical language.

Another part of the settlers were soldiers and officers of the army, who had no special vocation or training for agriculture.

But the rest, what were they ? It is commonly believed that they were farmers in France, but it is not so. It was even rarely so, and it is a curiosity of the colonisation of New France that France would send here colonists who were not farmers, but craftsmen. Read, for instance, the Charter of the Company of the Hundred Associates, which was drafted by Cardinal de Richelieu, then Minister of the King. He made an obligation to the company of sending here « des hommes de

tous métiers », men of all sorts of craft. The dictionaries of the time apply the word « métier » or craft, only to the use of machinery, and it is well known that agriculture, at that time, used no mechanical devices. More, when Richelieu explains his intentions, later in the charter, he says that these craftsmen, after they will have exercised their craft in New France for six years, may come back to France and be admitted to the various corporations of craftsmen. If more evidence is needed we will find it in one significant fact. When, before 1640, it was decided, by the Jesuits, to have a procession in the streets of Québec, the laymen asked themselves in what order they would take place in the procession, and they agreed that they would follow the order of precedence used in France by the various corporations of craftsmen.

As a matter of fact, the occupations mentioned in the documents for the new settlers are those of craftsmen : carpenter, brickmaker, smith, weaver, mason, and so on.

So the French Canadian was born a craftsman and not a farmer. Richelieu wanted the colonists to make prosperous the *trade* of France ; they had to take from the land something to eat, but their industry was to be the source of prosperity.

The Canadians have remained craftsmen even when they seemed to give most of their time to agriculture ; they were able to build their home, their barns, to make their furniture, their wagons

and carriages ; the women were able to weave and to make the clothing for the whole family, the carpets and the blankets, the towels and everything for their home.

Indeed, the first aim of France, in opening the colony of New France was to spread the Gospel and christianity amongst the Indians, but the second aim was commerce, trade and industry, not farming as such.

The craftsmen who came from France before the year of 1685 constitute the group that has assimilated and disciplined the rest of the immigrants who settled after that year, and imparted to the newcomers their spirit of craftsmanship as well as the little they had learned about agriculture.

This may explain the poor condition of farming, as is noted particularly by James Murray in his report of 1762 and by Durham in his Report of 1839. No, really, the vocation of the French Canadian was not, at the beginning, that of a farmer, but there are ample reasons to believe that it was a vocation to commerce, to craftsmanship and to industry. And in fact industry, I mean the small industry, the family industry, have always prospered amongst the French Canadians. If they have, at first, done little in the matter of industry, it is not on account of a lack of talents or skill, but because they had iess money than their competitors. With the change of rule after the Seven Years' War they were left with no

money. Intendant Bigot and the system of *papier-monnaie* having deprived them of whatever they might have previously gathered. Competition was made harder for them till about 1820, because the Church would not allow them to draw a rate of interest on their money.

In spite of such handicaps the French Canadians managed to take their share of the trade, as may be ascertained by the newspapers of the time. Durham himself praises their entreprises in banking and navigation, where they would have been more successful, he says, if firstly they had put less sentiment in their views and, secondly, if the education they received had been more practical.

Of course, it has become quite necessary for the French Canadians to develop agriculture ; but it was not their first vocation ; it was imposed upon them by circumstances. I know French Canadian writers who have invented a sort of mysticism about agriculture, about colonisation. They say our people is a pioneer people. I admit they made a success of felling trees, but when all trees will have been felled in the districts where the land is good for farming, I imagine that the French Canadians will not be obliged to find some other country, like Siberia, for the sole pleasure of felling trees.

Indeed, Destiny has, from the very beginning, marked the French Canadians for industry and trade as well as and even more than, for agriculture.

Consequently I would invite my English-speaking friends to give up the idea that the French Canadians are just good for agriculture, for colonisation, for hewing wood, for carrying water. They should, on the contrary, appreciate the French Canadians as a very good material for trade and industry, where both groups should be equals and partners, fit for competition.

As for the French Canadians they should give up mysticism and take to the sound realistic views of Cardinal de Richelieu, of Colbert, of Talon. Richelieu had found amongst the nobles and the clergy a prejudice against trade, as being a disgrace for their social rank. In order to kill that prejudice he wrote in the Charter of the Hundred Associates that any person of any social class, either clergymen, or nobles, or officers could be a member of the commercial undertaking without losing any privilege of their class.

There are still some French Canadians who look with contempt upon business, upon industry, upon commerce. They may easily lead their people on the wrong way. Let them rather try and be as realistic as Cardinal Richelieu was.

And you, my dear English-speaking friends, do not look at the French Canadians as being just Chinese coolies or parias or wood choppers, shantymen, water carriers. They can do much better than that. They are fit for industry, for small and large industry, for all sorts of trade. They can be your partners in all fields of activity

and make their contribution for the prosperity of Canada.

There, certainly, is a very good *terrain d'entente* where most of the Canadian citizens can meet. The French Canadians have now their Higher Commercial Schools ; they have their Technical schools ; they are preparing choice subjects for commerce and industry, a youth that can compete with their equals amongst the English-speaking young men and women.

Is it not true that the French Canadian boys and girls do very well in our war industries ? The women have temporarily left the making of carpets and bed-covers ; they use their skill in making fire-arms, ammunitions, fine tools, as well as the English-speaking Canadian women.

The French Canadian youths are not going against the tradition of their Church when they enter the field of industry. The first man to open a school for the various crafts in New France was the first bishop of Québec, Mgr de Montmorency-Laval ; he had two such schools, one at Québec and one at St-Joachim(*).

Hence, the great men who were the leaders of the settlers in New France had a very realistic mind and they would have made of the Colony a great industrial center if the Mother-Country, France, had allowed them to proceed. Let us hope that their genius, their realistic genius will con-

---

(*) Vid. A.-E. GOSSELIN, *L'Instruction au Canada sous le Régime français.*

tinue to guide our destinies. Let me hope, also, that the English-speaking Canadians will conceive a better opinion of their compatriots in the field of commerce and industry !

WHAT ABOUT RELIGION (*)

Should I attempt to speak about the difficulties arising from the differences of religion in our country ?

I know it is a very delicate problem, but as one of my English-speaking Protestant listeners explains in his letter to me : the difference of religion is the main source of division between Canadians. If it is so how could we avoid trying to dry that source ?

If we put aside any problem just because it is difficult I feel we are evading our responsibility.

Of course we have to tackle that problem as citizens, not as theologians, not in theory, but in practice ; we have to look for a compromise applicable in daily life ; we must study the ways of mutual tolerance.

* * *

All church-goers face a first difficulty, I mean Atheism, Agnosticism, religious indifferentism, totalitarian persecutions, neo-paganism, all of which are enemies of all sorts of Religion.

(*) February 21, 1943.

That evil is spread all over the earth, and it is the interest and the duty of all church-goers to to organize resistance against and even positive action on, such enemies. By "church-goers" I understand the Catholics, the Protestants and the Jews as well.

If these three groups are divided their action is weakened and the evil shall spread more and more in the world.

Hence, from the sole view-point of Religion itself a kind of entente, a sort of common action is highly desirable. Shall we, the Canadians, shrink from our responsibilities? We should not; on the contrary, we should try and forget our past divisions. These may have been bearable in ancient times, but in the light of present circumstances, they are no more tolerable. I think we can all agree on those grounds.

If we do not agree it is mostly on account of the training each of us has received in the familly, in the school, in the church.

I am afraid that the source of intolerance is to be found in such a training. If so, could we not examine the weak points of our training in Religion? Could we not find a remedy, I mean a remedy at least for daily life?

Let us put aside the strictly theological viewpoint. We may hope that the theologians will study the problem of unity and will find an acceptable solution. The man-in-the-street could hardly

aim so high ; he must content himself with the exigencies of practical life, of daily contacts.

And what are these exigencies ? Most of them belong to History. Children of our forefathers, we readily espouse their religious quarrels, which we transpose into the present time.

Some of these quarrels date back to the 15th, the 16th, the 17th, the 18th centuries ; they may be the object of studies and research by historians and theologians ; but should they impassion the man-in-the-street ?

As Canadians we ought to take into account just the difficulties which have kept us apart in the course of our own history. And even so we should examine them in the light or our present needs.

The most urgent of our needs is understanding and national unity. Consequently our first duty is to appraise our religious difficulties along these lines, to discuss them with a sincere desire of reaching concord and peace.

Such an attitude seems to me quite possible, at least between educated people, between the leaders of the nation in various fields of activity, of public and private life.

If we talk religion with a determination to start arguments, to raise quarrels, to wage war, we are going the way quite opposite to peace.

The best of course would be not to discuss that subject. Our main duty is to practice our religions to the best of our capacity, to prove the merits of one's religion by giving an example of righteous-

ness, of honesty, of virtue, of charity, of justice. Unfortunately it is so much easier to talk than to do things.

But what is it that is talked about between Catholics and Protestants? And what is it worth while? I give here the results of my own experience for many years, and I give only a few instances.

A first difficulty, often proferred, concerns the Huguenots in New France. One reads or hears pretty often the complaint that the Huguenots were not admitted to New France during the French Regime. The fact cannot be denied, and everybody knows that Cardinal Richelieu put into the Charter of the Hundred Associates a specific clause against the admission of Protestants in the Colony.

Such an exclusion has been regarded by Protestants, and even by some Catholics, as an evil measure. In so judging, of course, one forgets that the facts must be examined with their proper background. Religious tolerance as we understand it now is a modern conception ; it was not to be found in the seventeenth century. In those times intolerance was the common practice. Europe was torn by religious disputes and wars. The French government was unkind to the Protestants, but the English government was equally unkind to the Catholics, and the Anglican Church, in England, was equally intolerant *vis à vis* the non-conformist Protestants. In America the Eng-

lish colonies(*) were more cruel to the Catholics than the authorities of New France were to the Huguenots. And, even in New England intolerance was the rule between the various Protestant churches. So, let us deplore the fact of intolerance on both sides in those remote times, without making it an occasion for quarrels between us who live in the twentieth century.

Another grievance of the Protestants concerns the beginning of the British Regime in Canada. It has been said and written that England should have forced the Protestant religion on the new subjects, the French Canadians, from the very beginning. In the Treaty of Paris, the French Canadians were given the free exercise of their religion, but " in as much as permit the laws of England ". There have always been a few zealous Protestants who regarded these words as prohibiting the exercise of the Catholic religion, but the majority of the British leaders, at the time, had acquired enough of political wisdom not to interfere with the religion of the new subjects, except by way of persuasion. They knew that persecution had been of no avail in Ireland, and even in England. They knew, also, what had happened with the Acadians. Fifty years before, in 1713, another Treaty, that of Utrecht, had settled the religious question in exactly the same terms as were used for the Canadians in the Treaty of

---

(*) Vid. GUSTAVUS MYERS, *History of Bigotry in the United States*, Random House, New York, 1943.

Paris. All attempts to apply the restrictive clause had failed in face of the strong determination of the Acadians to retain their religious faith and practice.

The British leaders had come to the evident conclusion that any form of persecution would be of no avail, and that tolerance was the only issue.

If a few thousand Acadians had victoriously opposed the restrictive clause, what would do the 60,000 French Canadians, who had a far better social organisation, and who threatened to leave the country if they were not given the free exercise of their religion ? England preferred to listen to the lessons of wisdom ; she wanted the French Canadians to stay in the colony ; she wanted them to come, little by little, to esteem the British institutions and to take their full share in the prosperity ot the Colony. The British authorities, as a whole, did not depart from that attitude of conciliation, which was embodied in the Quebec Act in 1774, and thus they won the loyalty of the French Canadians. Was it not the right course to follow ? And why should we, the Canadians of to-day, quarrel about a decision that was decidedly profitable to the British Empire ?

The Catholics, on their side, have their grievances. What are they ?

They complain, first, that from the beginning of the English Regime there was a policy aiming at turning the French Canadians to Protestantism ; they feel offended and shocked and who

could blame them? But on the other hand one should not overlook the conditions prevailing in these times. England of the 18th century was sincerely Protestant ; anything Catholic was an offense in her eyes. It is no surprise to me that England would think of eliminating Catholicism from its new possessions in America. Catholic France, at that time, would probably have followed a similar policy. Is it not the great Cardinal de Richelieu who coined the latin motto, *Cujus Regio Illius et Religio*, which means One must take the Religion of the Country. If that principle had been applied, a Protestant country coming under the French rule would have been obliged to turn Catholic. That rule did not apply to the French Canadians ; England discarded persecution and violence to rely on persuasion. Of course such a policy could not please some of the zealous Protestants, those especially who had settled in Canada. They, either as private citizens or as members of the administration, endeavoured to foster the expansion of Protestantism amongst the French Canadians. While no one can deny their sincerity, I prefer the wisdom of the British authorities avoiding the persecutions which had disgraced Ireland, Scotland and England. I prefer the attitude of the second Anglican bishop of Québec, who opposed the untimely ardor of a part of his flock. His tolerance stays as a symbol.

Another historical fact makes the subject of discussions. It is now definitely a thing of the

past. It is the establishment in 1839 of the French Canadian Missionary Society. Its aim was to try to convert the French Canadian people to Protestantism. It died after eighty years of efforts.

I have written a booklet on that question (*) and I shall not repeat myself here, except for giving the essentials. No French Canadians, save very few and later, were members of that Society. I have read the extant Annual Reports of that Society. It is most amazing for a man of our time to read those reports, because they are really full of contempt about anything Catholic. The very existence of the Society may well be regarded as an outrage to the French Canadians. They might have answered back with a similar organisation for converting the Protestants to Catholicism. They did nothing of the sort ; they did not want new religious wars. They obeyed their pastors asking them to be better Catholics(†).

The methods used by the old French Canadian Missionary Society have not entirely disappeared. While the main Protestant churches respect their Catholic fellow-citizens' faith, others are found which have chosen to flood the Catholics with propaganda ; they use the postal service to send circular-letters, leaflets and booklets ; they also distribute them from door to door ; sometimes they enter the homes as vendors, with the purpose

---

(*) ABBÉ ARTHUR MAHEUX, *Le Problème protestant.*

(†) LÉON POULIOT, S.J. *La réaction catholique de Montréal, 1840-1.*

of disturbing the good faith of our people. Nothing in such activities is apt to foster National Unity ; it is all the contrary.

The Catholics of Canada, and particularly the French Canadians do their share for the Country's prosperity, and they are entitled to the respect of their faith. I think no historian could find in the past, no research worker could find in the present any evidence of interference with the religious affairs of their Protestant fellow-countrymen by the French Canadian Catholics. We just want religious peace to be assured and enjoyed by **both** sides.

There is presently a great danger in the quarrels between Christians. For, Christians we are, Catholics and Protestants. We have common enemies, I mean all those who oppose any form of religious belief. We have to fight immorality and indiscipline. We have to restore the social Order. These tasks are great ones and they require that all Christians be not divided, but united. We have, Christians of all denominations, the duty of setting an example for the rest of the world, the example of concord at least.

