Moving Beyond Two Solitudes:

Constructing a Dynamic and Unifying

Francophone/Anglophone Relationship, 1916-1940

Robert Talbot

Thesis submitted to the

Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

in partial fulfilment of the requirements

for the Doctorate in Philosophy degree in History

Department of History

Faculty of Arts

University of Ottawa

© Robert Talbot, Ottawa, Canada, 2014

ABSTRACT

By the end of the Great War, Canadians had become more divided along cultural-linguistic lines than perhaps at any other point in their history. Issues surrounding French-language rights outside Quebec and Canada's place in the British Empire had proved especially contentious leading up to and during the war. Twenty years later, however, the country was relatively united as it prepared to enter yet another global conflict.

This study explores the important (albeit partial) rapprochement that occurred during the interwar period between English- and French-speaking Canadians, and in Quebec and Ontario in particular. Remarkably, this rapprochement was the result of both a 'ground-up' pressure from civil society, and cross-cultural accommodation occurring among political élites. Driven by a combination of idealism and self-interested pragmatism, Anglophone and Francophone intellectuals, academics, professionals, businessmen and other citizens who were deeply concerned about the country's future led the call for a more tolerant, pluralistic and liberal Canadian society – one that would allow for greater acceptance of Canada's French fact and for a higher degree of cross-cultural accommodation. Gradually, rapprochement began making its way into the public discourse – through professional and fraternal associations, popular culture, and through more positive contact with the 'Other.' As the rhetoric of cross-cultural understanding developed a wider audience, the political parties responded. The Liberal Party, especially, pressured by its own members from within civil society, became the political vehicle for rapprochement, and began to deal with the big issues of Francophone/Anglophone relations in ways that had been almost impossible a generation earlier.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I must begin by thanking my supervisor, Michael Behiels. This project would not have been possible without his guidance and sage counsel. He always made himself available to read drafts, chat about the thesis and about life's many challenges, and he held my "feet to the fire" when the moment called for it. I am also grateful for his including me through research assistantships in a variety of projects throughout the degree, which, in addition to helping me get into scholarly conferences and publish, also helped keep me fed. I consider him to be a true mentor, a colleague, and a friend.

I would also like to acknowledge the hard work of my thesis examiners: Dr. Penny Bryden from the University of Victoria, and Drs. Damien-Claude Bélanger, Michel Bock and Jan Grabowski from the University of Ottawa. This is a "lengthy" document, to put it mildly, and I am grateful for the time and effort that the examiners put into reading the thesis and providing insightful comments. I must also thank those professors, colleagues, and friends who lent an ear and provided advice, support, and sundry assistance when called upon, including Jordan Birenbaum, Rich Connors, Suzanne Dalrymple, Serge Durflinger, Steve Gooch, Kenneth Jim, Jeff Keshen, Jacques Lafontaine, Manon Bouladier-Major, JoAnne McCutcheon, Nicole Neatby, Katie Rollwagon, Louise Roy, Sébastien Soucy, Takuya Tazawa, Mary and Terry Wadden, Don Wright, and the late Jean-Pierre Wallot. Of course, any faults that remain with the work are my own.

The deepest gratitude, I reserve for my family. My parents (Lloyd and Peggi) and my siblings (Carolyn, Mary Ann and Jonathan) have always been tremendously supportive, and my Grandma's love of history continues to inspire. Although he doesn't quite realize it yet, my son, Everitt, has been an incredible source of joy and strength. But most of all, I owe my wife, Sheila, an almost insurmountable debt of gratitude – for her love and understanding, and for the many sacrifices that she has made so that I could pursue my passion for history. Thank you, all.

This project was made possible with funds from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. The scholarly pursuit of history is fundamental to the democratic integrity of diverse societies like Canada. Funding from arms-length associations like SSHRC allows scholars the freedom and the means to think and write critically about the past, and to question the many "uses and abuses" of history that might otherwise go unchallenged. I hope they keep it up.

RT.

For my parents,

who put me in French Immersion.

"Il est si facile de s'emporter avec violence contre le passé, et d'y supprimer d'un trait de plume tout ce qui n'y correspond pas suffisamment à nos passions."[1]

"Too often do we exaggerate our own virtues and regard our own vices tolerantly – sometimes affectionately – and vent our indignation upon the other fellows'."[2]

[1] Camille Roy, "Le patriotisme de nos vieux maîtres. (À propos de *L'Appel de la Race*.)," in Roy, *À l'ombre des érables* (Québec: Imprimerie de l'Action Sociale, Ltée., 1924), p.298.
[2] William Moore, *The Clash! A Study in Nationalities*, Sixth edition (Toronto: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1919), pp.304-305.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS **IX**

INTRODUCTION **1**

OVERVIEW **1**
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK **3**
INTELLECTUAL HISTORY 3
ÉLITE ACCOMMODATION 8
TERMS AND CONCEPTS 10
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS 16
FEDERALISM 23
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY **29**
GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS AND TIME PERIOD 29
OUTLINE OF TOPICS AND SOURCE MATERIAL 34

CHAPTER I: THE GRAND NARRATIVE AND THE ROOTS OF DISCORD **40**

THE IDEOLOGICAL DIVIDE: COMPETING NATIONALISMS AND RELIGIONS **40**
THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC DIVIDE: ANXIETIES OVER DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGE AND ECONOMIC DISPARITY **52**
THE WAR-TIME DIVIDE: REGULATION 17, RECRUITMENT, AND THE HISTORIOGRAPHY **69**

CHAPTER II: RESTARTING THE PROCESS OF ÉLITE ACCOMMODATION: THE BONNE ENTENTE MOVEMENT **81**

THE GREAT WAR AND THE BIRTH OF THE BONNE ENTENTE MOVEMENT: THE BONNE ENTENTE LEAGUE, 1916-1917 **85**
THE IMMEDIATE POST-WAR EVOLUTION OF THE BONNE ENTENTE MOVEMENT: FROM 'BONNE ENTENTE' TO 'BETTER UNDERSTANDING' **100**

CHAPTER III: FROM BRITISH-CANADIAN ETHNIC NATIONALISM TO ANGLO-CANADIAN CIVIC NATIONALISM **115**

TOWARD LIBERAL CIVIC NATIONALISM AND BICULTURALISM **115**
A FIG LEAF FROM ANGLO-CANADA TO FRENCH CANADA: MOORE, MORLEY AND HAWKES **119**
DEFENDING THE FRENCH FACT: CHALLENGING PREVAILING BRITISH-CANADIAN PERCEPTIONS **125**
PROMOTING BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM **139**

CHAPTER IV: ANGLO-CANADIAN PROFESSIONAL HISTORIANS – REINTERPRETING CANADA'S PAST AS A FOUNDATION FOR RAPPROCHEMENT BETWEEN TWO FOUNDING COMMUNITIES **164**

INITIAL CHANGES IN THE ENGLISH-LANGUAGE HISTORIOGRAPHY **164**

Weaving French-Canadian history into a more sophisticated national narrative **168**

CHAPTER V: FRENCH-CANADIAN MODERATE INTELLECTUALS AND HISTORIANS RESPOND **204**

The 'Laval School' rewrites French Canada's past and present **209**
Thomas Chapais, the Laval School's senior historian **211**
Camille Roy, the Laval School's spiritual and philosophical leader **219**
The Irascible Liberal, Jean-Charles Harvey **232**
Gustave Lanctot: Building Bridges with English-speaking Canada **237**
Abbé Arthur Maheux: Liberal civic nationalist history as a foundation for unity **245**
Challenging Abbé Groulx's pessimistic view of Francophone/Anglophone relations **250**

CHAPTER VI: CIVIL SOCIETY AND CROSS-CULTURAL RAPPROCHEMENT **269**

The Canadian movement **270**
Business and professional associations help bridge the cultural-linguistic divide **276**
Montreal Board of Trade 279
Canadian Chamber of Commerce 285
Canadian Bar Association 292
Canadian Medical Association 303
Canadian Dental Association 313
Religious orders and cross-cultural rapprochement **320**
The ongoing activities of the Bonne Entente League **344**

CHAPTER VII: OFFICIAL MEASURES TO PROMOTE CULTURAL DUALISM AMONG THE PUBLIC **347**

The Sixtieth Anniversary of Confederation celebrations **347**
Expanding official bilingualism **363**
Adopting bilingual postage 364
Biculturalism and bilingualism in the federal public service 369
Adopting bilingual currency 382

CHAPTER VIII: THE 'FRENCH KISS' – ANGLO-CANADIANS ENCOUNTER THE 'OTHER' THROUGH POPULAR CULTURE **394**

Sport **394**
Popular literature, language acquisition, and film **404**
Print media **428**
Radio **441**

CHAPTER IX: TOURISM AND LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL DUALISM IN QUEBEC 467

HISTORY AS ATTRACTION 476
LANGUAGE AND CULTURE AS TOURIST ATTRACTIONS 481
QUAINTNESS 483
ASSERTING 'CANADIANNESS' AND ANGLOPHONE/FRANCOPHONE PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE 487
THE 'MODERN' CANADIAN PROVINCE 496
LEISURE 501
THE TOURISM PROMOTIONAL CAMPAIGN: A SUCCESS? 504

CHAPTER X: YOUTH AND THE PROCESS OF CROSS-CULTURAL RAPPROCHEMENT 514

YOUTH CLUBS AND ASSOCIATIONS 517
THE CANADIAN YOUTH MOVEMENT 521
TOWARDS A NEW CANADIAN HISTORY IN THE CLASSROOM 542

CHAPTER XI: THE LIBERAL PARTIES OF CANADA – BUILDING NATIONAL UNITY VIA ÉLITE ACCOMMODATION 557

FRENCH CANADA AND THE LIBERAL PARTY OF WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE KING AND ERNEST LAPOINTE 561
MODERATE FORCES CONVERGE: THE POLITICAL LOBBY TO RESTORE FRENCH-LANGUAGE EDUCATION RIGHTS IN ONTARIO, 1918-1925 576
THE QUEBEC LIBERAL GOVERNMENT OF LOUIS-ALEXANDRE TASCHEREAU WEIGHS IN 594
TOWARD AN ULTIMATE COMPROMISE: THE AMENDMENT OF REGULATION 17, 1925-1927 605
THE NEW POLITICAL CLIMATE IN ENGLISH-SPEAKING CANADA 612
CROSS-CULTURAL ACCOMMODATION IN PRACTICE: LIBERAL FOREIGN POLICY AND NATIONAL UNITY 618

CONCLUSION 653

BIBLIOGRAPHY 668

ARCHIVAL DOCUMENTS 668
SERIALS 669
BOOKS AND ARTICLES 671

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACC – Association of Canadian Clubs
ACFÉO – Association canadienne-française d'éducation d'Ontario
ACFO – Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario
BANQ – Bibliothèque et archives nationales du Québec
BEL – Bonne Entente League
BNAA – British North America Act, 1867
BUA – Better Understanding Association
CBA – Canadian Bar Association
CBC – Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
CBF – Corporations Branch fonds
CCC – Canadian Chamber of Commerce
CCF – Co-operative Commonwealth Federation
CDA – Canadian Dental Association
CDAF – Canadian Dental Association fonds
CFA – Canadian Fraternal Association
CFAP – Canadian Fraternal Association papers
CHA – Canadian Historical Association
CHR – Canadian Historical Review
CMA – Canadian Medical Association
CMAF – Canadian Medical Association fonds
CNEA – Canada and Newfoundland Education Association
CNR – Canadian National Railway
CPR – Canadian Pacific Railway
CRBC – Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission
CRCCF – Centre de recherche en civilisation canadienne-française
CRL – Canadian Radio League
CSA/AÉC – Canadian Student Assembly/Assoc. des Étudiants Canadiens
CYC – Canadian Youth Congress
GP – Godfrey Papers
JCCC – Junior Chamber of Commerce of Canada
JCPC – Judicial Committee of the Privy Council
LAC – Library and Archives Canada
LSR – League for Social Reconstruction
MYC – Montreal Youth Council
NCCUS – National Conference of Canadian University Students
NSL – National Service League
UFO – United Farmers of Ontario
ULO – Unity League of Ontario
UM – Université de Montréal
UO – Université d'Ottawa
WLMK – William Lyon Mackenzie King
YMCA – Young Men's Christian Association

INTRODUCTION

Overview

The 1920s and '30s witnessed an important, albeit partial, rapprochement between Francophones and Anglophones in Canada. This 'partial' rapprochement marked a significant change from the decades of conflict that had preceded it. Indeed, the Great War had shattered what little remained of an embattled relationship between the two segregated 'solitudes,' especially at the level of civil society. The cultural-linguistic separation of Canadian civil society had, in turn, prevented the political élites from bringing and holding the country together. Instead, politicians on both sides found it easier to exploit racism and religion for political gain. As a result, by 1918, Canada had arguably become more divided along cultural-linguistic lines than at any other point in its history. Prolonged debates over the country's place in the British Empire and its role in the war, the suppression of French-language education rights outside of Quebec, competing ethnic nationalisms, and the inflammatory conscription crisis of 1917-1918 had poisoned relations to the point that some doubted whether Canada's 'two solitudes' could coexist at all within the same political community.[1]

Scarcely twenty years later, however, Canadian society was more or less united as it entered another World War.[2] What is most remarkable about this apparent

---

[1] Even advocates of cross-cultural accommodation, like Ferdinand Roy, were skeptical. See Ferdinand Roy, *L'Appel aux armes et la réponse canadienne-française: étude sur le conflit de races* (Québec: J.-P. Garneau, 1917). One of the most salient works on this period remains Elizabeth H. Armstrong's *The Crisis of Quebec, 1914-1918* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1937).

[2] In 1939 Quebecers rejected the anti-war provincial government of Maurice Duplessis, and in 1940 the federal Liberals of William Lyon Mackenzie King were reelected with a sweeping majority after pledging to avoid conscription for overseas service.

The earliest public opinion surveys, although far from being perfectly accurate, also suggested that

rapprochement is that it was constructed in large part from the 'ground up,' in addition to benefitting from the 'top down' influence of sympathetic political leaders.[3] It began in 1916 with a formal 'bonne entente' movement led by professionals, academics and businessmen who were intent on fostering better relations, and flourished into a broader re-imagining of a more tolerant, pluralistic and liberal Canadian society. Driven by a mix of idealism and pragmatism, members of the expanding civil societies collaborated with colleagues across cultural and linguistic lines in order to pursue shared professional interests. Academics who were gravely concerned about national unity helped articulate the case for greater acceptance of Canada's French fact in particular, and for rapprochement generally. Liberal and civic nationalist ideals appealed greatly to the chattering classes in the wake of the racially-charged and disastrous Great War. Having come so close to the abyss of national disintegration, these intellectuals were determined to construct a more dynamic and unifying Francophone/Anglophone relationship.

If most of its proponents did not want for sincerity, the reconciliationist movement suffered at times from an over-optimism that could unduly raise expectations and result in disappointment and disillusionment. Many ardent British-Canadian

---

Canadians entered the war relatively united. A 9 September 1939 poll conducted in the comté d'Argenteuil recorded 65% of respondents in favour of participation "'within our means'" and only 20% opposed to participation. See John MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence on Canadian Foreign Policy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), p.152.

According to a Toronto *Daily Star* survey, even in mid-1942, at the height of Axis expansion and amidst another conscription debate, most Anglo-Canadians (93%) and French Canadians (59%) supported carrying on the fight. See Toronto *Daily Star*, 31 August 1942; Stanley B. Ryerson, *French Canada: A Study in Canadian Democracy* (Toronto: Progress Books, 1943), p.233.

[3] While an overall discussion of the role of civil society in this process has been lacking in the historiography, the role of the political élites has been discussed by scholars, especially with regard to the relationship between Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King and his Quebec lieutenant, Ernest Lapointe. See, for instance, Bernard Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque* (Montréal: Les éditions La presse, ltée., 1982); H. Blair Neatby, *William Lyon Mackenzie King, Vol. II, 1924-1932: the Lonely Heights* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958); Lita-Rose Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe: Mackenzie King's Great Quebec Lieutenant* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002); and MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence*, pp.9.

imperialists and French-Canadian nationalistes remained skeptical of 'bonne entente' and continued to promote separate visions for the English- and French-speaking peoples of Canada. Gradually, however, rapprochement began making its way into the public discourse – through engagement with civil society, through popular culture, and through more positive contact with the 'Other.' As the rhetoric of cross-cultural understanding became more popular among certain academics, professionals, businessmen and clergy, and as it developed an audience among elements the broader public, the political parties were forced to respond. The Liberal Party, especially, pressured by its own members from the intellectual, professional and business communities, became the political vehicle for cross-cultural accommodation. More than any other party, it was compelled to deal with the big issues of Francophone/Anglophone relations in ways that had been largely impossible a generation earlier.[4]

Theoretical framework

Intellectual history

The present work is for the most part an intellectual history – a study of ideas. John Higham described intellectual history as that which analyzes "'the relatively enduring organizations of thought and emotion, knowledge, opinion, faith and attitudes as they develop and operate within particular historical contexts.'"[5] It seeks not only to

[4] When an embattled Sir Wilfrid Laurier had governed in an entirely different, British-Canadian dominated context. The best compromise that Laurier could achieve for the education rights of Francophone minorities of western Canada, for instance, was far weaker than what was achieved in 1927 for Franco-Ontarians. In 1911, neither French nor British Canadians proved willing to fully accept Laurier's compromise on Canada's commitment to the British Navy. During the interwar period, however, both groups would prove far more accepting of a middle ground on foreign policy.

[5] In Clarence Karr, "What Happened to Canadian Intellectual History?" *Acadiensis*, 18,2 (Spring 1989),

describe ideas, but also to understand why they achieved particular prominence in the minds of intellectuals, leaders, or the general population at a given moment in history, and how they shaped historical events. To be sure, people's actions can be informed by a variety of factors, including physical and practical circumstances, needs or wants. But actions can also result from personal conviction, social convention, or a set of commonly or individually held beliefs, values or principles. As Gramsci, Foucault, and Said have taught us, ideas, discourse, and culture can determine relationships of power between people, and how people interact with each other. Canadian historian Doug Owram put it simply: "ideas are real and have real influence."[6] The symbolic values that people attached to ceremony, commemoration, to legislation and to history itself, both reflected and informed more general attitudes and perceptions.[7] Owram reminds us, however, that "ideas are the product of a particular era and social milieu rather than universal."[8] It is the historian's task to understand the context behind these ideas.

To that end, the present work attempts to understand the interwar period in both its British imperial and North Atlantic contexts. The combined efforts of several authors has provided a mountain of evidence demonstrating that British Canadians and Britons shared a strong emotional attachment, especially prior to the Great War.[9] This shared

---

pp.171-172.

[6] Doug Owram, "Intellectual History in the Land of Limited Identities," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 24, 3 (Fall 1989), p.116.

[7] See Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1970); David Cannadine, *Ornamentalism: How the British Saw Their Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); H.V. Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building: The Tercentennary Celebrations of Quebec* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999).

[8] Doug Owram, "Writing About Ideas," in John Schultz, ed., *Writing About Canada: a Handbook for Modern Canadian History*, (Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc., 1990), p.48.

[9] See Pocock, "The New British History in Atlantic Perspective: An Antipodean Commentary," *The American Historical Review*, Vol.104, No.2, (April 1999), p.490; Buckner, "Presidential Address: Whatever happened to the British Empire?", pp.11; Ged Martin, *Britain and the Origins of Canadian Confederation, 1837-1867*, (London: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1995); Donald F. Harris, "The Presentation of a British Canada in Shropshire c. 1890-1914," and Robert Wardhaugh, "'Gateway to Empire': Imperial

identity was underpinned by religious moralism, militarism, racialism, and an intense loyalism.[10] The new liberal, civic nationalism of the interwar would both challenge and accommodate this British identity. French Canadians and their supporters, for instance, pointed to 'British' rights to assert equality with English-speaking Canadians and insisted on Canadian independence, but *within* the ambiguous British Commonwealth of Nations.[11]

The North Atlantic context was equally important. As Michel Ducharme explains, "the Atlantic framework offers historians the possiblity of reinterpreting Canadian and Quebec intellectual history, letting them place it in its original context at the crossroads of the British Empire and the Americas."[12] If many Canadians in 1914 saw the world through an imperial lens, by the 1930s, many others had begun to see it through a decidedly North Atlantic, even North *American*, lense.[13] If at first bonne ententistes emphasized notions of British liberties, rights and pluralism as justification for cross-cultural accommodation, by the 1930s more North Atlantic themes had also emerged. Intellectuals considered multi-ethnic Britain as something of an inspiration for cross-cultural accommodation, but other multilingual or multinational states were also

---

Sentiment in Winnipeg, 1867-1917," in Colin M. Coates, ed. *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917*, (University of Edinburgh Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997), pp.196, 206.

[10] Sylvie Lacombe, "Imperial Loyalism: the English-Canadian Ideal of Chrstian Universality," in Colin M. Coates, ed. *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917*, (University of Edinburgh Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997), pp.187.

[11] See Kenneth Munro, "The Crown and French Canada: The Role of the Governors-General in Making the Crown Relevant, 1867-1917," in Colin M. Coates, ed. *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917*, (University of Edinburgh Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997), pp.78-109; Réal Bélanger, "L'élite politique canadienne-française et l'Empire britannique: trois reflets représentatifs des perceptions canadiennes-françaises (1890-1917)," in Coates, *Imperial Canada*, pp.122-140; Philip Girard, "British Justice, English Law, and Canadian Legal Culture," in Phillip Buckner, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Canada and the British Empire*, Companion Series (Oxford University Press, 2008), pp.260-275.

[12] Michel Ducharme, "Canada in the Age of Revolutions: Rethinking Canadian Intellectual History in an Atlantic Perspective," in Christopher Dummit and Michael Dawson, eds., *Contesting Clio's Craft*, pp.166, 186.

[13] Norman Hillmer, "National Independence and the National Interest," p.22; Hillmer, "O.D. Skelton: Innovating for Independence," p.67.

considered, including Belgium and Switzerland, and even Germany.[14] Moreover, foreign policy isolationism in the face of renewed tensions in Europe and a shared North American identity were increasingly seen as crucial for maintaining national unity – and as more appealing to French Canadians. The drive for cross-cultural solidarity was also informed by the perceived need to face down new ideological threats from Europe, namely communism and fascism. The growing American influence on both Anglo- and French-Canadian intellectual history during the interwar years must also be considered.[15] Popular American sport and film, for instance, influenced both cultural groups and caused anxiety among intellectual leaders.

The élite of French and British Canada were well positioned to articulate new and reoccurring ideas: they had the time, money and education, and the professional responsibility and personal interest that facilitated writing or speech making. Academics and scholars, especially, had a greater freedom to explore new, unconventional or controversial ideas. As such, they often gave the earliest expression to ideas that would gradually achieve salience among other élites and the broader population. Individuals who disseminated different ideas and ideologies during the interwar period were among the most prominent group of citizens: the political, civic, clerical, commercial, academic and professional bourgeoisie.[16] Their writings and speeches reflected the public mood in

---

[14] See, for instance Moore, *The Clash!,* pp.203-204; UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/88/6, Napoléon Belcourt, Circulaire no. 4 (G), Ottawa, 30 October 1925, p.1.

[15] Yvan Lamonde, "American Cultural Influence in Québec: A One-Way Mirror," in Alfred O. Hero and Marcel Daneau, eds., *Problems and Opportunities in US-Québec Relations* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1984), pp.106-126; Yvan Lamonde, *Ni avec eux ni sans eux: le Québec et les États-Unis* (Montreal: Nuit Blanche, 1996); Yves Roby, "Émigrés canadiens français, franco-américains de la Nouvelle Angleterre et images de la société américaine," in Gérard Bouchard and Yvan Lamonde, eds., *Québécois et Américains: la culture québécoise aux XIXe et XXe siècles* (Saint-Laurent: Fides, 1995), pp.131-158; Allan Smith, *Canada: An American Nation? Essays on Continentalism, Identity and the Canadian Frame of Mind* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1994).

[16] See Yvan Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1760-1896*, Volume I (Fides, 2000), pp.9.

part because it served their interests.[17] As the spiritual leaders of their flock, for instance, clergymen gave expression to the concerns of their congregations and parishioners, and communicated ideas that they hoped would set society on a better path and preserve the influence of the Church. Newspapermen and politicians, meanwhile, had a professional interest in both directing and reflecting the ideas and convictions of their constituents – the former might otherwise lose subscribers, and the latter risked losing votes. While separated from other elements of society by class, gender, race, religion, or other factors, then, the élites cannot be divorced from the societies within which they lived. As products of their time *and* drivers of change, their discourse both informed and reflected public opinion, as they do today.

Group biography of élites has been especially helpful in identifying larger trends in Canadian intellectual history.[18] Donald Wright and Ronald Rudin, for instance, applied group biography in their respective books on the historians of English-speaking Canada and of French-speaking Quebec. Their work revealed how historians from both communities provided a bellwether for important intellectual trends that would gradually be adopted by the broader society.[19] Mindful of this approach, the present work pays close attention to the discussions of Canadian historians, both English- and French-speaking, including how they interpreted the country's past and their hopes for its future.

---

[17] See Owram, "Intellectual History in the Land of Limited Identities," pp.121, 126.

[18] Barry Ferguson's group biography of interwar social scientists, academics, and public servants explores how Canadian liberalism was redefined in terms of a liberal political economy, an interventionist state, a more liberal-nationalist reading of Canadian history, and a lessening of economic and political ties to the empire. See Barry Ferguson, *Remaking Liberalism: The Intellectual Legacy of Adam Shortt, O.D. Skelton, and W.A. Mackintosh, 1890-1925*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993). Owram makes a similar case in Doug Owram, *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986).

[19] Donald Wright, *The Professionalization of History in English Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005); Ronald Rudin, *Making History in Twentieth-Century Quebec* (University of Toronto Press, 1997).

Élite accommodation

Élite accommodation is a reoccurring theme of this study. Several authors have applied élite accommodation theory to understand the relative democratic stability present in diverse consociational countries like Canada, despite its important cultural, linguistic, religious and other social cleavages. Dutch political theorist Arend Lijphart argued that consociational democracies require accommodation between political leaders of major social groups in order to remain stable and peaceful. This accommodation requires pragmatism grounded in "a minimum of agreement on fundamentals."[20] It is only possible when there is a shared fear of the chaos that might ensue should the political system come apart. Élite accommodation takes hold when the "rules of the game" are institutionalized, including "a business-like approach to politics, agreement to disagree, summit diplomacy among the élites, proportionality [of representation] between the [social groups], depoliticization of issues, secrecy, and acceptance of the government's right to govern."[21] Élites are able to attain acceptance of this accommodation from their respective social groups because the population is relatively "politically passive and deferential towards the leaders."[22] In this way, "overarching cooperation at the élite level can be a substitute for cross-cutting affiliations at the mass level."[23] The most "crucial factor," Lijphart maintained, "is the quality of leadership."[24]

---

[20] Arend Lijphart, *The Politics of Accommodation: Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), p.103. See also Arend Lijphart, *Democracy in Plural Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977).
[21] M. van Schendelen, "Consociational Democracy: The Views of Arend Lijphart and Collected Criticisms," *The Political Science Reviewer*, 14 (1985): 143-183, p.147.
[22] van Schendelen, "Consociational Democracy," p.31.
[23] Lijphart, *Politics of Accommodation*, p.200.
[24] *Ibid.*, p.211.

As Robert Presthus pointed out in his study of post-WWII Canada, élite accommodation must occur at the highest levels of political power in order to be successful.[25] Lijphart identified four principal factors to stable consociational democracies: a grand coalition, minority veto, proportionality, and segmental autonomy. As Martin Hering has explained, Canadian grand coalitions in which ethnic interests are accommodated traditionally occur within (more so than between) federal parties, specifically, federal cabinets. Since Confederation, the average proportion of Francophone ministers has been roughly thirty per cent, with representation being strongest in Liberal governments.[26] While a minority veto does not formally exist in Canada, Lijphart asserts that "a largely effective informal veto over decisions that concern the vital interests of French Canadians" has been historically present.[27] All three of these important characteristics – grand coalition, proportionality, and minority veto – were badly eroded under Prime Ministers Robert Borden and Arthur Meighen, and gradually reconstructed under Mackenzie King. Segmental autonomy, meanwhile (or provincial autonomy in the Canadian case), was also accommodated by the Liberal prime minister before the Second World War.

While occurring most crucially at the highest levels of political power, the culture of élite accommodation can be transmitted from below, from the intellectual, civic and social leadership to the bureaucratic and political leadership.[28] This 'civil society accommodation' is especially important when political élite accommodation breaks

[25] "In such political cultures [like Canada] it becomes the vital task of socio-political élites to play a nation-saving role by a sustained process of negotiation and bargaining among the leaders of major social groups, carried out at the highest political levels and aimed at overcoming the centripetal tendencies of the political system." Robert Presthus, *Élite Accommodation in Canadian Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), p.x.
[26] Martin Hering, "Consociational Democracy in Canada," in Philipps-Universität Marburg, *Ahornblätter: Marburger Beiträge zur Kanada-Forschung* (Schriften der Universitätsbibliothek Marburg, 1998), accessed 10 August 2013, http://archiv.ub.uni-marburg.de/sum/84/sum84-6.html.
[27] See *Ibid*.
[28] Presthus, *Élite Accommodation in Canadian Politics*, p.ix.

down, as it had in Canada by the time of the Great War. During the interwar period, leading professional, business, clerical, media, cultural, academic and intellectual figures of the French- and Anglo-Canadian communities, notably in Quebec and Ontario, increasingly came together and pressured the political leadership to do the same. The 1920s and '30s remained a time when compromise could be achieved through personal and private channels.

Moreover, the civil society and political élite lent visibility to an issue and established the discourse that informed public opinion. They communicated through parliament, newspapers and radio, wrote treatises and published pamphlets, gave public appearances, and spoke from the pulpit, the classroom and the lecture hall. The extent to which their ideas penetrated the larger social consciousness can also be measured through other aspects of civil society and popular culture, including: the activities, aims, and internal and external communications of professional, fraternal, and other societies and clubs, which were immensely popular in their day; popular fiction, historical literature, film, and even music; tourism promotion and travel literature; and youth, who are especially worthy of study, as they set the trend of ideas for the next generation of thinkers, writers, politicians and policy-makers.

Terms and concepts

At this point an explanation of important terminology and concepts is merited, beginning with the terms used to described Canada's two major cultural-linguistic groups. At the turn of the century, English-speaking Canadians of British extraction variously referred to themselves as Canadians, English Canadians, Anglo-Canadians, and

British subjects, among other titles. Broadly speaking, 'British Canadians' refers to that group of Canadians who were ethnically British (including English, Scottish, Welsh, and, more contentiously, Irish) and remained deeply attached to the British Empire and to British institutions and values.[29] The term 'English Canadian' is avoided as it can be construed to refer only to those Canadians of ethnic English extraction, and does not adequately capture the attachment to British institutions and values. 'Anglophone,' 'Anglo-Canadian,' or 'English-speaking Canadian' are also used to refer to this community, in part to convey when elements of the community began to assert a more 'indigenous,' *North American* identity over an ethnic *British* identity. The term 'Anglo-Canadian' is particularly useful, as the shared use of the English language began to replace British filiation as the most important unifying characteristic of this group. Moreover, 'Anglo-Canadian' was applied by both English- and French-speakers.[30] This group was predominantly Protestant, but included a large proportion of Catholics, especially among Irish Canadians.

The use of 'French Canadian' here requires less explanation, given its wider historical and historiographical usage. On occasion, terms like 'Francophones' and

---

[29] J.G.A. Pocock, "The antipodean perception," in Pockock, *The Discovery of Islands: Essays in British History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Phillip Buckner, "Presidential Address: Whatever happened to the British Empire?" *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, vol.4, no.1 (1993): 3-32.

[30] See, for instance, Percival Fellman Morley, *Bridging the Chasm. A Study of the Ontario-Quebec Question* (Toronto: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1919), p.156; George M. Wrong, "The Two Races in Canada," Lecture delivered before the Canadian Historical Association, Montreal, May 21st, 1925, University of Ottawa Archives, 01-CRC-1925-5, pp.11-12; Hillmer, "O.D. Skelton: Innovating for Independence," in Greg Donaghy and Kim Richard Nossal, eds. *Architects and Innovators: Building the Department of External Affairs and International Trade, 1909-2009* (Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 2009), p.71; and Hillmer, "National Independence and the National Interest," in Greg Donaghy and Michael K. Carroll, eds., *In the National Interest: Canadian Foreign Policy and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 1909-2009* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2011), p.15; Jean-Charlemagne Bracq, *L'évolution du Canada français* (Montréal: Librairie Beauchemin, Ltée., 1927), p.292; Camille Roy, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, fifth edition (Québec: Imprimerie de l'Action Sociale Ltée., 1930), p.269; Yvan Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1896-1929*, Volume II (Fides, 2004), pp.185-186; Robert Rumilly, *Histoire de la province de Québec*, Vol. XXVI, (Montréal: Les Éditions Chantecler, Ltéé., 1940), p.260.

'French-speaking Canadians' are used, but 'French Canada' and 'French Canadian' are privileged as they best connote the connection of language, culture and the Catholic faith. Until the 1960s and '70s, most Canadians whose first language was French self-identified as 'Canadiens-français' (if not simply 'Canadiens').[31] In this sense, a liberal use of the term 'Québécois' would be anachronistic. Moreover, French Canadians did not see their community as being territorially limited to Quebec – 'French Canadian' allowed the inclusion of other historic Francophone communities from throughout Canada, such as Franco-Ontarians and Franco-Manitobans. Acadians, while not French Canadians *per se* given their distinct history, can nonetheless be included under the broader terms of 'French Canada' or 'French-speaking Canadians.'

The concepts of rapprochement and reconciliation must also be defined in as far as possible. In the context of cross-cultural relations, a dictionary definition of rapprochement refers to the "establishment or resumption of harmonious relations."[32] Originating from the French "rapprocher," it implies a deliberate, intensive attempt to "re-approach" a subject. In other words, it implies the pre-existence of more or less peaceful relations, acknowledges a subsequent or historical breakdown in those relations, and, finally, asserts a desire to construct more positive relations.

Rapprochement can also be the product of unintended consequences, or a corollary to other objectives. (Tourism serves as a good example: while the Quebec government's first priority was to generate tourism dollars, the potential for 'enlightening' visitors about French Canada was seen as a positive by-product.) For the purposes of this study, rapprochement refers to an increased level of positive interaction

[31] Excepting Acadians, Métis, and Belgian immigrants to western Canada. Gratien Allaire, *La francophonie canadienne: Portraits* (Sudbury: AFI-CIDEF Québec, 1999), p.1.
[32] *Dictionary* (Apple Inc., 2009).

and meaningful improvement in relations between important elements of the two major cultural-linguistic communities. Rapprochement took on various forms, depending on the context: where the pre-war and war-time British-Canadian identity centred on imperialism and ethnicity, the interwar period witnessed more positive dialogue between intellectuals and academics from both sides, who increasingly emphasized civic nationalism; where previously British Canadians from outside Quebec had little contact with French Canada, the interwar period witnessed thousands of curious Ontarians and other tourists flock to 'la belle province'; where the 1917 government was a 'coalition' of British Canadians, the interwar period witnessed greater positive collaboration between political élites from both French and British Canada. It is argued here that interwar rapprochement was achieved on many fronts (although by no means all).

Where rapprochement refers to more limited and less tangible aims and accomplishments, the concept of 'reconciliation' refers to a loftier goal: the complete or near complete overcoming of previous difficulties, and the forgiveness of previous wrongs. It was this goal toward which some of the more ambitious, idealistic, and perhaps naïve bonne ententistes strove. It is referred to here not as something that was necessarily achieved during the interwar years, but rather as something that was sought after by more idealistic minds concerned with national unity – those who tended to 'set their goals high.'

During the 1920s and '30s, liberalism became more closely associated with cross-cultural accommodation. Liberalism in the Canadian interwar context refers to: a belief in democratic representation with checks and balances; respect for established authority *and* for gradual change in order to allow for both stability and material progress; equality of

opportunity and equality before the law; the guarantee of certain individual liberties; the separation of church and state; the protection of minorities against the tyranny of the majority; and the promotion of cross-cultural harmony.[33] "Liberalism," explained Prime Minister King, "is continually obliged to be fighting prejudice."[34]

Liberalism also became closely associated with civic nationalism – a national identity that was based not on ethnicity, but on shared values, shared historical experiences, and a common attachment to the political community. Whereas turn-of-the-century British- and French-Canadian conservatism, infused by the values of imperialism and ultramontanism, tended to emphasize the preservation of tradition and cultural homogeneity against corrupting influences, liberalism emphasized "unity in diversity."[35] Canada's diversity was its greatest strength, and not an inevitable source of conflict.

It was on this basis that liberal civic nationalists rejected cultural isolationism – the notion that Anglophones and Francophones would be better off if they left each other to their own devices and remained as culturally separate from each other as possible within Confederation.[36] As Norman Hillmer has explained, the "liberal nationalism" of

---

[33] See Jennifer Ajzenstat and Peter Smith, *Canada's Origins: Liberal, Tory or Republican?* (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1995), pp.1-2; Ian McKay, "The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History," *Canadian Historical Review*, 81 (2000): 617-645; Michel Ducharme and Jean-François Constant, eds., *Liberalism and Hegemony: Debating the Canadian Liberal Revolution* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), p.21; and Fernande Roy, *Progrès, harmonie, liberté: Le libéralisme des milieux d'affaires francophones à Montréal au tournant du siècle* (Montreal: Boréal, 1988), pp.49-58, 243-248.

[34] LAC, William Lyon Mackenzie King fonds, MG26-J13, Diaries (hereafter referred to as WLMK Diaires), entry for 16 July 1929, accessed 23 January 2011, http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/databases/king/index-e.html.

[35] Arthur Hawkes, *The Birthright: A Search for the Canadian Canadian and the Larger Loyalty* (Toronto: J.M. Dent, 1919), p.180.

[36] Groulx put it in these terms: "Nous sommes ici deux races, deux cultures, destinées à vivre l'une à côté de l'autre.... Vous, anglophones, êtes fiers de votre sang, de votre histoire, de votre civilisation; ... votre ambition est de vous développer dans le sens de vos innéités culturelles, d'être anglais jusqu'aux moelles. .... D'autre part, aussi fiers de notre passé, de notre sang, de notre culture que vous l'êtes des vôtres, nous prétendons que notre droit est égal au vôtre." Lionel Groulx, "Notre État français, nous l'aurons," speech delivered to the Congrès de la langue française, Quebec City, 29 June 1937, accessed 6 December 2013, http://archives.vigile.net/00-2/groulx-etat.html.

the interwar period "begins with national unity as the foundation of political action and ends with pragmatic flexibility in global affairs."[37] Whereas liberal civic nationalists rejected *cultural* isolationism (at least between Anglo- and French Canadians), they occasionally embraced *foreign policy* isolationism in so far as it served Canada's interests, namely cross-cultural harmony and national unity. To be sure, national unity has been an important concern across the political spectrum. But while some British-Canadian imperialists sought unity through imperial filiation and assimilation to the British model, and some French-Canadian ultramontanists emphasized unity through mutual separation of Canada's two solitudes, liberal civic nationalists emphasized cross-cultural *engagement* as the best means to ensure national unity. In practice, this meant tolerating the idiosyncrasies of both cultural-linguistic groups and engaging in relationships and initiatives for rapprochement. This ideal was given new life after the Great War by Anglo- and French-Canadian intellectuals, civic leaders and politicians.

This is not to say that all French- and Anglo-Canadian advocates of bonne entente and civic nationalism were liberals – there were conservatives, progressives, social-democrats, and even communists who hailed the 'political nationality' that had been created by the Fathers of Confederation. Nor is it to say that French- and Anglo-Canadian liberal values were identical. Anglo-Canadian liberals, for instance, continued to place greater value than French Canadians on Canada's membership in the British Commonwealth (as an independent state, not as a colony). Most did not wish for a complete break of sentimental ties with the Mother Country. Anglo-Canadian liberals also tended to be more statist in their outlook, which was in part a reflection of the

[37] "It seeks a balance ... between the competing conceptions of the national interest." Hillmer, "O.D. Skelton: Innovating for Independence," p.71.

Protestant Social Gospel movement, whereas many Catholic French-Canadian liberals continued to view social welfare as a responsibility of the Church. Anglo-Canadian liberals also continued to emphasize individual rights more so than collective rights, whereas the reverse might be said of French-Canadian liberals.[38] The point is that the two sides were not so far apart on these issues as to be incapable of achieving some kind of common ground – both sides were capable of compromise.

Comparative analysis

In addition to borrowing from intellectual history, the present work also makes use of comparative analysis – it compares some of the interwar intellectual trends in English- and French-speaking Canada. In the last twenty years, it has been relatively rare for Canadian historians to conduct studies that combine the histories of both communities. Emphasizing similarity and convergence has been even less fashionable. The historiographies of Francophone Quebec and of Anglophone Canada have flourished in the last several decades, but they have been written almost independently at times, as though the histories of both are easily separated, have limited implications one for the other, or are even incompatible – as though including both in a pan-Canadian history would necessarily go beyond the scope and practical necessity of a given theme or topic. As Magda Fahrni explains, "historians have tended over the past 20 years to focus on particular regions and to undertake microanalyses and microhistory.... [This] has allowed for an easy neglect of Quebec and the lack of communication between the two

[38] It was on this basis that Anglo- and French-Canadian liberals within the federal Liberal Party would clash on the Padlock Law of 1937. See Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, pp.138-141; Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.291.

historiographies."[39] Limiting the scope of study in such a way can be useful, and at times necessary. But historians should not take for granted that the histories of English and French Canada cannot be understood together, or that one tells us little of use about the other.