Let us pay less attention to our mutual grievances, those of the past and those of to-day. Let us consider, instead, what may favor national unity. If we study earnestly our christian religion, we will find many reasons to live as brothers ; if we study the Gospel we will find all possible reasons not to fight each other.

The ideal, I admit, would be to realize a perfect unity of creed, of discipline, of practice in worshipping the same God, the same Lord, the same Saviour, but such an ideal may be too high for our human weakness. At least we are all called to practice one virtue, charity, and if we do so, both Protestants and Catholics, we will be better Christians and better Canadians.

AFTER READING A HUNDRED LETTERS (*)

I have read again the hundred first letters, I mean those letters I have received from you, my English-speaking listeners. Yes, indeed, there are more then a hundred now. That second reading brought me more pleasure than the first, because it was easy to compare the letters from one another and, then, to compare them with the letters I had received from my French-speaking listeners.

Such a comparison is highly interesting and I believe it is most important, for the cause, to give you to-day at least some of the results.

The very first remark is the close resemblance between the two groups of correspondence. On both sides are found optimists and pessimists, gentlemen and rogues, kind hearts and bitter hearts. From both sides came anonymous letters, but, unfortunately many more from the English-speaking than from the French-speaking people. I had not been surprised with the French ones, for I remembered Jules Romains saying that, of all the countries he had traveled in, French Canada was the only one where he was assailed with anonymous letters, and then I

(*) February 28, 1943.

knew only too well that personalities of a much higher rank than mine amongst the French Canadians are continually assailed by such pests. But it was for me something like a shock to find out that the same dirty stuff would also come from English-speaking fellow citizens, and educated ones at that, if I may infer correctly from the handwriting and the quality of the paper. So, the conclusion is inevitable ; in both groups we have people of low moral standards, and we have all to endeavour to eradicate that shame from our ranks, even if it represents a small percentage. I wish a campaign were started in all our schools, in all our newspapers to get our public life rid of the pest of anonymous letters.

Now let us take the pessimists. Are they the majority ? Not at all. They are a little minority. They see evil everywhere. For them there is no hope. In their opinion nothing can be changed : we are bound to be separated, disunited ; that is settled forever. Such an attitude, of course, is very bad. It is, as it seems to me, rooted in a deep ignorance of the facts and in a firm determination to look at only one side of the problem. The pessimist has a long list of his own complaints, which he considers as undoubtedly just ; he has also a long list of the other party's faults, which he never analysed in order to ascertain whether they are real facts or just slanders.

In the campaign against disunity the anonymous writer is the slacker, and the pessimist is a

civilian who complains about everything without doing the least thing to bring victory. But there are also the good soldiers, and they are the majority. They know that there is something to do even if they do not entirely agree about the means to achieve the purpose. They are animated with a sound optimism ; they believe in victory ; they hope for a treaty of peace that will settle the problems of National Unity.

On both sides, French as well as English, these resolute optimists are the vast majority. And this fact brings to all of us a great hope for a better future.

I have said they do not agree about the causes of disunity. That is true. Most of my French and English correspondents believe that race and blood are of very little importance. Some say that the main source of our difficulties is the difference of religion, whilst others think it is not so ; the French Canadians do not consider religion as an obstacle to national unity, but some English-speaking Canadians give way to bitter reflections against Catholicism, of which they seem to have a great fear, at least for the future. In their opinion, I find a lack of sure information. I have tried, in my private answer to their letters, to throw light on their doubts. I hope I did not write in vain ; still if some of my listeners and correspondents have any other doubts I should like very much to continue the discussion with them in private and friendly correspondence.

The barrier of language is considered by many as the main difficulty. Since most of the educated French Canadians speak both languages they put less stress on that difference. As I said in a previous talk, the French Canadians desire a more rapid and a more general acquisition of both languages in all sections of the country. The majority of my English-speaking correspondents are asking for the same evolution. They believe that a working knowledge of both languages is necessary to both groups in order to bring about a better understanding. Their convictions are based on facts and considerations quite proper to determine the assent of public opinion.

On the other side there are those who think that all French Canadians must take the English language as their usual language and that there will be national unity the very day and only the day there will be only one language in Canada. That opinion is quite opened to question.

There are people speaking the same language without having unity of purpose and of action. Most of the Belgians speak French, and good French ; still they do not agree with people of France in politics, in national views, in the conduct of war, in the interpretation of international affairs. Most of the Irish people speak English, still who will dare to say that there is unity of views, of purpose, of action between Ireland and Britain, between the Irish at large with their English-speaking neighbours, even in America,

even in Canada ? The Americans speak English as their only language : but do they understand well the British people ? There are tremendous efforts presently being made to bring about a better understanding between those two great nations. Most of the South Americans speak Spanish, as the Spaniards of Europe, and yet they agree on few things. Portuguese is spoken in Portugal and in Brazil, but do these two countries agree on all things ?

No, really, unity of language is not in itself the very first source of National Unity. Let us take now the other aspect of the same problem. Look at Switzerland, where three different languages are spoken and see that national unity stand there firmly. A great many languages are spoken and are taught in the schools of Russia, and still all these various people are united in a common purpose and with a tremendous success, as anybody may see in the Russian victories over Hitlerian armies. Consequently the difference of language is not in itself the main obstacle to National Unity.

The essential condition to National Unity is a common purpose and a strong determination to achieve such common purpose.

What should be, for all Canadians, that common purpose ? We have only to look at the History of our Country to find it. Here, in this part of North America, have been put by Divine Providence two main groups of people, the French and the British.

Both groups have historical rights and historical obligations. We possess here the two greatest civilisations of the world. Being just British or just French would make of us pale copies of other nations. But taking the best of our mother-countries and adapting it to this particular country would create an original form of civilisation. Such an originality would be better than any copy.

Hence, our common purpose is to make of Canada a very prosperous nation, a highly distinguished nation, different from France, from England, from the United States.

The letters I have received, let they be French or English, leave absolutely no doubt on that point. The majority of Canadians accept or are ready to accept their country as one of a dual culture and a dual language. They are ready to invest in that proposition their time, their work and their money, because they believe and they know that the proposition will bring in due time big returns in glory and in money.

Of course, I imagine some of you, my dear listeners, will be surprised at first. But let the first moment of your surprise pass away and ask yourself one question : "If I were entirely rid of all sorts of prejudices, if I am ready to consider myself as a Canadian first, a Canadian second, and a Canadian last, if so, well, is it impossible for me to reach the same level of opinion where I am

told, where I see thousands of my fellow-country men solidly seated ?"

And certainly, my dear friends, your answer will be the right one. Instead of discussing on the very dubious merits of unity of language, we should discuss soberly in order to find the best means of achieving Canadian Unity on new, rich, strong and original bases. How much of a precious time have we not lost in futile discussions ? Shall we always behave like children with petty quarrels ?

Our real difficulties seem to be in the economic field, as a few of my correspondents point out. I think they are right. Our economic problems are of the greatest importance, the wheat problem in the West as writes one from Saskatchewan, the difference of wages, particularly in Québec and in Ontario, as indicated by some letters, adjustment between industry and agriculture, as some others see it. All these serious problems can be studied with equal curiosity and intent by Protestants and Catholics, by French-and English-speaking Canadians.

So, please, dear friends of all creeds and of various languages, let us go to work, to real work. Time for quarrels has passed. Time for unity has come, for understanding, for co-operation, hand in hand. If we make the wrong use of that precious time, our responsibility is great in the face of the young who later will judge us, perhaps with a well deserved severity.

SOMETHING IS BEING DONE (*)

Something is being done ; a flame is burning somewhere, a flame that may become a great fire. We have the various professions and trades, in whose meetings Canadians of both languages can talk and do talk together.

A first and very good instance is being given by the lawyers in their particular societies called Bars. Any given Bar in any Province puts together lawyers of various creeds and various languages. The Bars are not separated according to nationality or religion. This is quite remarkable in the province of Québec. There were difficulties in ancient times. One must not forget the acute conflict between two conceptions of the civil law, I mean the English common Law and the French civil Law, or the Coutume de Paris. A century ago those two conceptions seemed to be enemies, and irreconcilable. If you ever happen to read the voluminous Report of the Earl of Durham, published in 1839, you will find there evidence of the conflict. The French would accept nothing of the Common Law, the English would have the greatest contempt for the French Law. Durham's most harsh words are about that Law, which he despised from the first to the last word. But times have changed ; lawyers and jurists of both groups

---

(*) March 7, 1943.

have learned to get together in the meetings of their Bars, in the halls of the courts of justice.

They have explained to each other their particular views ; they have discovered the merits of both Laws. And the old strife has vanished. Same thing happened in the Association of the Canadian Bar, which groups French- and English-speaking lawyers of the whole Canada. This is a very fine example of mutual understanding between educated people.

Take, now, the medical profession. How many difficulties have arisen in the past. How many quarrels? There has been a time when a rigid antagonism separated the French and the English conceptions of the medical science and of the medical training. Common discussions were not possible. But time has passed. The Physicians and Surgeons, I mean in Québec, have organised their College, held meetings together, worked in the same hospitals, and talking together they took a better knowledge of the other's views. Then we have seen English-speaking doctors going to France and French-speaking doctors going to England or to the United States for their higher studies. The medical schools of Laval at Québec and of Montréal have retained the French conception of medical science and medical training, and the American Medical Association very wisely recognized the value of such training. Then came also the Canadian Medical Council ; the French Canadian Doctors became members of that

national Council, and of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada. Doctors of both groups meet regularly and are good friends, thus doing their share, as do the lawyers, for a better understanding throughout Canada.

The Pharmaceutical Association of Québec is composed of the druggists of both languages. In the General Association for the whole Canada the French Canadian druggists are admitted and their periodical has started the printing of at least one French page in each issue.

The Dentists have gone further, in putting in each issue of their periodical as many French contributions as are offered ; the relations between the two groups of dentists are excellent.

The Opticians and Optometrists have had their difficulties, which seem to have entirely abated ; their periodical also is bilingual.

The Canadian Chemists of both languages meet, with perfect harmony, in the Canadian Institute of Chemistry ; the president and the treasurer, for the time being, are both French Canadians, and in their periodical are to be found articles in French as well as in English.

In the Royal Institute of Architecture for Canada the chairmanship alternates between a French and an English speaking member and the relations between members of either language are most cordial.

The Forestry Engineers of the province of Québec have their professional Association of

friendly members. There is also a coast-to-coast organisation in which the French Canadians are welcome.

Same applies to the Surveyors ; the Canadian Institute of Surveying has a membership open to Canadians of both languages, and at least one French Canadian has been the president for a time.

In the Canadian Institute of Engineering the relations are excellent between members of either language.

Let us come now to the Authors. Here we have two distinct societies, The Canadian Authors Association and La Société des Écrivains canadiens. The relations of both societies are friendly. In October 1942 the English Association invited two French Canadians as speakers.

The newspapermen have many societies, namely one for the dailies, one for the weeklies, and the Canadian Press ; French- and English-speaking members are there on equal terms and officers are elected of either language.

Suppose we would add together the names on the lists of all those associations, we would find thousands of Canadians, of both groups, all of them ready to meet as partners, on equal terms, irrespective of creed or of language. There we find very good work done to promote understanding and National Unity.

Yet, it is not all. Let us take various other associations grouping businessmen, manufactur-

ers, retailers, Boards of Trade and Chambres de Commerce, Accountants. There also you will find Canadians of both languages working together for Canada's welfare, as partners, as friends.

I do not forget other societies for Nurses, for Pilots, for Lumbermen, for Sportsmen, for Municipalities, Assurances, in which the same good work of Entente is regularly accomplished.

Consequently we have an army of Canadians ready to get together. Of course, each association keeps busy with its own professional problems ; there may be a cause for a certain narrowmindedness. But all these people would come together for a broad view on public and national affairs, if only they were asked to devote a part of their time and of their attention to problems larger than the professional. If they did not, it is because they have always been left to themselves. I feel sure that the day some prominent Canadian will invite all these various Associations to join their forces in order to promote National Unity, their answer would be affirmative and efficient.

How could we forget the condition of the Canadians a century ago, as it is exactly mirrored in the Earl of Durham's Report ? Then it was rebellion, war ; then prevailed animosities and bitterness. Even if the situation were bad now, it is certainly much better than a hundred years ago. Then there were various British Colonies, and now we have one Canada. Then hatred

prevailed endemically, whilst now it is only sporadic.

Suppose we could bring together in a large national Association all the members of the Societies I have enumerated, with, also, the service and the social clubs, and the Canadian clubs and various Leagues, such an Association would be very powerful. Let us not forget that most of those who presently make trouble in Canada are ignorant followers of braggards ; they believe they are on the right way because their so-called leaders talk louder that the others ; but these poor fellows would give up the wolves, if they saw the moderate citizens solidly united together, marching forward with determination, holding in their hands the torch to enlighten the people.

Well, then, men of all professions and trades, I am calling to you. You have organisations ready to work. Certainly you have admired how various factories, made for peace-time production, have been turned rapidly to producing war machinery and munitions. Are you not called for a similar emergency ? Without abandoning your professional interests, you can assume a role of greater importance towards the needs of the nation. Your aim has always been the prosperity of the Nation. But presently the prosperity of Canada, it is just Canada's salvation through a strong national Unity.

We must unite and fight with energy all obstacles to our war effort : false rumors, slanders,

suspicions, idleness, gossiping, futile discussions, stupid quarrels ; there is a program of action for you personally, for you as a member of any professional organisation. You have learned and you know how to discuss, as gentlemen, your professional problems. Will you not apply the same methods to our national problems ?

The people may easily be misled by the wrongly informed or by the wrongly minded. If you keep silent, the fanatics will become the leaders.

I know very well that the best Canadians, of either language, are eager to join their forces in order to ensure the reign of justice and charity in Canada. They want prejudices to die, to die very soon, not only their natural death, which may be too long a process, but they think all good citizens should help by their continuous influence to kill prejudices. In matter of prejudices rationing and ceiling are not enough ; more drastic measures are necessary ; it is up to you all, members of the many coast-to-coast Associations, to stamp out prejudices and to spread everywhere the light of Truth !

GET TO THE BRAINS (*)

The University Professors, the learned men are the brain of the nation. What did they accomplish in matter of National Unity ?

Most of our universities, in Canada as well as in the United States, were, at their origin, ecclesiastical undertakings. Being different in religion they lived each a separated and secluded life : they had practically no contacts between themselves ; moreover, for a long period, they had no contacts with the public at large. A kind of consciousness of their higher rank, of their nobility, one may say, prevented them from getting in touch with the masses of the people, which in their mind would have been a derogation. They were satisfied with their studies, at their desk or in the laboratories, with their teaching in the classroom.

They came down from their ivory tower when the numerous applications of the scientific principles permeated common life, when the social studies took a great importance. Then the universities felt it their duty to attend to the needs of the people. They could hardly do that when isolated. They had to come together and this was

---

(*) March 14, 1943.

done by the creation of the National Conference of Canadian Universities, which brought around the same table not only the English-speaking but also the French-speaking Canadian Universities. Presently there are about thirty Canadian Universities members of the National Conference. More than twenty annual meetings have been held since the origin of the Conference. There Vancouver could talk with Halifax, Quebec with Toronto, London with Saskatoon, Edmonton with Montréal, Ottawa with Winnipeg, St. Joseph with Hamilton. Hence have been established very cordial relations between University professors of either language. The English majority has shown itself quite fair in electing to various offices many of their French colleagues.

Discussions have been held mostly on problems of administration, on programs of studies, on methods of teaching. The Conference, I think, might make a step forward if it gave more importance to the field of Philosophy, one of the most important amongst the branches of Higher Learning. It is a fact that there exists a great divergence between the views of the English and of the French in the realm of Philosophy. Yet I believe that National Unity would gain momentum if our Universities would come to a closer understanding about Philosophy.

The French Canadian Universities give now a good place to the study of English and American theories of Philosophy, though they spend most

of the time to the study of scholastic and thomistic philosophy. It is commonly held, in some quarters, that such philosophy is rather despicable. It is true that too often it has been poorly taught, but this in no way diminishes the value of the system.

It is well known that the scholastic philosophy has found staunch followers in prominent men like Maritain, Gilson, and, even in America, like Adler, of the University of Chicago. The English-speaking Canadian Catholics have formed at Toronto the very remarkable Institute of Medieval Studies ; the works of great medieval philosophers, especially Thomas of Aquinas, have been translated into English. Consequently there is now a very good *terrain d'entente* between the Canadian philosophers of either language ; a *rapprochement* in the higher intellectual field would mean unity of thought, which is essential to National Unity. It would give to our National life a character of originality, of a powerful originality.

Louis-Adolphe Paquet, late professor of Laval University and a man of vigorous mind, has created the Academy of Thomas of Aquinas, where mingle the Catholic Canadian philosophers of either language. May we hope to see some time our Protestant colleagues take their share in the works of that Academy.

This much about the University professors. Just aside are the students, who are contributing

also to National Unity by steady contacts. French Canadian students register at McGill, at Toronto, at Queen's and other English Canadian Universities. Laval and Montréal, both French, accept each year English-speaking students in their various faculties. This will create regular contacts and solid friendships between the younger generations of both languages.

The learned societies continue and complete the influence of the Universities. Generally speaking their work is unknown to the public ; for that reason I will say a word of them.

The first to be mentioned is the Royal Society of Canada. One of its five sections is composed of French-speaking members. In the sections devoted to sciences the English-speaking Canadians have for a long time been the only members, not because they desired to boycott the French Canadians, but because these were not, at the time, much interested in sciences. But it is not so presently ; the door has been opened to the French Canadians, and there is no doubt that it will stay wide open ; thus will be consecrated the principle of partnership, which serves admirably the cause of National Unity. In all sections the relations are excellent between the two groups. Recently the Royal Society has devised a new scheme, a plenary session for all the members of the five sections, the discussions bearing on general problems of National importance ; this will contribute greatly to put together the French and the English

intelligentsia and to put the learned men in closer contact with National Life.

The National Council for Scientific Research has proved favorable to the admission of competent French Canadians. The same policy is followed by the National Council of Social Research. In both Councils the presence of French Canadian members may prove of a great usefulness.

Another learned society, the Canadian Historical Association, proves itself very friendly to the French Canadians, when electing them to its council and to its Executive Council. The field of Canadian History is one where the French and the English have kept and still keep themselves too much apart. Let us hope that some time later both groups may unite in a general convention and try to reconcile some of their antagonistic views. The English-speaking historians have proved themselves ready to a close co-operation ; at their last annual convention (1942) there was one complete session on the history of Montréal ; in the 1943 convention there will be also one session with memoirs read in the French language.

The Catholic historians have their own society, namely the Canadian Catholic Historical Society ; it is organised on different terms, with two different sections, one English, one French ; but the annual meetings are held at the same time and in the same place, thus permitting contacts between the two groups. The annual report con-

tains the memoirs, the French and the English, under one cover.

In all these societies the organisation is established on different bases, but this does not affect the good quality of the relations between the members from both groups ; one may say in all truth that the Entente, the Bonne Entente, is fully realised in each of them and this is a very good contribution to the cause of National Unity.

We have made headway. The University professors, the members of the various learned societies have come to understand each other and to work hand in hand for the welfare of Canada. Such a cooperation is, in my humble opinion, one of the most significant facts in the national development of our country. I would not like to be exclusive and to say that the professors and the learned men do all the thinking for the nation ; but they certainly do most of it ; in a very large measure they are the brains of the nation.

Is it not quite evident that unity must first be conceived in the head before it passes through the members ? Suppose we could see, one day, all the learned men of Canada perfectly agreeing about the solutions to give to the various problems of National Unity. This surely would mean that understanding and unity are just around the corner.

Unless, however, the professors prefer isolating themselves at the top of their ivory tower. But I feel confident it is not so. The cartoon, so com-

monly seen in various periodicals and representing an absent-minded professor in his black gown and picking flowers when bombs are pouring down around him, is antiquated.

The professors know that their first function is to impart science to the students. They know, also, that they can do much better than that, if they are to train strong characters. But a higher function is theirs ; it is to train complete citizens, who in all ways of life will foster National Unity.

I wish some day there would be a large convention of all University and college professors, with all the members of our learned societies, for the sole purpose of studying one single problem, that of National Unity. It seems to me that a program of action would come out of such discussions ; the program would then go to the professional organisations, to the various clubs and leagues, to the newspapers in particular.

If all these citizens could agree on just a few great principles, and preach them, explain them everywhere, we would soon bring the popular masses together. Any other process would be very long to apply and of a doubtful success. Whilst if the leaders of the nation agree to think, to write and to speak the very same ideas about the progress of the country, the people would follow its leaders.

Is this just a dream ? I appeal to you, my colleagues of the Universities and colleges, of the learned societies. The Nation is expecting from you

leadership. Let us together make a clear blueprint of the future of Canada. Some work of that kind has been done, rather by isolated workers. Now is the time for a common action. If we shrink from our responsibilities how can we expect the people to take the lead or to consider its duties to the Nation rather than its own advantages and comfort?

THAT DEMOCRACY OF OURS (*)

There are things that are taken for granted, and Democracy is one of those things. Democracy is given as the only valuable form of government. It is quite possibly so, but, in spite of the continuously repeated assertions to that effect, doubts still remain in the mind of many good citizens. Kings, even absolute kings, even a few tyrants are known by History to have been good and kind leaders of their people. On the other hand some of the Democracies, in the course of History, have proved themselves more tyrannical than absolute kings. Democratic governments are made of men ; all men have their shortcomings ; their acts and policies are subject to criticism ; corruption may attack and did sometimes attack Democracies. The Athenian and the Roman democracies have fallen under their own insufficiencies and corruption.

Our great modern Democracies have not evaded that law. France is asking herself many questions about the failures of her democratic system. In some way nazism and fascism have been violent reactions against poor forms of democratic

---

(*) March 21, 1943.

control. The United States itself is questioning the value of its democratic life. England, old mother England, looks back to her past, though glorious it may be ; she admits her wrongs ; she admits that even her form of democracy can be made much better.

A similar kind of unrest is to be found in Canada, as expressed by the Social Credit, by the C. C. F. movement, by the New Democracy Party.

The same sort of uneasiness has made its way amongst the French Canadians. It is very useful, for the sake of National Unity, to try to explain to my English-speaking listeners, the views of their fellow countrymen, the French Canadians, about Democracy.

To most of the English-speaking Canadians, Democracy is a family inheritance. They date it back to the Magna Charta, which they consider as the embryo from which sprang all liberties. If this is true, Democracy is, for the Anglo-Saxon people, nine centuries old. Is it the same thing for the French Canadians ? No, it is not. As a distinct group the French Canadians date back only to the beginning of the eighteenth century. Then, and then only, they began to be different from the Frenchmen. Then, and then only, were to be found men and women who, for three or four generations, had been born here, had lived here only, had never gone back to France and consequently found themselves different from the Frenchmen.

As a distinct nation they came to life and they lived under royal absolutism, which forbade any kind of public assembly about public affairs.

Then came the English régime. The military rule, from 1759 to 1764 could not allow a democratic government. With the Royal proclamation, after the Treaty of Paris, an Assembly of the people was conceded but made unworkable by the maintenance of the Oath of Test. That obstacle was removed by the Quebec Act in 1774, but the creation of an Assembly was postponed. Finally it came in 1791. Here some of my listeners will say: Well, then, the French Canadians have now enjoyed the democratic rule for a century and a half. My answer is this : Did you see the French Canadians celebrate, in 1941, the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the first Legislative Assembly ? No, you know very well that such an event has hardly been mentioned.

Suppose, then, we accept the saying of Durham, who wrote in his Report that about twenty years were necessary before the French Canadians could learn the proper functioning of the parliamentary machinery. At least, if the French Canadians had a deep reverence for Democracy they would have celebrated in 1911 the centenary of their popular rights ; but even this did not happen.

Such an apparent indifference deserves an explanation. The reason is that the French Canadians think they did not benefit much from

the democratic régime. You may believe they are wrong in so thinking, but if you rely upon History there are reasons for thinking they are not wrong.

During fifty years, from 1791 to 1840, the power, the influence, the money were really in the hands of the other group, especially of the bureaucrats, who played in Lower Canada the same game as was played in Upper Canada by the Family Compact. Even for that period of a half century the disillusion of the French Canadians was great ; greater than is commonly thought, because they knew well the fight for Liberty in the France of the Revolution, and an equally zealous fight for Freedom in the United States.

The Act of Union in 1840 made things much worse. The great principle of Democracy is equality. But the French Canadians were then made to believe that they did not enjoy equality. They were not equals in the matter of language, since their tongue, which had been used as official for eighty years was no more official. They were not equals in the matter of religion, since a society was organised with the sole purpose of depriving them of their religion. They were not equals in financial matters, since they were compelled to pay a part of the debt of another province. They were not equals in matter of nationality, since the Report of Durham had declared them an inferior people and doomed them to poverty and to death.

Such a situation was just the negation of equality of rights, it was in itself a contradiction to Democracy. Durham, speaking of the tyranny exerted by bureaucracy writes that the French Canadians would not have deserved to be considered as a nation if they had patiently suffered that tyranny. Curiously enough that great man, Durham, put the same people in a much worse condition. They resented it and they still resent it. This is a fact that must be taken in account by you, my dear fellow-countrymen. Right after the Union Act of 1840 the French Canadians had to fight their way towards freedom though they were associated with the British Democracy. The light of dawn seemed to come for them with Confederation in 1867, but soon came clouds which have darkened that light. As a whole the French Canadians feel they are not equals with their fellow-countrymen. Democracy brought them little of what they hoped and expected.

Where is the responsibility for such a condition ? To answer that question one must make a distinction between the past and the present. There have been mistakes, errors and wrong doings in the past ; their authors have died, leaving us with an inheritance of difficult problems, which we have to settle between ourselves, if we are to bring peaceful relations in Canada. Mistakes have been made by both sides ; both sides must work together to correct the mistakes.

First of all we must reshape our idea of Democracy ; we must rejuvenate it with the Athenian concept of isonomia, which means equality ; If pride, on either side, makes us believe there is one group superior and one inferior, we will achieve nothing worth while.

The more I read the text of the British North America Act and the discussions that have prepared and accompanied its passing as a law, the more I am convinced that the Act was inspired by the idea of equality between the two groups then and there existing, I mean the French-speaking and the English-speaking groups, for there were no other groups at that time. Even if the wording of the Act was not perfectly clear about that spirit of equality, let us consider that new responsibilities have fallen and are presently falling upon us, the main one being the necessity of looking at the confederation Act as to a pact of equality between the representatives of two cultures, two civilisations, two languages, the French as well as the English, the English as well as the French, in all sections of the country.

I remember having met once, in 1942, with a man in Toronto. He told me, in very precise terms, that all the French Canadians ought to be put on board a ship and sent back to France. Such an attitude is typical of an opinion which still prevails in some quarters. This is worse than a prejudice ; it is a warlike attitude ; it certainly goes contrary to the spirit of Democracy.

I am not ready to say that that attitude is commonly spread amongst our English-speaking fellow countrymen. On the contrary I believe all of them, who are educated, think differently. But it is a duty for us all, the educated Canadians, to stamp out a kind of fanaticism that is most objectionable and most harmful to the cause of National Unity.

This, at least, I wanted to say, that the attitude as regards Democracy is not the same in both our groups. The French Canadians feel dissatisfied with democratic institutions. Some of them, a few indeed, have come to think that something like fascism would be better ; they have been influenced by Italian and by German agents ; but they are a very small minority. Others are trying to find some way to remedy the evils and abuses of the democratic institutions. In Great Britain there are study groups working on proportional representation. In French Canada it is rather question of corporatism ; this is not the expression of a need for revolution ; it is only the opinion that the functioning of Democracy has been vitiated.

For a certain time I have been thinking that the French Canadians had neglected the study of Democracy in their schools. It is true. But I also believed that our English-speaking fellow countrymen were giving much more attention in their schools to such a study. I realize, now, that the same neglect prevails in both groups. We do not teach our children Democracy or, if we do so in a

certain measure, we insist much more on the rights and privileges than on duties and responsibilities.

Well, then, we have to change our minds and our ways. Democracy should become a subject of teaching in all our schools. What kind of Democracy? Not the French, not the American, not necessarily the British, but a Democracy of our own, a Canadian Democracy, based on our double historical background, respectful of the differences between our two main groups. We should not copy what is being done elsewhere; on the contrary we should endeavour to create a new type of Democracy, something original, something different. It should be as a tailored suit made to our measure.

With the inheritance of the two greatest civilisations, the English and the French, we possess all the necessary elements to establish in Canada a new Order, provided it takes in account the qualities, the virtues, the potentialities of both groups.

Canada, indeed, is called to great things, if we only understand our responsibilities.

WHICH GROUP WILL DOMINATE ? (*)

For many of my listeners the question of « Which group is going to dominate » will seem preposterous. Yet, if I take in account what I have read in booklets, in periodicals and in the letters I have received, the question should not be put aside or treated lightly.

It is certain that in both groups, the French- and the English-speaking Canadians, there is a fear of the other's domination.

That such a fear should exist in the French Canadian mind is no wonder, when they consider the long advance taken by their competitors. They see very well that the English-speaking Canadians control the wealth, the industry, the finance ; they have the great majority ; they see that such advantages are solidly strengthened by the help received from Great Britain and the British Commonwealth and also by the neighbouring Republic, the United States. Hence, in the mind of the French Canadians, British domination is not only a possibility, it is a fact. A few of them go so far as to blame the British viciousness for their poor condition. Others will content themselves with finding the historical causes of their inferiority. Such is the French Canadian viewpoint.

(*) March 28, 1943.

What is the opinion of the other group? Of course it would not be fair to give any particular opinion as the only one held by the whole group. Here, also, are to be found differences of views on the same question. Still, it is a fact that a pretty large number of English-speaking Canadians fear a French Canadian domination, either in the future, remote or near, or in the present time.