For nationaliste Québécois scholars, the reasons for avoiding a comparative study of Quebec and Anglophone Canada are relatively straightforward. By definition, they are more interested in provincial history. Pan-Canadian studies lie outside their research interests – English-speaking Canada is perceived as largely irrelevant except for its having historically inhibited the emancipation and self-realization of Québécois society.[40] Anglo-Canadians' avoidance of including French-speaking Canada in 'pan-Canadian' studies is less straightforward. Fahrni provides a few possible explanations, such as "the language barrier, a lack of political will, the fear of doing Quebec history badly, and perhaps a hostility to nationalism."[41] The growing emphasis on regional or local histories has also contributed to a lack of "interest in syntheses or pan-Canadian studies, with or without Quebec."[42] In this context, many historians simply have come to take for granted

---

[39] Magda Fahrni, "Reflections on the Place of Quebec in Historical Writing on Canada," in Christopher Dummitt and Michael Dawson, eds., *Contesting Clio's Craft: New Directions and Debates in Canadian History* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2008), pp.11-12.

[40] Margaret MacMillan, *The Uses and Abuses of History* (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2008), pp.71-72. See, for example, Léandre Bergeron, *Petit manuel d'histoire du Québec* (Éditions Québécois, 1970); Robert Comeau and Bernard Dionne, eds., *À propos de l'histoire nationale* (Sillery: Septentrion, 1998). Even Michel Brunet's *La présence anglaise et les Québécois* (Montréal: Intouchables, 2009), while ostensibly a comparative history, is more intent on using the "English" presence as the backdrop for the rise of a Québécois national consciousness. Indeed, the book's original title was *La présence anglaise et les Canadiens* (1958). As Brian Young notes: "La froideur de certains historiens, tel Michel Brunet, envers les historiens anglophones était légendaire." Brian Young, "Les anglophones et l'historiographie Québec/Canada," in Marie-Andrée Beaudet, ed., *Échanges culturels entre les Deux solitudes* (Québec: Université Laval, 1999), p.43.

[41] Fahrni, "Quebec in Historical Writing on Canada," p.2.

[42] *Ibid*. Brian Young also speaks to this: "Dans le Canada anglophone, les études sur le régionalisme, les classes sociales, les genres, les groupes fondateurs, les autochtones et tous les autres fragments de la société ont gommé toute compréhension globale du passé. La place du Québec – de sa culture, de son histoire, de sa langue – semble de plus en plus restreinte. L'absence d'une mémoire commune – ou du moins de celle d'un passé partagé – demeure certainement une question troublante pour des citoyens ou, devrais-je dire,

that the history of French Canada was no longer relevant to Anglophone Canada. One historian complained of this "'implicit separatism'" in the historiography by referring to "the increasing number of accounts of the history of 'Canada' that are really accounts of English Canada (and often, not even all of English Canada) – as though Quebec had already left the federation and therefore need not be taken into account."[43]

This was not always the case in Anglo-Canadian scholarship. Forty years ago, Fahrni explains, "almost all large history departments in English Canada included a specialist in New France or French Canada, and ... Quebec was an integral part of textbooks, syntheses, anthologies and course offerings in English-Canadian universities."[44] Jeffrey Vacante has also spoken of the aversion of Anglo-Canadians from outside Quebec to including the province or French Canada in their research. He postulates that the dearth of Anglo-Canadian authors writing about Quebec or French Canada is due to the fact that many feel they lack the necessary cultural-linguistic 'authenticity' to speak with authority on the topic, and that they fear they may be criticised for doing so.[45]

By contrast, before Quebec's Quiet Revolution in the 1960s, Anglo-Canadian authors unencumbered by such existential baggage like Hugh MacLennan could write unapologetically, enthusiastically, and honestly about French Canada.[46] MacLennan's *Two Solitudes* (1945), which explored the difficulties inherent in reconciling the identities of Canada's two major cultural-linguistic groups, received rave reviews.[47] It won the

---

des partenaires?" Young, "Les anglophones et l'historiographie Québec/Canada," p.49.
[43] Fahrni, "Quebec in Historical Writing on Canada," pp.1, 3.
[44] *Ibid*., p.2.
[45] Jeffrey Vacante, "Hugh MacLennan and the Question of Authenticity in Canadian Historical Writing." Paper presented to the CHA, 2011, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, NB.
[46] *Ibid*.
[47] Hugh MacLennan, *Two Solitudes* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1945).

1946 Governor General's award and was hailed for providing a fresh approach to Canadian unity. In the 1960s, however, Quebec became increasingly "exoticized" in the minds of Anglo-Canadian academics. Many had become disengaged from the national question out of a doubt in their capacity to interpret and represent the Francophone Quebec point of view. MacLennan's credit subsequently went into a free-fall; Anglophone intellectuals criticized the book on the grounds that MacLennan, being an Anglophone, could not write a novel representative of Quebec society – only Francophones could explain their society. MacLennan was increasingly portrayed as being part of an older, naïve, and 'out of touch' generation. As Vacante explains, MacLennan was not anti-French – he believed that modernization and overcoming nationalism were necessary to reform Quebec society. Nevertheless, his representation of Quebec society was criticized in the 1960s as an inaccurate, overly agrarian and stereotypical representation of Quebec. Moreover, the book's focus on questions of industrialization, urbanization and cross-cultural rapprochement were seen as less relevant, especially by Québécois nationalistes to whom Anglophone intellectuals were prepared to defer on questions about their society.[48]

This apparent lack of comparative study has extended to the intellectual historiography. Relative to the number of works on 'French' Quebec or 'English' Canada, comparative studies of Anglo- and French-Canadian thought are few and far between. One important exception has been Sylvie Lacombe's *La rencontre de deux peuples élus* (2002). Lacombe makes use of both group biography and comparative history to identify trends in both British- and French-Canadian thought at the turn-of-the-century. She provides a detailed study of the lives and writings of the "representative"

[48] Vacante.

intellectual leaders of both sides: George M. Grant and son William L. Grant, Stephen Leacock, and Andrew Macphail for British Canada, and Henri Bourassa for French Canada. Lacombe's work reveals the fascinating and paradoxical similarities that existed between British-Canadian imperialism and French-Canadian ultramontanism despite the socio-cultural gulf that separated them. Both sides were highly moralistic, imbued with a sense of religious mission, and anti-American in outlook. Both emphasized the importance of race, and while advocating economic development, shared a growing anxiety over the moral implications of industrialization and urbanization. Both also called for political and economic reform. Finally, both had a global dimension, and were expressions of Canadian patriotism and a desire to achieve national maturity – one emphasized nationalism and autonomy as the best means, the other emphasized imperialism and loyalty. "Le premier aspect remarquable," Lacombe explains, "est que les opinions énoncées de part et d'autre ne s'opposent pas terme à terme mais qu'elles appartiennent plutôt à différents ensembles culturels significatifs ou configurations d'idées et de valeurs particulières."[49] Whereas Ronald Rudin has emphasized the relative

[49] "Le tableau qu'on a brossé est plus complexe: il montre que l'équivalent de la foi catholique au sein de l'ambition nationale correspond plutôt à la loyauté envers la Couronne et l'Empire britannique dans l'ambition impériale." Sylvie Lacombe, *La rencontre de deux peoples élus. Comparaison des ambitions nationale et impériale au Canada entre 1896 et 1920*, (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2002), pp.251, 261.

There are other important exceptions to the relative dearth of comparative intellectual histories of early twentieth-century Anglo- and French Canada. The biographies of Ernest Lapointe by John MacFarlane (1999) and Lita-Rose Betcherman (2002), for instance, situate the French-Canadian political leader within the context of the liberalism and pan-Canadianism that he shared with his Anglo-Canadian colleagues.

The Quebec historiography's "nouvelle sensibilité" movement has also been fruitful. It has criticized the exaggeration of the rupture between pre-1960 'traditional' Quebec and post-1960 'modern' Quebec. It situates Quebec within a broader continuity – as a New World society subject to similar influences and changes as those of other societies in the Americas, but subject to its own set of specific circumstances and influences. This has led a number of authors to re-examine Quebec traditionalism and conservatism. See Stéphane Kelly, ed., *Les idées mènent le Québec: Essais sur une sensibilité historique* (Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 2002); Christian Roy, "La 'nouvelle sensibilité' en quête d'une autre Révolution tranquille," *Bulletin d'histoire politique*, vol. 18, no. 2. (winter 2010), pp.195-204.

While much of the "nouvelle sensibilité" focusses specifically on French Canada and/or Quebec,

separation between historians from British and French Canada,[50] Lacombe's work suggests that intellectuals from both communities paid close attention to the political thought and opinions being expressed on the other side. Although they often disagreed, they fed off each other's work, reading each other's latest treatises and closely following each other's speeches.

Lacombe's comparative approach provides inspiration here for the comparison of the ideas of the moderate élites on both sides during the interwar period, and for the identification of points of commonality in their notions of how best to achieve national unity. I argue that, far from being indifferent to each other, the intellectual moderates of French and British Canada were indeed paying close attention to each other's work. How they formulated their own ideas, and how far they were willing to accept the need for change in their own communities, was informed by what was being said by the other; a moderate tone from one side encouraged a reciprocal moderation of tone from the other.

While Lacombe's study ends with the Great War, the present work attempts to bring together French- and Anglo-Canadian intellectual history during the interwar. The

---

some authors do include Anglo-Canada outside Quebec in their analyses (if not always exploring the question of rapprochement). Nelson Michaud, for instance, studied the alliance between federal Conservatives Arthur Meighen and Esioff-Léon Patenaude and why it ultimately fizzled. He asserts that the failure was due more to circumstance than to ideological differences. Dominique Foisy-Geoffroy, meanwhile, has demonstrated how French-Canadian traditionalists and the British-Canadian 'red tory' George Grant shared similar criticisms of post-WWII notions of progress and liberal cosmopolitanism. Like Sylvie Lacombe, D.-C. Bélanger explores the theme of anti-Americanism in British-Canadian imperialist and French-Canadian nationaliste thought, explaining that it was driven by a shared anxiety over modernity and its most tangible representative, the United States. See Nelson Michaud, "L'alliance conservatrice-nationaliste: mariage de raison ou nécessité politique?" in Michel Sarra-Bournet, ed., *Les nationalismes au Québec, du XIXe au XXIe siècle* (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2001), pp.79-94; Damien-Claude Bélanger, Sophie Coupal, and Michel Ducharme, eds., *Les idées en mouvement: perspectives en histoire intellectuelle et culturelle du Canada* (Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 2004); Dominique Foisy-Geoffroy, "Les idées politiques des intellectuels traditionalistes canadiens-français, 1940-1960," doctoral thesis (Université Laval, 2008); and Damien-Claude Bélanger, *Prejudice and Pride: Canadian Intellectuals Confront the United States, 1891-1945* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011).

[50] Rudin, *Making History in Twentieth Century Quebec*, p.x.

period presents its own set of unique challenges, not least of which is the greater difficulty in identifying leaders of interwar intellectual thought: the militant nationaliste Lionel Groulx, who cared deeply about his people but was a great skeptic of cross-cultural engagement, was of course such a leader, but he only represented one portion of French-Canadian thought – he was not nearly as representative as was Bourassa in his heyday.[51] For British Canada, the situation is even less clear – instead of two or three leading and representative intellectuals, there was a plethora of contributors, none of whom emerged as the principal thinker of the day. Their works must be considered collectively. Moreover, the ideas of both sides were in considerable flux, varying from retrenched ethno-centric British-Canadian imperialism and French-Canadian clerico-nationalism, to bonne ententism, accommodationism, liberalism and pan-Canadianism. Nevertheless, the present work endeavours to provide some comparison between moderate streams of Anglo-Canadian and French-Canadian thought.

Including Quebec in Canadian history, and vice versa, offers a number of analytical possibilities, including what Jürgen Kocka has referred to as "'entangled histories.'" This involves the study of "'the processes of mutual influencing, in reciprocal or asymmetric perceptions, in entangled processes of constituting one another.'"[52] Fahrni:

> Knowing the other – or *an* other – helps one to understand oneself. Comparison is inherently destabilising, rendering the familiar unfamiliar, forcing us to re-examine what we thought we knew in light of the other. ... [C]omparison allows us to interrogate supposed historical specificities (we might think here of the old clichés, propagated in English-Canadian writing for decades, of the 'backwardness' of a certain 'priest-ridden province'). Quebec historian and

[51] See Ramsay Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question* (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1966), pp.53, 108-109. Even Groulx's supporters conceded the limits to the Abbé's overall popularity: "Quant au chef de la jeune génération, c'est-à-dire ... l'abbé Lionel Groulx, ... notre grand mal réside dans notre refus d'accepter tel prophète et tel guide." Hermas Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada* (Montréal: Éditions de l'A.C.F., 1938), p.112.

[52] In Fahrni, "Quebec in Historical Writing on Canada," p.17.

> sociologist Gérard Bouchard also notes that comparison renders historians less likely to claim false exceptionalisms ... '[qui donnent] naissance [à] une perspective trop ethnocentrique et dont se nourrissent volontiers les entreprises identitaires, tout particulièrement les représentations de la nation.'[53]

The point here is that the intellectual histories of both communities, Anglo- and French-Canadian, cannot be understood in isolation from each other. The theme of constructing a more dynamic and unifying relationship was central to both during the interwar period – it waxed and waned in each in response to what was occurring in the other. In this way, the histories of accommodationist thinking in both British and French Canada during the interwar period were indeed 'entangled.' The current study does not set out simply to 'compare and contrast.' Rather, it aims to show the interrelationship of intellectual, cultural, political and social developments on both sides as they related to rapprochement.

Federalism

Finally, in addition to intellectual and comparative history, federalism offers a highly useful means to understand interwar Anglophone/Francophone rapprochement. As constitutional scholar David E. Smith explains, one of the distinguishing characteristics of Canadian federalism is that it is parliamentary in nature. Parliamentary federalism implies two things. First, it involves a concentration of power within the executive, with the cabinet and prime minister. This *executive federalism* can only function properly when the ruling party has meaningful representation from all regions of the country. Second, parliamentary federalism relies significantly on unwritten conventions, after the

[53] *Ibid*., p.17.

British constitutional tradition. This *informal federalism* is crucial for accommodating Canada's cultural duality.[54]

Another distinguishing characteristic of Canadian federalism is that it is "a double federation" of *cultural federalism* and *territorial federalism*. The *British North America Act* (1867) referred to linguistic and denominational rights on the one hand, and to provincial jurisdiction on the other.[55] These "two contrasting orientations to federalism," Smith explains, "present a challenge for any single constitution to accommodate."[56] Such was the case at the end of the nineteenth century when cultural federalism began losing out to territorial federalism (when French-language minority rights were subjugated for the sake of provincial control over education).[57] Those who prioritized cultural federalism over territorial federalism have tended to view Confederation as a 'Compact' of the two founding settler societies, French and British.

The 'Two Founding Nations' compact had been one of the major selling points of Confederation in French Canada. Since the mid-1840s, the Province of Canada had often operated on an informal 'double-majority' principle, whereby the executive was expected to command a majority of delegates in both Canada East (Quebec) and Canada West (Ontario), and be led by an informal dual premiership, with British- and French-Canadian co-premiers. French Canadians expected that this principle would be upheld after Confederation, albeit in a different form. George-Étienne Cartier, French Canada's Father

---

[54] David E. Smith, *Federalism and the Constitution of Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), pp.5, 155.
[55] *Ibid*., p.ix.
[56] *Ibid*., pp.ix, 20.
[57] *Ibid*., p.21.

of Confederation, went to great lengths to assure his constituency that the 1867 deal would be established on this principle.[58]

The 'Two Founding Nations' were not to be territorially limited. The *BNAA* granted special protection for the Catholic faith, French language and civil law in Quebec, where a French-Catholic majority could be preserved. But the two nations thesis included a privileged place for French-Canadian Catholics in the country as a whole. Henri Bourassa explained it in its simplest terms in 1913, on the eve of a war that would prove its greatest test:

> 'The Canadian Confederation ... is the result of a contract between the two races, French and English, treating on an equal footing and recognizing equal rights and reciprocal obligations. The Canadian Confederation will last only to the extent that the equality of rights will be recognized as the basis of public law in Canada, from Halifax to Vancouver.'[59]

Proponents of the idea pointed to the *BNAA*'s granting of federal powers for the protection of Catholic and Protestant minority education rights (Section 93 of the *Act*), and the granting of equal status to the French and English languages in the national and Quebec legislatures and courts (Section 133).[60] While the *BNAA* also gave English explicit protection in Quebec, it failed to provide explicit protection for the French language in the sister-province of Ontario. Cartier reassured anxious Canada East legislators that such explicit protection was unnecessary, as Francophone minorities could rely on the good will and 'British fair play' of their English-speaking counterparts

---

[58] Arthur I. Silver, *The French-Canadian Idea of Confederation, 1864-1900* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), pp.31; Ralph Heintzman, "The Spirit of Confederation: Professor Creighton, Biculturalism, and the Use of History," *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. LII, No. 3 (September 1971): 245-275.

[59] In Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*, p.150.

[60] Canada, *British North America Act*, 1867, accessed 10 October 2012, http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/Const/FullText.html.

– their language would be protected by the *spirit* of Confederation.[61] The two founding nations compact initially seemed to have prevailed with the terms of the *Manitoba Act* (1870), which protected both Catholic and Protestant education rights and gave equal status in the province to French and English.[62] The *North-West Territories Act* (1875) followed, providing essentially the same rights for French Catholics from Manitoba to the Rockies. The two founding nations thesis received wide acceptance among French Canadians in 1867 and afterwards, but it was much less popular in British Canada.[63] By 1914, few British Canadians would have defended it.

Several developments undermined the 'Two Founding Nations' thesis, especially the erosion of French Catholic minority education rights throughout the country. In 1871, the New Brunswick government created an ostensibly non-sectarian schools system by denying funding to 'separate' religious schools. The federal government protested, but failed to impose remedial legislation, as was its right under Section 93 of the *BNAA*. In 1890, Manitoba, now dominated by a British-Canadian majority, passed similar legislation that denied funding to religious (*i.e.* Catholic) schools, and abolished French as an official language. Two years later, the assembly of the North-West Territories followed suit, entrenching the policy in 1905 with the creation of Alberta and Saskatchewan. In 1912, Ontario passed Regulation 17, which removed funding from any

---

[61] George-Étienne Cartier, "Défense du projet de Confédération," 7 février 1865, in Yvan Lamonde and Claude Corbo, *Le rouge et le bleu: Une anthologie de la pensée politique au Québec de la Conquête à la Révolution tranquille* (Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1999), pp.202-214.

[62] Section 22 and Section 23, respectively, of the *Manitoba Act*, 1870. See *BNA Act*, 1867 (http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/Const/FullText.html), notes 50 and 67.

[63] The 'compact of nations' also had to compete with the 'compact of provinces' – Confederation as a compact of territories, not peoples – and with those who maintained that Confederation had not been a 'compact' of any kind, but rather, that it had created an entirely new political entity. Ramsay Cook, *Provincial Autonomy, Minority Rights and the Compact Theory, 1867-1921* (Ottawa: Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1970), pp.41, 51; Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*, pp.168-189.

school that used French as a language of instruction and communication beyond the first two years of education. Franco-Quebecers interpreted the denial of French-Catholic education rights in other parts of the country as a signal that they were not welcome outside of Quebec. The imperialist rhetoric of the day and the highly publicized trial and execution of French-speaking Métis leader Louis Riel in Regina in 1885 did not help.[64] Nevertheless, influential French Canadians like Henri Bourassa continued to insist on bilingualism and biculturalism as founding ideals for the country. "'The fatherland, for us,'" Bourassa wrote in 1904:

> 'is the whole of Canada, that is to say, a federation of distinct races and autonomous provinces. The nation that we wish to see developed is the Canadian nation, composed of French Canadians and English Canadians, that is to say, two elements separated by language and religion, and by the legal arrangements necessary for the conservation of their respective traditions, but united in an attachment of brotherhood, in a common attachment to a common fatherland.'[65]

Significantly, during the interwar period, the 'Two Founding Nations' thesis would begin to receive meaningful support among Anglo-Canadians for the first time since Confederation.

At the time of Confederation, the responsibility for upholding the cultural principle was given to the central government. Its tools for protecting cultural federalism were twofold: informal federalism and executive federalism.[66] Things fell apart around the turn-of-the century, however, and especially after the election of Robert Borden's Conservative government in 1911. Borden's Cabinet included only weak French-Canadian representation, and it utterly failed to act on Ontario's imposition of Regulation

---

[64] Silver, *The French-Canadian Idea of Confederation*, pp.18.
[65] In Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question,* p.117.
[66] Informal and executive federalism were used in an attempt to accommodate both cultural and territorial federalism with the Laurier-Greenway compromise of 1897. S23 of the *Manitoba Act* (1870) was not restored. However, where numbers merited, a half hour of religious instruction could be taught after class, and bilingual instruction could be given in cases where at least 10 students in a class spoke one other language. *Ibid*., p.158.

17. Cultural federalism was relegated entirely with the creation of Borden's 'coalition' government in 1917, which effectively excluded French Canada. Executive-level élite accommodation of cultural federalism would only be restored under William Lyon Mackenzie King, whose French-language skills were minimal,[67] but whose Cabinet always included strong representation from Quebec, notably with Ernest Lapointe, as well as representatives of the French-speaking communities from outside Quebec. A combination of informal and executive federalism would also be used to restore French-language education rights in Ontario, where the province was persuaded to amend Regulation 17. Smith explains that "cultural federalism depends upon political agreements, whether in the form of intergovernmental accords, parliamentary resolutions, or statutes."[68] I might add that informal political agreements, and the politically involved intellectual, professional, and business classes, also play a key role in promoting cultural federalism. Indeed, they understand that accommodation can and often does serve their interests, professional or financial.[69]

Smith also refers to the important role of "personal federalism," how individuals experience federalism. More specifically, this refers to how people and organizations outside of government organize themselves "on the federal principle" in their day-to-day lives, in social clubs, professional associations, sports groups, and so on. Smith explains that these groups often organize along provincial lines, and their national organizations are more often than not federative in nature, that is, composed of a series of provincial

[67] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.73.
[68] Smith, *Federalism and the Constitution of Canada*, p.160.
[69] During the Great War, for instance, reconciliationist business leaders came together in part out of a fear that British- and French-Canadian consumers and investors might begin boycotting each other's businesses. Robert Talbot, "Une réconciliation insaisissable: le mouvement de la bonne entente," *Mens. Revue d'histoire intellectuelle de l'Amérique française*, (automne 2007) vol. VIII, no. 1, p.85.

member organizations.[70] The interwar period witnessed the proliferation of several organizations that were federative in nature. Not only were they territorially federative, as per Smith's explanation, but, as we shall see, they were also culturally federative.

The interwar period provides a unique insight into the functioning of informal and executive federalism, and into how territorial, cultural and personal federalism can manifest in the organization of civil society. What is of interest here is not so much whether Canada is or ever was a formal compact of two peoples, but how far Canadians at various levels of society – in Ontario and Quebec in particular – experienced or even endorsed this understanding of Confederation, or something resembling it. To what extent did English- and French-speaking Canadians, both in positions of influence and within broader society, experience, endorse, and attempt to construct a more dynamic and unifying cross-cultural relationship during the interwar period?

Research methodology

Geographical focus and time period

This study is limited, for the most part, to the period from 1916 to 1940. The year 1916 marks the eve of the low point in cross-cultural relations: Union Government and conscription in 1917. It was also in 1916 that the first formal association for rapprochement was created (the Bonne Entente League). 1940 does not denote a 'high' point in relations so much as it marks what was, perhaps, the greatest test in Anglophone/Francophone relations after two decades of apparent improvement: Canada's entry into another world war. Ending this study around 1940 also allows for the inclusion

[70] Smith, *Federalism and the Constitution of Canada*, p.13.

of the crucial Quebec and Canadian elections of October 1939 and March 1940, respectively.

Most of this study will focus on Quebec and Ontario. French-Canadian society has always been centred in Quebec. Of Canada's roughly 2.5 million citizens of French background in 1921, 1.9 million, or 77%, resided in Quebec.[71] In addition to being the largest French-Canadian bloc, the Franco-Quebecers were by far the most influential group.[72] Canada's Francophone minorities outside Quebec will also be considered here, but Quebec merits special attention in any attempt to understand French Canada during the interwar period and how its relationship with British Canada evolved over those two decades. With its Loyalist self-image, Ontario remained an important historical and sentimental centre of British-Canadian society. Its population of 2.9 million in 1921 was the country's largest, and closest in number compared to Quebec. Ontario included some 2.3 million British Canadians, nearly half of Canada's 4.9 million citizens of British ancestry.[73] Quebec and Ontario were also home to the country's largest and most influential British- and French-Canadian minorities.[74] Together, the provinces accounted for 87% and 54% of the French- and British-Canadian populations, respectively.[75] Moreover, the social, economic and cultural ties between the British-Canadian communities of Quebec and Ontario, and between the French-Canadian communities of

---

[71] Out of a total provincial population of 2.4 million. See Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, Vol. I: Population: Number, Sex, and Distribution - Racial Origins - Religion (Ottawa: F.A. Acland, Printer to the King, 1924), p.356.
[72] See Allaire, *La Francophonie canadienne*, pp.1; Silver, *The French-Canadian Idea of Confederation*, pp.11.
[73] See Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, Vol. I, p.356.
[74] In 1921, 250,000 French Canadians in Ontario, or 8% of the provincial population, and 340,000 British Canadians in Quebec, or 15% of the provincial population. See *Ibid.*, pp.356, 568.
[75] See F.H. Leacy, ed., *Historical Statistics of Canada,* second edition (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1983), Table A125-163.

Quebec and Ontario, were so close that each can be said to have formed one larger bloc.[76] The British Canadians of Ontario cared very seriously about the vitality of the British-Canadian community in Quebec, as did the French Canadians of Quebec when it came to the French-Canadian community in Ontario. As such, the manner in which each province dealt with its minority was important because the treatment of the Quebec and Ontario Official Language minority groups affected broader Anglo-/French-Canadian relations.[77]

The extent to which prejudicial Anglo-Ontarian and Franco-Quebecer attitudes about the 'other' evolved from 1916 to 1940 provides something of a barometer for the overall improvement of Francophone/Anglophone relations in Canada, and in Central Canada in particular. The negative stereotyping and caricaturization on the part of one province fed on that of the other. What was important about these images was not their accuracy (or lack thereof), but, as Ramsay Cook explained, "the fact that people accepted them as a part of the picture of the world in which they lived."[78] More to the point, people accepted them so long as they were repeated by leaders in civil society and by politicians. So long as the invective persisted, a disproportionate significance would continue to be attributed to otherwise prosaic events that took on the mantle of 'national crises.'[79] How far these perceptions in Quebec and Ontario were able to change by WWII – and how far such 'national crises' were able to be diminished and managed – is a primary subject of interest here. How far the vicious cycle of invective was altered is crucial to understanding the gradual improvement in relations.

---

[76] See Silver, *The French-Canadian Idea of Confederation*, pp.11, 18.
[77] Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*, p.35.
[78] *Ibid.*, p.27.
[79] "It was to these basic, if often unconscious, stereotypes that politicians, preachers, priests, and journalists often appealed when Canadian public questions were discussed." *Ibid.*, p.27.

While Anglo- and French-Canadian exchanges and interactions occurred at various levels of society and throughout Canada, Montreal and Ottawa were key centres of evolution in the cross-cultural relationship. Both had high numbers of British-Canadians and French-Canadians and as such were the two most important cities of contact, conflict and rapprochement during the interwar years. As *the* major economic, industrial and cultural centre, Montreal naturally attracted some of the country's most prominent, affluent, and intellectually engaged British- and French-Canadian citizens. Sheer demographics ensured that encounters would occur at other levels of society as well. The country's largest city (618,506 people by 1921), it was arguably the most diverse, with a population that was 63% French, 24% British, and 12% Ethno-Cultural.[80] More than any other city, it could lay claim to being a crossroads of Canadian society. For French Canadians, this was their principal city. It was also the effective 'capital' of Anglo-Quebecers – more British Canadians lived here than anywhere else in Quebec,[81] and the English-speaking minority occupied some of the most prominent seats of power in this, the country's industrial capital. As such, Montreal remained the "'first city'" of British Canada.[82]

As the national capital, Ottawa was the country's political centre – it was here that the British- and French-Canadian political élite met, boarded together,[83] mingled and

[80] The largest groups were Jews (7%), Italians (2%), and Slavs (1%, mostly Poles, Russians and Ukrainians). Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, Vol. I, p.542.
[81] 42% in 1921 in the City of Montreal itself, which did not include the surrounding municipalities. Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, Vol. I, pp.356, 542.
[82] As Magda Fahrni reminds us, "Too many studies of English Canada adopt a presentist perspective and take Toronto as the centre of their study.... For two centuries, Montreal was the 'first city' of English Canada (as well as the metropolis of French Canada); it was here that could be found the country's financial and social élite." Fahrni, "Quebec in Historical Writing on Canada," p.19.
[83] Henri Bourassa and Robert Borden were room-mates for a time, which may have contributed to their unlikely political alliance in 1911. See Robert Craig Brown, "Sir Robert Borden," in Ramsay Cook and Réal Bélanger, eds., *Canada's Prime Ministers: Macdonald to Trudeau* (Toronto: University of Toronto

hobnobbed, and where party politics, decision-making and cross-cultural political compromise could occur at their highest levels. French Canadians from both in and outside of Ontario asserted a sense of ownership over the city. They insisted that the national capital should be truly representative of the nation – Ottawa children's education should be in keeping with their parents' language and religion (be they French or English, Catholic or Protestant), public services should be available in both languages, public service jobs should be open to French- as well as English-speaking Canadians, and Cabinet, Parliament and the judiciary should reflect French-Canadian as well as Anglo-Canadian interests, both in terms of membership, and in terms of policy- and decision-making.[84] On the border between the country's two largest provinces, it too was on the crossroads of Canadian society. The city was home to a high proportion of both British- and French-Canadian denizens, with a reversed ratio strikingly similar to that of Montreal. By 1921, 63% of the city's population was of British extraction, 28% French, and 8% Ethno-Cultural, out of a total population of 107,843.[85] For Franco-Ontarians, Ottawa was their cultural capital. To be sure, the Franco-Ontarian population was far more widely dispersed, rural, and far less wealthy and politically powerful than the Anglo-Quebecer population. Still, more French Canadians lived in Ottawa (12% of Franco-Ontarians) than in any other city in Ontario. Moreover, Ottawa functioned as the regional centre of Eastern Ontario, in which Franco-Ontarians were concentrated in the greatest numbers.

Press, 2007), p.206.

[84] See Camille Roy, *Pour conserver notre héritage français* (Montréal: Éditions Beauchemin, 1937), p.11.

[85] Not including neighbouring Vanier and Hull, with their large Francophone populations. Ottawa's largest Ethno-Cultural groups were Jews (3%), Germans (2%), and Italians (1%). Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, Vol. I, pp.356, 542.

Montreal and Ottawa were naturally home to the headquarters of several of the country's most important business, commercial, professional, academic, fraternal and political organizations and associations, in which the "who's who" of Canadian society interacted, and where new ideas and conceptions of Canadian citizenship percolated. Here, these associations could straddle the divide between British and French Canada, hire bilingual staff, and so claim 'genuine' national representation. For these reasons, Montreal and Ottawa collectively occupy a prominent place in the research. The provincial capitals of Toronto and Quebec City, each with overwhelming English- and French-speaking majorities, are also important, as influential moderate academics, intellectuals and politicians emerged from both cities.

Outline of topics and source material

This is a study of cross-cultural rapprochement, not of conflict. It is an examination of those things that may have helped foster better understanding and improved relations between many (but certainly not all) Anglo- and French Canadians during the interwar years. Without discounting the persistence of important sources of tension and discord, this study takes a "glass half-full" approach. Instead of asking the very legitimate question, "Why did certain divisions persist between Anglo- and French Canadians on the eve of the Second World War?" it begins with the equally important question, "Why were Anglo- and French Canadians apparently more united entering the Second World War than they had been exiting the First?" It is on this basis that the research for this study has been completed – by identifying potential sources of

rapprochement and trying to understand how effective they were within the context of the times. I make no apologies for this approach. Those things that have kept Canadians divided along cultural-linguistic lines, during the interwar years and otherwise, have already been much discussed in the historiography. Discord and rapprochement are opposite sides of the same coin. I am simply interested in the side that has, perhaps, received less "polish" from our eminent scholars. By giving due consideration to both, the historiography, as a whole, has much currency to gain.

The improvement in Anglophone/Francophone relations by 1940 must be measured against the situation as it existed leading up to and during the Great War. Chapter 1 provides the historical context for the state of cross-cultural discord at the end of the war, relying on the abundance of secondary sources available on this topic. Census data and other statistics are also analyzed so as to provide an understanding of the demographic and economic trends that were also generating anxiety and animosity between Anglophones and Francophones. The chapter ends by considering how some historians have portrayed the war-time years and the decades that followed it, and the question of rapprochement in particular.

If rapprochement was going to occur at all, it had to begin somewhere. How, then, did the process get started? What were the main ideas being articulated by advocates of cross-cultural engagement? Chapter 2 identifies the earliest formal associations that were created to promote rapprochement through élite and civil society accommodation, and looks at the archival records of these associations – the Bonne Entente League and the Better Understanding Association.

Anglo-Canadians, especially, were going to have to change their ways if meaningful rapprochement was going to be possible. Chapter 3 analyzes the published works of some of the most forceful early Anglo-Canadian advocates of cross-cultural accommodation in order to understand the central ideas underpinning the movement.

If national identity is grounded in a particular understanding of the past, then Anglophone conceptions of Canada's national story were also going to have to change. Chapter 4 looks at specific Anglo-Canadian historians to see how far their work both reflected and projected the reconciliationist discourse of the time. It relies on the published works of these authors and on the rich secondary literature.

In order for rapprochement to gain traction there had to be some level of reciprocation from French-Canadian intellectuals. Chapter 5 explores how Francophone intellectuals, including historians, responded to the new ideas emerging among Anglo-Canadians, and how far they remained open to the idea of a shared national identity and an historical narrative that was less skeptical of British Canada than the alternative being offered by Lionel Groulx. Like Chapters 3 and 4, Chapter 5 also makes use of the original published works of the individuals examined, as well as secondary sources.

The succeeding chapters explore how far the spirit of rapprochement may have reached beyond the academics and intellectuals – to politicians, the broader public, and an expanding civil society. Chapter 6 explores how some organizations in civil society began to reflect and project a discourse of cultural dualism, for both idealistic reasons and out of a pragmatic self-interest. It takes a brief look at how some of the new and reinvigorated pan-Canadian nationalist fraternal associations incorporated Canada's French fact into the civic nationalism of the post-WWI era, relying on newspaper reports,

Bonne Entente League records, and the secondary literature. The chapter also takes a detailed look at the archival records and annual reports of five of the most prominent national business and professional associations of the day, and examines the extent to which cultural federalism informed their organization and activities and why (for idealistic reasons, pragmatic considerations, or both). Two of these were old associations established long before the war (the Montreal Board of Trade and the Canadian Medical Association) and three were quite new (the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Bar Association and the Canadian Dental Association). Three were closely connected to the political élite (the MBT, CCC and CBA) and two were not (the CMA and CDA). Chapter 6 also examines how the Catholic Church in Quebec and Ontario attempted to smooth relations between Irish- and French-Canadian parishioners. The animosity between these groups before the war, especially in Ontario, had to be overcome in order for meaningful rapprochement to take root. For the broader picture, this section takes advantage of the published work of contemporary observers as well as the recent historiography. For the 'micro,' it examines in detail the symbolically important visit of the French-Canadian Cardinal Villeneuve to Ontario in 1934, using the published account of the visit as well as newspaper reports.

To what extent did other elements of the broader public gain exposure to Canadian biculturalism? What role did political élites and civil society play in this process? Chapter 7 looks at some of the most important symbolic measures undertaken by the federal government during the period – the sixtieth anniversary of Confederation, bilingual stamps and currency, and attempts at improving French-language services in government. These measures resulted in part from new pressures being placed on the

political élite by Canada's evolving civil society. In addition to secondary sources, for the 'inside' story, this chapter makes use of the Mackenzie King diaries and the writings and recollections of contemporary observers who closely followed these developments at the time. Newspaper accounts help flesh out how government initiatives were communicated to and experienced by the broader public.

Was the symbolic acknowledgement of biculturalism by government and civil society isolated, or did it reflect broader changes among the public? Could popular culture act as a vehicle for cross-cultural contact and understanding for some Canadians, and for Anglo-Canadians in particular? What were people reading, watching, and listening to? Did any of it reflect the discourse of rapprochement or cultural dualism? These are the questions that Chapters 8 and 9 seek to address. Chapter 8 explores changes in popular reading (by examining particular books, novels, histories and the print media), new radio programmes (by looking at the recollections of an early programme developer and the reporting in newspapers), and language acquisition (discussed in government reports and by contemporary observers). Chapter 9 examines tourism to Quebec, borrowing from the important work of Nicole Neatby.[86] Tourism is especially useful here because of the plethora of promotional material that remains available for analysis. Unlike other elements of popular culture, tourism is also measurable – government and rail company records provide inter-provincial travel statistics that can be analyzed.

Did young Canadians experience any kind of rapprochement? This would be important for the long-term. Moreover, young people are often more open to adopting new ideas and a national identity that differs from that of their parents. Chapter 10 explores the

[86] Nicole Neatby, "Meeting of Minds: North American Travel Writers and Government Tourist Publicity in Quebec, 1920-1955," *Histoire sociale / Social History*.,Vol.II (2003), pp.468.

apparent increase of student exchanges and the growth of national youth clubs and associations. The chapter makes use of the records of an urban youth association (the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Canada) and a rural youth association (the 4-H clubs). It also takes a detailed look at the records of a remarkable organization that brought Anglophone and Francophone youth together in common cause during the late 1930s: the Canadian Youth Congress. In 1919, bonne ententistes had called for the use of history to inculcate a better appreciation for the 'Other' among young people. What then, was the situation in classrooms by 1939? Chapter 10 closes with a brief look at the teaching of history in the classroom on the eve of the Second World War, using important texts, government and associational reports, and the secondary literature.

Chapter 11 shifts to the political scene. It explores how changes within intellectual and academic circles, civil society and the electorate pressured political parties, especially the Liberal Party, to confront the major issues separating Anglo- and French Canadians, namely language and foreign policy. This chapter makes significant use of secondary sources, but it also includes original primary research, drawing on prime ministers' papers, the Mackenzie King diaries, published letters, memoires, newspapers, Hansard, and the records of the Association canadienne-française d'éducation d'Ontario. It attempts to provide a new analysis of familiar topics that are central to the broader theme of the work. While Regulation 17 and Canada's interwar foreign policy have been much discussed in the historiography, they have not been adequately situated within the broader context of the process of cross-cultural rapprochement that began, in part, from the ground up – among intellectuals, civil society, and the public – after the Great War. Indeed, it was this very process that helped transform Canadian liberalism and the Liberal Party and made compromise on the highly contentious issues of language and foreign policy possible.

Chapter I: THE GRAND NARRATIVE AND THE ROOTS OF DISCORD

The Great War period is often considered the most divisive in Canadian history. As the historical narrative goes, French-Canadian opposition to conscription and at times to mere participation in the war raised the hackles of imperialistic and rather intransigent British Canadians. "During the World War of 1914-18," one historian concluded, "French Canadian 'nationalism' flared up in hatred against ... demands for help in men and money for the further prosecution of the war."[1] The tensions between Canada's two major cultural-linguistic groups had not begun with the war. They were rooted in deep ideological and socio-economic divisions, seemingly impossible to reconcile. The problem with much of the historiography is that it takes for granted that meaningful rapprochement was, indeed, impossible.

The ideological divide: competing nationalisms and religions

Even before the war, relations between Canada's two solitudes had been characterized by the conflict between British-Canadian imperialism and French-Canadian nationalism.[2] The aim of British-Canadian imperialists was "to consolidate the British Empire through military, economic and constitutional devices."[3] Imperialism, as Carl Berger explained, was a form of Canadian nationalism. Men like George Munro Grant and Colonel George Taylor Denison were convinced that national status could only be achieved by maintaining the imperial connection and by "acquiring an influence within

[1] Armstrong, *The Crisis of Quebec, 1914-1918*, p.vii.
[2] J.R. Miller, *Equal Rights: The Jesuits' Estates Act Controversy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 2001), p.ix.
[3] Carl Berger, ed., *Imperialism and Nationalism, 1884-1914: a conflict in Canadian thought*, (Toronto: Copp Clark Publishing, 1969), pp.1.

its councils."[4] For this reason, it was crucial that Canada assume a meaningful role in imperial wars, and especially during the Great War. Moreover, the 'new imperialism' of the late nineteenth century was more racially charged and much less tolerant than the mercantile imperialism – with its emphasis on economy, commerce, and utilitarianism – that had preceded it. The more intransigent British-Canadian imperialists, like the Orangist D'Alton McCarthy, constantly used the discourse of imperialism to attack the French-speaking minorities outside Quebec and demand their assimilation to the Protestant British-Canadian way of life. Unsurprisingly, French Canadians came to view British-Canadian imperialism "with massive hostility."[5] Unlike their British-Canadian counterparts, most had little sentimental attachment to the British Empire. Instead, nationalistes like Henri Bourassa saw British imperialism and foreign wars as a threat to national unity. He advocated for a more autonomous Canada in which the bilingual nature of the country would be better appreciated.