This last opinion is rather surprising, but I have found it in the letters I have received, not in many letters, but in letters written by educated people. The basis for that opinion is what my correspondents term "the Quebec solid block of 65 members of the House of Commons in Ottawa" This, naturally, will lead us to ask the question "Is there a solid Québec block at Ottawa?" I really wonder. Firstly, Québec has never sent to the Commons 65 French-speaking members, since there have always been English-speaking protestant members for Québec. Secondly, the French Canadian members have never belonged to one and same political party and they have very rarely, if at any time, voted unanimously for or against any given measure. Thirdly, it is a well known fact that the French Canadian representation at Ottawa has been quite regularly divided. Even now it is divided. If you care to read Mr. Rumilly's *Histoire de la Province de Québec*, a work in nine volumes recently published, I feel certain, my dear friends, that the celebrated Québec solid block will appear to you as a ghost,

and that you will discard a fear which is not in accordance with the facts.

You should also discard another fear, namely that there exist in the mind of the French Canadians, taken as a whole, a determination to dominate Canada, sooner or later. I think I can bear witness in that matter. I am a French Canadian, born in the province of Québec, educated in Québec ; I have mingled with all sorts of people ; I have read extensively books, booklets, tracts, periodicals of all sorts ; I have followed many public meetings ; I have discussed national problems with people of all rank and social class, and though I am over fifty years of age I have never heard a single French Canadian mentioning domination as a possible thing even for the future.

The French Canadians are concerned with survival, not with domination. They are presently only 28% of the total population ; they cannot expect immigration from other French-speaking countries ; they can rely only on their natural growth by birth, on a better control over public health. Yet their birthrate is impaired on the one side by the great numbers of men and women taking to celibacy in religious life, on the other side by the modern idea of birth control. How could such a situation inspire fear to their competitors, I hardly know.

The rest of the population, accounting for 72%, can rely, on the one hand, on their own birthrate, and, on the other hand, on the immi-

gration from all Europe, an immigration in which the French Canadian can take no share, because first it is not French-speaking, because, second, it is practically impossible for the immigrants in Canada to learn the French language.

That the French Canadians are concerned with only their survival appears evident with the consideration of two facts. The first fact is this : in 1937 there was held in Québec a great convention of the French-speaking people of the whole North America, including Canada, the United States and the West Indies. At the end of the convention a Committee was organized to continue under a permanent form the work of the convention. The very idea of such a convention means that the French-speaking people of North America consider that their very existence is threatened by the Anglo-Saxon Ocean in which they constitute only a series of small islands battered by a perpetually moving sea. But the very name they chose for their Permanent Committee is the clear expression of their own fear. What is that name? Is it Committee for French Expansion? or for French Domination? Not at all : It is just and only a Committee for French Survival in America. There, my dear fellow-countrymen, you will find evidence that Domination is entirely out of the picture, is absolutely out of even their dreams.

The second fact speaks as clearly as the first. It is the existence of a movement which you do

not like very much. That movement is the separatist movement. There certainly are, in the province of Québec, French Canadians who talk separation from the rest of Canada. Now, will you please ask yourselves one question : If these people wanted to dominate Canada, would they separate themselves from the rest of Canada? Certainly, not, is the sure answer. They would, on the contrary, stay with the rest, till they were strong enough to be the masters. They would try by all means to have immigrants from France, from Belgium, already knowing the French language ; they would induce the other immigrants, the non-French speaking, to come and stay in the province of Québec, to learn French, to become French Canadians, and so to strengthen their own positions.

But you know very well that nothing of the sort is being done by the French Canadians.

Let us suppose, however, that by some queer turn of Fortune the French Canadians would have, later, much later, the majority in the whole country. Then, some think, they would enforce their views in all fields on the English-speaking minority.

Well, even this eventuality I do not admit. The French Canadians have, about the working of a majority, a different idea from that of their English fellow countrymen. For the latter the rule set by the majority is a law and the minority must comply with it, like it or not. I have found

that opinion expressed in many English-speaking Canadian newspapers.

The French Canadians, on the contrary, think that a majority may be as tyrannical as an absolute king. Consequently they try to find other ways. For instance, in the province of Québec, they never questioned the rights of the English-speaking minority ; they gave it its own system of schools, entirely separate, from kindergarten to the University.

They have been interested, as are some politicians in Great Britain, with proportional representation in order to give to each group of opinion its legitimate part in the conduct of the country. Presently the French Canadians are interested in Corporatism, for the same reasons.

No, really, the French Canadians have nothing in common with the Conquistadores. They are no Alexander the Great, no Julius Ceasar, no Napoléon. Their ambition is not to crush under their heel their neighbour. They have no territorial ambition. They want their share, no less and no more.

Of all the political systems they certainly prefer the British form of Democracy.

They are ready to accept the New Order and a Commonwealth rejuvenated by the spirit of the Atlantic Charter.

To us, the French Canadians, the real Commonwealth is the one that will have been purged of a certain excess of the so-called imperialism,

the kind proclaimed by self-appointed mouthpieces, as wrote a British man to an American.

To us the basis of a real Commonwealth is the respect of the various cultures and languages, particularly of the two greatest ones, the French as well as the English, and their peaceful development on the same territory.

To us, the French Canadians, the true Commonwealth is a business of co-operation, not an affair of Domination.

To us the real Commonwealth is a great body, the members of which are animated by streams of friendship, of justice, of mutual respect.

To us, the Commonwealth is made of the most precious elements that are found in the Magna Charta, in the Declaration of independence, and in the various series of "points" given to the world by a Wilson and by many others. Finally, to us, French Canadians, the Commonwealth is simply a cristallisation of the best democratic principles and practises.

If it is that, all that, only that, you may rest assured, by dear fellow countrymen, that the French Canadians will give their blood to the last drop in order to defend and save such an institution.

For, in such an institution, no one is to dominate or to be slave. All citizens would be equals in all fields of activity. They would give more prominence to their duties and responsibilities than to

their right or to their might, even if it were the majority's might.

Well, then, let us, on both sides, give up our fears. Let us co-operate, like partners, in building one country, one country shaped by its historical background as a country of a dual culture and a dual language !

HIGHLIGHTS (*)

I was reading an English language daily in the last week of February. The first Editorial offered very good reading. There was praised an English-speaking Protestant mother who had written a very kind letter to the Canadian Catholic mother of a wireless operator who died in action. An admirable letter it was. Two men had been put together by aviation needs, one Protestant, the other Catholic. Both were killed in action. Now a woman lay bereft somewhere, a Catholic mother ; she needed consolation, and consolation came to her from where she perhaps did not expect it, from a Protestant woman and mother.

It is very good that a newspaper should have given prominence to that simple fact, because it is a symbol of the friendly relations that should prevail between Canadians of different creeds.

Of course, such a letter is not unique. If we could bring together in a common treasure our " war letters " we surely would find other similar letters equally deserving praise. Such letters are highlights piercing through the clouds of our much troubled public opinion. I have received two very different letters, filled with an astonishing hatred against anything Catholic. Mud, real mud.

(*) April 4, 1943.

But quickly washed and dried away by the letter, the one and single letter praised by the newspaper editor.

Highlight again in another letter I have received from a Catholic parish priest, English-speaking also. I cannot refrain from quoting from his letter; if he is listening he will pardon me. And you also, my dear listeners, you will pardon me for quoting words that are a praise, perhaps a little excessive, of one of my radio talks, the one about religion.

Says the good parish priest : " I have been wondering how best to express my admiration for your radio address . . . I am not sure that I can do justice to it in any words. I think it was the clearest and most fearless and altogether the sanest handling of a delicate subject that I can imagine. You have done a great service to the cause of National Unity. Your address deserves to be sculptured in enduring bronze and nailed to the walls of parliament and public institutions. It should be made compulsory reading in schools . . . I have lived, the pastor goes on, for fifty years in this community which is mixed both religiously and nationally ; and although I am the uncompromising enemy of heresy and must have preached thousands of sermons, I do not think I have ever said anything to arouse the feelings of protestants . . .

. . . Orangemen here have been some of my best friends. As for the French I may say without boasting that they have accepted me as one of

themselves. I remember returning from one of my missions one Sunday afternoon . . . when I met a procession of Orangemen in full regalia. Every last man of them took off his hat as I passed along . . . That was better than throwing bricks. "

On the one hand there is a Protestant mother sending her consolations to a Catholic mother. On the other hand here is a Catholic priest winning the respect of the Orangemen. Are not these real symbols of understanding and Unity ?

A little group of women and children, refugees from Great Britain, live in a small town of the province of Québec. An English-speaking lady of that town writes me a very kind letter, partially in French. Her charming letter may be summarized as follows : " Will you accept the thanks of one of your English-speaking listeners, for the splendid talk last Sunday ? . . . Your voice said to me 'I am an honest Canadian who loves my country and I am a person without prejudices, I am not a fanatic'. Your talks are so badly needed in our poor old Province at a time when all our future and all we value is at stake, we need so much the men who can hold on to a union of all (men of good will) ". Then she continues in French, saying " In my opinion, being Scotish and Protestant, Canada was born a bilingual country and must stay bilingual. We are separated not by language, but by false ideas. "

My dear listeners, is not that letter quite typical ? Is it not a highlight ?

Listen now to another English-speaking Protestant from Ontario. I quote him : " English Canadians do not dislike French Canadians when they know them. For many years I visited Montreal regularly and count among my best friends many businessmen there . . . For many years I have hunted and fished in Quebec . . . where I met the guides, the farmers and lumbermen. They are among the finest people I ever knew, great workers, honest, witty and kind. Knowing these things from personal experience it annoys me intensely when unjust statements are made by any individual or organisation which tends to offend the feelings of my French Canadian friends. "

Many other letters bring me the same honest view of the facts. Listen to that English-speaking protestant Canadian from British Columbia : " What I want is all to say to each other, British and French, French and British and Canadian citizens of much smaller numbers, is this : We are fighting that you may live as you believe is right, according to your faith and standards of conduct, and to work out your own destinies, when we come all to say that with sincere good will to each other we shall be a Nation, and a mighty one, even if small in numbers as yet. So let us work unceasingly for that. "

The spirit of that letter is the real Canadian Spirit.

The letter which brought me the deepest and the sanest emotion came from another English protestant woman, living in one of the Maritime Provinces. She relates the story of how she came to learn the other group's language. It was a long and costly affair. She started the study of French at the grammar school, giving attention to the subject because her father, who was an admirer of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, prompted her to do so. She continued at the University for four years, with a broadminded professor. " His lessons, she writes, were the equivalent of a little league of the Nations. " She perceived that a serious study of the modern languages becomes a real mission, because if one knows his neighbour's tongue, he possesses the key of his house. She became a teacher and she then took opportunity of the presence of a French lady, living in the neighborhood, to perfect her own knowledge of the French language. She might have felt satisfied with that, but she wanted more and decided to follow new courses in French at Dalhousie University. Gathering all her small savings she went to France for six weeks. Later she took advantage of the Summer Courses at McGill, while boarding with in a French-speaking family. And now she speaks and writes French perfectly. Much time, much work, much money, spent with pleasure, with the purpose of knowing the other group's language, soul and spirit.

Is this not an admirable example ? Indeed, it is. Is it unique or exceptional ? I do not think so ;

there are numbers of English Canadians, in the Universities, in the Colleges, in the High Schools, who did the like or something of the like. All of them deserve the same praise, for they may become, nay, they are very good workers in the field of National Unity.

On the other side, numbers of French Canadians have spent time, work and money for the purpose of getting a good knowledge of the English language and literature. I know many of them. They also may become and are in fact good workers in the field of National Unity.

I was asking for an army of such workers. I found whole battalions ready in the various professional associations. An army requires officers to lead it. We have officers ready in the professors and teachers who already possess the knowledge of both languages. Then, we have lots of citizens expressing their good will, saying they are ready to work under leaders. Since we have the officers, the soldiers and numbers of draftees, since the souls are prepared for the crusade of Bonne Entente, what are we waiting for?

We need a plan of action, we need headquarters to meet, we need coordination of the efforts. Well, let us sit down at our writing-desks. Let us formulate something quite constructive. You, my dear listeners, you, my dear correspondents, would you please put your attention, not on the weakness of this or that other point of my considerations. I may be wrong in the detail, but you all say I

am right in my purpose. Very well, then write me again and tell me how to organize the army and the campaign. Look around yourselves and find what are the prejudices in your own milieu ; find the way how to stamp them out. And get to work right now. Let everybody clean in front of his own house and the whole street, the whole city will soon be all clean.

Canada is that city, which must be made clean from prejudices. Sharpen your tongue and your pen. Speak and write. It is now time for action. All sons and daughters of Canada, fight disunity, preach National Unity !

SURVIVE OR CONQUER ? (*)

To dominate, let it be a fact or an intention, goes directly against the true spirit of Democracy, which is essentially made of equality. That is what we said in a previous address. The sooner we can get rid of any form of domination, the better it is for our Country. The two main groups that make the historical background of Canada must be equal, partners, friends, co-operators, trusting each other. Both must rid themselves of mutual fear. Both must eliminate from their language all threatening words. Both must eliminate from their minds and their souls bitterness and anger.

The idea of simply surviving must also be eliminated. After all, what is it, to survive ? It is just not to die. Survival, it is the idea of the man who is sinking in the water and who fights desperately for grasping a board or even a stick. Survival may be the ambition of the negro minority in the United States, or that of the Japanese minority in British Columbia. It may also be the ideal for some of the French Canadian minor groups in provinces other than Québec, or, again, for English-speaking minor groups in the Province of Québec. But it is a very insufficient ambition for

---

(*) April 11, 1943.

the Canadian people as a whole or for any of the two major groups of Canada, the English- or the French-speaking group.

Still, there is no doubt that many of the English Canadians think and talk and write in terms of survival. How can this be explained? It is by comparison with the powerful attraction of the neighbour country, the United States. Many English Canadians are afraid of that attraction, and I cannot blame them. They want to survive as an English-minded nation ; they do not want to become Americans. In this they are quite right and I approve them with all my heart.

They want to be Canadians forever, with their British background, as the other group wants to be Canadian forever, with its French background. Both are right.

The question is this : Where will both groups find a sound basis for their development? Is it inside or outside?

Many have been looking outside. Many French Canadians look to European France, from which only, they think, may come light and strength. Many English-speaking Canadians look at England, at Scotland, at Ireland, from which alone, in their opinion, may come strength and light.

Such an attitude may be good or bad. It is bad if it is taken through colonial views, strictly colonial views, with a determination, conscious or unconscious, to be more European than North

American, than Canadian. All of us, we have left Europe forever ; we are determined to stay here, hence to be no more Europeans, but Canadians. If not, why do we stay here ? If we prefer Europe to Canada, our place is in Europe, not in Canada. If we prefer European nature, woods, lakes, rivers, skies, architecture, standard of living, what are we doing here, with other skies, other forests, other streams, other seas, other styles of architecture, other ways of life ? Our first loyalty is to North America, to Canada. If others prefer Fascism, Nazism, French Republicanism, Russian Communism, if their loyalty is for such institutions, their place is not here ; it is where they have put their preferences.

But taking something from outside may be good, I said. Of course. A young country can take lessons from older countries. From them we can learn new techniques ; their history is a living guide for us ; their civilisation is a food of quality. On the condition, however, that we will make these techniques, that history, that food, our own, that we will apply them to our own needs.

On such conditions I am ready to accept something from outside and particularly from the two great nations who gave birth to our nation, England and France. But we may even go farther and take anything we deem good from other civilisations, either near or far.

Still, I sincerely believe, we, the Canadians, should take in ourselves what is required for our

progress. To be ourselves is a very great thing. To imitate the others is not so good. We have to produce here a new form of culture, of civilisation. We have our own destiny, which should be the law of our development. If we continue to draw only from outside, we will be pale copies, we will not be something different and original. If we draw from inside, from ourselves, we may become a distinct nation, we may achieve originality.

But how shall we do it? It is through what I call the spirit of conquest. Not domination, but conquest. The difference may appear slight, but it is sufficient. To dominate concerns the others; the spirit of conquest is to be applied to ourselves and to the nature in which we have been placed.

Firstly we must conquer nature. This is a characteristic of our Canadian life, as compared with Europe. It is a long time since Europe has made that conquest, but, here, in Canada, nature is still young and mysterious; she has not given all her secrets; she is so tremendously bigger than man, that we feel for her a reverence and a fear. We have to conquer nature, and we will do it through science, through literature, through the arts. We have done pretty well with science; In all our Universities, even the French ones, we have organised Departments of sciences, which are filled with good professors, with eager students, with a real spirit of conquest. Literature is lagging behind, if compared with science. Our writers are still too much turned towards the Old countries,

trying to imitate rather than to create. The arts did better than literature. Our painters, especially, deserve mention, for their eagerness to study our nature, to interpret it to the people.

This first conquest over nature should be supplemented with the conquest on ourselves.

For instance, we have too much disregarded the question of public health. This war seems to have opened our eyes on the poor condition of health of nearly one third of our male population. We have not tried enough to build a strong nation. Other nations, and not the morally best at that, have gained a serious advance on us in that field. In matters of health Canada is lagging behind many others. Something is presently being done, but we are so late, that still much more should be done, if we really want to win victory over our appetites and fancies, over our bodily weaknesses.

The spirit of conquest, we must also apply to our prodigalities. Rationing gave us a very good lesson. We see, now, how foolish we have been, while importing, at great cost, from foreign countries, things we hardly need, things we can produce in our own territory, things we could make and sell to the others, instead of buying them from the others. The various taxes, the Victory loans, have opened our eyes on our capacities, so much greater than was believed during peace-time. Such restraints were very good. Many of them should stay forever, because they are a sure way to some

form of economic independence. If we became a thrifty nation, as was France, as was England, also, as Scotland ever was, we would keep in our hands the key to a much greater prosperity. Would not that be a very great conquest?

We must also apply that conquering spirit to the management of public and private affairs. We should not be materialists, we should not be mystics, but we ought to be staunch realistic minds. The best English-speaking Canadians are often being heard complaining that their people are too materialistic, too much a money-making people ; even a great statesman like the Earl of Durham noticed that and wrote it in his celebrated Report on British North America, a century ago. On the other side, many good French Canadians deplore being too idealistic and not enough money-making ; certain French Canadian writers call their people to go mystic in various fields of activity. If History and Tradition mean really something to them, they should consider what great realistic minds were the founders of New France, the founders of the French Canadian nation. Cardinal de Richelieu, the Minister of the French king, and after him Colbert, another minister, were not dreamers, but realists ; trade, commerce, industry were, after religion, their first aim. Bishop de Laval, the first Bishop of Québec and the founder of the Québec Seminary, showed himself quite realistic when he opened schools of crafts and agriculture. Jean Talon, a great, the

greatest intendant of New France, was not a mystic, a dreamer ; he dealt with sound realities. This is the real French Canadian tradition, a tradition to be embraced again, in the very measure it may have been abandoned.

If we could blend together, in a good teaching, the best of the English and of the French traditions, we would have all the necessary ingredients for a first-class civilisation. Shall we be stupid enough to throw in the river such treasures? That is what we will be if we continue staying apart, as we have done in the past.

We have been young fools, if you permit me to speak frankly, on both sides. We have each received an inheritance, but we have kept it hidden the one from the other ; we have despised each other's qualities, virtues and treasures.

Let us now try and put them together. Let us put in both inheritances the spirit of conquest, a strong determination, a will to win over nature and over ourselves.

Come, come, Canadians of both cultures and of both languages. The Country is awaiting our arms, our hands, our heads and our hearts. Let us go to work, not apart, but together. There, and there only is salvation for our Canada !

THE TEACHING OF HISTORY ? (*)

The teaching of National History has been made responsible for the bitterness that exists between our two groups. Is it true ? It certainly is a common saying. You have read it in various periodicals. I have read it, also, in some of the letters I have received, from both sides.

The most significant of those letters is one written by a correspondent with a French name, but born from both stocks, the English as well as the French. He is a man of a good standing, he is educated, he has mingled with English-speaking as well as with French-speaking Canadians ; he was a student, for higher studies, in English protestant institutions ; he says he has had many discussions with English-speaking Canadians ; he has age and experience, and in his opinion the prejudices of the English-speaking Canadians against the French Canadians have their origin in the school, in the teaching of National History. I have heard many French Canadians being of the same opinion. The same opinion prevails amongst the English-speaking Canadians, who say that the French Canadian school is responsible for the hatred against the other group.

(*) April 18, 1943.

So, we have the same accusation from both sides. That there is hatred exhibited, is a fact that cannot be denied. But, to be just we must consider that the fact is not universal ; can we say that mutual hatred is a common thing ? No. I think it affects a minority on both sides, but it is a loquacious minority, it is a noisy minority, and some people deceived by the clamors of the vociferous minority are practically made to believe that the school is responsible for mutual hatred, and in the school the teaching of national history.

At first sight that seems to be true. But let us examine other factors. A first one is the individual temper : there are people who are inclined not to like and to love, but just to hate ; anything or anybody looking different is, to them, object of suspicion, of fear, of dislike, of hate ; of course they are exceptions, but they are trouble-makers, especially in critical times, such as is war.

The second factor is the family. The child takes naturally the social attitudes imposed upon him by his family. There are families in which anything French, or vice versa anything English is despised and hated ; the children brought up in such a milieu will draw from the school textbooks all the details that may confirm their prejudices. In that case the family is really responsible, not the school.

A third factor is made of certain associations for the youth ; some of them use to put stress on the differences between the groups, and sometimes such associations may destroy the good feelings

acquired by the young in the family and even in the school.

A fourth factor is the way religion is taught by certain persons ; I say quite definitely " certain persons ", because I think we should not hold responsible the various sects or creeds ; here the personal element accounts for much ; bigotry can be found in any form of religion ; for instance some of the letters I have received, without signatures, expressing a monstrous hatred against Catholicism, come from souls naturally bitter, overzealous, fanatical. Such souls would be the same in any kind of religion or creed ; they thrive on bigotry ; if they are given a part in the teaching of religion, they will plant the seed of bigotry in their pupils, and this may prevail against the good influence of the family and of the school(*).

A fifth factor is made of certain periodicals. It is a well known fact that some papers seem to be preoccupied with spreading bigotry and fanaticism ; they do not preach for something ; they preach against somebody or against something. Any form of religion being administered by human beings is bound to make mistakes, to suffer from shortcomings, to bear the stains of human weakness and sinfulness. It is always easy to gather from the history of one Church the undoings of some of its members, to present them to young people with a triumphal exclamation : Here is

---

(*) See MYERS, *History of Bigotry in the United States.*

the evil accomplished by that Church ; it is rotten, and so on. As a matter of fact the method is much too easy ; it should be discarded, entirely discarded as one good for feeble-minded, as one contrary to peaceful relations between citizens of various creeds.

One factor is left, and it is the school. From the point of view of National Unity we should, I suppose, eliminate the teaching of Mathematics, of Sciences, of Geography, of Latin and Greek, of foreign languages. The only teaching concerned directly with National Unity is that of History, especially of Modern History, and very particularly of National History.

The History of France and England have been intermingled for many centuries. These two nations have many times been at war, they have sometimes been friends. Such a situation is quite apt to brood evil feelings. The textbooks, or at least the teachers, may give prominence to the wrongs of the other party, without explaining the true responsibilities. The conclusions of the child will be that if he or she is English, it is in the measure he or she is not French, and vice versa ; such conclusions are bad for the two nations in Europe, and are still worse for our two groups here in Canada. Most of the wars between France and England are dynastic wars, they are even anti-democratic wars. Hence the teachers should tell the children that the dynastic enmities no more exist, that living now in a democratic

way, we should not give too much prominence to the wars organized by absolute kings. In a word, the teachers should tell the pupils, not the differences, but the similarities between England and France, similarities in blood and race, in religion, in education, in literature, in fine arts, in sciences, in politics, in civilisation and culture. Such a study would make an excellent background for establishing friendly relations between France and England in Europe, which seems to me the best means for maintaining peace in Europe ; at the same time such a study would be an excellent preparation to the study of our National History.

I have examined various textbooks of National history, both English and French. In some of them much importance is given to wars, according to the old idea of History. Some teachers will prefer that system, because they want the pupils to be interested and they know the pupils are interested in fights and wars. The natural consequence is that the children will immediately take sides according to their race and blood, to their religion, to their group. In other textbooks is to be found the romanticist idea of History ; and it is the idea of wars, fights, conflicts of all sorts ; History must be dramatised, and then prominence is given to any details that will stress the conflicts. The consequences are still worse, because wars are made more bitter, political conflicts are accentuated, religious differences are stressed. The pupils

are thus impressed with a fighting spirit, which they are only too apt to retain for their own life, for all forms of their activities, even social and commercial.

If this is done in the schools of our two main groups, it will be very difficult to bring them together. But, one will say, shall we alter the documents just for the sake of a better understanding? Not at all. The documents and the facts must be given just as they are, just as they happened, but they must be set in their proper background. The Dispersion of the Acadians and the expedition of Frontenac against Corlar, Salmon Falls and Deerfield cannot be excused, but they can be explained by the kind of international law that prevailed at the time. Frontenac's expedition is not worse, but it is no better than the destruction of the Palatinate by the French armies. The burning of the French Canadian houses and barns by the English armies during the Seven Years' war is not better but it is not worse than Frontenac's expedition. Such atrocities belong to olden times, but neither France nor England of to-day would approve of them now. Times have changed.

On the other hand, why should we put so much stress on wars? Would it not be better to give prominence to the social life, to the economic development of our ancestors? and to the democratic evolution of our people?

The new generation of professors of history is much better prepared for such a work than was the older one. Take, for instance, the textbook written by Georges Brown, of the University of Toronto ; this book makes History of Canada a streamlined one ; it insists on social and economic developments of our nation ; it gives justice to both our civilisations, the French as well as the English.

It seems to me that this is the right formula for a textbook on Canadian History. Of course, even with a good textbook something wrong may happen, for instance if the teacher is biased, if the family entertains fanatical ideas, if the various Associations for youth go directly against the school.

But not all defects can be overcome in one moment. In a Democracy all citizens are interested in the welfare of the country, and all citizens must take action along the lines of understanding and unity.

I did not mention the newspapers and periodicals. They also have their share of responsibility. I wish their editors would sometime hold a convention to study just one question, that of National Unity, how to prevent disunity, how to promote Unity. After all, the newspapers and periodicals remain the Adult's school. If they had a page or a space, regularly, on National History written according to the new formula, we may hope that the public opinion would soon be

changed for the better. Even the Letters to the Editor should be denied printing if they go against understanding and Unity.

These are my views, my dear fellow countrymen. I hope you will agree with me. If not, please write me your own views. In due time we will agree, nay we must agree !

OUR MOTHER COUNTRIES (*)

If you permit me, we will talk about our two mother-countries, France and Great Britain. Of all colonies throughout the world it seems to me that Canada is practically the only one to have retained a real cult for both mother-countries.

Other colonies, Holland's, Belgium's, Italy's, Portugal's, speak of their metropolis rather than of their mother-country. Even France's colonies speak in the same terms. But, we, the French Canadians, and you, the English-speaking Canadians, have continued for a very long time to call France and England by the name of our mother-countries. The inhabitants of the thirteen colonies would hardly use that term about Great Britain ; they simply addressed the British people as their brothers ; they considered themselves as just equals with the people of their metropolis. We, the Canadians, we still consider England and France as our mother-countries, though we have been separated from them, in fact and in law, for a long period. Such a characteristic of our national life may perhaps explain some of our divisions.

The attitude of the French Canadians has been the object of studies by their own writers and by English Canadian historians, which is not surpris-

---

(*) April 25, 1943.

ing, if their very peculiar situation is taken into account.

Let us, first, ask outselves what kind of a mother France has been for the French Canadians. In religious matters there is no possible doubt: France gave to New France the best of her blood. The missionaries, sent here by France, were first choice subjects. Suffice it to mention Father Jogues, Father de Brebeuf and their companions, the well-known martyrs, and Bishop Laval, with other Bishops, till de Pontbriand and Briand, or amongst the women, the great lady, Marie de l'Incarnation, and others, well famed, Catherine de Saint-Augustin and Marguerite Bourgeois, or lay women as Jeanne Mance, a brilliant constellation(*). To such a choice of persons, let us add millions and millions, in money, given away by France in charities of all sorts. In the religious field the French Canadians can never have too high praises for France, who showed herself a mother loving, devoted, generous, and that unceasingly. This realized the first intention of Cardinal de Richelieu, which was the preaching of Christianity by word and by example ; the preachers even gave their blood for the fostering of Christianity among the Indians.

France was not less generous with laymen. Consider only Champlain, de Maisonneuve, Dollard des Ormeaux, d'Iberville, Jean Talon,

---

(*) See ELLIOTT, *The Women Pioneers of North America.*

and so many others, without forgetting the most humble of the colonists, chosen with great care.

However, there is another side to the medal. The various companies have been neglectful, following their spirit of greed and imposing the burden of their monopoly. Most of the wars suffered by the colony have been imposed upon New France by European ambitions. Some of the administrative officers were mediocre ; an excessive control of the local affairs was enforced by a too distant office at Versailles ; the colony was denied the benefit of printing ; Bigot and his gang spent foolishly, taking the money and the bread from the habitants, and finally the colony was abandoned at the end of the Seven Years' War. Hence, as a people we owe much to religious France, but we owe much less to political France, which explains the painful exclamation of Mr. de Gaspé, saying : " Mother-country, a real shrew, has abandoned her Canadian children. "

After the cession to England those who would more cruelly feel the absence of France, were the clergymen and the religious congregations, because they then lost part of the very precious and very efficient financial aid of France. As for the people they had long since lost contact with the country of origin. The greatest majority of the families were composed of persons born here, riveted to the Canadian soil by many generations, having no more relatives in France, living here upon their

own work and industry. For such people the separation was much less painful ; they had come, little by little, to consider France as a far distant country, nearly as an enemy, writes Mr. de Bougainville. They could not lose much by the separation ; since they could retain their religion, their language and their laws, the difference would not be so great.