Henri Bourassa also ascribed to an ideal that left many British Canadians at unease: ultramontane nationalism. Ultramontanism in French Canada had its roots in the mid-nineteenth century. Following the failure of the Upper and Lower Canadian rebellions of 1837-1838 and the subsequent vacuum of ideological leadership that had been created by the removal of radical liberals, the conservative Catholic clergy asserted a stronger role for itself among French Canadians.[6] Around the same time, the conservative Bishop Bourget encouraged the adoption of a policy of looking more directly to Rome for religious, social, and cultural guidance. Known as ultramontanism, this ideology had become increasingly popular in parts of Europe, including France.

[4] Berger, *The Sense of Power*, p.259.
[5] Berger, *Imperialism and Nationalism*, pp.1; Berger, *The Sense of Power*, p.259.
[6] Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1760-1896*, pp.290.

Ultramontanism referred quite literally to looking "'au-déla des monts,'" over the Swiss Alps and into Italy and the Papal States, for inspiration. Beginning in the 1850s, an increasing number of the French-Canadian clergy travelled to Rome for higher ecclesiastical study.[7]

Ultramontanism emphatically rejected the separation of Church and State. It belonged in part to the larger trend of counter-revolutionary thought that arose in reaction to the secularism of the late eighteenth century. Ultramontanism advocated a central role for the Church in the operation of the State, so as to ensure the people's moral purity in mind, body and spirit, and collective adherence to the will of God on Earth.[8] It warned against the morally corrupting influences of liberal individualism and of the materialism inherent in Protestant capitalism. Instead, it emphasized family, a modest material existence, and a reliance on the Church itself as the best means for meeting one's corporeal as well as temporal needs.

Where the interests of Church and State conflicted, the former took precedence. To this end, ultramontanism emphasized the importance of an unbroken and rigid ecclesiastical hierarchy. God communicated His will to the pope, who in turn imparted it unto the bishops, who passed it down to the local parish priest from whom the people received their divine direction.[9] Who better positioned, then, to help guide the State than the Church, especially after the declaration of papal infallibility during the First Vatican Council of 1869-1870? In practice, this meant providing close counsel to monarchs and

---

[7] *Ibid*.
[8] *Ibid*.
[9] "'Let us each say in his heart: I hear my curé, my curé hears the bishop, and the bishop hears the Pope, and the Pope hears our Lord Jesus Christ,'" declared Montreal Bishop Mgr Ignace Bourget in 1876. In R. Douglas Francis et al., *Destinies: Canadian History Since Confederation*, Vol. II, 6th edition (Toronto: Nelson, 2008), p.56.

governments, and elected officials alike. Ultramontanists also emphasized the role of the Church in directing public instruction, not only from the pulpit, but also in schools, colleges and universities.[10] As such, religious and intellectual education was to be favoured over other subjects, such as math and science. For the next one hundred years, French-Canadian educational institutions would be directed and operated by the Catholic Church.

In its French-Canadian context, ultramontanism became closely linked with a conservative, ethno-centric nationalism. Like its British-Canadian counterpart, imperialism, French-Canadian clerico-nationalism emphasized cultural, linguistic and religious homogeneity. More specifically, it attributed to the French-Canadian minority a sacred mission to pave the way for Roman Catholicism's re-conquest of Protestant North America. "'A nation is constituted by unity of speech, unity of faith, uniformity of morals, customs, and institutions,'" declared Mgr Louis-François Laflèche, Bishop of Trois-Rivières and ultramontane leader, in 1866. "'The French Canadians possess all these, and constitute a true nation. Each nation has received from Providence a mission to fulfill. The mission of French-Canadian people is to constitute a centre of Catholicism in the New World.'"[11] Such ideals remained strong in the early twentieth century, and were espoused by French Canada's most prominent intellectual and orator, Henri Bourassa.[12] (While Bourassa was also a pan-Canadian nationalist and advocate of cross-cultural engagement, exclusively French-Canadian nationalistes like Jules-Paul Tardivel and Lionel Groulx were also strong advocates of ultramontanism.) Exactly how a small

[10] See Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1760-1896*, pp.290, 367.
[11] In Francis et al., *Destinies*, p.56.
[12] See, for instance, Henri Bourassa, "Discours à Notre Dame," 10 September 1910, in Yvan Lamonde and Claude Corbo, *Le rouge et le bleu: Une anthologie de la pensée politique au Québec de la Conquête à la Révolution tranquille* (Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1999), pp.315-320.

cultural-linguistic minority in the north-eastern corner of the continent would bring about the conversion of millions of non-Catholics was unclear. At the very least, French-Canadian society would act as a beacon of Christian purity and a North American foothold for Roman Catholicism in a sea of apostasy. Moreover, Catholicism and absolute loyalty to the Church would provide the French-Catholic minority with the best means of social, cultural, linguistic and, above all, religious preservation against the ever-present threat of British-Protestant assimilation. To this end, some clerico-nationalistes, like Tardivel and Groulx, insisted on cultural separation of English- and French-speaking Canada – contact and interaction with the corrupting influence of the 'other' must be kept to a bare minimum.[13] Even more than the programme of cultural separation, it was the claim of a divine mission and the implication that Catholics alone had any "prerogative or mission for Christian evangelization" that so irked Protestants, who at the time were experiencing an evangelical revival of their own.[14]

A series of developments in the decades after Confederation underscored the growing importance of ultramontanism within the Catholic Church, and the place of the Church itself within French-Canadian society and the new 'State' in Quebec. In 1871 the ultramontanes published their *Programme catholique*, wherein they declared the Church's right to direct parishioners on how to vote during elections – namely, for a party

---

[13] See Jules-Paul Tardivel, *Pour la patrie: roman du XXe siècle* (Montreal: Cadieux et Derome, 1895); Groulx, "Notre État français, nous l'aurons."

Bourassa, while vigilant against assimilation, advocated for greater positive interaction between Anglo- and French Canadians, especially among élites. Henri Bourassa, *Le Patrimoine canadien-français: ce qu'il est, ce q''il doit être. Discours prononcé au Monument national, le 27 avril 1902*. (Montréal: Cie de publication de la Revue canadienne, 1902). University of Ottawa archives, 01-CRC 1902-5.

[14] Robert Choquette, *Language and Religion. A History of English-French Conflict in Ontario*, (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1975), p.253.

Moderate secularists in Quebec, who were on the decline by the end of the nineteenth century, warned that the aggressive Catholicism would provoke British-Protestant extremism in turn. Frances Russell, *The Canadian Crucible: Manitoba's Role in Canada's Great Divide* (Winnipeg: Heartland, 2003), p.184.

and a candidate whose platform was seen as to be in keeping with the interests of the Church, whose interests were in turn deemed synonymous with those of French-Canadian society at large.[15] Generally speaking, this meant favouring conservatives over liberals. Since 1844, l'Institut canadien, a small group of liberal French-Canadian intellectuals, had criticized ultramontanism and the union of Church and State. In response, the Church denied members of l'Institut the sacrament and threatened excommunication. In one of the more sensational and highly publicized controversies, the Church refused the right of burial in consecrated ground for Joseph Guibord, a prominent liberal and member of l'Institut who died in 1869. The controversy garnered much criticism in the English-language press.[16] By 1877, French-Canadian liberals, led by a young Wilfrid Laurier, had been forced to moderate their Rouge liberalism ideology to a Victorian liberalism that was more deferential to the Church and acknowledged the important association of Catholicism and French-Canadian identity.[17] More secular French-Canadians in the Conservative Party, meanwhile, were gradually eclipsed by those more willing to emphasize the Church in Quebec life.[18]

By now, support for ultramontanism had grown significantly among the French-Canadian public. During the Guibord Affair, attempts to bury the body were turned back by angry mobs until an escort of 1,200 militia was called in. In addition to defending the

---

[15] "Un programme électoral catholique," in Albert Desbiens, ed., *Histoire du Canada. Une expérience tricentenaire* (Montréal: Éditions Sainte-Marie, 1967), pp.118-121. Originally in *Le Journal des Trois Rivières*, 20 April 1871.

[16] See, for instance, *History of the Guibord Case. Ultramontanism versus Law and Human Rights* (Montreal: 'Witness' Printing House, 1875), University of Ottawa microfiche, CIHM no. 05643. The book was dedicated to the memory of Joseph Guibord.

[17] John Dickenson and Brian Young, *A Short History of Quebec*, Fourth edition (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 2008), pp.186, 193. See also H. Blair Neatby, *Laurier and a Liberal Quebec: A Study in Political Management* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973).

[18] After George-Étienne Cartier died in 1873, the influence of the secular "castors" waned, with the exception of the short-lived government of Joseph-Adolphe Chapleau. See Andrée Désilets, "Joseph-Adolphe Chapleau," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, Vol.XII (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 1990), accessed 12 May 2011, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/chapleau_joseph_adolphe_12E.html.

interests of the Church at home, some French Canadians demonstrated their support for Church interests abroad. From 1868 to 1870 the Papal States fought an ultimately unsuccessful campaign against Italian unification. With the encouragement of local priests, some five hundred French-Canadian volunteers departed for Europe to serve in the papal army.[19] The legendary "zouaves," or "mercenaries of the Lord," were celebrated by generations of ultramontane nationalistes, including Lionel Groulx.[20] While deeply critical of Canada's participation in the Great War, the incongruity of celebrating a previous generation of Canadians' involvement in another foreign war at the behest of another foreign power was apparently lost on him.

A formal role for the Church in Quebec had been secured with the terms of Confederation. French-Canadian leaders had ensured that the new constitution guaranteed confessional schools in Quebec. Religion, even more so than language, was associated with the survival of the French-Canadian nation. One of the more controversial examples of the cooperation between Church and State in Quebec was the Jesuits Estates Act, passed in 1888 by the nationaliste provincial government of Honoré Mercier. The Jesuits had long hoped to claim compensation for lands that had been taken from the Catholic order after 1760 and transferred to the state. Public and ecclesiastical pressure for these demands grew with the popularization of the ultramontane nationaliste movement. Mercier, who had been elected on a platform that acknowledged Catholicism's primacy in French-Canadian society, appealed to the Pope to arbitrate the dispute. Ultimately, the

[19] Francis, *Destinies*, pp.56-57; Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1760-1896*, pp.290, 367.
[20] According to Groulx, "les zouaves représentent mieux qu'eux-mêmes, ils ont incarné notre vie intérieure et profonde, toute leur race dans l'explosion de ses meilleurs instincts." In Jacques Godbout, "Notre libération," *Liberté*, vol.14, no.3, (81) 1972, p.31.

provincial government paid out some $400,000 of public funds to the Jesuits, the French-Catholic Université Laval in Quebec City, and the Catholic dioceses of the province.[21]

Religious animosities die hard. For most Protestants who had grown up on tales of a Catholic conspiracy for world domination, French-Canadian clerico-nationalism posed a serious threat. Papal intervention leading to the awarding of public funds to religious institutions stood as an egregious example of ultramontanism in practice. The actions of the Mercier government convinced many Ontarians, who were already anxious about the future of Quebec's British-Canadian minority, "that Quebec was a theocracy."[22] Moreover, the Jesuits' Estates Act added fuel to the fire of a "'No Popery'" campaign that had taken root earlier during the 1880s. The federal government's refusal to disallow the Act over the objections of 13 Ontario MPs convinced some that both governments in Ottawa and Quebec City were under the influence of Papal authority.[23]

Collectively, these developments contributed to a deep suspicion and resentment of French Canada among British Canadians. Many Protestant British Canadians had been bred with a deep mistrust and dislike for Roman Catholicism. This was especially the case in Ontario, where Irish Protestants settled in large numbers during the nineteenth century.[24] The great suspicion was that the Catholic Church continued to have designs on the direction of the state itself, whether through a *de facto* or *de jure* control. Controlling the souls of the individual parishioner was apparently not enough: "'Individual servitude, however abject, will not satisfy the party now dominant in the Latin Church – the State

---

[21] A conciliatory $60,000 was paid to Protestant postsecondary institutions. Francis, *Destinies*, pp.56-57; Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1760-1896*, pp.367.
[22] Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question,* p.36. See Miller, *Equal Rights*, p.ix
[23] Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question,* p.36.
[24] Cecil Houston and William J. Smyth, "The Orange Order and the Expansion of the Frontier in Ontario, 1830-1900," *Journal of Historical Geography*, Volume 4, Issue 3 (1978): 251-264.

must also be a slave,'" declared British Prime Minister William Gladstone. "'No one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another.'"[25] It was a statement that doubtless reflected the sentiments of countless British Canadians.

Indeed, the controversy served only to confirm suspicions of French-Catholic domination of the federal government that had arisen over the terms of the *Manitoba Act* (1870) and the *North-West Territories Act* (1875), which guaranteed confessional schools and equal status for the French language in western Canada. The relative leniency shown to Louis Riel, Francophone Métis leader of the Red River Resistance (1869-1870), and to the Métis executioners of Manitoba Orangeman Thomas Scott, further enraged British-Canadian Protestants and convinced them that the federal government was in the pocket of the Church. Moreover, the favourable terms granted to the West's approximately 50% French-Catholic electorate made the early prospects for absorbing the region into British Canada and the orbit of Ontario seem bleak indeed. The old Upper Canadian dream of diluting the French-Canadian influence via Confederation and westward expansion lay in tatters. To be sure, strong British-Canadian emigration to the west in subsequent years and the defeat of the North-West Rebellion and Riel's execution at Regina in 1885 reassured militant Protestants that they could win the West. But the Jesuits' Estates Act (1888) quickly overshadowed the 'victories' of 1885 and reinvigorated the anti-Catholic, anti-French movement in British Canada, spearheaded by such extremists as D'Alton McCarthy and his so-called Equal Rights Association. McCarthy and others turned their focus to overturning French-Catholic minority rights across the federation.[26]

---

[25] In *History of the Guibord Case*, title page.
[26] See Miller, *Equal Rights*, pp.ix.

At the time, many British Canadians believed that linguistic and cultural homogeneity was necessary for national survival. For some Protestant British Canadians, and Orangemen in particular, this included religious homogeneity. The belief in such uniformity was real and sincere, however misguided. It became popular during the period of aggressive High Imperialism of the latter nineteenth century and reached its apogee during the Great War. It was the product of Social Darwinism and the perceived need for absolute national and imperial unity in the face of competition from other races and empires. It was also born during a time of severe economic recession. There was a real sense of insecurity over the future of Canada as a British alternative to the republican model south of the border.[27] In short, many British-Canadian imperialists believed that ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious diversity made Canada weak. Unchecked, it would lead inevitably to national disintegration. Britain might lose its place to the rising military and economic power of Germany, and a divided Canada would be absorbed into the much more wealthy United States. For British Canadians, then, it was not enough to ensure their majority in just Ontario or the Maritimes – if the British-Canadian people were going to survive, they would have to establish dominion over a large, geographically and economically viable alternative to their southern neighbour.[28]

The push in Canada reflected a view in Britain and in the other colonies of settlement that cultural, linguistic, religious and ethnic uniformity would provide the best means of guaranteeing loyalty and imperial solidarity in times of crisis.[29] A racially and

---

[27] British-Canadian opposition to the Jesuits' Estates Act "was a product of a mood of pessimism and ... anxiety over cultural, religious, and socioeconomic tensions in the young country." Miller, *Equal Rights*, p.x.

[28] See Lacombe, *La rencontre de deux peuples élus*, pp.131; Andrew Thompson, *Imperial Britain: The Empire in British Politics, 1880-1932* (Harlow, UK: Pearson Education, Ltd., 2000), pp.24-25.

[29] Dane Kennedy, *Britain and Empire, 1880-1945* (Harlow, UK: Pearson Education, Ltd., 2002), p.69.

culturally united "Greater Britain" (Britain and the Dominions) would allow the United Kingdom to retain its place as a powerful political, military, economic, and demographic nation-state. To that end, some British imperialist thinkers and administrators, like H.A. Gwynne of the British Parliamentary Emigration Committee, writing before the Great War, saw French Canadians and Afrikaners as a liability: "'the Empire is founded on race.... Cosmopolitanism in the British Isles and the Dominons would inevitably lead to the destruction of the Empire.'"[30] During the war itself, British officials were keenly aware of the reticence with which both Afrikaners and French Canadians responded to the war effort, and to conscription in particular.[31] It lent credence to the imperialist credo that uniformity and solidarity were one-in-the-same.

As such, British-Canadian nationalism was decidedly imperialist and ethno-centric. Based on the perceived superiority of the British 'race,' and Britain's historical example, it did not include an attachment to, but rather a separation from, Canada's French past. Applying a 'victor's justice' interpretation of history, it insisted that Canada's story truly began in 1759, when forces under General James Wolfe conquered Quebec for the United Kingdom and made way for the subsequent settlement of loyal, English-speaking British subjects. Thus, British Canada's popular anthem, "The Maple Leaf Forever," trumpeted Wolfe's victory and proclaimed the ascendancy of "the shamrock, thistle, rose entwined," with nary a mention of the fleur-de-lys.[32]

This British-Canadian nationalism also favoured a rigid, literal interpretation of Confederation that pointed to the very limited legal recognition that had been provided for the French language in 1867. Advocates of this view were eager to point out that the

[30] In Thompson, *Imperial Britain*, p.138.
[31] *Ibid*., p.166.
[32] Liberal moderate Anglo-Canadians would come to lament this. See Hawkes, *The Birthright*, pp.185-186.

French language had no legal standing outside of Quebec, the federal Parliament and federal Courts. They denied any intent on the part of the Fathers of Confederation that French be accommodated elsewhere. Even the *Quebec Act* (1774) and the *Constitution Act* (1791), they also noted, had omitted any formal recognition of the language (never mind the recognition that had been given to the Catholic faith).[33]

Moreover, these British-Canadian imperio-nationalists insisted that Canadian greatness and national status would be achieved by way of a strong role in the British Empire.[34] The imperialist and ethnic thrusts of British-Canadian nationalism at this time were intimately linked. The challenges from other empires – German, French, or American – and an increasingly diverse immigration from southern and eastern Europe to Canada at the turn of the century, lent strength to the argument that national survival required linguistic, cultural and religious homogeneity.[35] Moreover, in the age of social reconstruction, reform and social progress, some argued that the implementation of social programmes, whether state-driven or philanthropic, necessitated one language for the sake of efficiency. Teaching people English was seen as the key to bringing disadvantaged groups out of poverty, and to educating them about British values.[36]

For many British Canadians, 'British' values were synonymous with 'Protestant' values. Lockean notions of individual liberty and a strong work ethic were considered intrinsic to being both British and Protestant.[37] This brand of Protestantism contributed to

---

[33] See, for instance, Dr. J.W. Edwards, in Library and Archives Canada (LAC), Canadian Fraternal Association papers (CFAP), MG28-I3, transcribed proceedings of the first Better Understanding Association meeting, 25 July 1918, pp.43.
[34] Berger, *The Sense of Power*, pp.1.
[35] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.14-15.
[36] *Ibid*, pp.40.
[37] Smith, *Federalism and the Constitution of Canada*, pp.251; and R. Cole Harris, Pauline Roulston and Chris de Freitas, "The Settlement of Mono Township," *Canadian Geographer*, Volume 19, Issue 1 (1975): 1-17.

a hostility toward Catholics, and to doubts as to whether French Canadians could contribute to the type of society that British-Canadian imperialists hoped to establish. So long as they remained loyal to Rome, French Canadians' commitment to Canada and to the British Empire remained in doubt. So long as they remained 'priest-ridden,' French Canadians could never truly think for themselves, be productive or contribute materially to Confederation. By contrast, many French Canadians believed that so long as British Canadians remained hysterical imperialists whose first loyalty was to Britain and not to Canada, their intentions would remain suspect. By 1914, the ideological divide was deep indeed, and seemingly impossible to reconcile. Things would get worse before they got better.

The socio-economic divide: anxieties over demographic change and economic disparity

A closer examination of the census data and an explanation of the demographic situation leading up to and shortly after the Great War goes a long way in helping understand some of the tensions that persisted between the British- and French-Canadian communities. At the time, observers anxiously awaited each decennial release of census data as a means to substantiate their politically charged claims surrounding demographic change in Canada. The release of the 1911 census data cause quite a stir – it revealed that, east of Manitoba, French-Canadian population growth exceeded British-Canadian population growth.[38] The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries witnessed a huge influx of French-Canadian settlers moving into northern Ontario to work in the forestry, pulp and paper, and mining industries, and in some cases to farm. French Canadians were

[38] Hawkes, *Birthright*, p.197.

also taking up farmland in growing numbers elsewhere in Ontario, including Eastern Ontario and other traditionally British-Canadian Loyalist regions along the upper St. Lawrence and in Quebec's Eastern Townships. Given the higher French-Canadian birthrate, and the migration of many Ontarians to the West and to the US, alarmists worried that the province would eventually be swamped by the so-called "revanche des berceaux."[39] Extremists pointed to a French-Catholic conspiracy to quash Protestantism and suppress the English language. "'The dream of re-conquest and of ascendancy they have never abandoned,'" warned John Willison, editor of the Toronto *News*, in 1916.[40] Even more, the number of French-Catholics in Ontario had begun to exceed the number of Irish-Catholics, creating a conflict between Catholics themselves.[41]

The fight over French-language rights was driven by demographics. With the demographic debate came concerns over the expense of funding both English and French-language schools. For Protestants, the thought of using public funds to pay for Catholic schools was repugnant: "'In the last analysis,'" began an article in the Toronto magazine *Saturday Night* during the debate of the 1905 Alberta and Saskatchewan Autonomy Bills, "'the question to be answered is: Shall the Roman Church be established as a Government institution, supported by Government funds, with the Hierarchy of that Church forming the real Government?'"[42] Bankrolling the 'Romish Church' and the 'Frenchification' of the country did not make sense when the desired endgame was cultural, linguistic and religious homogeneity.

---

[39] See Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.146, 226, 319; Hawkes, *The Birthright*, pp.227.
[40] In Moore, *The Clash!*, p.160.
[41] Choquette, *Language and Religion*, pp.250-251.
[42] In Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*, p.35.

What drove commentators like Willison to such hysteria was the simple fact that British-Canadian numbers were indeed slipping in relation to those of French Canada (albeit not as dramatically as Willison might have claimed). Moreover, British-Canadian numbers were also slipping in relation to the Ethno-Cultural population. From 1881 to 1911, the Ethno-Cultural population as a proportion of the total Canadian population nearly doubled, from 8% to 14% (19% by 1941), or 1,004,990 souls in 1911. Over the same period, the French-Canadian population remained at a stable 29% of the total population (30% by 1941), or 2,061,719 people in 1911, and the ethnic British population fell from 60% to 56% (less than 50% by 1941), or 3,999,081 people in 1911.[43]

Moreover, British-Canadian ethnic nationalists and imperialists were keenly aware that their population depended heavily on immigration from the UK, while French Canadians could sustain their numbers on natural increase alone. More to the point: during times of economic hardship, like the Long Depression of 1873-1896 that remained fresh in imperialists' minds, British-Canadian numbers would suffer, while French-Canadian numbers would not. The massive British immigration that preceded the Great War could not be sustained forever. For British-Canadian observers, the proof was in the pudding. Minus the foreign-born British population, British Canadians only made up 44% of the total population in 1911, while French Canadians remained at 29% of the population.[44] From a twenty-first century hindsight, the merits of this hysteria over

[43] Leacy, *Historical Statistics of Canada*, Table A125-163, Series A297-326. The first censuses that recorded mother tongue showed a similar pattern: in 1931, English was the mother-tongue of 57% of Canadians, and French was the mother tongue of 27%. In 1941, these ratios were 56% and 29%, respectively. See *Ibid*., Series A185-237.

[44] See Leacy, *Historical Statistics of Canada*, Table A125-163, Series A297-326. Natural increase rates began to be collected in 1931. From 1931 to 1941, Quebec's population had a natural increase of 459,211, and a net migration loss of 1,991. Ontario's natural increase was only 278,488, despite its larger population. Even with its net migration increase of 77,484, Ontario's population increase was *exceeded* by Quebec. See *Ibid*., Series A339-349.

demographics may seem dubious. For those like Willison who believed firmly in the necessity of cultural and linguistic homogeneity for national survival, however, the census results for 1911 spelled certain doom.

The demographic situation was more acute along regional lines. West of Ontario, British-Canadian ethnic nationalists and imperialists could rest assured that their numbers had begun to far exceed those of French Canada. At the time of Manitoba's entry into Confederation in 1870, the English- and French-speaking populations were roughly equal in number. By 1881, British Canadians represented 45% of Manitoba's population, and French Canadians only 11%. Over the course of the next thirty years, the British-Canadian population in Western Canada skyrocketed, from 55,818 souls in 1881 to 1,068,334 in 1911, representing 63% of the region's total population. This included migrants from Ontario and eastern Canada, Americans, and immigrants from the British Isles. The number of French Canadians had grown significantly too, from 13,761 in 1881 to 90,464 in 1911, but as a proportion of the Western-Canadian population, it had dropped to a mere 5% – less than some Ethno-Cultural minorities, notably Germans and Ukrainians.[45]

While this may have provided reassurances to British Canadians, the effect on the French-Canadian outlook for Western Canada was understandably reversed. It served only to intensify anxieties about being swamped by Anglo-Saxons in a region that they had shared with Aboriginal people since the time of LaVérendrye, and heightened their

[45] Canada, *Census of Canada, 1880-1881*, Vol.I (Ottawa: Maclean, Roger & Co., 1882), pp.196, 208, 220, 228, 262, 296; Canada, *Fourth Census of Canada, 1901*, Vol 1: Population (Ottawa: S.E. Dawson, William Lyon Mackenzie King, printer to the King, 1902), pp.290, 296, 312, 350, 352; Canada, *Fifth Census of Canada, 1911*, Vol. II Religions, Origins (Ottawa: C.H. Parmelee, Printer to the King, 1913), pp.2, 340; Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, pp.356, 568; and Leacy, *Historical Statistics of Canada,* Table A125-163, Series A2-14.

sense of injury when rights and privileges that had previously been unmolested were suddenly removed, as in 1890 in Manitoba. The most ardent of British-Canadian imperialists in 1911, of course, could not be satisfied until the outright assimilation of all inhabitants had been secured. He could point, for instance, to the fact that Western Canada's French-speaking population had multiplied six times over since 1881, and that it now included important concentrations of French-Canadian and Belgian settlers in parts of rural Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. But the arrival of other, non-British, migrants to the west was a greater point of concern. By 1911, Ethno-Cultural Canadians represented roughly a quarter of Western Canada's population, or some 450,000 people.[46] This frustrated the British-Canadian imperialists' dream of establishing a culturally and linguistically homogeneous British nation from coast-to-coast-to-coast. Indeed, the prairie schools crises had been as much the product of a perceived need to assimilate Ethno-Cultural Canadians as a desire to snuff out Western Canada's French fact. For, if French Canadians were allowed their own schools, what then might German, Polish or Ukrainian Canadians demand?[47]

The census told a different story in central and eastern Canada. In every single province east of Manitoba, the rate of growth of the French population exceeded that of the British population. In Nova Scotia, from 1881 to 1911 the British-Canadian population grew from 342,238 to 378,700 people, but as a proportion of the total population, it dipped from 78% to 77%. The Acadian population, by contrast, grew from 41,219 to 51,746, or from 9% to 11% of the total population. In PEI and New Brunswick,

---

[46] See *Ibid*.

[47] Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*, pp.34-35; J.R. Miller, "Unity/Diversity: The Canadian Experience; From Confederation to the First World War," *Dalhousie Review* 55, 1 (Spring 1975): 63-82.

where the absolute number of British Canadians declined over the same period, the Acadian gains were even more impressive. In PEI, the French population went from 10,751 to 13,117, or from 10% to 14% of the total population, whereas the British-Canadian population dropped from 95,916 to 78,949, or 88% to 84%. In New Brunswick, the Acadian population grew from 56,635 to 98,611, or from 18% to 28% of the total population. New Brunswick's British-Canadian population, by contrast, dropped from 245,974 souls to 229,896, or from 77% to 65% of the total population. Taken as a whole, the British-to-French ratio in the Maritimes went from 79/12% in 1881, to 73/17% in 1911 (and to 74/19% in 1921).[48]

The relative Acadian gains were in part the result of a natural increase, but also the product of a depressed economy that pushed a larger proportion of British Canadians into the US or elsewhere in Canada in search of opportunity. The French population of the Maritimes was also helped along by strengthened institutions and representative associations, the appointment of an Acadian Bishop, Mgr Édouard Leblanc, in 1912, advances in fishing and farming, and the beginnings of a successful cooperative business model similar to that being pioneered by western farm and labour leaders, beginning in the mid-1930s.[49] Access to education also improved. In 1935, for instance, French-language instruction was expanded for Acadian teachers. By the late 1930s, there were three French-language or bilingual classical colleges and fifty convents in the Maritimes where Acadian teachers could train. The number of French or bilingual schools grew to

---

[48] Canada, *Census of Canada, 1880-1881*, Vol.I, pp.196, 208, 220, 228, 262, 296; Canada, *Fourth Census of Canada, 1901*, Vol 1, pp.290, 296, 312, 350, 352; Canada, *Fifth Census of Canada, 1911*, Vol. II, pp.2, 340; Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, Vol I., pp.356, 568; and Leacy, *Historical Statistics of Canada*, Table A125-163, Series A2-14.

[49] Allaire, *La francophonie canadienne*, pp.60, 70; and Silver, *The French-Canadian Idea of Confederation*, pp.7.

130 in Nova Scotia, 44 in PEI and over 500 in New Brunswick.[50] Still, Acadians remained more rural, less affluent, less educated and less politically engaged than their British-Canadian neighbours.[51]

In Quebec and Ontario, the French-Canadian population had also been growing for decades relative to the British-Canadian population. Quebec, of course, had always been home to a French majority. But from the late eighteenth century, it had also been home to a large, growing, and politically and economically powerful British-Canadian minority. Important concentrations of British Canadians, including Loyalist descendants, could be found in the Eastern Townships, Ottawa Valley, Quebec City and, most importantly by the late nineteenth century, in the political, industrial and economic centre of Montreal. For those who sought the creation of a homogeneous British nation on the northern half of North America, Quebec represented the greatest stumbling block. For a time during the early- to mid-nineteenth century, with the arrival of more immigrants from the British Isles and an exodus of French Canadians to New England, some British Canadians were hopeful that even Quebec's French-speaking majority might one day be overwhelmed. Since the Conquest, Quebec's ethnic British population had grown in relation to the ethnic French population. From the 1850s onward, however, the trend reversed. The change was starkest in regions that had historically held significant British populations. In Quebec City, for instance, the French population grew from 56% to 83% between 1861 and 1901 (by then, only 7% of the city's population was of British origin). Over the same period, the French population in Sherbrooke, the heart of the Eastern Townships, grew from 24% to 63%. By 1911, all but one of the historically English-

[50] Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, pp.79-80.
[51] Allaire, *La francophonie canadienne*, pp.48-50; Silver, *The French-Canadian Idea of Confederation*, pp.7.

speaking counties in the region were home to a French-Canadian majority. In Montreal, the French-Canadian population grew from 48% to 56% of the population between 1861 and 1901, and to 63% by 1921. The British population, which had been 41% of the city's population in 1881, had dropped to 24%, despite the fact that more of the province's English-speaking population had decided to congregate there.[52] Quebec nationalistes were quick to boast of this "re-conquest" of their province.[53]

The turn-of-the-century census data made it clear that hopes of displacing Quebec's French-Canadian majority were delusional at best. From 1881 to 1911, the French population increased steadily, from 1,073,820 (79% of the total population) to 1,605,339 (80%). British population growth could not keep up despite the advantage of ongoing migration from the UK – it grew from 260,538 in 1881 to 316,103 in 1911, but declined as a percentage of the total Quebec population, from 19% to 16%. With the arrival of more Ethno-Cultural immigrants, the British population had dropped to 15% of the Quebec population by 1921 (or 357,108 souls), while the French majority held steady at 80% (1,889,277 people).[54]

Montreal was by far Canada's most diverse city, with an ethnic makeup that was 63% French, 24% British, and 12% Ethno-Cultural. The vast majority of Quebec's Ethno-Cultural communities – some 70% – settled in Montreal. The largest of these groups that made up Montreal's 12% Ethno-Cultural population were the nearly 43,000

---

[52] Silver, *The French-Canadian Idea of Confederation*, p.17; Dickenson and Young, *A Short History of Quebec*, pp.204; and Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, p.542. On the demographic shift in the Eastern Townships, see also Jack I. Little, "Watching the Frontier Disappear: English-speaking Reaction to French-Canadian Colonization in the Eastern Townships, 1844-1890," in Michael D. Behiels, ed., *Quebec Since 1880* (Toronto: Irwin Publishing, 2002), pp.369-395.

[53] See, for instance, Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, pp.95.

[54] Canada, *Census of Canada, 1880-1881*, Vol.I, pp.196, 208, 220, 228, 262, 296; Canada, *Fourth Census of Canada, 1901*, Vol 1, pp.290, 296, 312, 350, 352; Canada, *Fifth Census of Canada, 1911*, Vol. II, pp.2, 340; Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, Vol I., pp.356, 568; Leacy, *Historical Statistics of Canada*, Table A125-163, Series A2-14; Allaire, *La francophonie canadienne*, pp.48-50, 96.

Jews (7%), 14,000 Italians (2%), and 5,600 Slavs (1%, including Poles, Russians and Ukrainians). The city included a plethora of other numerically significant groups, including Belgians, Chinese, Germans, Arabs ("Syrians"), Greeks, Austrians, and Romanians, each numbering over 1000.[55] Individuals from these Ethno-Cultural groups took on a variety of jobs in the economy. Montreal's Jews, for instance worked in manufacturing, as merchants, in the professions such as law and medicine, and, most notably, in the garment industry. For their part, many of Montreal's Italians worked as seasonal labourers, in the construction industry or for the railways, notably the CPR.[56]

By and large, the Ethno-Cultural communities were poorly treated before and during the war, much as in elsewhere throughout the country. Those that settled in Montreal were especially impoverished, having stopped immediately in Montreal upon disembarking as it was the cheapest option. Catholic immigrants typically sided with French-Canadian Catholics on important issues such as denominational schooling and conscription (the exception being the Slavs, many of whom were Orthodox, and some whose home countries had been ravaged by the Central Powers during 1914-1918). In addition to sharing the same religion, the bulk of these immigrants were predominantly working class and disproportionately poor. Montreal truly was a cross-roads of British, French, and Ethno-Cultural contact leading up to and after the Great War. To be sure, most neighbourhoods and individual households remained culturally homogeneous – intermarriage was still relatively uncommon, especially among the French-Canadian working class. Still, day-to-day contact with the city's many cultures was a simple reality for many Montrealers during the interwar period. "'In our family, my parents spoke

[55] See Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, Vol.I, p.542.
[56] Dickenson and Young, *A Short History of Quebec*, p.206.

Russian between themselves,'" recalled Nobel Prize winner Saul Bellow of his 1920s childhood in a Jewish Montreal household. "'The children spoke Yiddish with their parents, English among themselves, and French in the streets.'"[57]

The attitudes of both French and British Canadians toward each other during this period were coloured by their anxieties about the growing presence of this 'third' element. Fears of unfamiliar cultures, and of being 'swamped' by the Ethno-Cultural communities, reinforced fears of being swamped by the more familiar 'alien' British or French element. Anglo- and French Canadians who proved more tolerant or even accepting of the new Ethno-Cultural reality, meanwhile, also proved more open to English/French rapprochement. At heart, it boiled down to an argument on the merits of homogeneity, uniformity and cultural isolation on the one hand, versus pluralism, diversity and openness on the other.

Anxieties over immigration and Ethno-Cultural diversification were compounded by additional anxieties over the processes of rapid industrialization, urbanization, and population growth. Many French- and British-Canadian observers who emphasized a bucolic, rural existence as the healthiest basis for a society lamented the loss of an older, 'better' Canada. In 1881, fourteen years after Confederation, Canada remained overwhelmingly rural – 74% of the population still lived in rural areas. By 1931, 54% of Canadians lived in urban areas. Quebec and Ontario led the trend. In 1921 they were the only two provinces with urban majorities (58/42% in Ontario, 56/44% in Quebec).[58] The two largest provinces in terms of population, area and economic activity, they provided the heart of Canadian industry and manufacturing, with jobs alluring immigrants and

[57] In Dickenson and Young, *A Short History of Quebec*, p.206.
[58] Leacy, *Historical Statistics of Canada*, Series A67-69; Canada, *Sixth Census*, pp.345-346.

locals alike to migrate to urban centres like Montreal and Toronto. In just twenty years, from 1901 to 1921, Canada's population increased from 5.4 million to 8.8 million, while those of Ontario and Quebec increased from 2.2 million to 2.9 million, and from 1.6 million to 2.4 million, respectively.[59] The increase in population in the largest cities was staggering – Montreal more than doubled in just two decades, from 267,730 souls in 1901, to 618,506 in 1921.[60]

In addition to demographics, socio-economic differences between French and British Canadians contributed to the cross-cultural tensions that persisted through the Great War. Unfortunately, censuses from the period did not break down urban/rural residency, income levels or occupational data by culture or ethnicity. They did, however, provide such a breakdown along provincial lines. Quebec and Ontario provide the best comparison for discerning socio-economic differences between British and French Canadians.[61]

In 1921, the provinces shared several similarities in terms of population and economy. While Ontario's 1921 population of 2.9 million was 58% urban and 42% rural in 1921, Quebec was not far behind, with a population of 2.4 million that was 56% urban and 44% rural.[62] The occupations held by Quebecers and Ontarians were also remarkably similar. In 1921, 28% of the Quebec workforce was involved in agriculture, while in Ontario 26% of its workforce was involved in agriculture. Manufactures made up 20% of jobs in Quebec and 22% in Ontario. Equally important growth had occurred in the

---

[59] *Ibid*.
[60] Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1896-1929*, p.18.
[61] "A comparison of living standards in Quebec and Ontario can provide a fair picture of the relative inequality from which French Canada suffers: for these are the two main industrial provinces of the Dominion, with comparable populations, and with very similar industrial-agrarian structure." Ryerson, *French Canada*, p.147.
[62] Leacy, *Historical Statistics*, Series A67-69; Canada, *Sixth Census*, pp.345-346.

services sector, which made up 18% of jobs in both Quebec and Ontario by 1921. Trade, transportation and construction were also vital parts of both provincial economies. Combined, these various sectors provided hundreds of thousands of working class and middle class jobs to both British and French Canadians.[63] Indeed, over the next two decades, more French Canadians would secure middle-class employment as foremen, supervisors, inspectors, officials, and managers. Across Canada, French Canadians came to represent 32% of this class of workers in forestry, 22% in manufacturing, 22% in storefronts, 19% in transport and communications, and 12% in wholesale importing and exporting.[64] The upper-middle class also expanded significantly in the early twentieth century – the number of professionals in Quebec and Ontario in 1921, for instance, had grown to 52,325 and 63,336, respectively.[65] With the growth of the middle- and upper-middle classes came the growth of the civil societies of both Ontario and Quebec – civil societies whose interests would converge during the interwar years, and who would increasingly come together and push their respective political élites to do the same.

There were still some important differences that separated the British- and French-Canadian societies of Ontario and Quebec. Neither British- nor French-Canadian society could be said to have been truly rural, but French Canadians in Ontario and even in Quebec were more likely than British Canadians to have settled in rural areas. Ontario's French-Canadian minority, for instance, preferred to take up farming in the Ontario countryside while Quebec's British-Canadian minority gravitated toward the

[63] Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada*, pp.10.
[64] See Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, p.195.
[65] The professions grew significantly in both Quebec and Ontario from 1911 to 1921. Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada*, p.xvi.

cities, especially Montreal.[66] Still, if the French-Canadian minorities remained predominantly rural, French-Canadian Quebecers were clearly becoming an urban people, much like British Canadians. Yet, the stereotype of French-Canadian society as being primarily rural would play an important part in shaping both French- and British-Canadian perceptions of French-Canadian society during the interwar period.

One of the most important differences that separated the British- and French-Canadian societies of Central Canada related to income. While Quebec and Ontario shared remarkably similar economies, the rates of income were substantially different during the interwar. In 1926 (the first year of available data) the annual income rates were, approximately, $230/person in Quebec and $300/person in Ontario (a disparity that persisted into the Second World War and beyond).[67] One must also consider that Anglo-Quebecers tended to have higher-paying jobs, which would have affected the comparable income rates of Central Canada's French and British Canadians generally. The disparity in income was also a reflection of a disparity in access to higher education.[68]

British and French Canadians were separated by other socio-economic factors. With overpopulation, urbanization and industrialization came poverty, which, proportionately, affected more French Canadians, who tended to have larger families and

---

[66] By 1941, 70% of Anglo-Quebecers lived on the Island of Montreal. Dickenson and Young, *A Short History of Quebec*, p.204. For a thorough demographic analysis of Francophones in Ontario before the Great War, see Fernand Ouellet, *L'Ontario français dans le Canada français avant 1911: contribution à l'histoire sociale* (Sudbury: Prise de parole, 2005).

[67] Based on the combined income of Quebecers ($598,000,000) and Ontarians ($962,000,000) and divided by the total populations of Quebec (approx. 2.6M) and Ontario (approx. 3.2M) as determined by the 1921 and 1931 censuses. Leacy, *Historical Statistics*, Series A2-14, Series E1-13. The per capita annual income for 1940 was: Canada: $420; Ontario: $530; Quebec: $358. The average weekly wage in 1940 for male and female wage-earners, respectively, was: Canada: $24.78/$13.49; Ontario: $26.63/$14.37; Quebec: $22.75/12.70. Ryerson, *French Canada*, p.148

[68] By the late 1930s, for instance, there were fifteen English-language universities and only three French-language universities. Literacy rates had improved for French Canadians to over 90%. They were ahead of the Ethno-Cultural minorities, but still lagged behind Anglo-Canadians. Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, pp.193-197, 202.

were more likely to belong to the working class. Quality of life improved for most French Canadians as the nineteenth century gave way to the twentieth, but they continued to lag behind much of British Canada. In addition to income, birth, death and infant mortality rates provide another indicator of socio-economic circumstances. Quebec maintained the highest birthrate in Canada, but it dropped significantly, from 50 per thousand in 1885, to 29 per thousand in 1935. Over the same period, death rates dropped from 22 per thousand to 11 per thousand. Infant mortality also dropped significantly, from a shocking 409 per thousand in Montreal in 1885, to 182 per thousand in 1914 among French Catholics. French Canadians were catching up, but Montreal's Protestants fared much better – among them, the infant mortality rate dropped from 198 per thousand in 1885 to 116 per thousand in 1914.[69]

The sum effect of these disparities was that French-Canadian nationalistes like Lionel Groulx could point to the lower socio-economic standing as a source of grievance and resentment toward English-speaking Canada.[70] It is what would make the "maîtres chez nous" slogan so popular in later years. At the very least, the nationalistes could take solace in the fact that the French-Canadian population was growing at a faster rate than the British-Canadian population. The writers of *l'Action française*, for instance, mused about a separate state composed of Quebec and the Maritimes in which Francophones could escape once and for all "le fanatisme qui caractérise nos voisins d'Ontario."[71] By 1921, such a state would have been home to a comfortable 62% French majority.[72] While

[69] Dickenson and Young, *A Short History of Quebec*, p.202.
[70] See, for instance, Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, pp.107.
[71] *L'Action française,* vol. 4, no. 9, September 1920, p.405.
[72] In 1881, the French majority would have been a much less secure 53%. Canada, *Census of Canada, 1880-1881*, Vol.I, pp.196, 208, 220, 228, 262, 296; Canada, *Fourth Census of Canada, 1901*, Vol 1, pp.290, 296, 312, 350, 352; Canada, *Fifth Census of Canada, 1911*, Vol. II, pp.2, 340; Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, Vol I., pp.356, 568; and Leacy, *Historical Statistics*, Table A125-163, Series A2-

Groulx did not advocate political secession as the best option for French Canada, he warned that British-Canadian intransigence risked pushing the country toward such an eventuality.[73]

Like every other province east of its boundaries at the turn-of-the-century, Ontario experienced a rise in both the number and proportion of its French-Canadian population. While the British majority in Ontario was never seriously threatened, the demographic shift was still noticeable. Indeed, the hysteria of those who dreamed of a culturally, linguistically, and even religiously homogeneous British-Canadian nation from coast-to-coast-to-coast only to see it thwarted in Ontario – at the very heart of Loyalist sentiment and tradition – knew no bounds.[74] At the height of the Ontario schools crisis during the Great War, extremists had only to point to the most recent census data to feed their fury. In 1881, Ontario's British Canadians (1,548,030) represented 80% of the province's population. In 1911, although having grown to number 1,927,099, they now represented 76% of the total population (2,527,292). This relative decline was due partly to an influx of Ethno-Cultural immigration – Ontario's Ethno-Cultural population approached 400,000 by 1911. But it was also due to a significant growth in the French-Canadian population. In 1881, Ontario's French Canadians (102,743) represented only 5% of the total population. Having doubled to 202,442 by 1911, they represented 8% of the total population – a significant increase in only a generation. That same year they overtook Ontario's large German population to become the province's second-largest cultural-

---

14.

[73] Jean-Claude Dupuis, "Nationalisme, séparatisme et catholicisme dans l'entre-deux-guerres," in Michel Sarra-Bournet, ed., *Les nationalismes au Québec*, pp.95-96.

[74] As Chad Gaffield explains, "The position of minority-language education is always debated most vehemently when population patterns are changing. Shifting levels of majority and minority status have a dramatic impact on the ways in which policymakers, journalists, and the public at large define the educational implications of diversity." Gaffield, *Language, Schooling, and Cultural Conflict: the Origins of the French-Language Controversy in Ontario* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1987), p.31.

linguistic group – in every province east of Manitoba, French Canadians now represented either the first or the second largest population block.[75]

Ontario's French-Canadian population benefited significantly from Quebec emigration. To be sure, the Franco-Ontarian birthrate was high.[76] But it was the tens of thousands of Franco-Quebecers who migrated into Ontario from the 1850s onward in search of jobs and newly available land that boosted Franco-Ontarian numbers.[77] Much of this population became concentrated in a few key areas of Ontario – including along the Quebec border – where land was made available by the gradual exodus of the original British-Canadian settler population who had opted for the cities, the US, or new opportunities in the West. By 1901, two eastern Ontario counties contained French majorities, and four others, also in eastern and north-eastern Ontario, were at least one-third French.[78] Many of these Franco-Ontarians maintained family and institutional contacts with their *confrères* in the sister-province, and effectively formed part of the same community. The diocese of Ottawa, for instance, was made "part of the ecclesiastical province of Quebec, and its French-Canadian bishops were ready to appoint French-speaking priests."[79] Newspapers like *Le Canada* (1865-1869) and *Le Droit* (1913-) were published for a French readership on both sides of the Ottawa Valley. French-Canadian nationalistes took noticeable pride in the growth of the Franco-Ontarian

---

[75] Canada, *Census of Canada, 1880-1881*, Vol.I, pp.196, 208, 220, 228, 262, 296; Canada, *Fourth Census of Canada, 1901*, Vol 1, pp.290, 296, 312, 350, 352; Canada, *Fifth Census of Canada, 1911*, Vol. II, pp.2, 340; Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, Vol I., pp.356, 568; and Leacy, *Historical Statistics*, Table A125-163, Series A2-14.

[76] Silver, *The French-Canadian Idea of Confederation*, p.18.

[77] The number of Quebec-born Canadians living in Ontario (nearly 65,000 in 1911) far exceeded the number of Ontarians living in Quebec (22,000 in 1911). Canada, *Census of Canada, 1881*, Vol.1, pp.360, 394; Canada, *Fourth Census of Canada, 1901*, Vol I, p.416; Canada, *Fifth Census of Canada, 1911*, Vol. II, pp.442.

[78] Essex County, in the southwest, was also home to a large Franco-Ontarian minority that predated Confederation. Silver, *The French-Canadian Idea of Confederation*, p.18.

[79] *Ibid*., p.11.

community.[80] This connection with Quebec, Arthur Silver explains, ensured "that the local strength of the French Ontarians was much greater than their province-wide force."[81]

The combination of migration from Quebec, a high French-Canadian birthrate encouraged by Catholic doctrine, and nationaliste boasts of having "re-conquered" historically British regions of Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick was too much to bear for British-Ontarian alarmists. They pointed to a French-Catholic conspiracy to annex parts of their province to Quebec. Even worse, they claimed, the French Canadians were plotting to force bilingualism and biculturalism upon the entire country. "'It is part of the great ambition of the French that French be equal with English,'" proclaimed the *Orange Sentinel*, an important Ontario newspaper in the years leading up to the war. Its editor, Horatio Hocken, served as Mayor of Toronto (1912-1914). "'Should that demand ever be conceded,'" Hocken continued, "'the battle waged for a century will have been lost, and the barrier that Ontario has for so long opposed to the oncoming tide of French settlement will have been swept away. All that would mean to the destiny of Canada cannot be readily imagined. It would almost inevitably mean French domination and papal supremacy.'"[82] Canada's Battle of the Boyne, it seemed, would be fought on the Ottawa.

In Ontario, the demographic shift meant that French Canadians might become better positioned to demand more rights. Protestants resented the shift because it was French-speaking and entirely Catholic. Other Ontario Catholics, however, were equally anxious. Irish-Catholics feared they would have to compete with French-Catholics over

[80] "Qu'une vie catholique et française se développe en Ontario, en voilà la preuve indéniable." Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, pp.95.
[81] Silver, *The French-Canadian Idea of Confederation*, p.18.
[82] In Cook, *Canada and the French Canadian Question*, pp.36-38.

control of the local Church hierarchy, and over control of the separate Catholic schools – especially after 1911, when French-Catholics began outnumbering Irish-Catholics.[83] Moreover, many of Canada's English-speaking Catholics had integrated into the larger British-Canadian society by the early twentieth century, some even embracing imperialism.[84] As with their Protestant countrymen, the census data gave Ontario's Irish-Catholics pause. In 1881, 32% of Ontario's Roman Catholics were French Canadians. By 1911, this ratio had risen to 42%.[85]

The war-time divide: Regulation 17, recruitment, and the historiography

The main point of contention between British and French Canadians on the eve of war was the suppression of Francophone minority rights, notably the hated Regulation 17. Imposed in 1912, it restricted the use of French as a language of instruction in Ontario's publicly funded separate Catholic schools to the first two years of education. The school system was divided between secular and Catholic schools – not English and French. Officially, the regulation was aimed at improving the allegedly backward education program in Catholic schools that were run by local boards with French-Canadian majorities. These *de facto* French-Catholic schools were referred to as 'bilingual' schools, as they taught in both languages. The schools were said to employ teachers, mostly French-Canadian nuns, with inadequate training. Literacy rates were allegedly low, and, worst of all, British-Canadian Catholic students (including Irish-

[83] Choquette, *Language and Religion*, pp.250-251.
[84] See Donald H. Akenson, *The Irish in Ontario: A Study in Rural History* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1984), pp. 3-47.
[85] Canada, *Census of Canada, 1880-1881*, Vol.I, pp.196, 208, 220, 228, 262, 296; Canada, *Fourth Census of Canada, 1901*, Vol 1, pp.290, 296, 312, 350, 352; Canada, *Fifth Census of Canada, 1911*, Vol. II, pp.2, 340; Leacy, *Historical Statistics*, Table A125-163, Series A2-14.

Catholics) living in heavily Franco-Ontarian municipalities and neighbourhoods with only one Catholic school were 'forced' to receive their education in French or attend public schools, which were officially secular but effectively Protestant in their teachings. For British Ontarians obsessed with the demographic battle, the thought of their children being assimilated into the French-Canadian Catholic society was too much to bear. In communities or neighbourhoods that had both substantial Irish-Catholic and French-Catholic populations, like Ottawa, English-speaking school board trustees often failed to collaborate with their French-speaking colleagues. The end result was a Catholic clergy divided between English and French, internal bickering over resources and the language of instruction, and administrative inefficiency. The simple removal of French, critics argued, would be cost-effective and ensure proper instruction of the language of business and employment – that is, the King's English.[86]

In fact, Regulation 17 was a thinly-veiled attempt to assimilate the next generation of Franco-Ontarians into the larger British-Canadian culture and society (into which Ontario's Irish-Catholic community had already effectively integrated).[87] Several Irish-Catholic bishops welcomed the regulation and called for its implementation in their diocese.[88] Franco-Ontarians were understandably incensed. They fought the regulation at home and in the courts on constitutional grounds, but a 1917 decision of the JCPC ruled that Section 93 of the *BNAA* only guaranteed religious education, and not the language of instruction.[89] For Francophones in neighbouring Quebec – many with relatives in Ontario

---

[86] Centre de recherche en civilisation canadienne-française (CRCCF), "Le Règlement XVII," (Université d'Ottawa, 2004), accessed 10 October 2012, http://www.crccf.uottawa.ca/passeport/IV/IVD1a/IVD1a.html.
[87] See Mark McGowan, *The Waning of the Green: Catholics, the Irish, and Identity in Toronto, 1887-1922* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1999).
[88] CRCCF, "Le Règlement XVII."
[89] *Ottawa Separate Schools Trustees v. Mackell*, 1917.

– the regulation was yet another signal that Canada, as a whole, did not belong to them, nor they to it. In addition, the fear persisted that an attack on French-language rights outside Quebec might soon expand to an attack on French-language rights inside Quebec. In this context, Quebecers were as transfixed by the language battle in Ontario as they were by the battles raging in Europe, if not more so. Nationaliste members of the French-Catholic clergy in Quebec were ready to lend a helping hand to their brethren in Ontario.[90]

Regulation 17 posed a logical contradiction to French Canadians when it came to enlistment. Many drew a parallel between the oppressed European minorities for whom the British Empire was ostensibly fighting, and the oppressed Franco-Ontarian Catholic minority in Ontario. The hypocrisy of asking French-speaking Canadians to fight for minorities abroad and to defend French civilization in Europe, while the rights of Francophone minorities throughout Canada were being crushed, was painfully obvious.[91] French-Canadian volunteer rates for the Canadian Expeditionary Force understandably lagged far below the national average.[92]

The issue of recruitment became a serious bone of contention for British-Canadian families that had sons fighting in the Great War. Loyalty to the British Empire was for them a means of proving the worth of the Canadian nation, and Canada's interests were deemed inseparable from those of Britain. For this stream of imperio-nationalist thought, the apparent lacklustre enlistment of French-Canadian soldiers in

---

[90] Jean Provencher, *Québec sous la loi des mesures de guerre, 1918*, (Montréal: les éditions du boréal express, 1971), p.23.
[91] François Charbonneau, *La crise de la conscription pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale et l'identité canadienne-française*, Thèse de maîtrise (science politique), Université d'Ottawa, 2000, pp.36-37.
[92] See Robert Craig Brown and Donald Loveridge, "Unrequited Faith: Recruiting the C.E.F., 1914- 1918," *International Review of Military History*, 51 (1982), pp. 57-72.

Quebec and throughout Canada was unforgivable. Virulent accusations of disloyalty from the English-language press and the maltreatment of French-Canadian recruits in Canada's English-speaking CEF only made matters worse. As proposals for conscription met with opposition in Quebec, the English-language press increasingly identified French Canada as the enemy at home: "'A vote for Laurier,'" read a typical comment from the Toronto *Globe*, "'is a vote for the Kaiser.'"[93] Even Prime Minister Robert Borden, writing in private, erroneously lumped the "'French'" with the allegedly disloyal "'foreigners and slackers.'"[94]

It is important to remember that during the war many British Canadians, like their allies in Europe, sincerely believed that civilization itself was in jeopardy.[95] Ontario Premier W.H. Hearst explained his unconditional support for the war effort to a gathering of French and British Canadians in early 1917:

> At this time in the history of Canada we cannot think of any question but the war, ... if Germany should win, nothing else in the wide world matters, and it is our purpose and should be our purpose to take good care that Germany shall not win. .... It is for us to forget all else, whatever it may be, working with our eye single, with a single purpose in order that we may bring victory complete.[96]

Implicit in Hearst's message was the assertion that Canadian domestic quarrels mattered little in the context of a world war that was being fought for civilization. If Canada was to focus its energies on resolving its own problems at the expense of the war effort, any gains would be made meaningless by a German victory and the imposition of Prussian authoritarianism everywhere.

---

[93] In Robert Lahaise, *La Fin d'un Québec traditionnel, 1914-1939* (Montréal: Hexagone, 1994), p.47.
[94] In J.L. Granatstein and J.M. Hitsman, *Broken Promises: a History of Conscription in Canada* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1977), p.67.
[95] Michael S. Neiberg, *Fighting the Great War* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005), pp.16-17; G.W.L. Nicholson, *Official History of the Canadian Army in the First World War* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1962), pp.5-6.
[96] In LAC, Godfrey Papers (GP), MG30-C11, Vol. 2, transcribed proceedings of the second BEL meeting, 8-10 January 1917, pp.82-83.

It is equally important to appreciate the prognosis for the war as it was in 1917-1918. From 1917 and through to mid-1918, when the conscription debate reached its zenith and mandatory enlistment for overseas service was implemented, almost all signs pointed to an Allied defeat. Elements of the French Army were in mutiny, Italy had suffered horrific reversals only to have a joint Austro-Hungarian and German counter-offensive overrun its weak positions, and the British Empire's costly and foolish Passchendaele campaign had floundered on superior German defences in the mud of Flanders (Canadians felt that loss acutely, suffering some 16,000 casualties during the offensive in October and November 1917). The inexperienced troops of the newly-allied US Army would not reach the front in significant numbers until May 1918, seemingly too late to turn the tide. In the Balkans, Serbia was overrun and Rumania had surrendered. Worst of all, Russia, the largest of the Allied nations, had capitulated on the Eastern Front. Legions of battle-hardened German troops immediately transferred to western Europe, where Canadian troops were stationed. In March 1918 the Germans launched a massive offensive along the Western Front, reversing within a matter of weeks the years of hard-won Allied advances, and threatening Paris itself. By all indications, the Allies were about to lose the war unless every available man could be sent immediately to the front. "[A]t this time of international crisis, when human liberty is at stake, it is most desirable that every able-bodied man of military age should be qualified to defend his country," the Montreal Board of Trade, a fairly moderate organization representing British-Canadian business interests, reported at the time.[97] A few months after the war's unexpectedly abrupt conclusion, the Board's members admitted their fear that the war

[97] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, Council Annual Reports, 1912-1926, Annual Report for 1917 (published 1918).

could have been lost in 1917-1918: "at no time since the beginning of the war was the outlook so dreary, from the standpoint of the Allies, as during the late Spring or early Summer of 1918.[98] For British Canadians, the arguments in favour of conscription had been self-evident. Opposition had seemed treasonous – so much so that some British Canadians thought a violent crackdown might be necessary to ensure that French Canadians would 'do their bit.'[99] Even in the war's immediate aftermath, contempt for French Canada appeared widespread. It was all the more damaging because French Canadians were well aware of the vitriol.[100]

What have historians had to say about the years of crisis and their aftermath? British- and French-Canadian relations during the war have featured prominently in the historiography. The bulk of this historiography has focussed on the deterioration in relations and the major points of conflict leading up to, during and after the war. Some nationaliste Québécois writers, for instance, have done much to emphasize the grievances and downplay reconciliationist movements.[101] To be sure, animosity continued to prevail after the war among an important section of the traditional French-Canadian petite-bourgeoisie, including academic élites, journalists and clergymen. Several historians have discussed this at length. Susan Mann Trofimenkoff's and Gérard Bouchard's respective works on Lionel Groulx and the Action Française movement, for instance, highlight the persistence of French-/British-Canadian antipathy among elements of the petite-

[98] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, Council Annual Reports, 1912-1926, Annual Report for 1918 (published 1919).
[99] See Moore, *The Clash!*, p.129; Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.12; Hawkes, *The Birthright*, pp.203.
[100] "The French in Quebec and all over Canada know perfectly well that the 'one language' propaganda goes on." Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.224.
[101] Jean Provencher's 1974 play, *Quebec, Printemps 1918*, provides a good example, as does his *Québec sous la loi des mesures de guerre, 1918*. More recently, Normand Lester's *Le livre noir du Canada anglais* (Montréal: Les Intouchables, 2001) catalogued the several historical transgressions of Canada's English-speaking community against French Canadians. See also Brunet, *La présence anglaise et les québécois*, pp.259-270.

bourgeoisie during the 1920s.[102] For his part, Robert Comeau places the nationalistes of the interwar period within a larger narrative that traces an evolution of secessionism in Quebec. In addition to Groulx (although he was not, in fact, a Quebec secessionist despite his pessimistic outlook for Anglophone/Francophone relations), Comeau looks at secessionists like the ultra-Catholic François Hertel (a Groulx disciple) and the extreme right-wing *La Nation* editor Paul Bouchard, along with the corporatist Jeune Canada movement that persisted from 1932 to 1939.[103] In keeping with the Quebec historiography's recent reassessment of traditionalism,[104] Michael Gauvreau draws a link between the Catholic nationalism of the 1930s and the Quiet Revolution three decades later.[105] In their important general history of Quebec, John Dickinson and Brian Young point to the increased immigration that led to "heightened ethnic and linguistic tensions in Montreal and contributed to a resurgence in nationalism" after the Great War.[106] They acknowledge that intellectual thought, including within the Catholic Church, was "never monolithic," but nevertheless make the overall assessment that, during "the Depression, Quebec nationalists moved away from a pan-Canadian perspective to focus on Quebec's specific problems."[107] The rise of the Action libérale nationale of Quebec in 1934 and its nationaliste leaders Paul Gouin, René Chaloult and Philippe Hamel stand as evidence. The ALN's takeover by the revitalized provincial Conservative Party of Maurice

---

[102] See Susan Mann Trofimenkoff, *Action Française: French Canadian nationalism in the twenties* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975); Susan Mann Trofimenkoff, *The Dream of Nation: a Social and Intellectual History of Quebec* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), pp.218-232; Gérard Bouchard, *Les Deux Chanoines: Contradiction et ambivalence dans la pensée de Lionel Groulx* (Montréal: Boréal, 2003). See also Brunet, *La présence anglaise et les québécois*, pp.260-261.

[103] See Robert Comeau, *Histoire intellectuelle de l'indépendentisme québécois – Tome I, 1834-1968* (Montréal: Études québécoises, 2010).

[104] Christian Roy, "'La nouvelle sensibilité' en quête d'une autre Révolution tranquille," pp.195.

[105] See Michael Gauvreau, *The Catholic Origins of Quebec's Quiet Revolution, 1931-1970* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 2005).

[106] Dickenson and Young, *A Short History of Quebec*, p.271.

[107] *Ibid*., pp.291, 298.

Duplessis as the Union Nationale in 1935-1936 further contributed to the apparent ascension of Québécois nationalism over pan-Canadian nationalism. According to this interpretation, the resurgent nationalism of the interwar years beat a steady and largely uninterrupted path toward the Quiet Revolution of the 1960s.[108]

In *The Uses and Abuses of History*, Margaret MacMillan explains (in somewhat sensationalized terms) how *some* Québécois historians have applied a very deliberate reading of history as a means to establish a prescribed identity:

> It is all too easy to rummage through the past and find nothing but a list of grievances, and many countries and peoples have done it. French-Canadian nationalists have depicted a past in which the Conquest by the British in 1763 led to two and a half centuries of humiliation. They play down or ignore the many and repeated examples of cooperation and friendship between French and English. French Canadians – innocent, benevolent, communitarian, and tolerant of others – are the heroes of the story; the English – cold-hearted, passionless, and money-grubbing – the villains.[109]

In this context, nationalistes like Lionel Groulx who were deeply skeptical of Anglo-Canadians' willingness to compromise have received a great deal of treatment when it comes to the interwar period.[110] Developments contributing to rapprochement, both

---

[108] See *Ibid*., pp.271. Mathieu Bock-Côté takes this even farther. According to him, the 1995 referendum on Quebec secession "représente, en quelque sorte, le point culminant d'une longue transformation de la question nationale qui se déclenche à partir des années 1920 et qui deviendra de plus en plus importante à partir de la Révolution tranquille." Mathieu Bock-Côté, "Le 30 octobre 1995 — Le référendum sur la souveraineté : il était une fois l'indépendance," lecture organized by La Fondation Lionel Groulx, 16 April 2013, accessed 6 December 2013, http://www.fondationlionelgroulx.org/10e-conference-Le-referendum-sur.html.

[109] MacMillan, *Uses and Abuses of History*, pp.71-72. See also Marcel Trudel, *Mythes et réalités dans l'histoire du Québec, Tome 1* (Montréal: HMH, 2001), pp.209-234; D.-C. Bélanger, "Les historiens révisionnistes et le rejet de la 'canadianité' du Québec," *Mens: Revue d'histoire intellectuelle de l'Amérique française*, 2, 2001, pp.105-112. Bélanger criticizes the Quebec historiography's tendency to write Quebec's "canadianité" out of the history. Alexis Lachaine, meanwhile, argues that the suppression of the 1837-1838 rebellions has been more important in the thinking of Québécois nationalistes than the Conquest of 1759. Alexis Lachaine, "A Nightmare to Awaken from: The Conquest in the Thinking of Québécois Nationalists of the 1960s and After," in Phillip Buckner and John G. Reid, *Remembering 1759: the Conquest of Canada in Historical Memory* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), pp.211-225.

[110] MacMillan, *Uses and Abuses*, pp.71-72.

In 1956, Pierre Trudeau also lamented the literature's neglect of the moderate liberal French-Canadian intellectuals: "[S]i quelqu'un s'avisait de penser en dehors du nationalisme officiel ou même de le reformuler en modifiant quelque caractéristique essentielle, on tenait automatiquement cet homme pour

formal and informal, however, have received short shrift in both the English- and French-language historiographies. This is perhaps understandable, given that rapprochement goes against the grain of the grand narrative of division and discord.

To be sure, formal reconciliationist initiatives, notably the bonne entente movement (launched in 1916), are mentioned in passing in some textbooks and general histories of Canada's Great War experience, and in the occasional intellectual history.[111] Authors of such texts generally attempt to fit it into the larger narrative of animosity between French and British Canada. In so doing, they dismiss the movement as a disingenuous tool for conscription. For the Anglo-Canadians, they argue, national unity was secondary to using bonne entente to soft-peddle French Canadians into accepting conscription. "By 1917," surmised Robert Craig Brown and Ramsay Cook, "*Bonne Entente* had failed, and its English-Canadian sponsors had moved openly to the advocacy of conscription and coalition [government] under the new name of the Win-the-War Movement." The authors describe the source of the movement's failure:

> [A] movement whose objectives were never really fully shared, or perhaps even understood, by both French- and English-Canadian members could hardly be a permanent success. French Canadians appear to have hoped that *Bonne Entente* would aid in a satisfactory resolution of the language issue in Ontario; English-Canadian members expected it would convert their French-speaking compatriots to a greater enthusiasm for the war.[112]

In a similar vein, Yvan Lamonde's important volume on Quebec intellectual history lumps "les movements 'Bonne Ententistes'" with propaganda campaigns designed to

---

suspect." Pierre Trudeau et al., *La grève de l'amiante* (Montréal: Cité Libre, 1956), p.15.

[111] See, for instance, Robert Craig Brown and Ramsay Cook, *Canada, 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed*, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, Ltd., 1981), p.265; and Yvan Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1896-1929*, pp.37-43. The bonne entente movement is not even mentioned in Fernand Dumont et al., eds., *Idéologies au Canada français, 1900-1929* (Québec: Université Laval, 1974). For her part, Trofimenkoff holds a rather dismissive view: "What were French Canadians to think as the [1917 election] results revealed the racial cleavage in the country? That the cracks could be papered over with *bonne entente*? ... [T]he Action Française thought not." Trofimenkoff, Action Française, p.6.

[112] Craig Brown and Cook, *Canada 1896-1921*, p.265.

convince French Canadians to accept compulsory service. His chapter on the war years focuses instead on the more traditional themes of French-Canadian opposition to participation and the conscription crisis.[113]

A few authors have written specifically about the movement, but these studies are limited in scope. Brian Cameron's article on the first two years of the Bonne Entente League expands on the theme of British-Canadian duplicity. He too argues that the Anglophone participants only had conscription in mind. As the League transformed into the Win-the-War Convention, he explains, the movement's French-speaking members were left feeling deceived and betrayed.[114] The British Canadians had learned nothing from their firsthand encounters with the French-Canadian élite and civil society. With coalition government and conscription secured, they apparently abandoned bonne entente altogether. Like Cook, Brown, and Lamonde, Cameron ends his discussion of the movement in 1917. Until recently, Federal Commissioner of Official Languages Graham Fraser held a similarly belittling, abridged view of the movement: "The organization fell apart over the first conscription crisis, and in later decades, the phrase 'bonne entente' became almost a joke, evoking images of businessmen piously singing 'Alouette' as a clumsy gesture of goodwill following their after-dinner speeches."[115]

The interested reader must sift through Robert Rumilly's massive text on Quebec history, completed over fifty years ago, to discern a longer-term narrative of the bonne

---

[113] Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1896-1929*, pp.37-43.

[114] Brian Cameron, "The Bonne Entente Movement, 1916-1917: From Cooperation to Conscription, *Journal of Canadian Studies*, Vol.13, No.2 (Summer 1978), p.53.

[115] Graham Fraser, "Linguistic Duality, Language Narratives and the National Conversation," J.R. Mallory Annual Lecture, McGill University, 14 March 2007, accessed 10 September 2011, http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/speeches_discours_14032007_e.php. Fraser's assessment changed somewhat, if not entirely, in a later speech. See Graham Fraser, "Linguistic duality in Canada and narratives on language: for a different reading of history," address to the Société d'histoire de Toronto and the Alliance française de Toronto, 22 September 2010, accessed 12 September 2011, http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/speech_discours_22092010_e.php.

entente movement. Rumilly's overall assessment of the original Bonne Entente League is similar to that of later historians: "Le voyage de 'Bonne Entente' atténua peut-être les préjugés de quelques homes d'affaires ontariens. Il n'eut pas d'autre résultat pratique. Il ne changea rien à la situation scolaire."[116] In his analysis of the bonne ententiste initiatives of the post-war period, Rumilly remains equally critical of several of the participants' motives. He nonetheless acknowledges that the efforts of Senator Napoléon Belcourt and, later, the Unity League of Ontario ultimately helped to soften Ontario opinion in favour of repealing Regulation 17: "Par le contact avec des Anglo-Canadiens de ce genre – assez gentilshommes pour revenir sur des préjugés – Belcourt a obtenu, à la Unity League, des conversions décisives," he admits.[117]

Franco-Ontarian scholars Robert Choquette and Gaétan Gervais have analysed the bonne entente initiatives of the post-war. Their conclusions are much more favourable. They highlight how the Franco-Ontarian leadership, led by Senator Belcourt, sought out sympathetic and influential Anglophones from within the Orangist heartland of Toronto to create the Unity League of Ontario. This collaborative lobbying movement, they argue, served to gradually change attitudes within the provincial government and among the public generally. It ultimately made the removal of Regulation 17 possible.[118] Their work provides a rare and invaluable look at the bonne entente movement in the 1920s, but does not place it within the full context of its earliest incarnation in 1916-1917. Nor do

---

[116] Robert Rumilly, *Histoire de la province de Québec*, Vol. XXI, (Montréal: Montréal-Éditions, 1940), p.185.
[117] Robert Rumilly, *Histoire de la province de Québec*, Vol. XXVI, p.260.
[118] See Choquette, *Language and Religion*, pp.229-236; Gaétan Gervais, "Le Règlement XVII (1912-1927)," *Revue du Nouvel Ontario*, Numéro 18 (1996), pp.175-186; and Pierre Savard, "Relations avec Québec," in Cornelius J. Jaenen, ed., *Les Franco*-Ontariens, (Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1993), pp.239-240. See also Geneviève Richer, "'L'apôtre infatigable de l'irrédentisme français': la lutte de Napoléon-Antoine Belcourt en faveur de la langue française en Ontario durant les années 1910 et 1920," *Francophonies d'Amérique*, no 31 (printemps 2011), pp.87-108.

Choquette and Gervais fully situate the movement within the context of other important developments and initiatives – both formal and informal – that contributed to Anglophone/Francophone rapprochement during the interwar period, including after Regulation 17 was amended in 1927.[119] Indeed, it is this broader context – of an overall improvement in relations, from civil society, to the middle class, to the political élite – that the present study hopes to provide.

[119] Choquette's focus is on the relations between Catholics in Ontario. He pays relatively little attention to the role of the federal and Quebec provincial parties in ending the Regulation 17 crisis. See Choquette, *Language and Religion*, pp.257.

Chapter II: RESTARTING THE PROCESS OF ÉLITE ACCOMMODATION: THE BONNE ENTENTE MOVEMENT

Accommodation between the civil societies of French and British Canada, especially but not exclusively in Quebec and Ontario, was central to the modest but important rapprochement of the interwar period. Almost unexpectedly, the first formal attempt began amidst the full fury of the domestic and international turmoil that was the Great War.

In August 1916, a small group of liberal and conservative French- and British-Canadian community leaders gathered in Montreal to declare their allegiance to the greater cause of national unity:

> We, French and English-speaking Canadians, in conference assembled for the promotion of National Unity, having established, by friendly intercourse, a mutual respect and a firm conviction in the innate fair-mindedness of the vast majority of both races, do hereby place ourselves on record as of the unalterable belief that there is not now, nor ever will be in the future, any issue between the two races in Canada which cannot, and, of right, should not be amicably and equitably settled, and in such a manner as to give satisfaction to the great majority of all concerned.[1]

So was born the 'bonne entente' movement; its name inspired by the wartime 'entente cordiale' of the ancestral mother countries across the sea. The Bonne Entente League (BEL), the first incarnation of the movement, aimed to bring together leading figures of the estranged British- and French-Canadian civil societies of Ontario and Quebec in a cordial atmosphere, hoping to establish friendly relations and mutual understanding.

[1] Bonne Entente League (BEL). *The Bonne Entente: How it began, what it has done, and its immediate programme,* (Toronto: Office of the Bonne Entente, 1917), p.2.

Participants were predominantly middle- or upper-class businessmen, professionals and politicians, and, until the movement's final years, almost exclusively men.[2]

While the bonne entente movement's official objective was always to foster national unity, its diverse membership (gender and socio-economic status notwithstanding) meant that the movement would be coloured by a variety of secondary goals. The most obvious division was between the mostly Protestant British Canadians and the Catholic French Canadians. Nationaliste politicians like Liberal MP Paul-Émile Lamarche used bonne entente to voice their disapproval of Canada's colonial status within the Empire, and to denounce dishonest military recruitment practices. Orangists like the Conservative MP Dr. J.W. Edwards, by contrast, used the movement to defend discriminatory language policies and call for the assimilation of French Canadians. Adding to such divisions were the varying professional interests of bonne entente participants. The movement came to include politicians of all stripes, and from all three levels of government, as well as an array of lawyers, academics, doctors, clergymen, journalists, businessmen, industrialists, military recruiters and servicemen. For some politicians, bonne entente was a platform for grandstanding – a means to boost their political profile and that of their party. Some businessmen and industrialists were more interested in shoring up their commercial interests in one province or the other – national unity served their interests. Similarly, military recruiters hoped that by improving relations they could soften attitudes in Quebec against enlistment, and thus avoid conscription. Some servicemen used bonne entente to demand the approval of conscription outright. Ulterior motives aside, many bonne ententistes were driven by a genuine desire to keep the country from falling apart.

---

[2] *Ibid*.

The bonne entente movement went through three different phases during its existence, from 1916 to the 1930s. The first phase entailed the creation and early activities of the original Bonne Entente League, in 1916 and 1917. This phase began amidst the turmoil of the conscription debate and the dispute over French-language rights in Ontario. It was marked by an initial optimism, and was followed by disappointment as the country remained divided over those issues. With the end of the war, the second phase of the bonne entente movement, from 1918 to 1927, was characterized by a renewed focus on a more frank discourse and the effective removal of the discriminatory Regulation 17, in 1927. The movement was reinvigorated by a new membership that included academics and Franco-Ontarians, as well as new organizations; namely, the Better Understanding Association (BUA) in 1918, and the influential Unity League of Ontario (ULO) in 1921. The bonne entente movement's third and final phase was marked by the absence of its cause célébre – repealing Regulation 17 – and by the onset of the Great Depression. From the mid-1920s through the 1930s, the movement shifted its focus to public outreach and educating Canadians both within and outside élite circles about cultural dualism. Where a few authors have discussed these different phases in relative isolation from each other, the present work will look at the movement as a whole, and set it in the larger context of Anglophone/Francophone rapprochement during the interwar years. The movement's first five years, from 1916 to 1921, will be discussed at length in this chapter. The bonne entente's later years will be discussed in subsequent chapters and set within the context of later developments.

A more comprehensive study of the bonne entente movement, from its beginnings in 1916 to its post-war activities, reveals a complexity that is largely absent in previous

analyses. Among other things, links between the movement and leading political figures, as well as its overall impact, must be explored. First, in order to properly understand the original inspiration and goals of its creators, one must place the movement's creation within the larger context of the momentary spirit of unity that permeated Canadian society – British and French – at war's outset. It was this spirit of unity that the creators of the BEL originally set out to reconstruct, and not a tacit approval for conscription. Second, a more systematic analysis of the various goals and ideas attached to the movement thereafter remind us that the French- and British-Canadian elements of the BEL were not monolithic. The League of 1916-1917 held different meanings for different people. Specifically, recruitment and conscription were not necessarily the sole, nor the first priority of all British-Canadian members. Finally, a look beyond the year 1917 reveals that the bonne entente movement did not simply disappear with conscription. Instead, it persisted into the post-war era to become a more meaningful forum for debate and, as will be discussed in later chapters, a behind-the-scenes common front for the repeal of Ontario's discriminatory Regulation 17. Several of its members, both Anglo- and French-Canadian, became involved in other reconciliationist activities throughout the interwar period, in civil society and in politics. In short, the formal bonne entente movement was a part of something larger than itself. From the Great War through to the Great Depression, it provided a voice for moderation and unity. It laid the groundwork for cross-cultural rapprochement, helping reconstruct the process of élite accommodation that had been absent since the Laurier years, and giving expression to a new *civic* nationalism.

The Great War and the birth of the bonne entente movement: the Bonne Entente League, 1916-1917

A look at the context under which the BEL was created, and at the socio-economic background of its earliest members, helps reveal the movement's initial inspiration and purpose. The initial thrust for creating such a League came from British Canadians drawn from the petite bourgeoisie who were concerned about the state of British/French relations in Canada, and between Quebec and Ontario specifically. They had good reasons for being concerned. All were of relative means, if not only wealthy, educated, and well-read on Canadian political affairs. They were all men, yet above the age of enlistment. Moreover, they had a sense of responsibility to fret over national unity and the war effort, and the time on their hands to do so. All three of the movement's leading British-Canadian members, John Godfrey, Colonel Lorne Mulloy, and Arthur Hawkes, had already been involved in some way with recruitment, and had connections with the Liberal and Conservative parties. As middling political, business, or professional figures of the petite bourgeoisie, they were indirectly connected with the powers that be, but did not exercise control over the levers of power. They were compelled to find some means of getting involved in the sweeping wartime developments of the day. They would have keenly followed what the newspapers revealed about popular opinions in French and British Canada, and thus were exposed to some of the nastier rhetoric emanating from both sides.