When came the French Revolution and its bloody persecutions, they felt themselves with a much lesser affection for France. With the Constitution of 1791, they would have the impression of attaining a maturity that never France would or could have given them. Even the clergy, who had now sufficient local resources, was composed of men born in the country, enjoying liberties that the French Revolution would have taken away from them, could feel as little affectionate as the people themselves.

So, little by little, France was becoming a remembrance, and surely it was not any more the mother-country. But had Great Britain become for them a mother-country? Not yet. Not that Great Britain had not been generous towards them ; but its gifts had been spoiled by the harshness of some of the administrative officers, by the haughty attitude of a class, which gave itself as the aristocracy of the place, and by the necessity of a continual watch over the rights they cherished.

However, something came that might change their views ; it was the unexpected alliance between France and England against Russia in the Crimean War. Both were victorious, and on the occasion the English Governor-General invited the French Canadians to use together the English flag, and the French flag, the tricolor. Not much later a French frigate appeared in the waters of Québec ; that event, with the Treaty of Cobden in 1860, which renewed the commercial relations between France and England, did much to alter the sentiments of the French Canadians toward France.

For it meant closer relations between them and France. While French books had always entered Canada through indirect channels, now they would come directly. They came and they influenced the French Canadian mind and literature. As romanticism flourished in France, it was closely imitated in Canada, where poets and prose writers sang the praises of France much more than the beauties of Canada ; they tried to kindle in the hearts of the French Canadians a sort of platonic love for France, as a mother-country. That love became more ardent when France was crushed under the Prussian heel in 1870-71. When the French Empire was replaced by the Third Republic, the affections of the pious Canadians reverted to Ancient France whilst the *esprits forts* gave their preference to Modern France. This last one did not fail to foster the Canadians' love

for France, through visits, missions, decorations, gifts, and so on, which prompted them to consider France as their intellectual metropolis.

At the same time the French Canadians remained loyal to Great Britain ; they had a sincere admiration for the political and democratic institutions of Great Britain, so much so that at the end of the 19th century both countries were regarded by the French Canadians as two mother-countries, though for much different reasons.

The South African War came, with an imperialistic campaign, in many instances ill-conducted, or at least presented as such by nationalist speakers. The double effect was bad, and was adroitly exploited by the new nationalist party, which finally cooled down the esteem of the French-Canadians towards England ; so much so that at present few French-Canadians will use the word mother-country while speaking of Great Britain.

There are a few, nay many English-Canadians in the same dispositions. They even prefer sending students to the United States rather than to England, lest they return decanadianized.

So, little by little, both groups are coming to the same attitude towards the so-called mother-countries. Canada's own political development towards autonomy tends also to cool down the love for the mother-countries. The more we feel autonomous, the more we tend to talk to England as between equals. The presence of Canada in the

Superior Councils, her preponderant vote in certain assemblies, the rights conferred by the Statute of Westminster, the very organization of the British Commonwealth, the great participation of Canada to the present war in men, in money, in industrial production, all these factors entitle Canada to speak on equal terms with the United Kingdom, as partners in the whole Commonwealth.

Our children will be fed on these ideas and feelings ; when we say Britain, our mother country, they will say, the British, our brothers. The French-Canadians themselves will feel they have grown to be equal with the people of France, in the measure of the part they take in this war. As they admire the political institutions of Great Britain, they would like to feel that the English-Canadians admire the high culture of France. From both sides this is how we should look at our former mother-countries.

As a matter of fact for the best educated of the Canadians of both groups, there is no more European mother-country. They have one country only, and it is Canada. With Albion or with Marianne they want to deal as equal to equal. We should never look at them as enemies. On the contrary we retain for them a deep gratitude for their past services and a keen appreciation for the good they still can do us.

But we have to make the rest of the Canadians rid themselves of the last traces of colonial fever.

This will be done in due time. Shall it be long? Perhaps fifty years? But what is half a century in the life of a nation? We could do it more rapidly if we had the proper organization.

Where are the citizens, of either language, who would commit themselves in the establishment and the functioning of such an organization? They are many of course, in both groups. Are they ready to sign their name on a manifesto? Will they give of their time, their money, their influence?

Indeed the work of appeasement, the work of entente, the spirit of understanding and of unity is surely progressing. Who are the sincere Canadians who would refuse to participate?

Mr. AYLMER'S MISTAKE (*)

I remembered, of course, the teaching I had received at high school and at college in Québec about English literature. But that knowledge had become hazy in the course of years ; the name of Nathaniel Hawthorne was to me a pale remembrance, as I suppose Alphonse Daudet's name would be to a Canadian educated in an Ontario high school.

While I was lying in a bed at the hospital in Toronto, one of my friends brought me a little book of the collection World's Classics, and the book contained Hawthorne's Tales. My friend had marked five tales he considered as particularly interesting. I read them and felt convinced that my friend had a sound literary taste.

Amongst the tales I noticed one written in 1843, under the title " The Birthmark ". The title and the year attracted me much as being related with the multitude of thoughts coming to my mind after a lecturing tour in the Western Provinces of Canada.

I read the tale. Aylmer was a scientist, a sort of alchemist. Though his love was for science, he happened to fall in love with a woman, whom he

---

(*) May 2, 1943.

married. She was a beautiful woman, in whom Aylmer found no defect except after the wedding. On one of her cheeks the wife had a birthmark, kind of a little hand deeply impressed in her skin. Others, men and women, had long ago noticed that birthmark ; some said it spoiled, others averred it enhanced the woman's beauty. Aylmer was probably too deeply interested in his work to notice such a trifle in his prospective wife, but he paid it much attention, once married. And he conceived the idea of ridding his wife of the birthmark.

He opened his mind to her about his plan. The wife, at first, was greatly shocked at the idea ; she had always believed that the birthmark added to her beauty and that the mark went so deep in her nature as to have root in her very heart. But the husband could not come to think so and the birthmark became the source of a permanent quarrel between them. So much so that the woman finally agreed to submit herself to a treatment which would remove the birthmark. Full of joy, the husband started using all the powers of his chemistry to compose an elixir which would work wonders and make his wife a beauty without the slightest imperfection.

He realized the elixir ; the woman drank of it ; the birthmark disappeared, but the woman died.

Such is the sad story told by Hawthorne and I felt deeply impressed with the lesson it implied from the viewpoint of National Unity.

At the beginning of the 17th century, Mother France gave birth to a nation, on the shores of the St. Lawrence River; it was New France, Miss New France. She grew to be a beautiful woman ; she was active laborious, skilful, artistic-minded ; she loved to dream ; but she had been born with a birthmark on her very cheek, something she could not conceal. The mark was complex ; it was a mixture of three elements, a pattern typically French, a color distinctly Catholic, with a kind of aura taken from the great Nature in which she had been born.

After a long war — the Seven Years' War — Miss New France was forced to part from her mother France and to enter into a new family, mother Britain's family. There she met with one of mother Britain's sons, the young Mr. Canada also named Jack Canuck, a sturdy youth, who was very busy in his work, making money, playing politics ; he was a sort of alchemist, trying to transform everything into gold or silver ; he had faith in his own views as Aylmer had faith in his scientific dreams.

For a long time he considered the girl as a stranger who had been introduced into the family. They had their difficulties and their petty quarrels, as is natural between young people, even in the best families, but he did not pay attention to the birthmark on the young lady's cheek.

Little by little, young Jack Canuck became more and more interested in Miss New France.

He thought she might be a good wife to him. Both started talking together of the future. They declared they would forget their old quarrels. They made a survey of their assets. The woman had possessed large estates, in ancient times, as far as the Gulf of Mexico ; this had been lost, but she still had interests in the Maritime Provinces and in the Far West ; these should be protected and the prospective husband agreed to protect them ; he, on his side, had his own assets and he made sure that the bride would help him in developing them. But he paid little attention to the birthmark on the cheek of Miss New France.

When the terms of the contract were agreed upon between themselves, the groom and the bride wanted them to be written by a notary of high reputation and they went across the ocean to London, a great city, and there they found that notary, who was no other than the sovereign of England, Her Majesty Queen Victoria. That happened to be in the year 1867, and the contract of marriage became known under the name of the " British North America Act. "

Then, as in the best fairy tales, they settled down to be happy and bring up many children. But soon enough Jack Canuck felt his mind disturbed about the birthmark that was on the cheek of his wife. The more he looked at it, the more he felt inclined to dislike it. Finally he declared to his wife, that though she was perfect for the rest, she had one defect, which was the birth-

mark. The wife was deeply surprised and shocked, because she had always believed that the birthmark made her only prettier ; she was pained at the same time at the thought that what she believed to be part of her nature might be an offence to her husband.

Life began to be a burden to her, for nothing is more painful to a wife than the feeling that she is unpleasant to her husband. The birthmark said clearly that she was French, Catholic and Canadian ; and that very significance was what her husband considered as an imperfection, when she thought it was quite the contrary. The husband would hardly let a day pass without looking at the birthmark, without making some unpleasant remark upon the subject.

He soon formed a plan in his head. Like Aylmer the scientist, the alchemist, he had a very high opinion of his capacities, and he decided he was able to remove the birthmark which in his opinion marred the beauty of his wife. He kept busy in devising means to fulfill his purpose.

Curiously enough he did not consider that he had been himself neglectful in giving little attention to that birthmark before they married. The birthmark had always been there ; it was quite noticeable ; it had been noticed by all others ; he only had neglected to see it in due time. He should have considered that his complaint came too late.

Yet he wished for his wife so much good and so

great a perfection of beauty that he continued to take offence at what he considered a stain, the stain of French character, the stain of Catholic religion. And his bright mind was fertile in inventing ways and means of removing the stain.

The wife, of course, was well aware of her husband's intentions and she deplored them. She felt that the birthmark was so deeply impressed in her body that its very roots were deep in her heart ; she knew that to remove it from her skin would be to remove her own heart.

Without knowing, perhaps, Jack Canuck was proceeding absolutely along the lines followed by the alchemist Aylmer in Hawthorne's tale ; he would use painless methods on his wife ; he would, little by little, depreciate in her eyes her own religion ; he would suppress the teaching of her French language everywhere it was possible; he would tell her that her language was old-fashioned and out-moded in a country where the vast majority spoke only English ; he would tell her that his own culture, the British, was not only the best, but was really the only good one.

However, quite unexpectedly his wife discovered, in his vast library, a little book of tales, and as she was very fond of stories she began to read from the book ; and she found one tale entitled 'The Birthmark' ; she read the story of Aylmer the alchemist and of his wife, and how Aylmer wanted to rid his wife of a birthmark, how he devised the most powerful elixir to remove it painlessly, how

he succeeded in combining the elixir, how the wife quaffed it, how the birthmark disappeared, but alas ! at the same time, how the birthmark had its roots in her very heart, and how Aylmer saw his dear wife die in his arms.

Jack Canuck's wife saw immediately what would be her fate if she drank the elixir prepared by her husband. But she was determined that she would not die ; she would not have her French and Catholic birthmark removed from her cheek. She did not delay in telling her husband about her discovery of the book of tales, and about the terrible risk he was taking.

That was a blow for poor Jack Canuck. He had read many of the books in his library ; he even had read some of the tales written by Hawthorne, but he had not read the tale of the birthmark.

As he was a man of a good nature, a generous heart, a loving husband, a wise mind, he pondered over the matter and resolved that he had been wrong though with the best of intentions. His regret was as deep as his zeal had been great, and he started undoing all he had done against the birthmark. He went so far as entirely to change his mind about it. What he had regarded as a stain began to appear to him as just the contrary, and he told his wife : " My dearest, pardon me. I have been wrong with you. I have been overconfident in my knowledge, in my science, in my ambitions, in my hopes. I see very well, now, that your birthmark is an essential part of your dear self. No, I

do not want you to die ; I do not desire any more that you should be altered in your nature. I accept you as you are, a good French woman, a good Catholic wife, a good Canadian companion. We have had difficulties together ; a husband is bound to take time before he understands his wife well.

I admit I was prejudiced about your religion, your language, and all your French background. I have been brought up according to strictly British views, and I think I am tinged with what is termed British Pride. From now on I shall take another attitude ; your birthmark will be in my eyes your " grain de beauté ". We have not lived enough together ! I have kept apart in my workshop, and you have kept apart in your kitchen and your boudoir ; why not live together a little more ? »

And the wife answered : " My dear husband, you speak the right language. I have also to ask your pardon for my fancies and whims ; a woman, as you know, is bound to do such things. I admire your culture, I like your language ; since you do as much for my culture and my language, we should join forces and see that all our children will have the opportunity of learning both languages, of benefiting from both our cultures. We will help each other in bringing up a family of strong boys and beautiful daughters. "

Then Jack Canuck kissed his wife, and they were happy, and they had many children and they built a great country.

PILGRIM'S PROGRESS OR CELESTIAL RAILROAD ? (*)

Some of my correspondents have their own ideas about the part the French Canadians have to play in regard to national unity. One of those ideas might be expressed by the words " Have a streamlined religion. " As a matter of fact, they simply say : " Modernize your Church. "

This is really a striking idea. I had it in my mind when I happened to read another of Hawthorne's tales, which is entitled " The Celestial Railroad, " and, of course, when I was through reading the story I felt obliged to read Bunyan's " Pilgrim's Progress. " One of my friends had it on his book-shelf. It was a de luxe edition, well illustrated, and it was a pleasure to the eye as well as to the mind to accompany Bunyan's principal personage, Mr. Christian, along his journey to the Celestial City of Happiness. I was even wondering what Mr. John Bunyan would say if he saw me reading his book ,while seated in a comfortable rocking-chair and enjoying a cigarette as well as the de luxe printing of a book evidently written against anything de luxe. Yet, I felt myself sufficiently streamlined to do that, at the risk of receiving a severe blame from dear Mr. Bunyan's shadow.

(*) May 9, 1943.

What a difference with Hawthorne's "Celestial Railroad." This was the apex of comfortable living and travelling.

You know, as well as I do, that both tales — Bunyan's and Hawthorne's — are just dreams, but those dreams teach us very precious lessons about modernizing Churches, about streamlining religion. To-day, as well as in Bunyan's times, we have, we Christians, to make our choice between Pilgrim's Progress and Celestial Railroad. Bunyan's dream has its foundation in the Gospel; we may say that the dream comes from one passage of the Gospel, where it is said, in Matthew, 7, 13-14: "Enter ye at the straight gate; for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat. Because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth into life, and few there be that find it."

These are very remarkable words. I confess that I have been brought up, during the last part of the nineteenth century, with the idea that the way to Heaven is not an easy way. In those somewhat remote times, education was a tough process. I mean all education — religious, moral and intellectual. We were really trained to fight our way through and against difficulties of all kinds.