The movement's official history was straightforward in its explanation of the initial reasons for its creation:

> During the summer of 1916, it was keenly realized by several gentlemen in Ontario that unless something were done to improve the drift of feeling between

> the two principal races in Canada, as affected especially by the relations of the two largest provinces, national unity in the Dominion might become endangered and the good feeling which the opening of the war brought into action might disappear.[3]

At war's outset, French Canadians had seemed as enthusiastic about the war as their English-speaking counterparts, and for a brief moment in time, the two 'founding peoples' had appeared united in cause. Even Henri Bourassa, nationaliste and later a symbol of opposition to Canadian participation in the war, "croyait alors que la guerre pourrait favoriser 'l'union des races' anglaise et française au Canada."[4] *Le Devoir*, for which Bourassa served as editor, reported enthusiastically on the crowds at Quebec City that celebrated the declaration of war. In a rare display of imperialist sentiment, the newspaper cited an atmosphere of cross-cultural unity and support for the British Empire:

> La nouvelle officielle de la guerre entre l'Allemagne et la Grande-Bretagne a été reçue ici au milieu du plus grand enthousiasme: Canadiens français, Anglais, et Irlandais ont paradé côte à côte dans un même élan de loyauté et de patriotisme. [...] [L]es Canadiens français comprenaient tout le sérieux de la situation présente pour l'Empire et ils marcheraient épaule à épaule avec leurs concitoyens de races différentes.[5]

French Canada's general enthusiasm, writes François Charbonneau, "s'explique, par un désir de ... prouver la valeur des siens aux yeux [des] compatriote[s] de langue anglaise."[6] The desire to play a meaningful role in Canada's war effort could not have been more evident than at an October 1914 "monster recruiting meeting" at Parc Sohmer in Montreal for the creation of the 22e Bataillon (canadien-français). Federal Liberal Opposition leader Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Quebec Premier Lomer Gouin and even the

---

[3] BEL, *The Bonne Entente*, pp.1-2.
[4] Charbonneau, *La crise de la conscription*, pp.36, 38.
[5] *Le Devoir*, 5 August 1914, p.2.
[6] Charbonneau, *La crise de la conscription*, pp.36, 38.

provincial leader of the opposition gathered to speak on Canada's duty to defend her mother countries in Europe.[7]

The apparent broad-based sentiment of national unity was fleeting. Less than two years later, it had all but evaporated as a result of the ongoing suppression of French-language rights outside Quebec and increasing calls for conscription among British Canadians. Alarmed by the drastic change in British- and French-Canadian relations, and eager to recapture the spirit of unity displayed at the war's outset, a small group of Ontario politicians and businessmen set about to create a movement for rapprochement. Chief among them was John Milton Godfrey, federal Liberal politician and principal recruiter for the Canadian Expeditionary Force in the Toronto-Hamilton area. At a meeting of the National Service League in Toronto on 16 June 1916, Godfrey announced his idea. His fellow-recruiter, Colonel Lorne Mulloy, a blind veteran of the Boer War and a conservative, gave a rather amusing account of the initial idea for the movement, and of its simple and attractive logic:

> [T]wo or three of us were at luncheon ... in Toronto, and one man said, "I would like to take 50 Ontario men down to Montreal just to show them that the French Canadian does not grow horns." And someone said, "Yes, and if we could bring 50 French Canadians up here and show them that we do not sit up at nights to bark, it would be a good thing."[8]

The first objective of the League, then, would be to recapture the "good feeling" generated in the early months of the war. It had no official intention of settling the recruitment question: "It was clearly recognized that it was no part of Ontario's function to seek in any way to influence recruiting or any war work in Quebec," read the official

---

[7] Armstrong, *The Crisis of Quebec*, p.85. See also Jean-Pierre Gagnon, *Le 22e bataillon (canadien-français) 1914-1919. Étude socio-militaire*, (Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1986), pp.27-32.
[8] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, transcription of the first Better Understanding Association meeting, 25 July 1918, pp.6-7.

history.[9] The BEL remained limited in scope – it was to be the first step on the long road to reconciliation and national unity. The initiative was "not for the purpose of settling outstanding controversies, but to ascertain the chances of a more friendly feeling being developed, without which the settlement of controversy could not hopefully be achieved."[10]

To be sure, Godfrey was hopeful that improved relations would help foster an atmosphere more conducive to recruitment. A devout imperialist and a Methodist with a reputation for being anti-Catholic and anti-French,[11] Godfrey had grown concerned by the low level of enlistment among Franco-Quebecers. Through his contact with Arthur Hawkes, a bilingual journalist who was sympathetic toward French Canadians, Godfrey had softened his views somewhat. Godfrey, Hawkes, and Mulloy did not advocate for conscription. Rather, they hoped that by improving personal relations among the French- and British-Canadian élite, British Canadians at large would be less likely to insult their Francophone counterparts, and French Canadians would become less hostile toward the war effort. Moreover, the BEL would offer British Canadians a chance to convey their deep anxieties about the future of the war effort and their sincere belief that civilization itself was at stake. Finally, increased voluntary enlistment would help avoid the potentially divisive, last resort of conscription.[12]

From early on, Arthur Hawkes played a significant role in the bonne entente movement. Hawkes had an important moderating effect on the outlook of many

---

[9] BEL, *The Bonne Entente*, pp.1-2.
[10] *Ibid.*, p.2.
[11] Rumilly, *Histoire de la province de Québec*, Vol. XXI, p.181.
[12] See LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, John M. Godfrey, "History of the Bonne Entente Including a Narrative of the Evidence Leading up thereto" (1917), pp.7-11; and LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 1, Godfrey to Lord Shaughnessy, 20 June 1916.

Anglophone BEL members. Though born in England, the bilingual and eloquent Hawkes had spent several years living, writing, and lecturing in both Quebec and Ontario, and developed a deep affinity for the country and its people, both English- and French-speaking.[13] His initial hope that the movement would restore national unity – first and foremost by moderating Ontario opinion – comes across clearly in a letter he wrote to Sir Wilfrid Laurier upon Godfrey's initial proposal for a Bonne Entente League:

> I have attended, somewhat reluctantly, a meeting of the National Service League which rather surprised me. A discussion of the relations between Quebec and Ontario revealed a very gratifying willingness to provide the cordial cooperation between the two, by conference in which the utmost desire would be shewn (*sic*) to appreciate, as well as meet the Quebec point of view. What took place confirmed, very gratifyingly, the belief I have frequently expressed to you that the Ontario point of view can be happily affected if the situation is put on somewhat enlarged lines. Though I am not a member of the [NSL], the meeting shewed a disposition to welcome any cooperation. ... [T]he suggestion appeals staunchly to me.[14]

Hawkes ultimately took a chance on the BEL. He would be a mainstay of the movement throughout the interwar years.

Godfrey quickly set about laying the groundwork for the first BEL conference. He personally assumed the task of generating interest in Ontario, while Mulloy and Hawkes concentrated on Quebec. Sir Georges Garneau, Chairman of the National Battlefields Commission in Quebec City and himself a wartime recruiter, proved a valuable Francophone contact. With Garneau's assistance, Hawkes secured an invitation from the Sherbrooke Board of Trade for a preliminary visit of a handful of the Ontario delegates. Sherbrooke, which was still home to a sizeable British-Canadian minority, was deemed ideal as it was a community "in which the relations of the two races are of the friendliest

[13] See Cameron, "The Bonne Entente Movement," pp.42.
[14] LAC, Sir Wilfrid Laurier papers (LP), MG26-G, Vol.699, Hawkes to Laurier, June 17, 1916.

quality."[15] The delegates were enthusiastically received and the meeting proved a success. In short order, Godfrey, Hawkes and Garneau set up a joint committee of Ontario and Quebec representatives to organize larger meetings in both provinces. These meetings would bring together an even greater number of Anglophones and Francophones.[16] The movement was officially underway.

The list of participants at the BEL conferences of 1916 and 1917 was impressive. It included an array of Liberal and Conservative politicians from all three levels of government, successful lawyers and businessmen, judges, recruiters and members of the military, clergymen, and academics. Francophone participants included the likes of nationaliste Liberal MP Paul-Émile Lamarche; Zéphirin Hébert, Vice-President of the Montreal Board of Trade; advertising magnate O.S. Perrault of the Imperial Tobacco Company, also from Montreal; Quebec City Mayor H.E. Lavigueur; Quebec Liberal Premier Lomer Gouin; and the Liberal Senator Raoul Dandurand, among others. Anglophone participants included Toronto's Orangist Mayor Tommy Church; Ontario Conservative Premier W.H. Hearst; University of Toronto President the Reverend Robert Alexander Falconer; Colonel P.A. Guthrie, of New Brunswick, a staunch imperialist; S.R. Parsons, Vice-President of the Canadian Manufacturers Association; and even a fruit farmer from Beamsville, Ontario, Francis C. Jones.[17]

For four days in October 1916, some fifty Ontario delegates wined and dined their way on a good-will blitz through Quebec. Indeed, their enthusiastic hosts, numbering one

---

[15] BEL, *The Bonne Entente*, p.3.
[16] At the Sherbrooke meeting, the resolution unanimously passed called for Godfrey and Garneau to form a committee to create "'a permanent organization to promote racial good-will along lines of interchange of public speaking on topics of common concern, the dissemination of printed matter, and the spread of inter-provincial information through educative institutions.'" In Hawkes, *Birthright*, p.375. The Ontario component was to be headed by those who had the greatest contact with French Canadians.
[17] BEL, *The Bonne Entente*, pp.1-8; LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2.

hundred and fifty, ensured a visit they would not soon forget, complete with all the trappings of a diplomatic mission of peace and friendship. The Montreal hosts provided no fewer than thirty-five automobiles – fifteen more than asked for – for the somewhat nervous Ontario delegates as they stepped off the train. The group was then ferried around the city, paying visits to all variety of educational, business, and industrial institutions. They concluded the day with a banquet at the St. Denis Club, "at which the speeches on both sides covered the whole ground of inter-racial relations in a spirit of frank cordiality," according to the official history:

> It was the general consensus of opinion that the pilgrimage was far more than justified by this one event. It was proved that instead of candour between us causing ill-feeling, it immediately produces mutual respect and a desire for more intimate knowledge of each other's point of view. The hospitality of Montreal was unbounded, and the camaraderie of the hosts something to envy, even though it cannot be emulated by the more phlegmatic Ontario temperament.[18]

The wine, spirits and good feeling continued to flow as the delegates carried on with similar visits and banquets at Trois Rivières, Quebec City and Sherbrooke. They stuffed their bellies with oyster soup, Gaspé salmon and grilled wild duck, and their ears with the pleasant rhetoric of bonhomie.[19]

The return visit to Ontario in early January 1917 by fifty Quebec delegates proved to be just as much of a love-in. The Ontarians held their own grand banquets for their Quebec guests during the evenings and brought them to visit university establishments and munitions factories in Toronto and Hamilton during the day. Not to be missed, of course, was a final visit to Ontario's premier tourist site, Niagara Falls.[20] Having been so well-fed in Quebec, at Niagara the Ontarians met the Quebecers' culinary challenge with

---

[18] *Ibid*., pp.4-5.
[19] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, Menu, Sherbrooke, 11 October 1916
[20] BEL, *The Bonne Entente*, p.8.

their own offerings of truffled chicken, King Edward perch, and Niagara peaches in tee.[21] It was no wonder, then, that the speeches generally remained friendly and free from heated exchange.

Indeed, BEL organizers attempted to ensure that the discussion avoided controversy. For them, the first goal remained, above all else, to bring French- and British-Canadian relations to a semblance of civility. The divisive questions of bilingualism and conscription remained taboo. As Godfrey later explained, "we believed it not possible to discuss controversial subjects."[22] While discussed in private and in correspondence, then, most delegates heeded his wishes and avoided speaking directly on conscription and the overall question of military participation. Instead, most men turned to the rhetoric of racial equality, flattery and mutual admiration. Typical was the flowery language applied by Garneau at the Hamilton conference in January 1917:

> You came to us in October last believing that by getting into closer contact with us you would find that the blood that ran in our veins was as rich and warm as yours, and that we could not possibly fail to find those common grounds of ideals and agreements we were looking for. We have come to you trusting, trusting absolutely, unfalteringly to the sound, broad-minded, true inward large heartedness of the people of the province of Ontario. Have we been disappointed, gentlemen? I need only ask that question of the men of our delegation from the province of Quebec to get their answer at once. (Voices: No.)[23]

When the war did come up, men would speak to the gallantry of the soldiers at the front, and of the proud military heritage of both the French and British peoples. Military men, both Anglophone and Francophone, were particularly keen on promoting this message, in large part to dispel doubts of Quebec's loyalty. There was no shortage of references to the

[21] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, Menu, Niagara, 10 January 1917.
[22] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, Godfrey, "History of the Bonne Entente," p.15.
[23] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, Georges Garneau, Speech in BEL meeting proceedings, 8-10 January 1917, pp.110, 140.

gallantry of the 22e Bataillon (canadien-français), which had just won an impressive victory at Courcelette on the Somme in September 1916.[24]

Positive remarks were also made by non-military officials. They did so out of a genuine admiration for the troops, as well as a desire to serve their own purposes. "The frequent occurrence of Quebec names on the casualty lists from the seat of war," proclaimed Premier Gouin, "shows that the same fidelity holds today with the same strength of the French Canadian of today."[25] It was for Gouin a means to tacitly rebut the argument for conscription; Quebec was already doing its part, and then some. Ontario Premier Hearst, for his part, used the occasion to denounce partisan politics and grandstand on the war issue, making an indirect pitch for conscription. Hearst's conviction in the necessity of imperial solidarity in the face of a real and serious threat to civilization was clear:

> [N]othing else in the wide world matters.... [This] calls not only for the best that is in a united Canada but the best that is in the united Empire wherever the British flag floats the wide world over. (Applause.)[26]

While the premier was ready to make allusions to conscription, he avoided any mention of the equally controversial question of French-language rights.

Reading between the lines of cordial speech, the movement clearly held different meanings for different people. Participation was, after all, quite diverse. To say nothing of the cross-cultural divide, the variety of professional interests involved meant that those partaking in the movement were inevitably informed by differing points of view. In short,

---

[24] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, Speeches by Colonels McCullough of Hamilton and Girouard of Quebec City, BEL meeting proceedings, January 8-10, 1917, pp.101, 231

[25] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, Lomer Gouin, Speech in BEL meeting proceedings, 8-10 January 1917, p.60.

[26] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, W.H. Hearst, Speech in BEL meeting proceedings, 8-10 January 1917, p.82.

each man brought with him to the banquet halls his own personal agenda. Still, many understood that cordial relations and national unity served their interests. Businessmen at the BEL gatherings, like Zéphirin Hébert or S.R. Parsons, doubtless feared that animosity between Quebecers and Ontarians would encourage inter-provincial boycotts. Accordingly, both provincial premiers and the various mayors present at the conferences called for economic solidarity. The City of Trois Rivières, meanwhile, distributed a booklet *To Our Guests From Ontario* inviting them to invest in their part of the country:

> You have come in the interests of the great professional, manufacturing and commercial institutions for which your fair and industrious province is justly famous, ... to see with your appreciative and practical eye, the many advantages we lay claim to, to study at a glance our principal natural resources.[27]

For these bonne ententistes, then, national unity and national prosperity were one in the same. Achieving unity, however, would take more than money.

Some of the more militant recruiters, such as Colonels P.A. Guthrie and R.W. Leonard, had joined the movement purely because they hoped that bonne entente would, Leonard told Godfrey, "favourably influence opinion in Quebec in favour of registration or conscription."[28] Godfrey was quick to caution against such presumption: "I do not advocate a campaign in the Province of Ontario with the object of compelling Quebec to accept registration and compulsion," he told another anxious Quebec recruiter. "Our position in Ontario should be that our relation must be friendly, and that now is not the time for this Province to enforce its opinions on anybody else."[29] Hawkes had as much advice: "we must avoid the printed suggestion that we are trying to put over anything on

---

[27] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, *United we stand, divided we fall: address to our guests from Ontario by the Citizens of Three Rivers*, October 10, 1916, p.1.
[28] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 1, R.W. Leonard to Godfrey, July 21, 1916.
[29] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 1, Godfrey to VanFelson, July 3, 1916.

Quebec."[30] At heart, Godfrey, Mulloy, Hawkes and Garneau did indeed hope that the spirit of friendship engendered by the movement might indirectly soften attitudes in Quebec against enlistment (not conscription). But this was for now a secondary priority – it remained contingent on the need to change attitudes in Ontario and bring an end to the obnoxious attacks against French-Canadian loyalty.[31]

Being as they were on the minds of those in attendance, subjects of controversy could not remain entirely limited to indirect remarks. As Godfrey recalled, "[t]his view [to avoid controversial subjects] was subsequently dispelled by the remarkable frank and honest speech made by Paul Lamarche at the Montreal Banquet."[32] Lamarche, a nationaliste, laid out his views quite plainly at the inaugural gathering in Montreal, 9 October 1916: "Nous avons, ici, la conscription non de fait, mais de force, la conscription du pauvre forcé de s'enrégimenter par la main pesante du riche." On French-language rights: "la chose la plus pénible pour un Canadien, [c'est d'être] privé du privilège de parler français."[33] At Hamilton in January 1917, Liberal Senator Raoul Dandurand also used the opportunity to speak out at length in defence of French-language rights, and cautioned in general against "the prejudices that exist throughout your province against the French."[34]

For their part, a few British-Canadians used the occasion to speak in defence of Ontario's rather intransigent language policies, while others emphasized the war effort. Toronto Mayor Tommy Church opened his speech at the 8 January 1917 meeting in

[30] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 1, Hawkes to Godfrey, July 13, 1916.
[31] "I believe if proper wisdom and tact is used we can accomplish great things. The chief difficulty I find at present is the attitude of this Province of Ontario." LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 1, Godfrey to VanFelson, July 15, 1916.
[32] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, Godfrey, "History of the Bonne Entente," p.15.
[33] In *La Presse*, October 10, 1916, p.12.
[34] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, Raoul Dandurand, Speech in BEL meeting proceedings, 8-10 January 1917, p.225.

Toronto by pointing out to his Quebec guests that "no City in the Overseas Dominions has contributed more men [to the war effort] than Toronto..., fighting the battles of truth and righteousness."[35] Exactly how this related to engendering a 'bonne entente' between British and French Canadians was unclear, but the obvious implication was that Quebec and Montreal should take inspiration from Ontario and Toronto and contribute more to the war effort: "some parts of Canada have not done as well as others," he continued. Still, Church was careful to state that he was "proud of the record your province has made both before and after Confederation."[36] Like the Mayor of Toronto, Ontario Premier Hearst also appeared to believe that the conferences were primarily concerned with the war effort and persuading more Quebecers to enlist: "We have at the present time only one great and supreme object that draws us all together and gives us a common thing to work for, the great war in which we have a common interest as British subjects and in which we have a common interest as lovers of freedom throughout the world. (Applause.)"[37] With a view to dissuade his French-Canadian guests from wading into the language issue, Hearst defended the principle of provincial autonomy, and reminded them that, in the context of the ongoing war, "It is for us to forget all else ... in order that we may bring victory complete."[38] French- and British-Canadian soldiers, he continued, were fighting for "the freedom of the world. The call comes to us to support them with more men and more munitions and in every way."[39] Most orators, whether French- or

[35] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2., Tommy Church, Speech in BEL meeting proceedings, 8-10 January 1917, p.1.
[36] *Ibid.*, p.2.
[37] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, Hearst, Speech in BEL meeting proceedings, 8-10 January 1917, p.78.
[38] *Ibid.*, p.83.
[39] *Ibid*., p.84.

English-speaking, dutifully avoided French-language rights and conscription altogether, instead making broad commitments to tolerance and friendship.

Significantly, some Anglo-Canadians, including both Catholics and Protestants, proved sympathetic to the French-Canadian point of view. These were typically individuals who either had lived in Quebec, or had an appreciation for French Canada's language, culture and history. University of Toronto French Professor John Squair, for instance, was solely interested in bringing about reconciliation and mutual understanding, writing Godfrey:

> You are reported this morning as saying that you desire conciliatory measures regarding Lower Canadian matters. [....] Your words seem to me the most sensible ones I have heard for a long time. I believe that serious difficulties are facing us unless we can live in peace with our French Canadian fellow citizens.[40]

Squair proved immediately interested in the movement, taking part "in practically all its activities."[41] Squair's University of Toronto colleague, the Reverend George McKinnon Wrong, an Anglican, was also involved in the BEL. A professor in history and ethnology, Wrong promoted the study of Canadian history, including New France.[42] For these men, the bonne entente movement represented an opportunity to favourably influence Ontario opinion, more so than Quebec opinion. Arthur Hawkes was certainly of this mind. John Boyd, a bilingual alderman for the City of Montreal, proved more explicit in his views: at the conferences in Ontario he openly questioned why, given the generous treatment of the English-speaking minority in Quebec, the Franco-Ontarians could not be so justly treated.

---

[40] LAC, GP, MG30-C11 Vol. 1, Squair to Godfrey, June 23, 1916.
[41] Henry James Morgan, ed., *The Canadian Men and Women of the Time: A Hand-book of Canadian Biography of Living Characters*, Second Edition (Toronto: William Briggs, 1912), p.1053. See also LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, Godfrey, "History of the Bonne Entente," p.13; *Le Devoir*, October 10, 1916, p.2.
[42] See LAC, GP, MG30-C11 Vol. 2, Godfrey, "History of the Bonne Entente," p.17; and Morgan, *Canadian Men and Women of the Time*, pp.1189-1190.

An embarrassed Godfrey had to cut short Boyd's speech for "want of time."[43] In the end, the Bonne Entente League of 1916-1917 succeeded for the most part in avoiding controversy as the participants more or less gave over to the general bonhomie that Godfrey had hoped for.

Boyd's concerns echoed those of other Anglo-Quebecers of the period, both in and outside the movement. They worried that the treatment of the Francophone minorities would precipitate a backlash in their own province. "'As to the argument that the *English language alone* should have unquestioned rights in Ontario because it is an English Province,'" read one newspaper editorial out of Montreal in May 1916,

> 'would not the corollary be that the French language alone should have unquestioned rights in Quebec as it is a French province? When was it ever settled that Ontario should be entirely English and Quebec entirely French? … [T]he educational policy in any of the provinces cannot be divorced from the larger political considerations which were in mind when Confederation was formed. To ignore these conclusions is, we believe, dangerous, and destined to introduce serious elements of disruption in the country.'[44]

Such a concern had driven W.S. Bullock, a Baptist Minister and Quebec MPP from the Eastern Townships, to move a resolution in 1915 condemning Ontario's Regulation 17. In his plea for leniency from British Ontarians, Bullock made an emotional invocation of history:

> '[Speaking] as a descendant of that noble band of Empire Loyalists ... who came and united their lot in the Province of Quebec, with the French-Canadians of this province, speaking in this House as a representative of the Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec, and speaking in this House as a child of the bilingual school, ... I simply wish to say to our friends in Ontario: Remember in all your legislation the greatest word that ever fell from the lips of the great Head of the Christian Church – "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye likewise unto them" – for this is the law, the spirit of all true law, the spirit of the law of the British Empire and the spirit of the law of the Dominion of Canada.'[45]

---

[43] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, John Boyd, Speech BEL meeting proceedings, 8-10 January 1917, pp.175.
[44] Montreal *Witness*, 23 May 1916, in Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.188-189.
[45] In *Ibid*, p.319.

It would take the better part of a decade for such progressive views to become more widely adopted among Anglo-Canadians.

The immediate impact of the 1916-1917 Bonne Entente League was limited. To be sure, it certainly bore deep symbolic significance for many involved. Typical, for instance, was the gushing optimism displayed by Georges Garneau during its early years:

> I cannot help saying, gentlemen, that you have been making history.... To you, for your love of your country, to your patriotism, to your high ideals, to the unswerving courage and determination with which you carried out the ideals which you had in view, to the judgement and tact which you have displayed on every occasion, the success of this movement is due. (Applause.)[46]

Some of the BEL participants fancied themselves Fathers of Confederation of a sort – creators of a bold movement that would give to Canada the nationality and unity it deserved. It was no coincidence that the first conferences of the BEL had all the pomp and ceremony of a great exercise in nation-building. One need only glance at the lavish programmes, dinner menus, carefully preserved newspaper clippings, unpublished official histories, transcribed speeches and correspondence of the records to appreciate the pretensions of those first years. The very fact that Godfrey and others preserved the records of the movement in such meticulous fashion as they did is testament to the historical significance they hoped it might, in time, take on. At the very least, the Bonne Entente League of 1916-1917 provided an early setting within which moderate ideas and different conceptions of Confederation could germinate – ideas that would begin to flower in the 1920s and '30s.

---

[46] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, Garneau, Speech in BEL meeting proceedings, 8-10 January 1917, pp.110, 140.

The immediate post-war evolution of the bonne entente movement: From 'Bonne Entente' to 'Better Understanding'

In February 1917, Godfrey, Mulloy, and Hawkes shifted their efforts toward creating the bipartisan Win-the-War convention "'for the purpose of suggesting and promoting aggressive measures for hastening the successful issue of the war.'"[47] The consequences of the unforeseen failure at the Somme in fall 1916 – including a staggering 24,029 casualties for the Canadian Corps alone[48] – had confronted the recruiters with a startling new reality: the war might be lost, and along with it, civilization itself. Where the more moderate recruiters had once hoped to avoid conscription, it increasingly seemed a necessity.

The convention was held in Montreal in May 1917, bringing Liberal and Conservative delegates together from across the country in a show of support for the dual policies of union government and conscription. In what historian Brian Cameron has called "a callous misjudgement that had the effect of undoing much if not all of the goodwill the [BEL] had achieved," Win-the-War organizers "hit up on the idea of attracting the support of Quebec 'bonne-ententistes' by promoting the meeting as a 'National Unity Convention ... to discuss the national and economic problems arising out of the war.'"[49] Two resolutions were printed for distribution, one in French and the other in English. The first sought to address national and economic problems caused by the

[47] In Cameron, "The Bonne Entente Movement," p.52.
[48] Desmond Morton, *A Military History of Canada*, fourth edition, (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1999), p.143.
[49] Cameron, "The Bonne Entente Movement," pp.52-53.

war; the second sought to create "the greatest moving force of the country for the prosecution of the war."[50]

Hawkes, tasked with persuading Quebec representatives to participate, held deep misgivings over the discrepancy in the convention resolutions. "Returning to Toronto," he later wrote, "[I] reported that candid action was necessary to keep faith with Quebec in accordance with the resolution on which delegates were being procured in that province."[51] Hawkes tried in vain to get the Ontario organizers to honour the National Unity premise on which Quebec delegates had agreed to participate, but instead was met with the "implacable hostility of those who had become responsible for the movement."[52] At the convention, his attempts to get "the language question" on the agenda, "and to establish a bi-racial Commission to deal with it on broad, comprehensive, informative and far-seeing lines," were rejected by hostile Win-the-War organizers for being unrelated to the all-important war effort.[53] After all, with the future of civilization itself seemingly at stake, the Canadian language question was moot – the enemy would have everyone speaking German if allowed to win, never mind French or English. Hawkes was not the only Anglophone who saw the convention as disingenuous, and who questioned the merit of its end-goal. "'Win-the-War' has become the spiritual injunction of Canadians," wrote Ontario lawyer and popular author William Moore in 1918, "but winning the war merely for the sake of a win, would be poor consolation."[54]

---

[50] Hawkes, *Birthright*, pp.376-377.
[51] Hawkes, *Birthright*, p.377.
[52] He did not name names. Hawkes, *Birthright*, p.378.
[53] Hawkes, *Birthright*, p.242.
[54] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.19.

The language resolution sponsored by Hawkes had been replete with assertions in favour of bilingualism, French/English equality, and the need to accommodate French Canada in particular. It directly linked the war effort with the language issue:

> 'That this Convention, recognizing that a feeling of disquiet, with regard to the position of the French language in Canada, has contributed to a certain unrest in connection with the war, and realizing that the elimination of controversy from the relations of the two principal foundation stocks of the nation would promote the unity which is essential to the most effective prosecution of the war, and the future contentment and prosperity of our country, requests the joint Chairmen to nominate a Commission whose duty it shall be to make a thorough survey of the historical and actual conditions surrounding the question, and to present to the country at large, suggestions looking to the solution of the national problem inherent in the duality of language, which distinguishes the proceedings of both Houses of Parliament and the Federal Courts.'[55]

As it turned out, Hawkes had pushed the envelope too far, and too soon. Fundamentally, his proposal amounted to a change in the way British Canadians thought about Confederation – a change that they were not yet prepared to accept. Hawkes's ideas would find greater acceptance over the following two decades. In the immediate aftermath of the Win-the-War convention, however, Hawkes wrote bitterly that his attempt at creating a "National Unity League" had been "strangled with its swaddling clothes."[56]

Just as Hawkes had anticipated, those French-Canadian bonne ententistes who participated in Win-the-War on the premise that it was a National Unity Convention were sorely disappointed. Three days prior to the convention, Prime Minister Robert Borden announced his plans for conscription. Most British-Canadian Win-the-War delegates supported the plan, as well as a union government that would bring together Anglophone Liberals and Conservatives. Questions pertaining to National Unity, meanwhile, took a

[55] Hawkes, *Birthright*, p.378.
[56] Hawkes, *Birthright*, p.242

back seat.[57] "'We have been so badly deceived by Ontario,'" wrote one disillusioned Francophone BEL member, "'that those of us who had believed in the sincerity and honesty of the Bonne Entente movement felt humiliated at the fact that we had been caught like a lot of schoolboys.'"[58] Within the year, the election of Borden's union government created a parliamentary split along linguistic lines and conscription was imposed, to the outrage of French-Canadian nationalistes. The country was divided more than ever. The bonne entente ideal, it seemed, had withered on the vine.

Hawkes, writing a year later, publicly condemned Win-the-War for having hijacked the bonne entente movement. "At all events," he wrote afterwards, "a wrong has been committed upon the French, and British fair play dictates that the fact be known, lest similar wrongs be attempted and the road to permanent amity be not only obstructed, as it is now, but totally estopped (*sic*)."[59] For Hawkes it was important to lay bare for Anglophones the deception that had been committed in their name, and to set the record straight as to the role and conduct of the Francophone membership. The "miserable failure rests upon English ... shoulders," and stood "as a warning to those who may imagine that keeping faith with the French can be negligently observed and ... for those who sometimes wonder why Quebec suffers from wounds which they cannot discern."[60] Hawkes insisted that the French-Canadian participants of the early BEL had been sincere in their intentions. Unfortunately, he could not say the same for all of the British-

[57] The BEL and Win-the-War were not one in the same. While a number of Anglophone BEL members quit in favour of Win-the-War, most Win-the-War participants had never been involved with the BEL, and over a third were not even from Ontario or Quebec. See R. Matthew Bray, "A Conflict of Nationalisms: The Win the War and National Unity Convention, 1917," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Winter 1980-81): 18-30

[58] In Cameron, "The Bonne Entente Movement," p.53.

[59] Hawkes, *Birthright*, p.243.

[60] *Ibid*., pp.377-378.

Canadian members, although he did not name names.[61] "[W]hat single-minded men entered as a purely patriotic movement," Hawkes lamented, "became the victim of a peculiarly odious form of machine politics."[62] He worried that the 'Bonne Entente' name had been sullied, perhaps irreversibly. Worse, Hawkes feared that French Canadians might never again find it in themselves to trust in the goodwill of Anglo-Canadians. Win-the-War had "deepened distrust, in Quebec, of Ontario professions, to which the phrase 'organized hypocrisy' has been applied."[63] It remained to be seen whether Anglo- and French-Canadian civil society could be brought together again in common cause.

Despite this unhappy series of events, it would be misleading to suggest that Win-the-War was simply a continuation of the bonne entente movement. Some of the more moderate bonne ententistes, including Anglo-Canadians, continued to promote the cause of mutual understanding. Hawkes carried on his work, notably with the publication of *The Birthright* (1919), which provided an exposé on the BEL's premature demise. More than ever before, he argued, the onus was on Anglo-Canadians, "well-disposed citizens in Ontario and other provinces," to bring about real change, and to convince French-Canadians of their sincere desire for rapprochement. "'If a *rapprochement* is to take place,'" explained one French-Canadian bonne ententiste whom Hawkes interviewed for his book, "'Ontario will have to do something special. It would be idle to think that the French people of Quebec, as a whole, will ever consent or agree to any movement, unless

[61] "[T]he good faith of the French was as transparently unquestionable as their courtesy and accessibility were unfailing. Candour forces the admission that the same cannot be said of elements with which they were induced to cooperate." *Ibid*., p.242

[62] The 1917 election campaign was an affront to parliamentary democracy: "faith was again broken in Ontario, whence … soldiers from other provinces [were] induced to vote in Quebec on the pretence that they could not say where they had formerly lived." During the campaign, the extremists had felt "that it was a good thing to have the racial and religious fight out!" *Ibid*., p.378-379.

[63] Hawkes, *Birthright*, p.241.

Ontario gives absolute evidence of conciliation and consideration in a most tangible form.'"[64]

For all his doom and gloom, Hawkes still held out hope that change was possible. He implored French Canadians to believe that some of the Ontario BEL members had been and remained sincere in their intentions. All they needed was a second chance, if not in the form of the BEL, then under some other name or by some other means: "There is a plenitude of goodwill on both sides of the Ottawa River, waiting for constructive expression," he insisted.[65] Hawkes defended the League's initial purpose, asserting that such a movement was a necessary first step in bridging Anglo- and French-Canadian perspectives. Without at least attempting to establish a more amicable atmosphere, neither cultural-linguistic group would be willing to hear the concerns of the other:

> Where there is such a chasmal divergence the first requirement is an improvement in temper – a new readiness to appreciate the other party's point of view. Till that is gained nothing is gained, and controversial proposals from those whose paramount duty it is to reduce inflammation would be inopportune.[66]

Before having been hijacked by nefarious elements, Hawkes continued, the BEL *had* been on its way to accomplishing something real:

> The pessimists have much to justify them; but the optimists have more. Before it was proposed in 1916 to try to bring the peoples together, most people thought the idea was impracticable. The advance that was made exceeded all expectations. The failure that followed was not inherent in the advance. Men and women of goodwill are much more numerous today than they were supposed to be. Ways of mutual discovery will be found.[67]

If for nothing else than his own reputation, and for the future of a country that he had come to love and call his own, Hawkes had to believe that rapprochement was possible.

---

[64] *Ibid*., pp.379-380.
[65] *Ibid*., p.241.
[66] Hawkes, *Birthright*, P.241.
[67] *Ibid*., p.244.

John Boyd was of a similar mind. Boyd had publicly opposed Regulation 17 from the beginning.[68] Shortly after the collapse of the BEL, he busied himself distributing publications to newspapers and politicians across the country. In an open letter to *La Presse* in February 1918, Boyd apologized on behalf of his fellow British Canadians. In 'damage control' like Hawkes, Boyd hoped to convince French Canadians that there was still a good number of British Canadians who sincerely desired reconciliation:

> It would be a great mistake for French Canadians to believe that all English-speaking Canadians are hostile to them; on the contrary, many English-speaking Canadians have strongly protested against the unjust attacks made upon the French Canadians.... [T]he attacks ... emanate from a comparatively small minority and not from the mass of English-speaking Canadians, who are good and fair people.

The challenge, he continued, was to educate British Canadians:

> The main obstacle to be overcome is the want of knowledge on the part of many English-speaking Canadians.... [T]he actual position of the French Canadians should be placed clearly, fairly and comprehensively before English-speaking Canadians throughout the Dominion and it is to that work that I am now devoting my humble energies in the interest of racial concord and national unity.[69]

Despite their momentary fixation on the war effort, Godfrey and Mulloy would also return to bonne entente activities as the war came to a close.

Far from being abandoned, then, the movement was officially re-launched in the early summer of 1918, while Germany's massive offensive raged across the Western Front. This second effort, known officially as the Better Understanding Association (BUA), was unofficially dubbed the "Meilleure Entente" in the French-language press.[70] It included new and old members, and was to be based in Ottawa as a permanent

---

[68] Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.219.
[69] In *What Quebec wants: reply of La Presse to a question from Ontario for the English speaking people of the Dominion, with a foreword by John Boyd* (Montreal: Librairie Beauchemin, 1918). Boyd's comments also appeared in *La Presse*, 27 February 1918.
[70] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, press clipping, *Le Droit*, 2 September 1920.

association. The new association was spearheaded by William Charles Mikel. A successful lawyer, he had grown up in Belleville in eastern Ontario – what he described as a crossroads between British and French Canada.[71] As President of the Canadian Fraternal Association (CFA), with its thousands of members and an executive made up of both Anglo-Canadians and French Canadians, Mikel was in a unique position to call upon a diverse list of participants.[72] Mikel organized the initial two-day meeting in Ottawa for July 1918, consisting of twenty-eight Quebec and Ontario civil society leaders and representatives from the various CFA-affiliated organizations. It was followed by meetings in November 1918 and September 1920.

For the most part, BUA participants were politicians, professionals, or educators. Anglophone participants included Dr. E.O. Platt, Mayor of Belleville; Dr. J.W. Edwards, an Orangeman and Conservative MP from Cataraqui; Colonel William Nesbitt Ponton, an Ontario lawyer from Belleville sympathetic to French-Canadian concerns; and James B. McKillop, a Crown Attorney from London, Ontario. Mulloy and Godfrey also took part in the renewed deliberations. Francophone participants included former Montreal Mayor and Alliance Nationale member, L.A. Lavallée; J.A.A. Brodeur, a Montreal Alderman; and Rodolphe Bédard, President of the Société des Artisans Canadiens Francais. Significantly, the BUA also had Franco-Ontarian representation, including O.J. Rochon, a member of l'Union St. Joseph du Canada; Napoléon Champagne, the Acting Mayor of Ottawa, a Conservative and a member of the Société des Artisans Canadiens Français;

[71] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, Mikel to CFA members, 19 June 1918.
[72] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, Mikel to CFA members, Mikel to CFA members, July 18, 1918.

and Aurélien Bélanger, a school inspector in Ottawa and a prominent member of the Association canadienne-française d'éducation d'Ontario (ACFÉO).[73]

The objectives of the BUA were similar to those of its predecessor. Mikel was driven by a genuine concern that, in light of recent events, the country would be "torn asunder" if a "better understanding between the French speaking and English speaking Canadians" was not achieved. He had brought his idea before the CFA in late April 1918. Earlier in the month, the conscription crisis had come to a head when four civilians were killed and ten soldiers wounded during a riot in Quebec City. "[T]he present is the psychological time for the meeting," he told CFA members.[74] Mikel's opening remarks to the BUA revealed as much:

> One of the difficulties of the situation is the fact that the people of the Province of Quebec and the rest of the Dominion mingle so little with each other and have so little acquaintance. Want of intercourse between the people of the North and South is regarded as one of the principal causes of the American Civil War.... Let the Fraternal Societies by their Lodges supply that knowledge to the people.[75]

Some delegates, new to the bonne entente movement and driven by the same sense of urgency, displayed a characteristic optimism. Belleville's Mayor Platt called it an "epoch-making gathering."[76] Another delegate went further: "I do not think that at the present juncture in the Dominion of Canada there is any more important meeting than this and one from which such important results may flow."[77]

While some of the newcomers to the movement bore all the enthusiasm and naïveté of their predecessors, those familiar with the old BEL were anxious to avoid

---

[73] Bélanger was a vociferous defender of the quality of education in Ontario's French-language schools. LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, Better Understanding Association (BUA) meeting transcription, 25 July 25 1918.
[74] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, Mikel to CFA members, 19 June 1918.
[75] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, Mikel, speech, BUA meeting transcription, 25 July 1918, p.17.
[76] Platt in *Ibid.*, p.17.
[77] J. Foy in *Ibid.*, p.31.

repeating its mistakes. Indeed, the informal name of 'Meilleure Entente' was perhaps an attempt to distinguish the BUA from its precursor. To this end, the meetings were of a much smaller scale, and had fewer of the trappings of the original League. Mikel wanted to move beyond the old emphasis on the commercial and political élite, and Ontario and Quebec.[78] The meetings of the renewed bonne entente movement also took on a different tone compared to earlier years, as Mikel encouraged participants to speak frankly on the burning issues. Mikel distinguished between the new and old organizations:

> It was said of the Bonne Entente [League] that they had big banquets and a good time generally, but the people looked upon the proceedings as not having any serious intent. Let us go at this as a serious proposition, not to be mixed up with parties, entertainments and good times; let us get at something useful for the country.[79]

Many of the participants agreed on the need for a meaningful forum of debate. "It won't do to meet here for mutual admiration, wear swallowtail coats and have swell dinner parties, and think we are going to turn the whole world inside out because our belly is stuffed full of oysters," said E.T. Essery. "We have to get down to solid facts and make up our minds as Canadians."[80]

Chief among the original bonne ententistes participating was Colonel Mulloy. Bearing the lessons of the first bonne entente initiative in mind, his was a cautious optimism: "we have allowed the two great races which form the foundation stock of the nation that is to be to get into a most disagreeable and unseemly family brawl." He went on to attack the press and opportunistic hot-headed politicians – including a bold attack on Orange extremists – for exaggerating and inflaming the bad feeling. He openly sympathized with those French Canadians who believed they were being unduly

[78] See LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, press clipping, *Le Droit*, 2 September 1920.
[79] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, Mikel in BUA meeting transcription, 25 July 1918, p.17.
[80] In *Ibid.*, p.8.

oppressed: "If you can make a French Canadian believe that he is being persecuted, Prussianized over, he would not be a man if he did not stand up for his own."[81] Napoléon Champagne agreed with Mulloy that "the whole of the French people and the whole of the English people cannot be judged by a few hotheads."[82]

Given the frank tone of the conference, the question of French-language rights in Ontario inevitably took centre stage, and a heated discussion ensued. J.W. Edwards provided a rather lengthy defence of Regulation 17. The Conservative Ontario MP was an Orangeman, a devout British-Canadian imperialist, and a proponent of assimilation.[83] Canada, Edwards asserted, was an English-speaking country, and must remain so if it was ever to prosper. As such, the French language had no constitutional status in the province of Ontario or anywhere else in Canada, except, he conceded grudgingly, in Quebec. Nor should French have expanded constitutional status, Edwards continued, lest it lead to the balkanization of the country. Edwards alleged that in some parts of Ontario, Protestant Anglophone children had little choice but to attend nearby French-language schools, where an inferior level of education supposedly existed.[84] These assertions were hotly contested by the Franco-Ontarian delegates, Champagne and Bélanger.

Interestingly, the strongest opposition and most eloquent rebuttal came not from a French Canadian, but from Colonel Mulloy. The son of an Orangeman and a veteran of the Boer War, Mulloy remained an imperialist and a Conservative. His conception of a British Empire that was founded on a shared set of political ideals, however, allowed for cultural heterogeneity – one did not preclude the other. Moreover, the experiences of the

---

[81] Mulloy, *Ibid.*, pp.5, 9.
[82] Champagne, *Ibid.*, p.20.
[83] Moore described him as "an opponent of the French-Canadians." *The Clash!*, p.267.
[84] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, Edwards in BUA meeting transcription, 25 July 1918, pp.43.

old BEL had profoundly influenced the thinking of Mulloy and others. "The result," he recalled, "was to neutralize forever in the minds of those fifty men much, if not all, of the prejudice and suspicion that they had entertained."[85] Mulloy's forceful defence of French-language rights demonstrated his sense of responsibility to promote a different, more pluralistic, vision of Canadian society:

> Now, it is true that the French language has no legal right in Ontario. It is true that the Quebec Act and other Acts ... did not mention the French language. But it was understood. That is why it was not mentioned. And we, the English-speaking men of Canada, may, if we want to stick to the legal side of it, default upon our moral security. I have no brief for French Canada, I speak simply for myself as a citizen of this young Dominion, and so far as I feel, I feel that we must not and we will not default on our moral security. The French Canadian ... is here to stay, and you cannot legislate him out of Ontario or out of Canada, nor can you legislate his tongue out of his mouth. He is here to stay and equity and justice must govern our relations if we are ever to be a nation.

The Colonel went further, describing a civic nationalism reminiscent of George-Étienne Cartier:

> I belong to that group of Canadians who are not less proud but more proud of our Canadian citizenship in that it includes a solid block of the worthy descendants of ancient and chivalrous France. You men of French Canada have what we have not; we have what you have not; and our respective cultures in their interplay one on the other will produce a great nation.[86]

The debate quickly became personal as Mulloy questioned the worth of the politicians on Parliament Hill and at Queen's Park who opposed French-language rights. "They are a fair representation, morally and intellectually of the class of people who send them to Ottawa and Toronto," retorted Edwards. "Just put that in your pipe and smoke it." Mulloy was quick to counter:

> Mulloy: I agree with you thoroughly that the country gets just the kind of government it deserves.
> Edwards: I go further, it gets a much better government than it deserves.

---

[85] Mulloy, *Ibid.*, p.8.
[86] *Ibid.*, p.87.

> Mulloy: You know, if you want to roost high you must fly high. The point is not to fly over the roost. We want better politics and better citizenship in Canada, and we are going to get both.[87]

Emboldened by the colonel's powerful defence of French-language rights, Bélanger took up the cause. The French Canadians of Ontario, he argued, "are, so to speak, the link, the missing link, in the evolution ... which must come if there is ever going to be a Canadian nationality worthy the name." Mistreatment of the Franco-Ontarian minority, he continued, was seen in Quebec as "but one step towards invading the Province of Quebec and trying by the same or similar methods to Anglicize completely."[88] He, too, evoked a liberal civic nationalism that called for the meaningful participation of both societies in the Canadian state: "We want to vie with you to make this Canada the best land in the world, we want with our patriotism to do more if possible than you are doing not only for Canada as a whole but in particular for Ontario." In closing, Bélanger appealed, like Mulloy, to the moral conscience of his British-Canadian colleagues: "We are not despondent at all, and we are not planning any reprisals at all, because we have a firm and continued hope in the ultimate natural fair play of the British race in this Province. (Hear, hear.)"[89] Despite this plea, the conference ended without any unanimous agreement on the language question.

It was this lack of consensus that motivated the leaders of the BUA to hold ongoing conferences. They believed firmly that the best first step in addressing the grievances of both English- and French-speaking Canadians was to lay them out in plain and frank terms. At the second conference, held at the Château Laurier in Ottawa, 28 November 1918, John Godfrey came to speak on the successes and failures of the first

---

[87] *Ibid.*, pp.95-96.
[88] Bélanger, *Ibid.*, p.100.
[89] *Ibid.*, pp.102, 117.

bonne entente initiative. Participants agreed to form a subcommittee made up of Godfrey, Edwards, Mikel, Bélanger, Champagne, and Rodolphe Bédard, President of the Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, "to make a draft of the differences existing between the French and the English in Canada with the idea of endeavouring, if possible, to reconcile those differences."[90] Featured most prominently among the "differences" listed was, once again, the issue of French-language rights in Ontario, viewed ever increasingly by bonne ententistes of both cultural-linguistic affiliations as the principal source of ill feeling.[91]

At the third meeting of the BUA, held once again at the Château Laurier, in September 1920, delegates agreed to create a permanent organization.[92] The BUA secured a variety of influential endorsements. In 1921, as a result of Mikel's influence, the Canadian Bar Association adopted a resolution calling on its membership to use their influence within their respective communities to bring about greater Anglophone/Francophone understanding.[93] By now, the movement's meetings and activities had picked up the participation of an increasing "number of Canada's leading Statesmen."[94] Mikel received letters of support from all nine provincial premiers and from both Conservative Prime Minister Arthur Meighen and Liberal Leader of the Opposition, William Lyon Mackenzie King.[95]

The available historical record for the BUA ends here – whether the organization continued or ceased activities after just having secured the endorsement of the political leaders of the land remains unclear. More likely, it was simply rolled into the Unity

[90] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, BUA meeting minutes, 28 November 1918, pp.1-2.
[91] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, "Statement of the Case, as prepared by the Committee," p.33.
[92] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, "Call for the Third Meeting," n.d., p.19.
[93] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, Meighen to Mikel, August 18, 1921, p.37.
[94] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, "Call for the Third Meeting," n.d., p.19.
[95] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, Various dates, pp.37-43.

League of Ontario in 1921 (see Chapter 11). What is certain, however, is that the BUA did not mark the end of formal and informal efforts at promoting cross-cultural rapprochement. Far from it – a number of people involved in the original BEL and the BUA would go on to pursue their reconciliationist efforts in new and old organizations and through other initiatives. Individuals from outside these organizations would also take up the cause. Indeed, if the discourse of cross-cultural accommodation was going develop further, it would have to be taken up by the academic and intellectual élite.

Chapter III: FROM BRITISH-CANADIAN ETHNIC NATIONALISM TO ANGLO-CANADIAN CIVIC NATIONALISM

Toward liberal civic nationalism and biculturalism

The activities of the Better Understanding Association coincided with the adoption of a more liberal and civic nationalism among an influential group of Anglo-Canadian intellectuals after the war. Liberal civic nationalism was not new to English-speaking Canada, but it had long played second fiddle to imperialism. Turn-of-the-century Ottawa lawyer John S. Ewart was an early proponent. He insisted that Canadian identity should be grounded in Canada's North American experience and rest on the values of secular liberalism, and not on an ethno-centric filiation to Britain and the Empire. This entailed an assertion of individual liberties, democracy, separation of church and state, and the promotion of Canadian interests in both economic and foreign policy, *i.e.* independence.[1]

These ideas became more influential with the increased study of Canadian political and economic questions at the university level from the 1890s onward. Budding social scientists and political economists from Queen's University, the University of Toronto and elsewhere, like Adam Shortt, O.D. Skelton, W.A. Mackintosh and Lester B. Pearson, began entering the federal public service in significant numbers in the 1920s and '30s. They would help shape the policies of the Liberal governments of Mackenzie King.[2] French-Canadian public servants also played a role, including Paul-Émile Renaud, PhD, Université de Montréal law professor Jean Désy, future Governor General Georges

[1] See John S. Ewart, *Canadian Independence* (Ottawa: S.n., 1911); John S. Ewart, *Canada, the Empire, and the United States* (New York: S.n. 1927); John S. Ewart, *Canada's Constitutional Status* (Ottawa: John S. Ewart, 1929).
[2] Ferguson, *Remaking Liberalism*, pp.3, 41.

Vanier, and House of Commons law clerk and constitutional expert Maurice Ollivier.[3] These individuals advocated for the centralization and expansion of the Canadian state as the best means to ensure relative equality, social justice, and economic stability.[4] They considered utopian social gospellers, ideologues calling for American annexation, and imperial federationists to be irresponsible and unrealistic.

The avowed pragmatism of these liberal civic nationalists extended to biculturalism: accommodating French Canada for the sake of national unity just made sense, and would require relatively little sacrifice in terms of policy. Attitudes among Anglo-Canadians at large, however, had to change, beginning with the development of a greater attachment to Canada itself. Thus, these intellectuals advocated for "an autonomist or liberal-nationalist interpretation of Canadian history."[5] Shortt and Skelton, especially, rejected imperialism outright. Canada's geographic, economic, and environmental circumstances, they argued, were distinct from those of Britain. Imperialist goals of closer economic and political ties were "bizarre and dangerous." Economic union with the Empire, they warned, "would warp Canadian development," and political union would pose "a dangerous threat to parliamentary responsibility."[6]

All the same, liberal civic nationalists did not entirely reject internationalism nor an ongoing and evolving connection with the Commonwealth. They emphasized the pursuit of the shared national interests of Canadians. Because Canada was a trading nation with close economic ties to the British Empire and the US, and because it was a

---

[3] Hillmer, "National Independence and the National Interest," pp.15-16; Hillmer, "O.D. Skelton: Innovating for Independence," p.65; Betcherman, Ernest Lapointe, p.162.
[4] Ferguson, *Remaking Liberalism*, pp.xi, xiv.
[5] *Ibid.*, p.233. See also Terry Crowley, *Marriage of Minds: Isabel and Oscar Skelton Reinventing Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003), pp.73.
[6] Ferguson, *Remaking Liberalism*, p.90.

diverse country for which military engagements posed a threat to national unity, Canada could and should do its part to uphold a world order in which peace, diplomacy, trade, individual rights and liberal democracy prevailed. The rationale for maintaining close relations with the US and UK, then, was not so much ethno-cultural as it was civic nationalist – it was simply in the national interest.[7]

Moreover, this liberal and *civic* Canadian nationalism made it possible for Anglo-Canadians – who had historically avowed an *ethnic* British-Canadian nationalism – to accept an identity that was inclusive of Canada's French fact. In the wake of Canada's Great War experience, many Anglo-Canadian intellectuals became disenchanted with the imperialist stream of Canadian nationalism and with the dominant historical narrative that had promoted Canada's conservative, anti-democratic British past.[8] The end of the war and the subsequent demise of the Imperial Federation Movement opened the door for the more liberal option that had been around since Ewart's day. The liberal civic nationalists were proud of the country's wartime achievements and its increased autonomy, but disillusioned by the brutal destruction and domestic turmoil begot by aggressive imperialism. Canada needed a new sense of identity; one that was equal to the country's newfound status and would allow for greater national unity. To that end, moderate Anglo-Canadian intellectuals endeavoured with some success to build bridges with their counterparts from French Canada. It was no coincidence that many had been or became intimately involved with the bonne entente movement and other initiatives aimed at rapprochement, including reforming the notorious Regulation 17.

---

[7] *Ibid*., p.90.
[8] See Brook Taylor, *Promoters, Patriots, and Partisans: Historiography in Nineteenth-Century English Canada* (University of Toronto Press, 1989).

Driving this desire for a rebranded identity that better incorporated both cultural-linguistic communities was the sense among many of the Anglo-Canadian intellectual élite that British-Canadian intransigence, rather than any wrong committed by French Canadians, had been responsible for the separation that had developed during the war. According to this view, it was the amorphous Anglo-Canadian community that required a change in mindset and perspective, and needed to shed its exclusive, ethnocentric British-Canadian nationalism. The long dreamed of unilingualism and cultural homogeneity – no longer deemed realistic, just, nor desirable – were increasingly replaced with a more contemporary cultural-linguistic dualism. Authors like Arthur Hawkes, Percival Morley, and William Moore argued forcefully that Anglo-Canadian society should embrace the French language and certain aspects of French-Canadian culture. These intellectuals were increasingly prepared to accept a more pluralistic 'two founding nations' view of the country.[9] They also became more interested in the history of New France and French Canada as a means to better understand cultural differences and to establish a shared national story. Rightly or wrongly, Anglo-Canadian intellectuals increasingly asserted a personal pride over Canada's French past and present. Historians like George Wrong and A.L. Burt, for instance, made French-Canadian history a principal area of research. They gained important Francophone allies. Convinced of the sincerity of some Anglo-Canadians, the French-Canadian moderates endeavoured to persuade the public and their colleagues that rapprochement was both desirable and possible.

[9] Official Languages Commissioner Graham Fraser has also taken notice of these intellectuals: "I believe they laid the foundation for a Canadian identity which includes linguistic duality – an element that has been critical to defining Canada as a country and has made tolerance and the acceptance of others one of our basic values." Fraser, "Linguistic Duality, Language Narratives and the National Conversation."

This intellectual movement was significant because it provided the leading edge for a larger trend of increased positive interaction between Anglo-Canadians and French Canadians at various levels of society during the interwar period – it both informed and reflected changes occurring in public perception and sentiment. As Hawkes explained, the élites and intellectuals of Canadian society, and in particular, the Anglo-Canadian society, had a responsibility to engender goodwill among the public:

> It is useless for sane men and women to allow ill-will to develop in provincial masses, without regard to the attitudes of men and women who have learnt to understand each other, and who understand, also, that the harmony of the State must be founded on the goodwill of the individuals composing it.[10]

A fig leaf from Anglo-Canada to French Canada: Moore, Morley and Hawkes

Among the earliest commentators to forcefully convey the need for Anglo-Canadian recognition of cultural dualism in the interwar period were William Henry Moore, Percival Morley, and Arthur Hawkes.[11] Their studies, all published in the immediate aftermath of the country's greatest national unity crisis, are important in establishing the context of prevailing British-Canadian thought and the sheer disunity in the country as perceived in British Canada in 1918-1919. Some of their ideas in support of biculturalism were radical for the time. Others amounted to wishful thinking – they were imbued with a heavy dose of idealism and at times lacking in well grounded realism. But collectively, they gave expression to a nascent sentiment among some Anglophones that British Canada had been unjust in its treatment of French Canadians.[12]

---

[10] Hawkes, *Birthright*, p.379.
[11] Fraser, "Linguistic duality in Canada and narratives on language."
[12] "After World War I, the defence of traditional Anglo-Saxon exclusivism became more of a liability. Open-minded people had turned to a more flexible and pluralistic conception of society." Choquette, *Language and Religion*, pp.253-254.

According to these authors, British Canadians held the lion's share of blame for the national unity crisis. These authors repeatedly invoked the past (including historical wrongs committed by British Canadians as well as the historical rights of French Canadians) in order to justify a better treatment for Francophones across Canada.

To the extent that national unity was a major concern among Anglo-Canadians after the war, Moore, Morley, and Hawkes were the bellwether authors of their time. They merit discussion at length because they articulated early on, and with great clarity, that set of liberal civic nationalist ideas that would be repeated – sometimes explicitly, sometimes ephemerally – in intellectual discourse, in historiography, among civil society, in popular culture, and in politics.

At a glance, William Henry Moore might seem an unlikely proponent of greater Anglo-Canadian accommodation of French Canada. Moore grew up in Ontario at a time when imperialist ideas were at their zenith. The son of a clergyman, he was steeped in the Loyalist mythology of the day. From a young age he was taught that his Loyalist ancestors had been persecuted first for their religion, and then again for remaining faithful to the Crown. Moore became a lawyer after graduation from the University of Toronto in 1894. Reading *The Jesuit Relations* and Francis Parkman's history of New France turned him on to Canada's French heritage. As a young man he befriended Samuel Genest, a future executive for the ACFÉO, whom Moore described as a "gay and carefree companion."[13] It was Genest's role as a leader in the campaign against Regulation 17 that would eventually draw Moore into the controversy.[14] Professional life

[13] In Terrien, *Quinze années de lutte*, p.44.
[14] "'If Sam Genest was at the head of some sort of revolution,'" he wrote, "'then something extraordinary must be going on.'" In Terrien, *Quinze années de lutte*, p.44.

brought Moore into contact with other French Canadians, including Henri Bourassa, whom he greatly respected.[15]

Percival Fellman Morley was also an unlikely sympathizer of French Canada. As a young man growing up in Ontario he had been taught that French Canadians were, by and large, an unenlightened and unreasonable people. However, travelling in Quebec and interacting with the people opened his eyes to their magnanimity and generosity of spirit. An Ontario public servant[16] with an affinity for history, Morley had become enchanted by Canada's French past. His reading of the works of French-Canadian intellectuals, journalists, political figures and authors like Napoléon Belcourt and Benjamin Sulte quickly impressed him "with their earnest and thoroughgoing conviction of the righteousness of their cause."[17] Morley's own writing would borrow heavily from Belcourt in particular.[18]

Arthur Hawkes brought something of an outsider's perspective to the national unity question. Originally from England, he had lived and worked for several years in Ontario and Quebec as a journalist, lecturer, CNR publicist, and natural conservation lobbyist. Hawkes had developed a deep sentimental connection to Canada. He referred to himself as "a Canadian citizen" and to his time in the country as a "Canadian pilgrimage covering a third of a century."[19] Hawkes was bilingual, and had developed a special affinity for French Canada during his time in Quebec, where by the end of the war he was

---

[15] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.247, 58, 127, 254, 295.
[16] He was an analyst for the Ontario Department of Health. Carl Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History: Apects of English-Canadian Historical Writing Since 1900*, Second edition (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), p.17.
[17] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.26-27.
[18] See Morley's citations of Belcourt at Morley, Bridging the Chasm, pp.62-63. Belcourt's assertion that French was Canada's founding language, and that French Canadians wanted to learn English (on their own terms), so as to contribute to Confederation and be successful, were ideas promoted throughout Morley's book.
[19] Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.xv. See also Cameron, "The Bonne Entente Movement," pp.42.

well known for his activities with the original Bonne Entente League. Hawkes had hoped the League would serve to restore national unity – first and foremost by moderating Ontario opinion.[20] But he had been bitterly disappointed when the movement was eclipsed by the pro-conscription 'Win-the-War' initiative. Even then, he would continue lecturing on behalf of the BEL and lobbied prominent politicians for the cause of national reconciliation.[21]

Moore and Morley were motivated to write by the alarming circumstances of the time. Moore's *The Clash!* (1918) and Morley's *Bridging the Chasm* (1919) were penned at the height of the Conscription Crisis and published shortly thereafter. Moore submitted his manuscript to his publisher on 1 April 1918, the same day that the Quebec City Easter Weekend riots broke out over the imposition of the Military Service Act. The first edition of *The Clash!* appeared that September, when the imminence of an allied victory was not yet obvious to the general public. Morley wrote his book under similar circumstances during the latter part of the war while living in Toronto.[22] More to the point, the books had been written when all signs pointed to an Allied defeat, making the authors' assertions of British-Canadian intransigence that much more impressive.

In the war's immediate aftermath, British-Canadian contempt for French Canadians' apparently low enlistment rates appeared widespread. The implications for national unity were grave, as French Canadians were all too aware of the vitriol and subsequent calls for forced assimilation.[23] This, and the apparent failure of the BEL, is what had motivated Hawkes to write *The Birthright: A Search for the Canadian*

[20] LAC, LP, MG26-G, Vol.699, Hawkes to Laurier, June 17, 1916.
[21] Hawkes, *Birthright*, pp.240; LAC, Meighen Papers, MG26-I, Vol.100, Godfrey to Meighen, n.d. [January 1924?].
[22] Moore's book stole some of his thunder. See Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, foreword.
[23] Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.224.

Canadian and the Larger Loyalty. It appeared in May 1919. Not since the 1837-1838 rebellions and Lord Durham's controversial report, Hawkes wrote, had the country been so divided.[24]

The authors' were reacting to the violent British-Canadian sentiments that they feared would destroy the country. If we keep telling French-Canadian Catholics that they are disloyal, Moore asked, why should they remain loyal at all?[25] British-Canadian intransigence, he maintained, more than anything else, was responsible for the state of national disunity. Morley, especially, captured the gravity of the situation. In his view, the national unity crisis was the greatest crisis in Canada's young history, having brought it to the brink of civil war. If the country were to continue on its present course, he warned, "an ultimate rapprochement between the two peoples will become well-nigh impossible."[26] Yet, Morley was hopeful that the country's near-death experience would instil a desire for change and reconciliation.[27]

Moore, Morley, and Hawkes worried that British-Canadian intransigence would turn French-Canadian nationalism into Quebec secessionism. This observation was as exceptional as it was prescient, given that the most prominent French-Canadian nationaliste of the time, Henri Bourassa, promoted a pan-Canadian, dualist nationalism. Even Lionel Groulx refused to strictly identify the French-Canadian nation according to provincial boundaries.[28] During the Manitoba and Ontario schools crises, Moore explained, British Canadians

---

[24] *Ibid*., p.196.
[25] "If there be in allied countries any division upon religious grounds," he told one obstinate friend, "it is because those of your way of thinking have insisted upon its existence." Moore, *The Clash!*, p.xviii.
[26] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.125.
[27] See Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.7, 125, 130-131.
[28] See Michel Bock, *Quand la nation débordait les frontières: les minorités françaises dans la pensée de Lionel Groulx* (Montréal: HMH, 2004).

> commonly asserted that French-Canadian nationality had freedom for self-expression only in that part of the land acquired at the Conquest, marked off by the boundaries of Quebec. Under that doctrine there were 'English-Canadian Provinces' and a 'French-Canadian Province.' Hence French-Canadianism was forced to become provincialism.[29]

If British Canadians continued to tell French Canadians that they could only exist freely in Quebec, and begrudgingly at that, then perhaps they would begin believing it. Hawkes: "the French-Canadian is made to feel like an alien when he leaves Quebec. He sometimes meets antagonism in one of his own cities. It is not impossible to hear in a Montreal street car remarks about 'These damned French.'"[30] Hypocritically, British Canadians continued to criticize French Canadians for being insular.[31] Who could blame them when they felt their very language and culture were under attack? Francophones must be made to feel at home *across* Canada.[32]

The need for Anglophone/Francophone reconciliation was more important to Moore, Morley and Hawkes than any other issue. Winning the war was simply not worth the cost of tearing the country apart.[33] "This problem in self-determination is more vital and permanent in Canada than those which have vexed Canadian statesmen [negotiating the Armistice] in Paris," Hawkes asserted.[34] Canadians could not afford to miss this last chance for rapprochement – the country's very existence depended on it:

> To bungle our relations with the French is to bungle the future of Canada. The war has taught us nothing if it has not taught us that the old narrownesses are pitifully impossible for the new standards by which nationalities, democracies, liberalities and justices must be measured. We must take stock, not so much because we care for the French as because we love Canada.[35]

---

[29] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.282.
[30] Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.187.
[31] "It is foolish to condemn the French because they are too attached to Quebec, and then compel them to feel like foreigners when they remove to [Ontario]." *Ibid*., p.187.
[32] *Ibid.*, pp.187, 196. See also Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.170.
[33] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.xxiii, 5.
[34] Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.193.
[35] *Ibid*, pp.243-244.

Over the course of the war, Canadians had fought for liberty abroad and managed to assert a place for themselves on the world stage. But if they failed to settle their domestic affairs and let the country fall apart – if the very values for which Canadians had fought and died abroad were not upheld at home – then "All the doing, dying, suffering, mourning, all the soul-stirring tragedies of the war, the Great War itself," Moore wrote, would have been for nothing.[36]

In the course of their work, all three authors attempted to explain the points of view of both English and French while also deconstructing the misconceptions of both. Their chief objective, however, was to change the views of reasonable Anglo-Canadians. Two overriding themes are present in all three books. First, opposition to negative British-Canadian attitudes, values and ideas; and second, the promotion of Canada's French fact.

Defending the French Fact: Challenging Prevailing British-Canadian Perceptions

Moore, Morley and Hawkes were opposed to the idea of a unilingual, unicultural and Protestant-dominated Canada. They challenged their readers to consider the downsides of what Morley referred to as "monotonous uniformity."[37] Homogeneity led to a narrowness of perspective, intolerance, and an erroneous (and dangerous) belief in racial superiority. It was a cold, heartless, even inhuman ideal that prescribed living only for the state: "Such is the doctrine of homogeneity. It is a mechanical thing," wrote

[36] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.19-20.
[37] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.13.

Moore.[38] He was decidedly put off by the aggressive, racist nationalism of his day, a sentiment that would gain traction among liberal intellectuals after the war. On the one hand, he saw notions of racial superiority as the root cause of Canada's national unity problems. But Moore's condemnation of aggressive racialism was also a reaction to four years of a horrific war that at its outset had been justified with the rhetoric of proving once and for all the superiority of one race over another. He likened the sentiment to an intoxicating drug poisoning the national consciousness: "it is indeed the well of our troubles," he explained. "So long as we continue to drink its intoxicating waters we shall never dwell in harmony with the French-Canadians, nor any other nationality."[39] The perceived value of one nationality over another was subjective – it was the product of insularity: "The conviction of race and national superiority lies deeply in the breast of all men who rub shoulders only with their own."[40]

Moore dismissed much of the contemporary race theory as absurd, a "fallacy." He strongly believed that *all* British subjects were entitled to "that right of justice which, since the early days of history, has been supposed to be inalienable to the white, red, yellow, brown, and black men who constitute the humanity of the British Empire."[41] Invoking history and ethnography, Moore pointed out that theories of racial superiority were subject to too many exceptions. He challenged leading American racialist Madison Grant head on, including Grant's assertions that French Canadians were of inferior 'stock':

> The doctrine that God gave one race an inherent superiority over another, is the nostrum of those who want something for nothing; the consolation of those who,

[38] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.41.
[39] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.306.
[40] *Ibid*, p.306.
[41] *Ibid*, pp.229.

> finding little commended by others in their own lives, fall back upon the achievements of race as a source of pride. …. [We must] get rid of the old notion that there is a fundamental physical difference between … the average English-Canadian and the average French-Canadian; … it is essential, to rid ourselves of that notion, if we are to deal with Canadian national problems in the light of the truth that is alone worth while.[42]

A people's historical record, Moore argued, was far more important than any alleged biological predisposition. Moore believed that British Canadians in particular – wrapped up as they were in notions of British racial superiority at the height of the Empire's power – needed exposure to other cultures to develop a respect for difference. The country was in desperate need of an "unravelling of the Canadian race garment."[43]

The authors spent a considerable amount of time debunking negative, racialistic French-Canadian stereotypes. Moore's writing, especially, was revealing both in terms of the stereotypes commonly held at the time, and in terms of the rebuttal he offered. A common assumption among British Canadians of all classes was that French Canadians were largely uneducated. Citing one telling encounter, Moore revealed the point to which British Canadians in 1918 were embarrassed by French Canadians' alleged backwardness at a time when English culture, Protestant values and material wealth were the hallmarks of national success:

> 'The French-Canadians are illiterate,' said an Ontario high functionary one night when Regulation 17 was being discussed at the dinner table. And illiteracy has been so often charged that it cannot be passed by with a mere denial. …. 'The French-Canadians of Northern Ontario are very stupid,' continued my friend, apparently not at all abashed that the official statistics failed to back up his dogmatic assertion. …. 'And in what language do they talk to you?' 'In bastard English,' he replied, in tones of contempt. 'I don't understand French,' he added, as if submitting evidence of his own superiority. …. I have heard men of intelligence assert dogmatic opinions of French-Canadian character upon no better authority.[44]

---

[42] *Ibid*, pp.81-82.
[43] *Ibid*, p.81.
[44] *Ibid*, pp.125-127.

Moore pointed out that Quebec literacy rates in fact ranked fourth out of the nine provinces. He knew several among Montreal's French-Canadian professional and business élite who were eloquent in both languages. More to the point, it was simply hypocritical to judge French Canadians by their ability to speak English, especially when those making such accusations could not even speak French.

In a similar vein, Moore, Morley and Hawkes vigorously defended the quality of Canadian French, often referred to derisively by others as a patois, an "unintelligible jargon."[45] Such accusations were hypocritical, given the idiosyncrasies of Canadian English. Morley rejected the view of many British Canadians that they were doing French Canadians a favour by forcing them to learn the more 'civilized' English language. Moore and Morley delighted in the JCPC's observation that the very authors of Regulation 17 had used poor "'obscure language'" in drafting the motion.[46] The authors observed that the French spoken among the common folk in Canada was not unlike that of the common folk in France, and that the French-Canadian élite received a literary and grammatical education comparable to that offered in Paris. Morley pointed out that French-Canadian journals and literature were as sophisticated as any other, and that several authors and orators had won recognition in France.[47] Canadian French was a part of the country's heritage – "it is a Canadian language," Hawkes wrote.[48] The authors invoked historical nostalgia in an attempt to endear Canadian French to their Anglophone audience. Canadian French was a preserve of "old words and old phrases, old proverbs

[45] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.79.
[46] See Moore, *The Clash!*, p.133, 134. See also Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.150
[47] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.156; see also Moore, *The Clash!*, p.128.
[48] Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.216.

and old constructions, forgotten in France, [that] have lived [on] in Canada."[49] Even more, Canadian English and Canadian French shared common Latin and Norman roots, and Britain itself had experienced three hundred years of bilingualism.[50]

Moore again turned to history to debunk several other stereotypes of French-Canadian inferiority. To counter the assertion that French Canadians were poor farmers who made inefficient use of the land, Moore pointed out that New France's habitants had persevered despite the harsh environment and hostile indigenous and British neighbours. To the commonly held stereotype of French-Canadian ineptitude in business, he pointed to British Canadians' easy access to British and American credit. French-Canadian businesses, Moore argued, were more truly Canadian because they were not backed by foreign capital. French Canadians did *not* have to assimilate to a Protestant British mentality to succeed in enterprise any more than British Canadians required conversion to Judaism.[51]

Consistent with Moore's rejection of racialism and religious homogeneity was his rejection of the ethnic "Nation-State." Ethnically homogeneous states were unrealistic, impractical, and illogical – boundaries would always cross ethnic lines, and minorities were inevitable. Moreover, the pursuit of the homogeneous nation-state led to injustice and oppression.[52] Moore pointed out that, while attractive, absolute democracy (as defined by the full expression of the will of one ethnic group) – did not beget absolute liberty. The absolute freedom of one group invariably came at the expense of another:

---

[49] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.128. See also Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.151.
[50] *Ibid*, p.116.
[51] *Ibid*, pp.80-91. For Morley, too, the British-Canadian obsession with French Canada's supposed faults approached absurdity. Here, one senses Morley's disappointment in the arrogance of his own people. British Canadians allowed their perspectives to be shaped by the "sinfulness and error" of the few, while "cheerfully exempting" the plethora of French-Canadian success stories. Like Moore, Morley blamed the Conquest and racism for putting French Canadians at a disadvantage. Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.23.
[52] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.180-185, 197.

"The doctrine [leads to] incalculable suffering in application."[53] For this very reason the ethnic nation-state was inherently unstable. Moore pointed out that Canada's own experiments in creating ethnic nation-states – the creation of a separate Upper and Lower Canada along cultural-linguistic lines – had failed, "for there were French in both provinces and English in both."[54] 'Race' and 'nationality' did not have to be synonymous: "Men may be of the same race and of different nationalities; and, for that matter, of the same nationality and different races. A man may throw off the nationality of his parents and accept another, as many are doing today in the New World."[55]

For those who insisted on the importance of race, Moore and Hawkes used history to assert a common ancestry for French and British Canadians. For instance, they had a shared Roman heritage. More importantly, they had a common *French* ancestry that gave both peoples their greatness. The Norman invasion of 1066 had made the Angles and Saxons more 'civilized.' The felicity of history, then, meant that neither was in a position to reproach the other with smug superiority. "What an upsetting of tables when the works of ethnologist and of historian are fitted together!" wrote a jubilant Moore. "The French-Canadians can no longer reproach us with what is now a rather unpopular Teutonic ancestry without reflecting upon their own blood [Viking heritage by way of Normandy]; and we can no longer sneer at Mediterranean 'lack of virility' in their blood without reflecting upon ours [Latin heritage by way of Rome]."[56]

The authors also invoked historical British principles of liberty, justice, fair play, inclusiveness, and pluralism in defence of French-Canadian rights and interests. They cut

[53] *Ibid*, p,184.
[54] *Ibid*, p.185.
[55] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.62. See also Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.100, 130.
[56] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.73. See also Hawkes, *The Birthright*, pp.196.

to the heart of a British-Canadian identity that prided itself on upholding British ideals. It was a theme common to other sympathetic sources of the time, both English and French, for it was designed to meet even the most intransigent and racist British-Canadian imperialists on their own turf by arguing that unilingualism and uni-culturalism were, in fact, un-British.[57] Moore defined 'Britishness' not in terms of ethnicity, religion or language, but rather as an attachment to a shared set of and values, namely, pluralism:

> [S]urely a second language and a second school are not inconsistent with British principles. 'English Protestant' is not, as some would have us believe, a synonym for 'British.' …. [T]he English language and the Protestant religion are not the distinguishing jewels of the British Empire. …. We who live under the protection of the Union Jack are of no particular race: we are of all races; we are of no particular language: we are born to all languages; nor are we of any particular Church: for in Greater Britain, God is worshipped after the manner of all Churches. The word 'British' in the sense of nationality, expresses a 'super-nationality,' incorporating without weakening the various nationalities which compose the humanity of the British Empire. Therein lies the genius.[58]

Morley pointed to pluralism and bilingualism elsewhere in the Empire, as in South Africa, where white Anglo-South Africans and Afrikaners coexisted. Minorities were accommodated throughout the Empire, so why not in Canada?[59] It was an argument that would be picked up by Franco-Ontarian leaders calling for respect of their own bilingual schools.[60] French Canadians, Morley continued, were the King's subjects like any other, subject to the same rights, liberties and privileges. "British men may be born to speak French," Moore put it simply.[61] What was significant about this discourse in particular is

---

[57] Accusing oppressive forms of governance for being 'un-British' was a tactic used elsewhere by colonial subjects, including in India. See D.A. Low, *Eclipse of Empire*, (Cambridge University Press, 1991), p.65.
[58] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.xi-xii.
[59] "An Empire in which the Welsh, the French of Jersey, the natives of Malta and the Sikhs of the plains of the Punjab are equally at home and equally respected in their language rights, is surely great enough to accord the fullest toleration in this respect toward the pioneer settlers of the Empire's premier colony." Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.83.
[60] See UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/88/6, Napoléon Belcourt, Circulaire no. 4 (G), Ottawa, 30 October 1825, p.1.
[61] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.232.

that it foreshadowed the liberal *civic* nationalism that many intellectuals would come to adopt throughout the course of the interwar period over the *ethnic* nationalism that had been so prevalent leading up to and during the Great War. These ideas opened the door to a pluralistic, even dualist, Canadian identity that remained accessible to those who did not want to completely shed their 'British' identity.

The authors were writing at a time when conceptualizations of the British Empire were beginning to change, not just in Canada, but in Britain and in the other colonies and Dominions.[62] To be sure, Moore, Morley and Hawkes had exaggerated the extent of British pluralism. Notions of English cultural and linguistic superiority continued to prevail in Britain and elsewhere. Still, a modest heterogeneity had been built into the Empire from the start. The culturally and linguistically diverse peoples of the British Isles, including English, Scottish, Irish and Welsh, had all played a part in empire building.[63] The success of the Scots in Canada, for instance, had instilled a certain pluralism from early on.[64] Moreover, the British Empire of the 1920s was significantly different from the British Empire of only a few decades earlier. The Empire now included more territory, more people, and thus more diverse societies, than ever before in its history.[65]

Accommodating the several peoples of this vast political community required some appreciation for pluralism, and of the right of *some* peoples – whites especially – to govern themselves. Prominent British imperialist Leo Amery believed optimistically that

---

[62] See Thompson, *Imperial Britain*, pp.35; Kennedy, *Britain and Empire*, p.69.
[63] Thompson, *Imperial Britain*, p.31.
[64] The Scottish sense of "'self-reliance'" had become a crucial element of the collective British identity. *Ibid*., p.31.
[65] The imperial identity, asserted colonial administrators like Lord Curzon and the Earl of Meath, must go beyond unity of language, race and religion. *Ibid*., p.33.

the shared appreciation for the liberal parliamentary tradition would encourage French Canadians and Afrikaners to embrace a "'wider patriotism, blended with and yet transcending our several national patriotisms.'"[66] Alfred Milner, another prominent imperialist and colonial administrator, also believed it possible to develop a "common imperial feeling" based on shared values "in races of non-British origin," but warned that it "was unlikely to be 'of a fervid type.'"[67] Still, notions of racial unity continued to predominate, especially when it came to conceptualizing the all-important relationship between Britain and the Dominions. Cultural, linguistic, religious, and ethnic uniformity were still seen by many as a means of guaranteeing loyalty and imperial solidarity in times of crisis.[68] The intellectuals promoting pluralism in Canada, then, were at the vanguard of the new idea of 'Britishness' as having little to do with race, language or religion, and everything to do with a shared set of values, notably, an appreciation for liberty and parliamentary democracy.

Moreover, the Great War had weakened Britain's hegemony, making pluralism and accommodation pragmatic necessities if the country hoped to hold together its far-flung empire. Not only had the war exacted a heavy toll on Britain's military, but it had strengthened the clout of the self-governing colonies that had participated. Leading up to and especially after the Great War, the colonies of settlement demanded and achieved greater accommodation within the Empire. At the forefront were the Dominions with

[66] In *Ibid*., pp.29-30. Parts of Afrikaner society did "embraced a wider imperial identity," and the notion of a "pluralistic future for South Africa" after the Boer War (1899-1902) and the granting of self-government in 1910.
[67] In *Ibid*., p.30.
[68] See Kennedy, *Britain and Empire*, p.69.

influential non-British-Protestant white populations, including Irish Catholics, Afrikaners, and French Canadians.[69]

More controversially, Moore, Morley and Hawkes drew parallels between British-Canadian attitudes and German imperialism. Ontario's "argument for the necessity of homogeneity" was precisely the same argument that Germany had made when suppressing the rights of its own French minority, they argued. Both had imposed a tyranny of the majority.[70] Borrowing from nationalistes like Henri Bourassa and Armand Lavergne, Moore and Morley challenged the hypocrisy of fighting for freedom and the rights of minorities in Europe while denying it to people at home.[71] Far from being insulated from each other, then, at least some intellectuals from the two cultural-linguistic communities were taking note of what the other side had to say.

Moore and Morley cited French Canadians' generous treatment of the British-Canadian minority in Quebec, contrasting it with the plight of the French-Canadian and Acadian minorities. "In the Province of Quebec, with an English-speaking population of 350,000, English-speaking communities enjoy perfect freedom in regard to English schools," wrote Morley. "But somehow the rule fails to work the other way. Heads I win, tails you lose. …. The position is absurd."[72] It was much to their credit, he continued, that Quebec's French-Canadian majority had not retaliated for what was happening in Ontario. "Were such linguistic restrictions applied today to the English-speaking minority

---

[69] Kennedy, *Britain and Empire*, p.45; Low, *Eclipse of Empire*, pp.58.
[70] See Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.21-22, 29, 31, 42, 178, 232, 300; Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.76; Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.223.
[71] "[T]he conflicts of nationality and race, disfiguring the Old World, have uncovered nowhere a majority more willing than that of Ontario to strike at a minority's sanctity of home." Moore, The Clash!, p.231. For Bourassa and Lavergne, see Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*, pp.37. Lavergne: "I ask mself if the German régime might not be favourably compared with the Boches of Ontario.'"
[72] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.66-67.

of Quebec Province, the result would be armed intervention."[73] Moore called for the Quebec model in Ontario and Manitoba.[74] Both authors pointed to Anglo-Quebecers' concerns about a backlash in their own province.[75]

Moore reminded Anglo-Ontarians of a past in which they had been the linguistic minority, in the United Province of Canada. Notwithstanding a few mischievous politicians, relations in the Canadas had been cordial thanks to the generous attitudes of Francophones.[76] It was only when British Canadians became the majority in the 1850s that they became more intransigent and relations soured. The cross-cultural achievement of "self-government" was soon replaced with British-Canadian "selfish government."[77] Moore mused that French Canadians had fared better under British rule, before self-government gave control to British Canadians.

Moore, Morley and Hawkes asserted that, even *if* unilingualism were to be deemed desirable, it was unachievable. First, the Catholic French-Canadian population was too resilient. International examples abounded of unsuccessful attempts at quashing minorities. Besides, treating them with contempt had only reinforced their determination to persist as a distinct people, driving a wedge between the two societies and making reconciliation that much more difficult. Even if an unlikely homogeneity was achieved, it could no more guarantee national unity than could diversity: one need look no further than "our English-speaking Protestant Loyalist ancestors who fought against their

---

[73] *Ibid*, p.82.
[74] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.318.
[75] "It would be a great mistake for French Canadians to believe that all English-speaking Canadians are hostile to them." John Boyd in *What Quebec Wants*, p.3.
[76] "When we were the minority and they the majority in those early days [before Confederation], the hospitality of the Canadian wilderness was proverbial. …. [T]here was a spirit of the brotherhood of man." Moore, *The Clash!*, p.296.
[77] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.297.