Now, please do not take me for a sad, mournful and melancholy mind, interested only in the past, in the old ways of life. No, certainly no. I am not a

praiser of past times ; I like modern life and scientific inventions. I just want to know how much I can accept of the idea of a modernized Church, as it is advocated by some of my correspondents, and probably by some of my listeners. We are all influenced by the education we have received, but independently of my former tough training and having in mind just the needs of modern society. I would like to go more deeply into the problem of modernizing the Churches, the Christian Churches.

The more I try to reconcile that modernizing with the Gospel the more I find them opposed, contradictory, irreconcilable.

Methinks we have all been spoiled, to some extent, by the opinion of some philosophers, such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau, for instance, and accordingly we are all trying to make things easy. Take education. Do we require any effort on the part of students and pupils? Practically none. We want smooth methods everywhere. Amongst educators, our praises go to those who make everything easy and smooth. In ancient times it was held that there was no royal road to knowledge. We have changed that and made things such that all our children are kings for whom royal boulevards and well paved ways extend in all directions. We are forgetting that in moral life, effort is a necessity ; that in education, fighting, struggling, making effort is necessary if we want

to endow our children with a strong moral character.

We want the same thing in matters of religion. Lots of us, Christians, make endeavors to modernize and streamline religion. "Narrow is the way," says the Gospel? Well, let us widen it. "Narrow is the gate," says the Gospel? That's easy to correct. We will make of that little gate a large portal, wide enough for Rolls Royces and Pierce Arrows.

The Pilgrims had trouble in climbing the hills of Difficulty, of Lucre, of Error? Let us cut those hills. It is a long, long way by walking? Why not have a railroad — a celestial railroad, from the city of Destruction to the Heavenly City? Certainly, in these our times, we have all the engineers and contractors for such an enterprise. You will recognize them while I recite their names, just as John Bunyan wrote them in his book. We have Mr. Talkative, son of Mr. Say-well, who can sell the bonds. Here is Mr. Smooth-way, a close relative to Hawthorne's Mr. Smooth-it-away, nearly twins, able engineers who can remove all difficulties. Here is Mr. Facing Both-ways, who will be a perfect dispatcher. Sir Having Greedy will fix the tariffs and salaries. Lord Desire of Vainglory will head the Department of Publicity. Lord Luxurious and Lord Carnal-Delight will take charge of the pulmans. Mr. Hate Light will manage the tunnels. Mr. Live-Loose will take care of the dining-car, with the liquors. Mr.

Hold-the-World will make the company the last word in monopoly. Mr. Two-Tongues will be the director of the Vanity Fair.

As you see, there will be employment for many people, the very same people who became acquainted with Mr. Christian in the 17th century. There will be work also for Mr. Hawthorne's people, Mr. Live-for-the-World, Mr. Hide-Sin-in-the-Heart, Mr. Scaly Conscience, Mr. Take-it Easy. Following Hawthorne's advice, we should also interest the clergy in the building and functioning of our modern Celestial Railroad, and we will have, as in these time, the Reverends Shallow-Deep, Stumble-at-Truth, This-Today, That-Tomorrow, Clog-the-Spirit, and Wind-of-Doctrine. Of course we should have also Mr. Money-Love, who finds it "possible to justify the morality of any action which brings cash."

While building the railroad, we will span by bridges the valleys of Despond, of Despair, of Death. To fill in some of the gaps we will use the garbage of the good books, which are never read, and of the good or bad sermons rarely or never listened to.

The main difficulty, in such a process of modernization, will be the terminal. It was a problem even for Bunyan's Mr. Christian, who found out that right near the gate of the Celestrial City there is a trap-door leading to Hell. It was a problem also for Hawthorne reaching by railroad the same city,

just to find out he had been cheated by the Eternal Enemy.

Yes, we could perhaps modernize the Church as far as that gate, but there always will be the difficulty of the terminal, the admission within the heavenly doors. The problem was greater for the railroad travellers than for the pilgrim, slowly progressing, and this leaves me wondering if the comfortable and luxurious railroad can finally take us, Christians, to heaven.

Hawthorne's railroad is a dreamer's fancy. But there are such dreamers nowadays. Some considered the way so hard between this world and the next that they have simply declared there is no other world. These are the Atheists. Others have modernized religion on various points ; for instance they have rationalized the Holy Bible to such an extent that the Sacred Writs are left empty of their content ; or, they never go to church, they never care to listen to a sermon, they never read either the Bible or any other book about religion. They are like those passengers who stay sleeping in their berth for the whole duration of the trip. Others travel with a pass, never giving a penny for religious needs.

Modernized, indeed ; highly modernized. Is it really that sort of modernization some of my correspondents have in their mind ? I would be afraid, perhaps, of the answer. I have discussed the matter with Protestants of various creeds, and I have found out with great pleasure that they would not

allow their church to be modernized to such an extent. They are not Puritans, indeed, but they are rather in favor of Mr. Christians' Pilgrim's Progress than of Mr. Smooth-it-Away's railroad.

It is also the opinion of the Catholic Church. Her religious writers dislike the very idea of a celestial railroad ; they would all approve of the spiritual views of John Bunyan, except, of course, about the Pope. They tell their Catholic readers that the way and the gate are narrow, as it is said in the Gospel.

But I may have been mistaken. Perhaps my correspondents, when asking for modernization of the Catholic Church, were thinking just of the administrative department. If it is so, I wonder why. After all, no two churches will be administered in the same manner, and this temporal and material side of religious activity is not of primary importance. The great problem is Faith and Charity ; it is a pure conscience ; it is gaining life by following the One who said : " I am the way, the truth and the life. "

In the pursuit of such ideals, we are all bound to make mistakes, because we are all human beings. Is it not a pity to see the various Christian denominations throwing at each other's head the human errors, mistakes, weaknesses of their members and of their clergy, as if nineteen centuries had taught us no wisdom, no tolerance ? What sweet music to the enemies of the Christian religion to hear our discord ! What contentment

to the Pagans and to the Atheists to see the Christians discussing, after so many centuries, the very fundamentals of their religion ! And yet, that is what we are doing. We don't want to forget, we don't to forgive. We get busy with futile historical and academic discussions, or we are intent upon replacing the Way of the Cross by the way of Vanity Fair ; the village of Repentance by the town of Shun-Repentance. Oh ! indeed, what fools these mortals be ! And we are those fools " busy with our petty quarrels. "

His Majesty the King of England our King, has asked us, Canadians, in 1939, to set an example the world might follow. Words of wisdom he said. People of wisdom we are if we only listen to him, if we answer his call.

If we stay divided, we set an example but it is a very bad example. If we unite, then we set an example — a good example. May I be allowed, though only a citizen, to repeat here the generous call of our Beloved Sovereign. May I invite you. Canadians, to try and be, first of all, good Christians ; to try and enlighten others, not by our vain discussions but by a righteous life. Let us deal with the sound realities of the sublime teachings offered by our Sacred Books rather than by dreams of modernizing the Church. Let us take humbly after the steps of the Pilgrim, instead of boarding the train of a railroad that may lead us only to destruction. There, I believe, is the truth, the truth that we should not smooth away.

AFTER READING 300 LETTERS (*)

The flow of letters has continued, steadily, growing in numbers, growing in quality, growing in interest. The correspondents represent, however, a small portion of the listeners. I have been surprised, while travelling and lecturing across Canada, at the number of people listening to these addresses on Canadian Unity. They are interested in the subject itself, and I see in that a strong evidence of the growing desire for a better understanding between the two main groups of our Canadian nation.

Shall I say again that most of my correspondents agree with my views? Yes, I shall, if only to fortify the weak, who need the certitude of belonging to the majority. They will come to us, they will stay with us, if they perceive that we hold the right end of the stick.

There are also the dissidents, those who disagree, partly or wholly. It is a real pleasure to follow a discussion with them. Some day, when I am given more leisure, I will prepare an answer to each of the objections offered by my correspondents. I have also in mind a questionnaire to be sent to all my correspondents, and to all those of

---

(*) May 16, 1943.

my listeners who will ask for it. I have distributed, in the four Western provinces, 400 copies of that questionnaire, and I have already received very interesting answers. It would be easy, with the help of the letters I have received, to prepare a new and more precise questionnaire, which would bring more precise answers.

For the moment I think that a great number of difficulties would be solved by a better knowledge of our Canadian history. Many Canadians seem to believe that Canadian history begins in 1867, with the Confederation ; such a view may prevail particularly in the Western Provinces, since they became members of our Confederation only in or after 1867. Others think that the history of Canada begins only with the Treaty of Paris in 1763. Rare are the English-speaking Canadians who consider the history of the country before that year. I do not mean that the period of the French rule is not the subject of teaching in the schools ; but it is quite possible that the time given to that period is too short, or that many students regard the French rule as of no importance for their public life. The French Canadians, for their part, study carefully the whole history of North America, and particularly the period between the discovery of Canada by Jacques Cartier in 1534 and the cession of Canada to England in 1763.

Hence results a disparity of historical knowledge which, I think, accounts for many of our mis-

understandings. I have felt that in many of my conversations with English-speaking Canadians. They have felt it themselves when the historical facts were offered for their consideration, and they have expressed their regret that they either did not learn or they had forgotten the facts.

Curiously enough, one Westerner told me quite frankly that history should not be given much attention. This may be excusable in a businessman intensely taken up with the present conditions of life. Yet it makes for lots of misunderstandings between our two groups, since they are not on the same ground. Canada will remain a mystery to the vast majority of her citizens if the whole history of the country is not properly explained. The new books of Professor Long and of Professor George Brown(*) will do much to shed light on the period before 1763, if they are put in the the hands of the English-speaking students in high schools and university, but there will be left the great numbers of boys and girls who leave before the end of high school. Something ought to be done for them. At least the course given in extension departments should include a clear explanation of the above mentioned period ; otherwise our problems of Canadian citizenship will probably remain unsettled forever.

(*) LONG. *A History of the Canadian People. New France.* Ryerson.

(*) BROWN, George W. *Building the Canadian Nation.* Dent and Sons.

In all places where I have used the historical facts in my lectures, the hearers have been pleased and they have asked for more ; they even insisted that I should return and give a series of lectures on Canadian history. There is a field for work open to all our University professors. We could even conceive a plan for an exchange, whereby English-speaking professors would come to Québec to teach their views on English Canada, whilst French Canadian scholars would go to our other provinces to teach the French period of our national history. Such lessons, on both sides, would start discussions which might be very profitable to the audiences. There are enough professors, in the English Canadian Universities who could use the French language for such courses, and many French Canadian professors know English enough to use that language in similar lectures in the other provinces. With many Canadians I believe that such an exchange would greatly promote understanding between the two groups.

Here I come to another part of my little speech. Some of my correspondents tell me they don't like the use of the expression " two groups " ; they seem to want just one group ; they use a number of considerations in order to convince me that it is highly desirable for Canada to apply here the method of the melting pot, to apply it to the French-Canadians especially. This again takes us back to history. Any Canadian, of any social origin, who will have studied Canadian

history from its very beginning, will be forced to admit that the melting-pot theory cannot apply to the French-Canadians. Facts are facts and any honest mind must bow to their powerful light. It is a fact, well established, that the French-Canadian people have successfully resisted all attempts to assimilate them ; their present determination is so strong that I know of no power on earth to weaken or to break it. Any such attempt could only irritate them and make more sure and more fatal a separation between the two groups.

Would it not be a better policy to take them as partners ? Such a stand is gaining more and more every day amongst the English Canadians, and particularly amongst those who have come in direct and frequent contacts with them. This also I know by numerous letters and conversations. The difficulties remain only with those of the English Canadians who have never met the French Canadians. I admit there are lots of them, but this is only a reason for the others to try to enlighten their friends.

The people of Great Britain have long ago come to think that Canada is a country of a dual culture and a dual language. It seems to me that the French language is more taught and learned in the British Isles than in English Canada, which is really surprising. The public men of England speak French more than our public men do. I know many American colleges and high schools in which the French language is

taught and learned as much as in English Canada, though it is much less necessary in the United States than in our country.

I have often quoted, in my lectures, the opinion of our beloved King, George VI, on that topic. Our king considers Canada as a country of a dual culture. I cannot imagine that a single Canadian of English language, being a loyal subject, would go contrary to the king's views on such an important question.

Then we have no other alternative than to come to an agreement. The first article of the agreement should be to discuss our common problems, in a polite and friendly fashion. The members of our Parliaments are entitled to enjoy freedom of speech. Yet, they are restricted by many rules which force them to be polite, to be accurate, to avoid insinuations. The same rules should apply to all discussions, all writings, all speeches about national problems, and particularly to our newspapers. At least the best citizens should conform to such rules ; they should see that their favorite newspapers did the same.

I remember that the Earl of Durham, speaking a century ago about the French Canadians, said that they were right in rebelling against the abuses of the well-known bureaucracy of these times. If Durham appeared to-day on the Canadian scene he certainly would blame those, either citizens or newspapers, who use harsh language any time they deal with the French Canadians.

The terrible stress of a long war may account for a certain amount of nervousness. To-day and from now on it may be quite different. To-day the bells of the Catholic Church in Quebec ring loud to celebrate our Victory in Africa. To-day the Catholics of French Canada, following the call of His Eminence Cardinal Villeneuve, are kneeling in their churches to return thanks to Almighty Lord for our Victory over the enemy. Our hopes, in French Canada, are already turned to thanksgiving. Our hopes have become a certitude. To-day the French Canadians congratulate in their hearts the great nations, Britain, the United States and France, for their gallant deeds. Today the French Canadians feel proud of their English-speaking fellow countrymen for their part in the victory. They also have their share in that victory, and Quebec is proud of her sons, the French Canadians of all Canadian provinces, who have been in the battle. Quebec feels justly glad about the participation of France in their big success.

Nearly a hundred years ago, when France and Britain had won victory together, the British Governor-General of Canada asked the French Canadians to put France's tricolor flag beside the British flag to celebrate the event. The same invitation might well be extended to them to-day. None of my correspondents, none of my listeners would object to it, I am sure of that. Nearly all of the 300 letters I have received make me think that the two main groups of Canada want to

unite, and that they are in fact more united than is thought. Organizations like the Union démocratique, the Institut démocratique and Le Bloc d'Entente Canadienne speak loudly for the French Canadians. Similar societies are being organized amongst the English-speaking Canadians.

Really National Unity is on its way to final Victory over prejudice ! Let us all help to its triumph !

ABOUT THE BIBLE (*)

In a Letter to the Editor, recently published in a Montreal daily of English language, I read valuable considerations about the sacred books. While reading that letter I could not refrain from remembering the letters I have myself received, in which my listeners expressed their regret that the Catholic Church was opposed to its members reading the Bible.

Many Protestants, it seems to me, think that the Catholics are prohibited from reading the Holy Book. This is a great wonder to me. I am now nearly 60 years old ; I have been educated in Catholic schools, and I am sure that nobody ever prevented me from reading the Bible. It was quite the contrary, for I have been many times urged to read it. I have brought up two children and I have made sure that they read it. I have often bought Bibles to give as wedding gifts or in other circumstances. I have never found the Catholic book-shops short in their stock of Bibles.