English-speaking Protestant Revolutionary neighbours."[78] Moreover, French-Canadian resilience was testament of their democratic spirit: "The very struggle that the French-Canadians are making today, its tenacity and its depth of resolve against great odds, is our best assurance that they are a fit people beside whom free men may dwell in a common State."[79] Even outside Quebec, unilingualism and uni-culturalism remained unachievable and undesirable. On the one hand, the Francophone minorities, especially in Ontario, were large and unlikely to disappear. All three authors provided a plethora of statistics to counter the assertion that Francophone numbers were insignificant outside Quebec.[80]

They also argued that British-Canadian fears of a French-Canadian takeover were simply absurd. Morley was especially sarcastic in paraphrasing the fears of paranoid Ontario Orangemen:

> Having at length achieved a French majority in this province, they [Franco-Ontarians] would straightway deprive us of our schools, our libraries, and our churches, muzzle the press, introduce bilingual schools everywhere with the English language a disappearing quantity, tax Protestants to exhaustion to swell their own coffers, and perhaps reintroduce the rack, the dungeon, and the stake to bring all recalcitrants back safely within the fold.[81]

Besides, added Hawkes, Canada was a big country, and there was room for both peoples to live and work alongside each other: "There is no need for conflict; the wilderness is big enough to absorb the surplus energies of the two nationalities, wide enough for both English and French settlements, each developing, under its own culture, in mutual toleration."[82] Indeed, Ontarians should be grateful for French-Canadians' willingness to

---

[78] *Ibid*., p.301.
[79] *Ibid.*, p.302.
[80] See *Ibid*., pp.48, 313; Hawkes, *The Birthright*, pp.197, 202, 227.
[81] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.21. See also Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.197.
[82] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.168; see also Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.90; Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.196.

open up the province's north since British Canadians were too un-enterprising to do it themselves! French Canadians were moving into formerly British-Canadian agricultural areas like Eastern Ontario and the Eastern Townships because they still valued agricultural life, while British Canadians were increasingly abandoning it. These migrations, argued Moore, were only natural and legitimized by the legacy of explorers, fur traders and lumberjacks: northern Ontario had been French Canada's historical playground, and Eastern Ontario was a natural extension of the historic Ottawa and St. Lawrence Valley French-Canadian communities. This French-Canadian enterprise benefited everyone: "such settlement is for the good of Ontario, the good of Canada, the Empire, and the hungry world generally."[83]

Moore rejected assertions that bilingual schooling in the Catholic separate system was too expensive and of poor quality. He pointed out that several English-school teachers lacked proper certification. Moreover, the government was spending more litigating against the bilingual schools than it would cost to properly fund them. Besides, the provincial governments had both an historical and a moral obligation to pay for French-language schooling: "It is, if you like, a penalty for having obtained this land by conquest; a situation which must be met just as we meet our obligations to the aborigines."[84] Two interesting themes emerge in Moore's thinking here. First, British-Canadian ancestral culpability for the Conquest and for the historical suppression of French-language rights. Second, French-Canadian indigeneity as the basis for a right to French-language education – an exceptional argument for its time among Anglophones.

[83] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.148.
[84] *Ibid*, pp.312-313.

Moore, Morley, and Hawkes were opposed to Regulation 17 on principle, but they also criticized the measure on its own merits, or lack thereof. Moore dismissed the argument that the regulation was for French Canadians' 'own good,' pointing out that the Germans had applied the same logic when suppressing Polish-language rights. Such reasoning was pedagogically absurd – forcing a Franco-Ontarian child to attend school in a different language would inhibit his ability to learn. Regulation 17 was nothing more than a "badge of inferiority," an "unpardonable sin," a nefarious "denationalization; the object of Regulation 17, as expressed by its creators," Moore wrote, "is 'to rescue this province from bi-lingualism' and dual nationality."[85] Morley sarcastically referred to it as "this legislative gem."[86] Franco-Ontarians had every reason to resist its implementation. Moore praised Franco-Ontarian resistance against Regulation 17, alluding to the particularly bitter fight in Ottawa where mothers had defended their children's schools with hairpins and an unyielding sense of justice. French-Canadian intellectuals and social critics like Henri Bourassa, Moore argued, were equally justified in their harsh rebuke of the poisonous rhetoric from Ontario and of the maltreatment of Franco-Ontarians: "They are – view the matter as you will – the injured party, and would be more than human to suffer without resentment."[87] Morley called upon Anglo-Ontarians to consider the situation from the French-Canadian perspective:

> It would be a wholesome exercise, therefore, for our Ontarian to try to place himself, mentally, in the position of a French-Canadian. Let him be of the minority, the conquered race, in a land whose predominant civilization is utterly foreign to his own and out of sympathy with his ideals. Would it be natural for

[85] *Ibid*, pp.61, 34-35.
[86] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.81.
[87] "The French-Canadians are being deprived of 'natural' rights or privileges – call them what you will – that they have been enjoying in the schools of Ontario with only fitful interruptions since before Confederation." Moore, *The Clash!*, p.224.

> him, under these circumstances, to adopt the current Imperialistic sentiments, however righteous, with the ease of the majority?[88]

What if Ontario's linguistic proportions were reversed, he asked, and a French-Canadian government imposed a 'Regulation 17' on British Canadians? To drive the point home he cited all of the relevant sections of the regulation, replacing every instance of 'French' with 'English.' His prediction as to the outcome was dripping with sarcasm: "Under circumstances such as these the English minority would, of course, cheerfully and without protest, acquiesce in the new law and freely admit that they had, after all, scarcely had any justification, all along, for maintaining English schools!"[89] Morley's tone spoke to his frustration and a growing doubt in the good will of his own people.

Promoting Bilingualism and Biculturalism

Not only did Moore, Morley and Hawkes defend the place of French Canadians in Canada, but they also promoted it. All three sincerely believed that English-speaking Canadians would benefit from cultural and linguistic dualism. They called for greater recognition of Canada's two founding nations, French and British, at a time when many British Canadians denied the very existence of a French-Canadian nationality.[90] Moore insisted that French Canadians met all the hallmarks of a genuine, distinct nationality, perhaps more so than British Canadians. They had an "ethnical identity ... rare in its solidarity," a "complete identity of language – another rare thing in the experiences of nationalities," unity of religion creating unprecedented social cohesion, and, most

[88] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.33-34.
[89] *Ibid*, p.82.
[90] "The French are a national entity in Canada – not a chain of provincial woes. …. [They] are one of the deep-founded walls of the Canadian house." Hawkes, *The Birthright*, pp. 194, 195.

significantly, three hundred years of "a common history and common traditions."[91] Combined, these national qualities gave French Canadians an unprecedented resolve to preserve their language and traditions and to live up to their past. For Morley, French-Canadian devotion to their history, "race and traditions" – a devotion that exceeded that of British Canadians – was a source of admiration: "In Quebec … there still survives a love of poetry and legend, and a sense of the beauty of the mother tongue, and an enthusiasm for its cultivation amounting almost to a religion. Deeply enrooted, too, in the life of the people is a pride in the traditions and achievements of their race."[92]

This resolve had been fed by the threat of assimilation. French Canadians were "islanders in a sea of continental Anglo-Saxon-Americanism," and had been oppressed at the hands of "the English-Canadians who would have all within the country welded into homogeneity."[93] Morley shared the very real fear of this threat on behalf of French Canadians: "When one sees the inroads that the English influence has made, even in the heart of old Quebec, one is concerned, not about a 'French menace' to our Anglo-Saxon liberties, but about the possible ultimate disappearance of the beautiful French tongue from our soil."[94] For Morley, French-Canadian assimilation was not a source of hope, as it had been for so many of his predecessors, but of dread.

Moore, Morley and Hawkes believed that Canada's diversity was its greatest strength, not its weakness. Moore spent a good part of his book describing the advantages

[91] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.6-9.
[92] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.114-115.
[93] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.10.
[94] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.90-91.

of national diversity, or what he called "harmony in diversity."[95] Morley referred to "unity in diversity," a concept born out of the Great War:

> That diversity does not mean weakness or disunion, and that perfect freedom of self-determination and the utmost diversity of types and civilizations are not incompatible with unity and loyalty to a common ideal, are surely truths abundantly established during the years through which we have just been passing. …conformance to one language and to one form of culture is not essential to unity; on the contrary, there would be considerably more unity in the country were all legitimate differences more fully recognized and allowed freer scope for their development. Indeed, unity is impossible until we shall have learned the lesson of unity in diversity and have graduated from our present parochialism into a Canada-wide nationalism.[96]

Morley promised that "Canada will be the richer for the accident of a biracial population." This diversity should be a point of *pride*, not frustration or shame, for Anglo-Canadians.[97] The assimilation of Canada's cultures into one culture would represent "an inestimable loss," for, each element brought to the country its individual strengths.[98] Among these intellectuals, at least, George-Étienne Cartier's ideal was once again finding salience.

Linguistic diversity, especially, was of great value. It could unlock the riches of human thought and philosophy: "languages are so many storehouses upon which man may draw if he has the key," wrote Moore. A diversity of language helped prevent intellectual stagnation. Morley believed that this diversity would leave Canada's future generations with a rich cultural legacy:

---

[95] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.302. "In Canada, English talent is complemented by French talent; we are not alike, and yet we are not sufficiently unlike to render political cohesion impossible." Pp.303-304.
[96] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.105, 109. Hawkes also referred to "unity in diversity" in *The Birthright*, p.180.
[97] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.14.
[98] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.247. "Let each nationality respect the other; each help the other in preserving and improving that which each thinks is best in its own culture; and out of respect and sympathy must come, not homogeneity, but that better something else in our national life, in our religious life, in life generally – harmony in diversity." Moore's emphasis, *Ibid*., p.266.

> Will not Canada be the richer if the Laurentian Province can resist, in a measure, the forces of continentalism, and build for itself a culture of its own, French-Canadian and yet, in the truest sense of the word, Canadian? Will not the historian of the future record as good whatever we may do today to encourage diversity of thought and ideals in our national life?[99]

Moore's ruminations on this theme spoke to the beginnings of a change in mentality among some Anglo-Canadians:

> [J]ust as the world is better for its infinite diversity of character, so the State is better for diversity to the extent of the capacity of its machinery to provide preservation for several national cultures. But the bulk of the reasoning has been the other way; it is only within recent years, for causes which will soon become apparent, that men have come to the conclusion that not only on the old moral grounds, but for reasons of self-interest, the State should protect and preserve as valuable assets its national cultures.[100]

Moore appealed to Anglo-Canadian material sensibilities when he explained that the French language opened up the country to a world of business opportunity and international diplomacy.[101] He likened Ontario's suppression of such a valuable resource to "set[ting] fire to our forests."[102]

For Moore, Morley and Hawkes, there was more than simply preserving French for French Canadians. Remarkably, fifty years before the Official Languages Act, they called for national bilingualism, in which both communities would have a working knowledge of each other's language. Hawkes, pointing to recent census data, argued that official bilingualism was merited in at least some parts of Ontario where French-Canadian numbers were strong. Official national bilingualism, Morley wrote, was the key to reconciliation. It would ensure equal rights and equal opportunity for Canada's two founding peoples. French Canadians could finally take full advantage of the opportunities

---

[99] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.166-167.
[100] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.180.
[101] Time would prove him right. Canada's bilingualism helped win it a seat on the League of Nations Council. Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.134.
[102] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.95-96.

that all of Canada had to offer. French Canadians, Morley reminded his readers, *wanted* to play a meaningful role in the life of the country and in its development.[103] Looking to bilingualism promotion in Belgium, Moore was hopeful a similar policy in Canada could provide a shared source of pride.[104] French helped make Canada unique. Moreover, it had the potential to compensate for Anglo-Canada's perceived lack of linguistic distinction vis-à-vis Britain and the United States. Indeed, it was Canada's surest bulwark against absorption into the US.[105] The call for full bilingualism at the federal level was radical for the time, and unrealistic. But change must start somewhere. Over the course of the interwar period, such ideas would begin finding their way into both French- and Anglo-Canadian intellectual circles.

The true value of knowing more than one language, Moore explained, was intrinsic. "It is an old proverb that says: 'He who knows only one language knows none.'"[106] French could open up Anglo-Canadians to a world of culture, near and far. Moore and Morley lamented British Canadians' apparent ineptitude when it came to learning a second language, and envied French Canadians' apparent ease with English.[107] The pride that some British Canadians took in their ignorance of the French language was stupid and absurd.[108] The failure to learn French was deplorable, both pedagogically, and as a cause of national disunity. It was also emblematic of British-Canadians' immature refusal to adopt a truly unique, *Canadian* culture:

---

[103] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.92-93, 163-164; Hawkes, *The Birthright*, pp.214.
[104] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.203-204.
[105] *Ibid*, pp.201, 308.
[106] *Ibid*, p.118.
[107] "[T]he English-speaking Canadian cuts a sorry figure beside his French-speaking countryman in the matter of linguistic accomplishments. .... Are we English-Canadians not making a mistake in thus neglecting the study of the French language, with the unlimited facilities we have for such study at our very door?" Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.141.
[108] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.125-127.

> The neglect of any State to train its high school students in the use of the 'accepted neutral language of all nations [French],' is bad enough; but the neglect of English Canada is indefensible. It is explainable only on the theory that, having imported our scheme of education from the United States, along with our shaving soap and talcum powder, we have neglected to adapt it to conditions which are peculiar to this country. Nothing has contributed more to our national misunderstandings than the English-Canadians' plain disposition not to understand the French tongue [and so] not to understand the French-Canadian.[109]

As such, French-language instruction for Anglo-Ontarian children would have to be improved, at the very least to keep up with French Canadians' linguistic prowess. Morley looked to the Quebec education system as a model for second-language teaching.[110]

Bilingualism had the potential to unite the country, not to divide it. It would allow for greater interaction, exchange of ideas and points of view, and cross-cultural understanding. Moore called for bilingualism among the editors of major newspapers to allow the media to more accurately convey the pan-Canadian national mood.[111] Generations before the French-immersion programmes of the Trudeau era, Morley called for a similar plan. If bilingualism were brought about through the education system, he argued, it would serve to prevent discriminatory attitudes from becoming entrenched in young minds.[112] Moreover, the French taught in English schools should be Canadian French. Moore called for bilingualism in the federal public service and in Cabinet. So did Hawkes, asserting a tenuous (if admirable) precedent:

> There is nothing in the *British North America Act* specifically compelling the business of the Departments with the French to be carried on in French; but some things are so simple that the law, ass though it be, can comprehend them. The unlimited right to use French in debate, the compulsion to print all statutes in it, the use of both language by the Governor-General in opening and proroguing

---

[109] *Ibid*, p.118.
[110] Ontario should begin teaching "French in the primary classes of the public school, while the imitative faculty of the children is still strong. This is done in Quebec and the results are striking. I once heard a French play given by English-speaking boys in the city of Quebec; most of these boys had learned French at school. The French press gave the production unqualified praise." Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.145.
[111] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.119.
[112] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.157-158.

> Parliament, and the bilingual constitution of all federal courts – these things imply the transaction of Departmental affairs in French as well as in English.[113]

Hawkes insisted that parliamentarians be more functionally bilingual, especially the English-speaking members and senators: "How can a member of Parliament be truly efficient if he cannot understand all that takes place in Parliament?" he asked. Hawkes foresaw the day when Franco-Ontarian MPs would be able to ask questions in French and receive replies in French from the relevant ministers. In a similar vein, Hawkes also insisted that the national capital, the city of Ottawa, should be officially bilingual.[114]

Hawkes called for more federal intervention in the protection and promotion of language and culture. The schools question, he argued, was national in scope, and not merely a provincial matter.[115] For, it hinged on the future of Canada – as a united, bilingual and bicultural nation, or as a divided congeries of peoples lacking a shared identity.[116] Hawkes explicitly rejected the 'states rights' federalism championed by provincial compact theorists: "The line between provincial right and federal discretion cannot be so rigidly drawn as some delimiters of frontiers suppose."[117]

In addition to recommending a closer association with the French language, Moore, Morley and Hawkes pointed to several other French-Canadian qualities that Anglo-Canadians would do well to adopt as their own. These included a love of culture, art, music, language and literature over money-making and utilitarianism; a commitment

---

[113] Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.211. Hawkes added: "The bilingualism of the Senate, the House of Commons, all the Departments of the Government, the Supreme Court, the Exchequer Court, and of every tribunal established by the Dominion ... is not a mischance, to be outgrown like an infantile cast of the eye." P.201.
[114] *Ibid*., pp.210-216. Bourassa had been advocating this for over a decade.
[115] *Ibid.*, pp.196-198.
[116] "The French question is much more national than provincial. …. Things are sometimes bigger than they seem. What many comfortably-minded people desire to regard as a school affair in Ontario, is a dominant question in the future of Canada." *Ibid*., p.197
[117] *Ibid.*, p.212.

to faith; appreciation for rural life; and a general "contentment." Stodgy British Canadians could learn a thing or two about becoming comfortable with outward expressions of emotion.[118] Moore and Morley's admiration of French-Canadian society was not a one-dimensional, patronizing view of a 'quaint' people, for they spoke at length of their educational, cultural and intellectual sophistication.[119] Overall, it was a refrain that would be repeated increasingly during the interwar period – the result of a changing Anglo-Canadian mentality, fear of cultural Americanization, and anxiety over the intensification of Canadian industrialization, urbanization, and rural depopulation.[120] "If and when we eventually reach the happy decision that there are other things than what America today is most eager about," Morley explained, "we shall find our French-Canadian neighbours and ourselves very much nearer together than we are today."[121] Moreover, Moore and Morley, like later authors, believed French-Canadian culture held out the possibility of identifying a truly Canadian spirit, in contrast with the British and American alternatives. Morley channelled Henri Bourassa when he argued that Quebec was the most *Canadian* province, and that French Canadians made the country unique.[122]

---

[118] See Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.93, 114, 120, 138, 167; and Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.94, 102.

[119] See, for instance, Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.166.

[120] See Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.114; Moore, *The Clash!*, p.155; and Ian McKay, *The Quest of the Folk: Anti-Modernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994).

Interestingly, these were precisely the anxieties shared by French-Canadian nationalistes. See, for instance, Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, pp.114.

[121] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.104. Moore: "With the restoration of 'contentment' to the English-Canadian vocabulary, Canada may become the home of many millions of people who regard production simply as a means to a sane, healthy development in life. .... It may be that the French-Canadian ideal, which tempers production by social enjoyment, is indigenous to the country; and that the English-Canadian objective of getting rich ... is not permanently realisable in this country." Moore, *The Clash!*, p.167.

[122] "Canada would suffer a distinct loss were Quebec to be made over and her thought and speech and life cast in the prevalent American mould.... Is she not truest to Canada and does she not best serve the Canadian civilization of the future by not too readily renouncing [her] ideals and traditions...? [Quebec] is one of our best guarantees that Canada, in part at least, will remain Canadian." Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.113. See also Hawkes, *The Birthright*, pp.190.

All three authors promoted the place of French Canadians outside Quebec. The French had been the first Europeans to live in much of present-day Canada, the first to open it up to 'civilization' and Christianity, the first to settle it. As such, they had an historical *right* to flourish throughout Canada.[123] Ontario, especially, was at heart a bicultural, bilingual province, no matter what one might prefer to believe. Moore invoked the past to underscore the injustice of the present: "The ashes of French-Canadian martyrs mingle with the earth of Old Ontario; yet there are men who wantonly scoff at the 'natural rights' of the descendants of the Old Régime within the Province! The soil of Ontario is a veritable sanctuary to the French-Canadian people."[124] By denying French-language rights in their province, Ontarians were denying their own heritage. It had not always been this way. Moore cited prominent Ontarians who in the past had defended French in the province, such as Egerton Ryerson and Oliver Mowat.[125]

Moore, Morley and Hawkes were not practitioners of history, rather, they quite clearly *used* history to construct an at times tenuous narrative in support of pan-Canadian biculturalism. Their efforts were well intentioned, if not strictly academic. The historical foundations of French-language rights outside Quebec, as presented by the three authors, were legal and constitutional, as well as moral. "In the light of the country's past and in the light of the world's present, the French-Canadians are morally entitled to cultural autonomy in the land which Britain holds under the title deeds of the Treaty of Paris," explained Moore. "It is a moral obligation, but surely moral obligations are our sacred obligations!"[126] Moore used history to emphasize Catholic and French-Canadian loyalty

[123] See Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.12; Hawkes, *The Birthright*, pp.196.
[124] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.55.
[125] *Ibid*., pp.254, 299.
[126] *Ibid.*, pp.299-300.

to the British Crown in order to counter contemporary accusations of disloyalty stemming from the opposition to conscription. French Canadians had remained loyal to Britain in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries because of the Crown's repeated promises for their religious and cultural preservation. The Crown had made its promises in the 1760 terms of surrender at Montreal, the 1774 *Quebec Act*, and the 1791 *Constitution Act*. The French-Canadian "right to self-expression"[127] had been entrenched with the 1867 *British North America Act*. Unfortunately, too many Anglophones had dismissed "the documents which set it forth ... as so much 'constitutional rubbish.'"[128]

Moore, Morley, and Hawkes's flexible reading of history lay in stark contrast to much of the narrative that had dominated nineteenth-century British-Canadian historiography. They disputed the common assertion that French Canadians' right to live throughout Canada according to their traditions had been extinguished by the Conquest. Hawkes rejected altogether the description of the French Canadians as a 'conquered people.' All God's children were created equal – one random act 150 years in the past did not give one group the right to subjugate another for all eternity.[129] Unlike earlier British-Canadian historians, Moore and Morley thought it fortunate that the British conquerors had not crushed the small French-Canadian population at the outset. Such an act would have left an irredeemable stain on British-Canadian history. Instead, Anglo-Canadians could be proud that the (supposed) tradition of British leniency toward the several nationalities of its Empire had *begun* with Canada. More than a point of pride, it was a

---

[127] "*Relying on the inviolability of a British pledge of the right to self-expression, they remained true to Great Britain in the years when the Empire appeared to be crumbling to pieces." Ibid*, p.278. Moore's emphasis. For Moore, religious and cultural preservation were a right via the 1774 Quebec Act, and not a 'privilege' as many British Canadians were asserting in 1918. See also Hawkes, *The Birthright*, pp.196.
[128] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.14-15.
[129] Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.183.

heritage Anglophones were morally obligated to uphold. The period of leniency that followed the Seven Years War was "One of the brightest pages in the history of the relations of the two Canadian peoples," Morley wrote.[130] Indeed, Governor Guy Carleton's tact and tolerance were to be revered, for his actions had ensured "the good name of British justice and the self-respect of English-Canadians ever after."[131] One senses that, for the authors, past examples of goodwill were especially important in the context of their sense of collective guilt over the transgressions of the present. Moreover, they provided an historical basis upon which Anglo-Canadians and French Canadians could build for the future – they lent legitimacy to reconciliationist initiatives in the present.

The 1774 *Quebec Act*, apparently, constituted an historic promise to French Canadians that they would not be forced to assimilate. Moore cited British officials who had pledged to "'leave the people just as they were.'"[132] Hawkes dismissed unfavourable interpretations of constitutional legislation then-popular among British Canadians – whatever one might want to argue in order to diminish French-Canadian legal rights, it did not change the fact that Canada was significantly French-speaking:

> You may be able to interpret perfectly what the authors of the *Quebec Act* of 1774, and of the *Constitutional Act* of 1791, intended, from the point of view of conquerors, legislating for the 'conquered,' three thousand miles away. You may possess all the mind of the Fathers of Confederation. But you will not then have disposed of two millions of native-born Canadians….[133]

Instead, Hawkes called for "political elasticity in men who interpret" the constitutional implications of 1760, 1774, 1791, and 1867. Much in line with French-Canadian

---

[130] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.43.
[131] *Ibid.*, P.12-13.
[132] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.17.
[133] Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.183.

assertions, Moore, Morley and Hawkes emphasized the *spirit* of the *Quebec Act* – in addition to the recognized religious rights came *de facto* recognition of language rights. Respect for French in the *Act* had been taken for granted, they argued, which was why it was never explicitly mentioned. "Sentences were not incorporated into the Quebec Bill specifically granting the freedom of the French language; nor, for that matter, were there specific sentences granting the freedom of air," wrote Moore. "Without air, there could have been no continued life for the individual, and without language no continued life for the nationality."[134]

In contrast to several of their historiographical predecessors, Moore and Morley dismissed the validity of the 1840 Durham Report. In contemporary British Canada the Report was a favourite of "Those who would force an English mind upon the French-Canadian, who refuse to tolerate the 'French pretensions to nationality' within Canada."[135] Durham had spent only five months in Canada, and had scarcely travelled the country. Moreover, Durham's assimilationist policy went against the British principle of benevolence for conquered peoples. Besides, it was already too late for assimilation in 1838, and even more so in 1918. For Morley, the 1841 Act of Union's abolition of the use of French in the courts and in "a legislature half French in constitution" was a gross injustice.[136] It was the last in a long list of historical attacks on the French language and culture in Canada. By contrast, Lord Elgin garnered much praise from the authors for his pluralism, advocacy of the French language, and for promoting mutual respect and responsible government as a means for improved race relations.[137]

---

[134] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.19.
[135] *Ibid.*, p.309.
[136] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.45.
[137] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.311.

Adding to their argument that French-language rights were historically, legally and constitutionally grounded, the authors maintained that French-language minority rights had been implicit in the terms of Confederation. Moore:

> [I]t is a gross violation of the spirit of Confederation, now to contend that the *British North America Act* was designed to protect merely Catholic rights in Ontario and Manitoba, and Protestant rights in Quebec, and not French-Canadian rights and British-Canadian rights as well.[138]

At heart it was a question of a 'moral' versus a 'letter-of-the-law' interpretation of Confederation. This ran counter to the frequent argument that the *BNAA* did not guarantee any special rights for Francophone minorities. Moore and Morley adopted the 'two nations' compact theory that was popular among French-Canadian historians. Morley took this a step further to argue that a measured autonomy of the two nations had been the intent of Confederation.[139]

The authors rejected the popular assertion that the constitution only guaranteed religious minority rights. At the time of Confederation, Moore pointed out, references to 'Protestant' and 'Catholic' rights were synonymous with 'British' and 'French.' Hawkes and Morley argued that the bilingualism of the federal parliament and federal courts, to which all provincial legislatures and courts were subservient, created a precedent for French-Canadian minority rights.[140] (They conveniently ignored the *BNAA*'s specific references to English-language rights in Quebec.) It was plain, the authors insisted, that in the discussions leading up to Confederation protection for minority language rights had

---

[138] *Ibid*, p.188.

[139] He refered to "the looseness of its organization" and the "freedom and the autonomous rights of the constitutent nations." "Let each people, while loyal to the national ideal, develop its culture and live its life in its chosen way. The resultant Canadianism, a federation of peoples of diversified forms of thought and culture, bound together by a fundamental oneness of sentiment, might not please our extremists, but it would be richer and more fruitful than the uniformity they desire. And is not this diversity, in fact, the spirit and intent of Confederation?" Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.111-112.

[140] See Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.187; Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.77-78; Hawkes, *The Birthright*, pp.201, 213.

been intended. Moore cited Antoine-Aimé Dorion, a "father of confederation," who had welcomed entrenching special rights for Quebec's British-Canadian Protestants, but had also called for the recognition of French-Canadian Catholics in Ontario.[141] He invoked George-Étienne Cartier's assertion that the spirit of Confederation would ensure the rights of both minorities and that British Canadians' sense of justice could be counted upon to respect those rights.[142] Morley and Hawkes argued that the long history of formal and informal recognition and practice of French-language rights before and after Confederation both in and outside Quebec – in education, in municipal affairs, etc. – reinforced both the legal and moral precedent.[143]

Moore and Morley were both deeply proud of French-Canadian contributions to the country's collective history. They believed that Anglo-Canadians should take pride and ownership of that history too; it made up for their own admirable, yet somewhat dull, pioneer history.[144] French-Canadian history was a history to get excited about, to capture the imaginations of children and adults alike, to draw Canadians who otherwise had little inclination into learning more about their national history – it challenged the assumption that Canadian history was 'boring.' "When I was a boy," Moore recalled,

> the history of Canada before the coming of the English was dismissed with a few cursory lessons. I admired the patient toil of the English pioneers who hewed their farms out of the forest, but down in my heart I envied the boys of Scotch, English, and Irish descent who could repeat tales of the days when knighthood was in flower in the shires of their forefathers. …. And then I read in Parkman, and later, in 'Les Relations,' page after page, book after book, the wonderful tales in which knights, voyageurs, missionaries, and soldiers, lived again their lives of adventure in this country of my birth. Their exploits rivalled those of the Iliad and the

[141] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.186.
[142] "[I]n both [Ontario and Quebec], the rights of the minority were to be protected by a sense of fair play. [The minorities] were to be continued in the freedom of self-expression by the spirit of toleration which M. Cartier believed would characterize the major nationalities in both provinces. That was the spirit of the fathers of Confederation." Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.187-188.
[143] See Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.44-46, 54; Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.211.
[144] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.55.

> Odyssey; and having been reformed in my homeland, stimulated my youthful patriotism.[145]

In this sense, French-Canadian history served to make Canadian history seem more 'ancient.' It was important for Moore to point out that their historical presence had been throughout Canada, not just in Quebec. These were Canadian heroes, not just French-Canadian heroes.[146]

Moore believed this history was more relevant than the lessons in British Isles history taught to Anglophone children. It was unjust that French-Canadian children in Ontario – not to mention British-Canadian children – could not be taught this captivating history, and in their own language. Ontario "was carved out of Quebec," and, contrary to the frequent historiographical refusal "to acknowledge the lien of French culture upon this province," virtually every region had an historical French-Canadian presence, whether Northern Ontario, Southwest Ontario, Eastern Ontario, or the Ottawa Valley.[147] Much of Ontario's French history had been tragically suppressed.[148] Too much emphasis had been placed on Loyalist and British history at the expense of New France and

---

[145] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.58. Morley had as much to say: "But alas! …. In the Ontario schoolroom the portion of our history previous to 1759 is but a necessary prelude, ... the real Canada dawns only with the Battle of the Plains of Abraham. The inculcation of a greater appreciation of the rôle (*sic*) of the French-Canadian in our history would go a long way toward the creation of a better attitude amongst us. This should not be difficult, for the French regime, with its exploration and missionary endeavour, its seigneurs and pioneer settlements and Indian wars, is not the least interesting part of Canadian history. The vanishingly small space at present devoted to such themes in the Ontario School Readers could well be increased." Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.138-139.

Lester Pearson described the narrow British-Canadian outlook in similar terms: "[In 1913], to transpose John Wesley, the parish was my world, geographically and in other ways. The parish was an area of not more than fifty miles around Toronto. Quebec was virtually a foreign part.... As for the rest of the world, I thought about it, and this was normal for the times, largely in terms of the British Empire.... Canadian nationalism hardly touched us in those days since our teaching was concentrated on Canada as part of an empire." Lester B. Pearson, *Mike. The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson*, Volume I: 1897-1948 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), p.15.

[146] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.45. Moore cited the work of more recent, like-minded Anglo-Canadian historians Lawrence Burpee and C.W. Colby. Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.45, 57.

[147] *Ibid*, pp.43, 47, 49.

[148] "That the influence of the old French Régime in the early life of the country now called Ontario, is not fully realized by the present generation, is easily explained. *The truth is that much of the evidence was destroyed*." Moore's emphasis, *Ibid*., p.51.

French-Canadian history. The fault lay largely with British-Canadian historians and educators. Moore pointed out that it had fallen to *American* historians, like Francis Parkman, to pick up on Canada's French history in recent decades.[149]

The authors went to great lengths to emphasize British Canadians' and French Canadians' common Christianity, invoking the 'golden rule': do unto others as you would have them do unto you.[150] Infighting between Christians was senseless. Moore found the division between Irish and French Catholics in Ontario particularly deplorable. To that end, he called for greater Anglo-Canadian appreciation for French Canada's historical contribution to 'civilizing' the country – a point of pride, Moore argued, for all Christians. (Never mind that this reading of history left little room for the consideration of Aboriginal civilizations.[151]) Hawkes also asserted that this shared history could serve to draw people together: Anglo-Canadians, he wrote, "cannot refuse to like the French-Canadians they know, unless they wish to dislike themselves. Your French friends wish nothing better than to share with you the country which their ancestors explored, their clergy Christianized, and their kindred saved to the Empire."[152]

The national unity, conscription, and language-rights crises of the war forced some deep soul-searching for those Anglo-Canadians, like Moore, Morley, and Hawkes, who sympathized with French Canada, but felt guilty by association – "sharing," as Moore put it, "all the faults of his nationality":

> We English-Canadians have habitually had our good eye upon French-Canadian faults, and our blind eye upon our own. We have judged the French-Canadians by their poorest men, the English-Canadians by their best; and have not, unnaturally,

[149] *Ibid*, pp.58-59.
[150] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.319.
[151] "French Canadians fought with the Indians to make this country 'safe for civilization.'" Moore, *The Clash!*, p.57.
[152] Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.196.

> concluded that, financially, commercially, artistically, morally, socially, and generally, we are superior.[153]

For those who opposed the wrongs committed against French Canadians, both past and present, the sense of ancestral culpability ran deep. Hawkes, writing shortly after the apparent failure of the Bonne Entente League, felt a personal need to salvage his own reputation. He needed to believe, in light of his recent disillusionment, that rapprochement was possible, and that the country that he had come to love and call his own could be saved.[154] For Moore, the desire for rapprochement was equally personal. He connected it to his own family's history:

> When I think of this country's national past, I remember having heard that only three generations ago, one of my ancestors crossed the Niagara River and, in reaching Canada, thanked God that he was again under the Union Jack. …. *He came not to destroy the convictions of others, but to build upon his own*. He left the shores of the dividing Niagara River cursed – in English – as a Britisher, and landed on British soil to receive a 'bienvenu.' I cannot forget that the first kindness my ancestor received in his new home was from a French-Canadian.[155]

For his part, Morley recommended a national exercise in self-reflection. Anglo-Canadians needed to realize that they had been the cause of much of the troubles and that, indeed, *they* may be in the wrong.[156] As Hawkes put it, "good-willing people should learn that the French leaders are free from blame.... It is for the English to prove ... whether the former offences can be purged and a repetition of them avoided."[157]

The problem in 1918, however, was that bigoted British Canadians dominated the discourse.[158] The fault lay especially with those who used the crisis for personal gain –

---

[153] *Ibid.*, p.304-305.
[154] *Ibid*., pp.240.
[155] Moore's emphasis, *The Clash!*, p.294-296.
[156] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.24, 105.
[157] Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.380.
[158] Such bigots "[are] not an unfamiliar figure," Moore lamented. "You may meet him on the trains, in the lodge-rooms and public corridors, wherever in fact the clash of nationalities is discussed. .... With many, race, national and religious antagonisms are regarded as natural. That there should be harmony in diversity

politicians and newspapermen especially. Morley lamented the sensationalism and deliberate misrepresentation of 'radical' French-Canadian opinion in English-language papers.[159] Hawkes, having witnessed the collapse of the BEL, its replacement with the Win-the-War movement, and the bitterly divided Parliament of 1917, was especially critical of these "lovers of polluted air." These "politicians, who ought to know better, encourage [division], because they thrive on disunion, on the suppression of historical truth, and on intensifying popular prejudices."[160] If national unity was ever going to be achieved, the country would need a better politics, less petty and free from race-based party divisions.

For his part, Moore remained hopeful that English-speaking Canada could change. It would be up to Anglo-Canadians to see that "the wrong must be righted. The past is unseverably tied into the present and let us not forget that today will be the past of tomorrow."[161] Failure would leave later generations with a legacy of ancestral guilt, national disunity, and democratic bankruptcy – a tyranny of the majority.

> For the last time I ask: do we believe in freedom? Many of our English-speaking ancestors came to this country in search of it. .... Have we obtained it only by the destruction of the freedom of others? Must French-Canadians pay for English-Canadian freedom by the loss of their own?[162]

Increased positive interaction and exposure to each other's culture, the authors believed wistfully, would help break down the greatest barrier to national unity: ignorance.[163] People would see for themselves the fallacious underpinnings of the poisonous rhetoric

---

is regarded as impossible." Moore, *The Clash!*, p.xxi.
[159] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.15, 25, 135.
[160] Hawkes, *The Birthright*, pp.217, 224.
[161] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.292.
[162] *Ibid*, pp.315-317.
[163] "Would it not be better for the Ontario folks who lie awake nights worrying about this 'papal menace,' to direct their nervous and mental energy into ... getting acquainted with their new neighbours and perhaps learning to greet them in their own tongue?" Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.90.

they had been taught from an early age – they would realise that they were not so different after all. Reaching young people through the education system and extra-curricular activities was the first step.[164] With English-language instruction already strong among French Canadians, Anglo-Canadian students should be made reasonably fluent in Canadian French. A common historical narrative for the schools, explained Morley, also held out the promise of uniting Canadians from an early age:

> The school, both in English and French Canada, could be made a potent influence for national unity. The development of a Canadian tradition that would give due recognition to all the elements of our national life and culture would be a grand step in the right direction. .... The inculcation of a greater appreciation of the rôle (*sic*) of the French-Canadian in our history would go a long way toward the creation of a better attitude amongst us.[165]

The education of newcomers and children alike was crucial so as to prevent them from carrying on the old race hatreds for yet another generation. Student exchange programs to Quebec would also provide positive exposure for Anglophone students.[166] Interestingly, these kinds of initiatives would materialize to some extent in the interwar period.

Tongue-in-cheek, Morley encouraged all Anglo-Canadians, especially Ontarians, to travel to Quebec, as he had done:

> [I]f some of our Ontarians who nurse the orthodox Ontario conception of Quebec and the French-Canadian would take their next vacation trip down the St. Lawrence ... they would make the interesting discovery that the natives of Lower Canada have, like themselves, attained to more or less of a civilized state; that pea-soup can nourish some solid virtues; that, indeed, the Quebec parish is moved

---

[164] "One of the penalties of the bigness of our country is that the various groups, largely isolated from one another, dwell in ignorance of their fellow Canadians a few hundred miles distant, and that this ignorance proves a veritable hotbed for ... prejudices. The problem is an educational one. Further intercourse would correct most of these misunderstandings." Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.136-137.

[165] *Ibid*, pp.138-139.

[166] Morley recommended "A closer contact with Quebec by means of summer schools, exchange of teachers, extension lectures and personally conducted excursions for students and teachers. McGill and Laval Universities could be easily enlisted in this 'bonne entente' movement. Just here it may be said that Ontario people do not realize that French is the language of one-third of our people, that Quebec French is good French, that it has a rich literature of its own, that its public men, its teachers, its scholars and orators, are the equals of any in North America." Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.147.

> by very much the same social and moral impulses as govern a Methodist community in the south-western peninsula of Ontario. They would come to the wholesome realization that the French-Canadian's chief joy is not in captiousness and contrariness; that his life is too happy and contented to be frittered away in disputes.[167]

Hawkes, too, was optimistic that innate, mutual curiosity would encourage learning and understanding.[168] As later chapters will show, the authors would have been pleased by some of the developments in the interwar period, especially with respect to tourism.

Morley cautioned Anglo-Canadians that any outward willingness to change must be genuine. Mere rhetoric – the kind employed by the 1916-1917 BEL – was not enough.[169] The movement's early failure had been a bitter disappointment not only to French Canadians, but to moderate Anglo-Canadians as well. If future efforts were not sincere they would generate more distrust and make rapprochement impossible.[170] Both Morley and Hawkes cautioned that genuine national unity could only come slowly, and may take generations. Moreover, this process could no longer afford to be slowed down by the hurtful rhetoric of extremists. Actions had to follow words, and the first overture would have to be made by Anglo-Canada.[171] In short, élite accommodation was important, but not enough. Change must come from above and below: among civil society, the broader public, and politicians. Fostering positive interaction at all levels was key.[172]

---

[167] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.137-138.
[168] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.114, 115; Hawkes, The Birthright, pp182, 240.
[169] "Nous rencontrons, écoutons, lisons assez souvent des 'bonnes ententistes' de langue anglaise, apparement animés des meilleures dispositions à notre égard [....] Ils nous parlent avec de grands gestes et des sourires engageants des bonnes relations qui devraient exister ... mais ils ne mettent jamais le doigt sur la place." "La Question du Québec," *Le Droit*, 16 March 1918, p.1.
[170] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.135-136, 158-160; Hawkes, *The Birthright*, pp.242.
[171] "Let us put our own house in order. Then, perhaps, under the inspiration of our example, our neighbours may undertake a little overhauling in their own domain." Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.131.
[172] *Ibid*, p.158.

Moore, Morley and Hawkes earnestly hoped that Canadians would move toward a more inclusive *civic* nationalism. They gave early expression to the post-war Anglo-Canadian assertion of a distinct Canadian identity, or Canadian "nationality," as it was then termed. Confident in their wartime achievements, English-speaking Canadians had begun to develop "a bumptious conceit of nationhood."[173] Moore wrote at length of how French Canadians no longer identified with France, and how Anglo-Canadians had already begun to lose subconsciously their 'Britishness' and adopt a more North American identity. He saw Canadian nationality in part as a combination of British and French heritage, but also completely distinct from either country as it was a product of the people's surroundings.[174] "Canadianism," Morley declared, "is something larger than any one race or civilization."[175] This did not mean that Canadians, British subjects that they were, would have to give up their imperial identity.[176] Indeed, as Hawkes was keen to point out, Canadians could have multiple identities. But above all, Canada, and not Britain nor the Empire, should come first. For some, the very thought would have seemed radical – many British Canadians believed that the Empire trumped everything, and equated Canadian patriotism with treason, conjuring up images of the American rebellion in 1776.[177] For Hawkes, a more liberal Canadian national identity would serve to gradually supplant ethnic nationalism, which was the force behind discrimination, the suppression of democracy, prejudice against immigrants and French Canadians, and the spurious idea of an Imperial Union run out of London. By adopting the same, confident

[173] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.4.
[174] Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.244.
[175] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.164-165.
[176] Some would not relinquish their Britishness until the 1960s. See Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution* (2006).
[177] See Hawkes, *Birthright*, pp.5.

pan-Canadian nationalism shared by some Francophones, Anglo-Canadians could overcome their colonial inferiority complex: "There, indeed, lies the difference between the French and English of Canada," Hawkes explained. "While the English wonder how long they must wait for a Canadian nationality to which all of their speech will give unqualified allegiance, the French proclaim that for many generations they have had a nationality that is dearer to them than all else in the world."[178]

Hawkes's book, written for the most part after the war, best captured the growing appetite among many Anglo-Canadians for a truly *Canadian* identity. For him, achieving national unity was a "problem in self-determination."[179] Consistent with his belief that Canadian interests should take precedence over those of the Empire, Hawkes was a strong proponent of Canadian autonomy in international affairs. In order to achieve full "national manhood," Anglo-Canadians had to let go of the apron strings, come out from under the wing of Britain, and accept Canada for itself. This process was inextricably linked to acceptance of the country's French fact.[180] Without Anglophone/Francophone rapprochement, Canadians could not achieve a national identity, "the birthright." Moreover, what Hawkes and, later, statesmen like William Lyon Mackenzie King would come to realize was that Canadian autonomy could remove a major obstacle to rapprochement (*i.e.* British Canadians' blind commitment to imperialism), and finally create a common loyalty for both Anglo- and French Canadians. It was this loyalty to Canada that Hawkes hoped Anglo-Canadians could learn from their French-Canadian countrymen. He went so far as to suggest that Anglo-Canadians drop 'The Maple Leaf

[178] Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.186.
[179] *Ibid*, p.193.
[180] "Many of us are as afraid of the French as a gawky youth is afraid of a girl. We vow that we will never enter into full national manhood on level terms with them. We are like the honest, but marvellously incomplete young man who says, 'I'm always going to stay with you, mother.'" *Ibid*, p.184.