During many centuries the Catholic editors and printers have put on the market thousands and thousands of editions of the Bible, and they have always found people ready to buy them.

(*) May 23, 1943.

In order to facilitate the reading of the Bible by Catholics, special editions have been prepared, containing the best parts of the Old or of the New Testament. Naturally, more attention has been given to the Gospels ; pocket editions have been made, some having the four Gospels, others having separately one Gospel. In some editions the four Gospels are put together so as to present the chronological series of events.

All these various books have been largely spread among the students of all sorts of schools and among the people at large, so giving to all the faithful the facilities of reading the Bible.

Do the Catholics avail themselves of so many opportunities? I think they do. To what extent? Here I believe the answer would be practically the same for Catholics and Protestants. In both sections there are fervent and lukewarm people. The fervent go themselves to the fountain, the others have to be persuaded to drink from the font. Many Protestants, while talking with me, have complained of their own indifference towards the Bible. Even the Gideon Bibles put in every hotel room bear evidence that they are very little used. It is the same with the Catholics ; though they are given all possible facilities some will remain negligent.

In order to counteract such negligence the Catholic Church makes it a duty to its priests to read a part of the Gospels every Sunday in the churches, with an explanation, short or long,

according to circumstances. Moreover the Catholic prayer book for Mass or Divine Service contains for each day of the year two or more extracts from both Testaments. At the Evening Office preference is given to Psalms.

My conclusion is that Catholics are given full facilities for reading the sacred books.

The fact remains that Catholics refuse to buy or to accept as a gift what is termed a "Protestant Bible". That there are a few differences between a Protestant and a Catholic Bible, is a fact, a well-known fact. For instance, some books are not recognized by Protestant Churches, as being inspired and they are not included in their Bible. One of my Protestant correspondents even complains of the exclusion of the Book of Tobiah, in which he sees a beautiful glorification of Christian marriage.

Such a question is rather the affair of the theologians. The good people are not much interested in it. They want their spiritual food without inquiring about the exact number of calories or of vitamins, leaving the problem to the specialists.

The other main difference is that a Catholic Bible will always have explanatory notes, whilst some of the Protestant Bibles have not. I have always wondered why there should be complaints about the presence of explanatory notes in editions of the Bible. Any edition of literary masterpieces must come with such notes. Who could understand well Chaucer or Shakespeare, or Milton, without

commentaries? Even the Atlantic Charter has been edited with explanatory notes. If such a document, written in plain modern English and filled with our modern thoughts, requires explanations, what of the ancient books, which have come to us, down the centuries, through translations of translations. And what to think of the so-called "streamlined" editions? I remember having read a streamlined edition of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, which in my opinion was just a profanation. Holy Scripture must be protected in some way against possible distortions of its real meaning, of its Divine message.

It is not my purpose to open here a controversy or even a discussion on a theological or on an historical question. I only want to put myself on practical grounds. One thing is practical; it is that more and more of the Christians will read the Bible, and the best amongst the Protestants do not at all object to the presence of explanatory notes in the Catholic Bibles. Yesterday, I happened to look at the window of a store, the store of the Bible Society, a Protestant organization; they had there Catholic as well as Protestant Bibles, or Catholic editions of books containing extracts from the Bible. This, I think, is a much better method than to try to force upon the Catholics a Protestant edition of the Holy Scripture. The same method should apply in hotel rooms, where the Catholics should find Catholic editions of the Bible. They are not allowed to read

from editions which do not bear a regular imprimatur given by some Catholic authority ; but such editions are easily found on the market, and sometimes they are less expensive than others. Why, then, not use them ? No Protestant would blame a Jew for reading the Talmud or the Thora, or a Moslem reading from the Koran. Why should he blame a Catholic for reading from an authorized edition of the Bible ?

We should, as much as possible, avoid such controversial points ; we should be realists, even in matter of religion and make sure that the essentials are given the people. Let the specialists take care of higher controversies, let the good people have the food they need for their spiritual life.

But there are quarrelsome persons who take their delight in controversies, and especially in religious discussions ; they want these disputes to be made public, especially in some periodical. Is it really good ? I doubt much. The right place for scientific discussions is in the laboratories and academies, but not in public places. Historical controversies are better held in university departments and in archives. Why not do the same with religious problems ; let the theologians study them and when their studies are advanced enough, they will give the clear results to the public. As for us, the public, let us take what is certain in science, in history, in religion and try to make an honest life out of it.

Many of my correspondents have pointed out the necessity of doing so. They see very well that controversies have only one sure effect, which is to bury under a deluge of words the only essential thing, which is charity. We are only too prone to bear on our religious discussions, just as Pharisees are shown in the Gospel bearing sacred words on their chests and forgetting the essential cleanliness of the soul.

Is it not childish and foolish ? Indeed, it is. How many so-called Christians, along the centuries, have sacrified the unity of the Church, for the triumph of their quarrelsome spirit. How many Canadians would gladly sacrifice, and are actually sacrificing, national unity just to ensure that their views on some controversial subjects shall prevail !

This is neigher Christian, nor Canadian. It is just egotism. It goes directly against sane patriotism, against the true spirit of citizenship.

Really, did Divine Providence send us to this country for perpetuating old quarrels, or for ensuring a freedom that Europe could not give? Our futile discussions batter national unity as high seas batter the beacon erected to give light and guidance to the ships travelling through the dark night of the ocean. We do exactly as if we wanted to wreck the beacon and to put out the light.

Well, after all, it is too much controversy, it is too little good work. Such spirit I easily find in many of my correspondents. Of course it is not

without value to me, for it forces me to come to a more precise doctrine on national unity. Yet I may be allowed to prefer the letters in which I find practical and positive suggestions. This is much needed.

Even in this new country, our mothers, France and Britain, gave us a European house to live in. We have been obliged to remodel the house at various times. We still have to do it. Some of us want the whole structure to be pulled down and an entirely new building erected. They are the radicals. Others object to all plans of alterations ; they say that if the house was good for our fathers, it is still good for us ; they are the born traditionalists. Others want to demolish the large wing of the house, the French one of course, and to replace it by some Lancashire construction ; these are the die-hard imperialists. Others want to build two different houses, one English and one French ; they are the separatists.

I believe the old house, with its two wings, was a solid building. I believe it still needs a few alterations. I believe it is not necessary to make two different constructions. I believe we can use some European materials, but they must be shaped according to our North American and Canadian style.

Above all I believe that we should not eternally keep sitting down on the pile of materials and discussing the difficulties met by our forefathers.

We must get to work, we must make the house more comfortable, more safe, more enjoyable.

If we do not stop our silly talking, if we do not rush with the work, we will be left under a leaking roof, or even in front of a ruined edifice. We will have no safe place to read the Bible, let it be Protestant or Catholic, let it be French or English.

Canadians, listen to my call. Stop controversies. Get to work !

LET'S SET AN EXAMPLE THE WORLD MAY FOLLOW (*)

So, this address is the twenty-first of the series. I have been surprised at hearing the statement, for I had never thought it would be so long, when I started in January. Fortunately for you, this address, to-day, will be the last of the present series. Summer has come, and you will be busy with your Victory Garden, as well as with our victorious armies. Then, if I may add a personal touch, I have been kept so busy this winter with colds and with lectures across Canada that my health requires some attention, and perhaps much attention.

You will, then, permit me to take my leave. The regret is mine, for it was a very great pleasure, indeed, to make your acquaintance, to discuss with you, to exchange correspondence with you, to feel that, with you, I was progressing along the lines of national unity.

I regret that I was unable to deal with all the aspects of a very big problem. What is it we have examined together? Racical origins, language, national ideals, business relations, religion, with Bible and with the "celestial railroad," democ-

---

(*) May 30, 1943.

racy, domination, survival, the teaching of history, our mother-countries, assimilation, the relations of professional associations and of the universities with national unity.

It is at the same time much and little. Much for what is involved, and little for what has been left aside. I have said nothing of geography, of education, of the standard of living, of the National Anthem and of a National flag, and of many other problems of great importance, such as economics and politics.

My little radio addresses have surely stirred the public opinion, much more than I thought they would do. The same happened with the French addresses, which have caused a flow of 200 letters and as many oral exchanges of views. In both groups, the French- and the English-speaking, the same amount of interest has sprung out about the entente in Canada. The study of national problems has become à la mode. Newspapers and radio programs have taken their share in that study ; societies have been and are being organized for the same purpose. In the parlors, with or without the regular cup of tea ; at the table, with or without guests, national unity has become the topic of conversation. If only for that, I feel very glad to have disturbed the peace of the quiet souls !

The book which contains my French addresses was published on the 10th of March and in less than two months it was out of print, a second

printing being necessary to answer the public demand. Here is something most gratifying : it is the fact that the college students took nearly half of the first edition. Hence, something is moving forward even amongst the younger generation of the French Canadians.

The English addresses will also be put in book form, probably in June, and it will then be possible to satisfy the orders sent by numerous English-speaking Canadians. You have enquired whether or not the English talks were a translation of the French ones. Well, they are not exactly a translation. Most of them are entirely new texts, for I considered that there are special problems for each group, or that the same problem may be, and often is, viewed differently by each group. Consequently the two books, the French and the English, are a complement to each other.

One of my English correspondents asked me : But, Monsieur l'Abbé, after the radio addresses, what to do ? This is a very pertinent question. Are we going to forget about it ? Not at all. The end of the talks is only the beginning of the work. Now we have to work. The French Canadians have asked me the same question, and they have received the same answer. I told them to take the book, to read it, to make each chapter the object of a study, to find out the weak points, and to submit precise criticisms.

May I ask you the same favor ? I know it is presently being done by one group in Toronto.

Let me hope that other societies will do the same in other cities of Canada.

I have mentioned a questionnaire which I have left in seven of the western towns. The questionnaire is composed of 11 pages. It deals with the main problems. A fair number of answers have already come to my address in Québec ; others will come. If some of you would like to have a copy of the questionnaire, let him write me and he will receive it by mail.

The French and the English letters ,the answers to the questionnaire, the criticisms of both books, the clippings from newspapers and periodicals, all this material will permit me to build a doctrine of national unity. Once the various opinions will have been digested, I would like to write an answer on each question, to mail it to all my correspondents, so as to attain a greater precision in the expression of a theory of national unity.

After that it would be possible to make a book on the subject, preferably in collaboration, with writers chosen from each of the two groups.

Such a book should then be put in the hands of the professors and teachers, of newspapermen, of members of various professional organizations, of the various clubs, throughout Canada. Through such channels the doctrine would spread among the masses of the people and among the younger generation. It would be a solid basis for a course in Canadian citizenship.

We could then supplement it with a study of the best pages and the best poems of our Canadian writers, of other authors, French, British and American, where they wrote about Canada.

The pupils of the elementary schools and of high schools, the students of colleges and of universities who would have absorbed that food would become better citizens of Canada, of North America, of the world. It would be a short cut to nationhood. We could then realize Sir Wilfrid Laurier's prophecy, that this 20th Century will be Canada's century.

And above all we would realize the superb ambition of our beloved King, that Canada, through her dual culture and dual language, may set an example that all the world may follow.

Such is the goal set to our efforts and nothing less could satisfy a young and strong nation as is the Canadian nation.

Garneau, the first and foremost of the French Canadian historians, warned his compatriots, a hundred years ago, against trying new systems ; he told them to leave that to the great nations. The advice was hardly good for that time ; it certainly is not good for our times. Canada is desirous to do great things, and to start right now doing them.

The highest goal offered to our ambitions is to set an example the world may follow.

To set an example. Is this not a dream ? Oh ! no. Nothing is so real. Twin stars we are, turning

the one around the other. Twin stars, making one unit. Twin stars rolling in space towards our destiny. True twins always agree between themselves ; they make a moral unit though they are physically separated. Their unity is an example to brothers who do not agree. Our unity in diversity will be the example other nations in similar conditions may need. After this war there will be, in Europe and in other continents, dual or triple nations, who may be only too prone to foster divisions in themselves, on account of differences of blood, of language, of religion. Where shall they look for an example of mutual tolerance, of understanding, of entente, of union ? They will turn their eyes towards the Canadian nation, where two groups live an harmonious life and work in sincere co-operation for the welfare of their country.

Our Sovereign went even further, when he said that all the world may follow Canada's example. We have, then, to climb higher. Our example will apply to all the world, not only to small nations made of many parts, but to the nations, small or great, who abide under the sun. Our spirit of initiative, our progressive methods, our pacific ways of settling difficult problems, our peaceful relations with our neighbors, our will for co-operation, our right use of the democratic privileges, our sense of duty and responsibility, our knowledge of the two great languages of this world, our culture of the two greatest civilizations of the

western world, our fidelity to the sound principle of philosophy, our deep religious life modeled on the Gospel, all these qualities and virtues will be an example to the rest of the world.

Is not this a noble ideal? Is it not what we should do, what would cure us definitely of our childish moods?

Men of good will, where are you? Do you hear the call to a higher life? Voices make themselves heard from the depth of the past.

Voices of Greece and of Rome urging us to retain the best of the classical culture.

Voice of France, asking her sons and daughters to maintain in North America the virtues she has along the centuries proposed to the imitation of the nations. Voice of England, calling her sons and daughters to keep brilliant in North America the light of her political institutions.

Voices combined of France and of Great Britain, urging us to defend, to enrich and to radiate in America both inheritances they trusted to us.

Voice of Christianity calling us to put our life in accordance with the Gospel, to spread the Christian life through Canada and through all countries.

Voice of our own country asking us to consider her as our real mother and to make her happy and glorious.

Canadians of all racial origins, of the various creeds, of either language, we have all answered the call to arms against our common enemy ; we will answer the call to organize peace and security

in the world. But all these splendid efforts would be lost if we failed to listen to the voices of the past, if we attempt to realize national unity while ignoring the immortal principles of justice and of charity.

His Majesty George the Sixth
our beloved King:

"The sense of Race may be a dangerous and disruptive force; but English and French have shown in Canada that they can keep the pride and distinctive culture which it inspires while yet combining to establish a broader freedom and security than either could have achieved alone."

Winnipeg, 1941, Empire broadcast.

"By God's grace, yours (Canada's) may yet be the example that all the world may follow."

Halifax, 1941, farewell address.

« *The great task before us is to realize our potential greatness as a nation, the* richesses of cultural diversity which is ours. *We shall accomplish this only if French and English Canadians work together to build a strong and united Canada.* »

ACHEVÉ D'IMPRIMER
LE 29 MAI 1944
POUR
LES ÉDITIONS DES BOIS-FRANCS
PAR
CHARRIER & DUGAL LIMITÉE
QUÉBEC.

$1.00 BY MAIL. — PAR LA POSTE. $1.10

The books of **Les livres de**

L'ABBÉ ARTHUR MAHEUX

are sold by **se vendent aux**

ÉDITIONS DES BOIS-FRANCS
C. P. 460, Québec,

and at booksellers. **et chez les libraires.**

BNQ
000 325 776