Forever,' "a colonial song" that "alludes to the senior Canadians only in a boastful reference to the conquest" and contained "no historical implication which Canadians who are neither Irish, Scotch nor English can equally acclaim" in favour of the French Canadians' 'O, Canada,' "a truly national anthem for the typical Canadian" in which "it is Canada that the verses laud."[181] Hawkes's preference for 'O, Canada' would soon be validated. By the early 1930s, it featured prominently on national radio as the *de facto* national anthem.[182]

The goal of a common identity did not mean that Moore, Morley and Hawkes advocated the disappearance of two distinct, English-speaking and French-speaking nationalities. Moore denounced the American model of a 'melting pot' as a thinly-veiled brand of Prussian-style assimilation.[183] Canada should have its own model: a state-sponsored cultural pluralism that included Anglo- and French Canadians (and, to a lesser extent, Aboriginal Canadians).[184] The 'fusion of races' hoped for by others was neither inevitable nor desirable:

> Canada needs both mentalities, one to temper and strengthen the other. They are natural complements. The Provinces of Canada will gain, not lose, by protecting [both] culture[s]. …. The existence of the French and English nationalities in Canada is the handiwork of Divine Providence, out of which, with mutual toleration, will come inestimable benefit to Canada, and it may be when both are bigger, older, an wiser, a substantial good to the whole world.[185]

---

[181] *Ibid*, pp.185-186.
[182] CNR's popular Sunday evening musical program opened with 'O Canada.' The purpose, recalled CNR Director of Radio E. Austin Weir, was to be "emblematic of national unity." Earnest Austin Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting in Canada* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965), pp.45-46.
[183] "It is but a reiteration of the old pre-christian Athenian precept, 'one Blood, one Speech, one Cult, one congruous Way of Living.'" Moore, *The Clash!*, p.300.
[184] "I hope there will always be English-Canadians and French-Canadians. Each has a service to perform which the other cannot do; and the State machinery is capable of being directed in preserving and developing that individual capacity for service, that culture to which the 'old inhabitants' cling, as well as the culture of the 'new inhabitants,' and still leave a reserve power sufficient to care for the more limited culture ... of the easily forgotten 'aborigines.'" Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.246-247.
[185] *Ibid*, p.309.

It was a truly pan-Canadian vision for biculturalism and bilingualism – one that saw Canada as a potential example to a world of heterogeneous states.

More than anything, the books and their authors were important as a reflection of the 'cutting edge' ideas of the time. Their collective influence on the discourse of the interwar is noteworthy. *The Clash!* was intended to provide an "education" for "the general public." Publishing the book was something of a risk, given that its ideas were somewhat controversial for the time.[186] But it paid dividends. The book was accorded "generous reception ... in all parts of the world, but especially in Canada."[187] The first edition appeared in September 1918. By February 1919 it was in its sixth edition. Moore's book was so successful that even Bishop Fallon, Regulation 17's greatest cheerleader, came to view the author as a grave threat to public opinion in Ontario.[188] The success of Moore's book is important because it challenged prevailing British-Canadian prejudices and attacked the sacred cows of British-Canadian thought, and for this reason, many Anglo-Canadians were provoked into read it. Even if they did not agree with all of Moore's arguments, they were at least exposed to the very ideas that were necessary to rebuild the Francophone/Anglophone relationship. ACFÉO certainly welcomed the work. Its secretary, J. Edmond Cloutier, remarked that *The Clash!* and *Bridging the Chasm* "[ont] bien considérablement calmé les esprits et apaisé les passions," and had encouraged the ACFÉO to reach out to sympathetic Anglo-Canadians.[189] The French-language press also took notice.[190] In 1920, Moore's book was translated into French by

---

[186] See "Review of *The Clash*," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Dec. 1919), p.430.
[187] J.M. Dent, in Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.ii.
[188] "'Of one thing I am convinced, namely that the interests of the English-speaking Catholics of Ontario cannot safely be entrusted to Mr. W.H. Moore.'" Fallon to F.D.J. MacDonagh, London, 24 November 1926, in Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.230.
[189] Cloutier, *Quinze années de lutte! 1910-1925*, p.66.
[190] See, for instance, Omer Héroux, *Le Devoir*, 15 janvier 1921, p.1.

Le Devoir columnist Ernest Bilodeau as *Le choc*.[191] While Morley and Hawkes's books were not as commercially successful given their having been published on the heels of Moore's groundbreaking work, all three were widely read by Anglo- and French-Canadian intellectuals and academics.[192]

Moore and Hawkes, in particular, developed an influence on the political scene. Hawkes dutifully continued his lecturing and lobbying work with the BEL and other like-minded organizations, playing a role in the lobby against Regulation 17. He got involved with the Liberal Party, catching the attention of Prime Minister King, who came to believe that he was a man with "some very true ideas."[193] Hawkes became an influential party organizer, both federally and provincially. Moore, identified early on as a moderate Anglophone with a strong understanding of both cultural-linguistic communities, was persuaded to run for the federal Liberals in 1926. He lost the election, but went on to win in 1930, when King decided that he should take an even stronger role in party organization, and was re-elected in 1935 and 1940.[194] Moore's role was a sign of the changing times, and of the growing sympathetic view of Anglophones within the Liberal Party. Moreover, from 1918-onward, many of Moore's, Morley's, and Hawkes's ideas would be repeated by other Anglo-Canadian intellectuals, including, most notably, professional historians.

---

[191] William Henry Moore, *Le Choc: étude de nationalités*, traduit par Ernest Bilodeau (Montréal: Librairie Beauchemin, Ltée., 1920).
[192] See Roy, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, pp.287-288.
[193] WLMK Diaires, 20 November 1925.
[194] Parliament of Canada, "William Henry Moore," accessed 1 May 2011, www.parl.gc.ca. See also WLMK Diaries, 29 July 1930, and 8 August 1930.

Chapter IV: ANGLO-CANADIAN PROFESSIONAL HISTORIANS – REINTERPRETING CANADA'S PAST AS A FOUNDATION FOR RAPPROCHEMENT BETWEEN TWO FOUNDING COMMUNITIES

The post-WWI period witnessed a renewed interest in Canadian history. This included a renewed Anglo-Canadian interest in the history of French Canada. Alongside the old tales of James Wolfe, Isaac Brock, and John A. Macdonald, the revisited stories of Jacques Cartier, Samuel de Champlain, Louis-Joseph de Montcalm and George-Étienne Cartier came increasingly to inform the historical consciousness of a number of leading English-speaking intellectuals. For them, history could provide the sentimental glue that would keep the country together. They believed that it could serve to educate the Anglophone population about the distinct character of French Canada, and foster greater tolerance for the differences in outlook. An understanding of history could be used to dispel negative stereotypes and misperceptions. It could also be used to identify commonalities: shared experiences, ideas, and values.[1] Significantly, the work of Anglo-Canadian authors was followed closely by French-Canadian scholars, and much of it was warmly received.[2]

Initial changes in the English-language historiography

Understanding the evolution of a more moderate, inclusive Anglo-Canadian historiography in the interwar period requires an appreciation for the state of British-Canadian historiography before the Great War. On balance, nineteenth-century English-

[1] See Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History,* pp.43; Wright, *The Professionalization of History*, pp.52.
[2] See Roy, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, pp.287; Roy, *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, pp.28-29; Arthur Maheux, *Canadian Unity. What Keeps Us Apart?* (Québec: Université Laval, February 1944), pp.76.

language authors put forward a decidedly British version of the country's past. They tended to emphasize the glory of British military victories in Canada (over the French and Americans), the struggles and triumphs of British settlers (especially the Loyalists), the sound leadership of anti-French colonial authorities like Durham and Sydenham, and the stability inherent in the country's anti-democratic, Tory roots. In large part, these themes had been the product of a decidedly British cultural and ethnic sense of patriotism: "Loyalty to the colonial land of their birth imposed a long-term responsibility on patriot [historians]," explains Brook Taylor.[3]

Such an historiographical emphasis was necessarily done at the expense of Canada's French and Aboriginal past. If anything, the ongoing presence of French Canadians, notably but not exclusively in Quebec, posed a significant problem to "patriotic" British-Canadian historians in the 19th century whose preferred narrative traced Canada's evolution into a prosperous, British society.[4] Canada's true history of progress, then, began with the Conquest of 1759 and the arrival en masse of English-speaking immigrants. The Loyalist and British yeoman settler, who was intelligent, resourceful, industrious, and equipped with a strong sense of justice, self-government and liberty, lay in stark contrast to the hapless habitant, whose individualism had been suppressed by the secular and religious hierarchies of New France and a "priest-ridden" society after the Conquest. Authors like John McMullen, John Fennings Taylor, and Henri James Morgan lamented the fact that the French Canadians had not been rapidly assimilated after the Conquest due to the overly lenient British authorities. The *Quebec Act* and *Constitution Act* were especially regrettable for having guaranteed the long-term

[3] Taylor, *Promoters, Patriots, and Partisans*, p.267.
[4] *Ibid.*, p.115.

survival of a distinct French-Canadian community. The problem was, fortunately, reversed in 1841 with Lord Durham's *Act of Union*. The unfortunate collaboration of Baldwin and Lafontaine, and then Confederation, however, undid much of the Act's achievements by ensuring French-Canadian democratic representation and influence: first with the 'dual majority' principle, and then with a bilingual federal parliament and the restoration of a separate province with a French majority.[5]

There was little serious interest among British-Canadian historians in French-Canadian history until very late in the nineteenth century.[6] What really sparked this interest was the work of an American: Francis Parkman and his nine-volume *France and England in North America* (1865-1892). Still, "Parkman reinforced rather than altered received opinion in English Canada."[7] Parkman saw the struggle between Britain and France in North America as "a titanic engagement between Protestant individualism and Catholic authoritarianism," a battle between progress and backwardness.[8] Moreover, contemporary British-Canadian authors rarely exhibited the same level of interest in their treatment of historical New France and French Canada. To be sure, some commended individual heroes of New France or French Canada, but they had less to say about the society as a whole. William Kingsford, for instance, English-speaking Canada's first "national historian," who in the 1880s wrote what was until then the most complete English-language history of Canada, at times depicted the French Canadians of New France as wholly deprived, even depraved.[9] They were far better off under British,

---

[5] *Ibid.*, pp.156-160.
[6] With a handful of exceptions. See Wright, *The Professionalization of History*, pp.9-10.
[7] Taylor, *Promoters, Patriots and Partisans*, pp.259.
[8] Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, p.4.
[9] Jean-Jacques Defert and Claude Couture, *Récits du XIXe siècle. Structure et contenu du discours historiographique au Canada au XIXe siècle: Garneau, Kingsford, Rameau et Smith* (Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2009), p.15. See also William Kingsford, *The History of Canada*, Vol. 7 (Toronto:

Protestant rule, he surmised – New France had been entirely lacking in liberties, material progress, and intellectual and political sophistication. British benevolence (as opposed to French-Canadian perseverance) opened the door to all these things.[10]

Seeds of change, however modest, began to take root in the historiography leading up to the Great War as Anglo-Canadian history became increasingly professionalized. At Canada's major English-language universities history gained recognition as a distinct, specialized discipline. In 1894 George M. Wrong was appointed to the University of Toronto's newly created chair of history, and Queen's University's Adam Shortt began lecturing on the economic and social history of Canada. A year later, Charles W. Colby was appointed to McGill to teach history as a separate subject. Colby was more sympathetic to French Canadians' historical sense of place:

> 'The French-Canadian loves this land because he has taken root in it. He feels that his ancestors fought the savage and tamed the wilderness, without much help from outside. His face is not set toward France…. [He] had fixed [his] fortunes in the New World and meant to remain.'[11]

These and other historians began to place more emphasis on source-work, with the increased accessibility of archival collections and scholarly journals, like the *Canadian Historical Review*.[12] Wrong called for a more critical and professional history but, like Thomas Chapais and Arthur Maheux in French-speaking Canada, he did not believe history could be reduced to an exact science. It must be approached with a sense of detachment – events must be judged within the context of the times, and with an awareness of human nature. Like other moderate Anglo-Canadian intellectuals of the day,

---

Rowsell & Hutchison, 1887), p.11.
[10] Defert and Couture, *Récits du XIXe siècle*, pp.66-69; Taylor, *Promoters, Patriots and Partisans*, p.265.
[11] In Moore, *The Clash!*, p.243.
[12] See Taylor, *Promoters, Patriots and Partisans*, pp.3-4; Wright, *The Professionalization of History*, pp.28, 52; Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, p.13.

Wrong took inspiration from the late Catholic Cambridge scholar and advocate of pluralism, the Lord John Dalberg-Acton, who argued that historians must approach the past with impartiality, but also with a consciousness of the need to draw moral lessons. For him, explains Carl Berger, "the instructive role of history was akin to that of religion: to heal, to conciliate, and to brood over the mysteries of life."[13] The professionalization of Anglo-Canadian history intensified during the interwar years, notably with the formation of the Canadian Historical Association in 1922.[14] Even among non-professionals and in popular history, a narrative in which the historical perseverance of French-Canadian culture was seen as a 'good thing' began to emerge by the early 1930s.

Weaving French-Canadian history into a more sophisticated national narrative

Taken together, the changes in the historiography allowed for more sophisticated analyses of Canada's French past, as historical narratives gradually became less coloured by imperialist boosterism and assimilationist sentiment.[15] History was now being taught more seriously at higher levels of education, from a somewhat less ethno-centric perspective, and by individuals sympathetic to French Canada. Institutions like Wrong's University of Toronto required all graduate history students to learn either French or

[13] Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, p.15.
[14] Wright, *The Professionalization of History*, pp.65.
[15] William Moore, for instance, cited English historian-philosopher Thomas Buckle, who argued that the shape of a nationality is determined by a combination of "Climate, Food, Soil, and the General Aspects of Nature." According to Moore's interpretation, Canadians were distinct by virtue of their British and French heritage, but they were also unique by virtue of their shared experience in Canada. "There will develop a new nationality, and it will be neither French nor English; it will be Canadian. The Englishman fondly imagines that he can remain an Englishman in Canada, he and his children. But they cannot, according to Buckle, ... by the inexorable law of Nature.... The French-Canadian for years imagined himself nationally French…. [But] three hundred years have left the foundation of a new nationality which he himself has called Canadian." Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.236-237.

German.[16] Anglo-Canadian histories of Canada's French heritage became more numerous, and these more serious studies were not limited to the patronizing or derisive portrayals that often characterized the pre-war histories. While the pre-Conquest era received the greatest attention, several works included French-Canadian history *after* 1763 as well,[17] providing a narrative in which Francophones did not simply disappear into the background of the teleological Canadian story of progress.

Arthur Doughty, appointed National Archivist in 1903, gave early expression to the new interest in Canada's French heritage. During the 1920s he served as an occasional advisor to Prime Minister Mackenzie King.[18] As an Anglo-Quebecer, Doughty was troubled by the divergent historical narratives being put to Canadians, and believed that this could be corrected with a better understanding of the facts via archival research. He set about collecting huge swaths of documents from various archival collections in Canada, Britain and France.[19] In the 1920s, the document acquisition program accelerated and the National Archives was able to bring together historians young and old from across the country and give them access to both Canada's English- and French-language history.[20] A number of Anglo-Canadians were particularly interested in the latter. Graduate students and budding historians who flocked to the archives included the likes of A.L. Burt, an Albertan, who studied French-Canadian history and the origins of the conciliatory 1774 Quebec Act, J.B. Brebner, whose chief interest was Acadian history and British policy, and Arthur Lower, who would go on to write sympathetically of

[16] Wright, *The Professionalization of History*, p.57.
[17] By 1924, for instance, McGill offered a graduate course on Canadian history covering 1840-1867. *Ibid*., p.58.
[18] See D.B. MacRae to J.W. Dafoe, 29 October 1926, in Ramsay Cook, "A Canadian Account of the 1926 Imperial Conference," *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, vol. 3, no. 1, (1965), pp.54.
[19] Danielle Lacasse and Antonio Lechasseur, *Les Archives nationales du Canada, 1872-1997*, La Société historique du Canada, Brochure historique No. 58 (Ottawa 1997), p.6.
[20] *Ibid*., p.9.

Canada's French heritage and its bicultural future in his most famous work, *Colony to Nation* (1946).[21]

The context in which Anglo-Canadian historians were writing in the interwar lent itself to a more dualist interpretation of Canadian history. Like Moore, Morley, and Hawkes before them, many leading Anglophone academics were looking to define a more unique, indigenous Canadian identity and to distance themselves from the racialism and colonial mentality of pre-war British Canada (without divorcing themselves from the British political institutions and liberties that had given birth to Canadian parliamentary democracy). They were also acutely aware of the desperate need to repair Anglo-/French-Canadian relations and to adopt a liberal civic nationalism that could be both accessible and acceptable to Canada's two major cultural-linguistic communities.[22]

Under these circumstances, researching and writing about Canada's constitutional history and the winning of responsible self-government became all the rage after the war. This was in large part a response to the country's increased autonomy from and equality with Britain in international affairs.[23] Canada needed a reinvigorated historical narrative befitting its newfound constitutional status. Anxious to validate the constitutional achievements of the present, historians evoked the constitutional achievements of the past, presenting the country's history as one of (mostly) unbroken constitutional progress from 1791 onward. This narrative would prove more amenable to a sympathetic portrayal of French Canadians and their leadership, who had long advocated autonomy, and of historical Anglophone/Francophone partnerships. In contrast to much of the pre-war

[21] "'It is very interesting to see the actual renaissance of Canadian history in the course of preparation,'" Burt remarked in 1926. Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, p.29.
[22] See *Ibid*, pp.42-43.
[23] *Ibid*, pp.36, 42.

narrative, it entailed a celebration of moderate individuals from both cultural-linguistic communities, and favoured autonomists over imperialists.

Several Anglo-Canadian academics picked up on these themes after the war. Chester Martin, who succeeded Wrong at the University of Toronto in 1929, focussed on Canada's constitutional history and the moderate Anglophone/Francophone partnership that had helped advance Canadian self-government in the 1840s. He celebrated the fact that, despite the racial animus often prevalent in the country, it was the moderates who quietly persisted and effected true change, and not the noisy radicals who invoked violence. Constitutional evolution, not revolution, had allowed for more Canadian self-government and autonomy while maintaining flexible ties with the empire. French/English cooperation was central to this success.[24] W.P.M. Kennedy, an influential Irish-Canadian constitutional and legal scholar also from the University of Toronto, traced a similar evolution to Canadian self-government. Kennedy was an internationalist who warned against equating the state with ethnicity. Like Moore, Morley and Hawkes, he believed strongly in the advantages of diversity.[25] *Canadian Historical Review* editor W.S. Wallace was also a firm proponent of the idea that the country was home to both "'an English Canadian and a French Canadian'" nationality that shared a "'common fatherland, a common history.'"[26]

Anglo-Quebecer John Boyd would have agreed. The bilingual Boyd had been an enthusiastic supporter of the Bonne Entente League, even if he had been troubled by its initial failure. Born in Montreal to Scottish parents, Boyd rose to the position of

[24] For Martin, "the heroes of his history were the moderate reformers – Howe, Baldwin and Lafontaine, and Lord Elgin.... Martin noted that responsible government depended on bi-racial cooperation and that it was won by party." *Ibid*, p.36.
[25] *Ibid*, pp.40-42.
[26] In *Ibid*, pp.42-43.

alderman. As a prominent journalist for the Montreal *Gazette*, Toronto *Mail & Empire*, and other Canadian and American newspapers, Boyd became well known within the highest political circles in Canada.[27] Before, during, and after the war he wrote history, poetry, newspaper articles, pamphlets, and delivered lectures in defence of Canadian nationalism and in favour of Anglophone/Francophone unity.[28] Boyd was even honoured by the Saint-Jean-Baptiste Society for taking a hand in organizing its 75th anniversary celebrations.[29] He had an abiding interest in French-Canadian history – he considered the likes of Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine and Dollard-des-Ormeaux to be among the country's greatest heroes.[30] Among French Canadians, including Henri Bourassa, Boyd gained a reputation as a rare Anglophone who fully understood and defended French Canada, and who advocated for concord between the 'races.' During the war, he had been a voice of calm in a sea of storms: "John Boyd! Un nom clair et net, franc et sans dol, éclatant et sonore comme un coup de clarion," declared Montreal writer Sylva Clapin.[31] In

---

[27] See preface by Sylva Chapin in John Boyd, *Sir George-Étienne Cartier, Baronnet, Sa Vie Et Son Temps: Histoire politique du Canada de 1814 à 1873* (Montréal: Librairie Beauchemin, Ltée., 1918), traduction: Sylva Clapin.

[28] See, for instance, John Boyd, *Canadian nationalism, a speech delivered at* Le Devoir *dinner, Windsor Hotel, Montreal, 28 January 1911, to commemorate the first anniversary of the founding of* Le Devoir*'s newspaper* (Montreal: [s.n.], 1914); John Boyd, *The Nationalist Movement, An article written for the* Canadian Magazine, *January 1911* (Montreal: [s.n.], 1911); John Boyd, *Fair Play for the Province of Quebec* (Montreal: [s.n.], 1917); John Boyd, *The Greatness of Quebec: an address delivered to the Montreal Publicity Association* (Montreal: Librairie Beauchemin, 1919); John Boyd, *The future of Canada: Canadianism or Imperialism* (Montreal: Librairie Beauchemin, 1919); John Boyd, *Canada: an appeal for racial concord and national unity, speech delivered in proposing the toast of 'Canada' at the annual banquet of the St. Patrick's Society, Windsor Hotel, Montreal, 17 March 1920* (Montreal: Canadian National League, 1920).

[29] See Clapin in Boyd, *Sir George-Étienne Cartier, Sa Vie Et Son Temps*, p.vi.

[30] See John Boyd, *The death of Dollard and other poems* (Montreal: [s.n.], 1914). Boyd gave a speech about Dollard during the 250th anniversary celebrations of the martyr's death, 29 May 1910, at Place d'Armes in Montreal.

[31] Clapin continues: "Ce nom s'impose bien ... comme un appel que tous les Canadiens aimant sincèrement leur pays souhaitent entendre résonner d'un océan à l'autre, pour calmer les esprits, ramener parmi nous la concorde dont nous avons tant besoin, et surtout nous aider à constituer l'idéal vers lequel il nous faut tendre, c'est-à-dire un idéal réalisant l'union nécessaire des différentes races et religions constituant ce vaste Dominion." In Boyd, *Sir George-Étienne Cartier, Sa Vie Et Son Temps*, preface.

recognition of his efforts to educate Anglo-Canadians about the French-Canadian perspective, Clapin referred to Boyd as the "'Unificateur des Races'":

> Ses compatriotes reconnaissants, et en particulier ses compatriotes canadiens-français, lui ont décerné d'un commun accord pour ses efforts si méritoires et incessants dans l'oeuvre à laquelle il a maintenant pour ainsi dire attaché sa vie, et qui est celle de mieux faire connaître à ses compatriotes anglais ce que représente réellement, en somme, pour la prospérité et la grandeur de ce Dominion, l'apport et l'appui de la race française au Canada.[32]

Boyd became widely recognized for defending French Canada against the most vitriolic wartime attacks in the English-language Canadian and American presses, and for taking his message of "justice pour les Canadiens-Français" across Canada with speeches in Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, Winnipeg, Victoria, "et en maints autres endroits du Canada."[33] The greatest threat to Confederation, Boyd argued, was not French-Canadian disloyalty, but the loud minority of British-Canadian fanatics, the general lack of understanding of Canada's French history, and the abandonment of the Macdonald/Cartier ideals of liberalism and tolerance.[34]

Boyd believed that Canada's history was rife with inspiring examples of successful cross-cultural collaboration, "entre autre LaFontaine, Baldwin, Cartier, Macdonald, et de nos jours sir Wilfrid Laurier."[35] That history could provide inspiration to help change the present. In 1914, Boyd published a biography of George-Étienne Cartier.[36] Boyd saw Cartier as an historical hero who belonged to all Canadians,

---

[32] In *Ibid*., p.vi.
[33] In *Ibid*., p.vi.
[34] *Ibid*., p.xv. Writing in mid-1918, Boyd was convinced that the country was closer to the brink of collapse than at any other point in its history: "jamais, depuis l'établissement de la Confédération, les animosités de races et de provinces n'ont été aussi prononcées que dans le moment actuel. .... La faute ne doit certainement pas, en toute justice, en être attribuée aux Canadiens-Français. ... [Ils] ont été trop souvent en butte aux calomnies et à des attaque injustes."
[35] *Ibid*., p.xix.
[36] John Boyd, *Sir George-Étienne Cartier, Baronnet, His Life and Times: A Political History of Canada from 1814 to 1873* (Toronto: MacMillan, 1914).

regardless of background.[37] Moreover, Boyd wanted to educate Anglophones about the crucial contributions that Francophones had made to the country's constitutional development. "English-speaking Canadians in particular," Boyd wrote in the preface,

> would do well to remember that a great number of eminent French Canadians like Papineau, LaFontaine and Morin took for granted the political liberties of all Canadians, and they must never lose sight of the fact that this Dominion exists as it does today in large part because of a French Canadian.[38]

Boyd's work was the first major full-length biography of Cartier. In addition to providing Anglophone audiences with an early glimpse of Cartier's life and political contributions, it made available for the first time English-language translations of some of his most important speeches, notably those on Confederation. The acknowledgements section of Boyd's book provided a veritable 'who's who' list of the Anglo- and French-Canadian political and historiographical establishments of the day.[39]

The book was successful enough to merit a French-language edition, published in December 1918. Writing at the height of the Conscription Crisis, Boyd hoped that the book would serve as a reminder for French Canadians of the interest that some Anglo-Canadians took in French Canada and its history.[40] Boyd pointed to the success of the English-language edition as proof that "un grand nombre de Canadiens de langue anglaise" appreciated French Canada and its historical contributions.[41] The biography was also well received in French-speaking Canada. The province's Département de

---

[37] "La mémoire de George-Étienne Cartier est aujourd'hui l'héritage de tous les Canadiens." Author's preface to the English-language edition (translated), in Boyd, *Sir George-Étienne Cartier, Sa Vie Et Son Temps*, p.xxiv.
[38] Translated from the author's preface to the English-language edition. *Ibid.*, p.xxvi.
[39] See Boyd, *Sir George-Étienne Cartier, Sa Vie Et Son Temps*, p.xxviii. The list included Charles Tupper, Robert Borden, Wilfrid Laurier, Lomer Gouin, John Willison, Maxwell Aitken, Rodolphe Lemieux, F.D. Monk, T. Chase Casgrain, T.C. Chapais, Henri Bourassa, A.G. Doughty, and David Ross McCord.
[40] *Ibid*., p.xviii.
[41] "[Les] Canadiens de langue anglaise, éclairés par l'histoire et par les faits, reconnaîtront que les Canadiens-Français, ... offrent un exemple qui pourrait être suivi avec profit par tous les Candiens." *Ibid*., p.xx.

l'Instruction publique even gave out copies of the book to reward promising young students.[42] Boyd received letters of endorsement from Cardinal Bégin, Archbishop Bruchési, and Quebec Premier Gouin. Bruchési believed that it was the duty of "chacun de nos historiens" to understand that "le meilleur moyen de consolider le lien qui doit unir les deux éléments fondamentaux du peuple canadien, c'est encore de reconnaître les qualités réelles de chacun d'eux, de ne jamais exagérer leurs défauts, de ne leur prêter aucun travers!" For Gouin, Boyd's book provided encouragement at a time when national unity was in doubt: "pour ne jamais perdre l'esprit du pacte fédératif, il convient de relire la pensée qui l'a inspiré."[43]

Although not an historian, *per se*, John Squair was another influential scholar promoting rapprochement. The long-serving University of Toronto French-language professor had been an enthusiastic member of the BEL and later joined the Unity League of Ontario. He was driven in part by an anxiety over the country's future should cross-cultural misunderstanding and animosity persist.[44] Above all, he implored the English-speaking public to embrace tolerance: "Canada's race difficulties will be solved 'not by might nor by power' but by the tolerant spirit."[45] From a young age, Squair had studied French out of a belief that it was his "duty to be able to understand his fellow countrymen through their language."[46] Squair had worked with the Ontario Education Association, and had nothing but praise for the Quebec education system, which had been criticized by those who tried to justify Ontario's suppression of French-language instruction. Like

---

[42] See front cover insert in *Ibid*., copy held in collection of Michael Behiels, Ottawa.
[43] *Ibid*., pp.vii-xii.
[44] LAC, GP, MG30-C11 Vol. 1, Squair to Godfrey, June 23, 1916.
[45] In Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, foreword.
[46] C.D. Rouillard et al., "French Studies at the University of Toronto: 1853-1993," (University of Toronto, n.d.), accessed 1 May 2011, http://french.chass.utoronto.ca/dept-of-french/history/ (1 May 2011), ch.1; Roy, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, pp.287-288.

Moore, Morley, and Hawkes, he preferred "the Franco-Canadian dialect," having studied it after developing an affinity for its unique expressions and accents while living among Franco-Ontarians and in Quebec.[47] Canadian French was a part of *all* Canadians' heritage, he told Anglophones, a thing to take pride in as it set the country apart. Squair lamented the fact that prejudicial attitudes had been inculcated in students from an early age, and were therefore difficult to overcome. He called for greater interaction among youth in particular. Anglo-Canadians, especially, needed to get to know their fellow countrymen:

> 'They might go to Quebec and take lessons in French, with great profit. French-speaking students, although they need intercourse with us less than we need it with them, often come to us and take courses in engineering, law, or medicine. May more of our English-speaking students learn to reciprocate!'[48]

Like Moore, Morley and Hawkes, Squair held up bilingualism as the answer to Canada's national unity problems.[49]

Squair's colleague and perhaps the most important of the early interwar Anglo-Canadian academics preoccupied with the national unity question was the Anglican Reverend and University of Toronto professor, George M. Wrong. An admirer of Wilfrid Laurier, Wrong had been interested in Canada's French history since before the Great War. His interests had been piqued as a result of vacationing north of the Quebec City, where he became acquainted with local priests and guides. Wrong was also inspired by the works of Francis Parkman, and by his friendships with J. Edmond Roy, the Assistant Archivist at Ottawa, and Church historian Abbé A.H. Gosselin. These experiences had

---

[47] Morgan, *Canadian Men and Women of the Time*, p.1053. See also LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, Godfrey, "History of the Bonne Entente," p.13; and *Le Devoir*, October 10, 1916, p.2.

[48] "'[A]rrogant forms of prejudice have taken root amongst us, which have told us that fellow-Canadians did not speak good French.'" In Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.156.

[49] "'[I]f today we had in Ontario as many English-Canadians who spoke French as there are French-Canadians in Quebec who speak English, our racial troubles would vanish into thin air.'" In *Ibid*., p.158.

cultivated an appreciation for the stability of French Canada's social and religious order, and for the hard-working habitants and the French-Canadian working class. "'They are sober and industrious; their family life is pure; they are prudent and frugal in their habits,'" Wrong explained. In spite of their limited means, he continued, "'most of the people live in comfort and they enjoy life – enjoy it probably much more than would an Anglo-Saxon community of the same type.'"[50] Wrong believed that Parkman had not gone far enough in displaying a genuine appreciation for French-Canadian society. Parkman, he explained, described French-Canadians as "'a priest-ridden folk, ignorant, lacking virility, and ineffective as colonizers.'"[51] This was not why New France had fallen, Wrong argued, for the people themselves had been virtuous and hard-working settlers. The fault lay with the colonial authorities, whose tyranny and corruption spelled disaster for the settlement. Such a presentation of historical French-Canadian society could only help to dispel some of the negative stereotypes that prevailed among Anglophones in 1918.

Wrong's writing on French-Canadian history increased significantly after the war, taking on a new urgency in light of Anglo-/French-Canadian relations. Like Squair, Wrong had taken an active role in the BEL and in advocating for French and English equality in Quebec and at the federal level.[52] Wrong saw the existence of a French culture within Canada as a decided advantage, providing Anglo-Canadians with access to one of the greatest branches of European civilization. He believed that English-speaking Canadians, above all, were in desperate need of being enlightened about the 'other.' A

[50] In Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, p.19.
[51] In *Ibid*., p.20.
[52] See LAC, GP, MG30-C11 Vol. 2, Godfrey, "History of the Bonne Entente," p.17; Morgan, *Canadian Men and Women of the Time*, pp.1189-1190; George Wrong, "The Bilingual Question," *The New Era in Canada*, ed. J.O. Miller (Toronto, 1917).

devout Christian, Wrong even asserted that Anglo-Canadians could learn a thing or two from the Quebec experience about inculcating religious values from an early age.[53]

Wrong had been a committed imperialist before the war. By 1918-1919, like many other Anglo-Canadian intellectuals, he had become something of a Canadian autonomist. Wrong rejected the race theory that separated British and French Canadians. There was "no mysterious power in race, ... but rather differing cultures, educations, and traditions."[54] An understanding of the history and the contexts within which those distinctions had developed would serve to remove what had theretofore been perceived as irreconcilable differences. The two peoples could also benefit from more positive interaction with each other.

In Montreal in May 1925, Wrong delivered the keynote address to the annual meeting of the fledgling Canadian Historical Association, entitled "The Two Races in Canada." Throughout, he repeated several of the themes present in the writings of Moore, Morley, and Hawkes. Like them, Wrong rejected notions of racial superiority or a "master race." This was in significant part the product of post-war disillusionment with Social Darwinism and the ethnically homogeneous nation-state. In the Canadian context, it entailed a rejection of the racial-imperialist nationalism of the pre-war that had favoured a culturally, linguistically and ethnically exclusive British Canada. In keeping with his methodological preferences, Wrong asserted that a neutral "scientific method," free of passion, was necessary to analyze the touchy English/French 'problem' with objectivity.[55]

---

[53] Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, pp.18-19.
[54] *Ibid*., p.20.
[55] Wrong, "The Two Races in Canada," p.5.

Wrong echoed the call for a more inclusive, pluralistic Canadian patriotism – what was by now becoming a more common theme. Like Moore, Morley and Hawkes, he rejected equating the nation with the state. Wrong applied his preferred version of history to prove his point. Several states, past and present, he argued, did not have uniformity of language or religion, including Britain. "History has thus demonstrated that there may be a variety of nationalities within a single nation."[56] Wrong set out what he believed to be "necessary to create for Canada a united patriotism":

> This patriotism cannot be based on a single language; it cannot be based upon outward unity in religion, but it can be based on something deeper than even these – on liberty which is man's natural right; and on its children which are toleration and magnanimity. Canada has the germs of a new type of society combining in a common patriotism the culture which England and France have produced in Europe. Neither element can alter the unchangeable past. Their traditions and their culture are unlike. Neither element should be asked to abandon anything which it values in respect of its outlook upon life. To develop such a new type is a hard task…. Yet nature herself has creative vigour and she is working to produce a united Canadian nation from the two elements which reflect the richest culture of Europe.[57]

In short, Canada's diversity was what gave it its potential greatness – it was an unequivocal rejection of pre-war ethnic British-Canadian nationalism. Neither people would have to give up their distinct character or identity. The new, civic patriotism for Canada would have to be based on shared values and principles, such as liberty and pluralism, and take advantage of those strengths that both peoples brought to the table.

It was up to historians, Wrong explained, to identify what Anglo-Canadians and French Canadians shared in common. Both, for example, had experienced for generations a similar environment, including climate, physical surroundings, and occupations.

---

[56] *Ibid*, p.3.
[57] *Ibid*, p.14.

History also pointed to a common Celtic and Norman ancestry, descended from northern peoples.[58] For Wrong, the historical implications for the present were significant:

> There is in reality no barrier of race to keep the English and the French apart in Canada: the two peoples are identical in racial origins. Since in Canada they live together in the same scene there are not differences of environment. The differences are those of education and tradition. There is no mysterious gulf of race to be bridged.[59]

In addition, Anglo- and French Canadians had a shared political history and attachment to British parliamentary government. To that end, they had long demonstrated a common desire to resist absorption into the US. The very recent history of having won for Canada a measure of autonomy and a place on the world stage as a result of the war also held out the promise of achieving a shared national identity: "The status of at least theoretical equality with Great Britain consummated as a result of the great war makes it easier for the two peoples to feel a common loyalty based upon national self respect."[60]

For Wrong, fostering the new, shared identity required a lessening of *British*-Canadian nationalism. It was a significant concession, given Wrong's imperialist leanings before the war. He was optimistic that this change was already well underway: "In Canada 'Loyalty to France' is an empty phrase and 'Loyalty to England' is, I fancy, going rapidly the same way." The phrase was "inappropriate on the lips of a Canadian.[61] Only a few "eccentric Anglo-Canadians," Wrong maintained, "would like to seem English." Theirs was an immature sentimentalism, "the folly of youth." He hoped it would "give way to riper wisdom."[62]

---

[58] *Ibid*, pp.4-5.
[59] *Ibid*, p.5.
[60] *Ibid*, p.12. This statement came a year before the Balfour Declaration of 1926.
[61] *Ibid*, pp.11-12.
[62] *Ibid*, p.12.

Wrong warned against the heavy hand of intolerance. It was not only the oppression of French-language rights that must be stopped, but also the stereotyping and insults directed at French-Canadian culture: "there is suffering in the intolerant spoken word, often the unconsciously intolerant word, which belittles and sneers at that which others hold dear."[63] Moreover, leniency and understanding were far more likely to achieve national unity than repression. Recent and historical experience had demonstrated as much. The relative leniency of British authorities toward French Canadians in the late eighteenth century was an example to follow – a lesson that Anglophone historians would repeat during the interwar.[64]

Wrong believed that a 'new' reading of Canadian history was necessary to pave the way to mutual tolerance and understanding. The old, boastful and bombastic historiography of the past, "which is largely centred in victories over the other," must be abandoned. The abuse of history to serve a contemporary agenda of belligerence had been especially apparent in English-speaking Canada:

> The masses link their patriotism with historical incidents which come to have an almost sacred character. The English element in Canada rejoices in the victory of Wolfe on the Plains of Abraham and honours Lord Durham as the most enlightened interpreter in the nineteenth century of Colonial needs. The French element sees otherwise. … Lord Durham … hoped for the extinction of their separate nationality.[65]

Wrong was particularly critical of those who lamented that the French Canadians had not been forcibly assimilated after the Conquest.[66]

Canadian history, Wrong argued, had proved that racial superiority was a myth and that assimilation had failed. All peoples believed in their own superiority in one way

---

[63] *Ibid*, p.13.
[64] *Ibid*, p.13.
[65] *Ibid*, p.11.
[66] Wrong, "The Two Races in Canada," p.13.

or another – Aboriginal, French, and British Canadians had all scorned each other in their own fashion.[67] Wrong pointed out how, in 1760, the British had ignorantly assumed that the French Canadians would voluntarily assimilate to the Protestant faith and the English language and culture. The Great War itself had demonstrated that minorities did not so easily give in to forced assimilation.[68] With an admiration bordering on pride – as though it was a part of *his* inherited history too – Wrong described the tenacity French Canadians had demonstrated in 150 years of coexistence with British Canadians:

> Latent in the French character is a tenacity of purpose fiercely aroused by adverse pressure. .... When … the tie with France was broken, the Canadians had to learn to rely upon themselves alone. …. Separated from France they would remain French and cling to the language, the social customs, the laws, [and] the religion [69]

Against all odds, the French Canadians had carved out a place for themselves in Confederation. Wrong was hopeful that French Canadians were finally overcoming the imbalance of wealth and opportunity that had long favoured British Canadians: "What Tocqueville called equality of conditions makes for unity. It is no longer true that in Canada the English alone have wealth with its possible attitude of superiority. There are French-Canadian millionaires."[70] French Canadians had earned their designation as one of the two founding peoples. Wrong was optimistic that assimilationist attitudes were falling into disfavour as archaic and cruel, at least in educated circles. The reality was that Canada's French fact was there to stay.[71]

---

[67] "When the Europeans first came to Canada the native races considered themselves equal or superior to those of Europe. …. Crossing the sea to Canada we find the Englishman despising the French-Canadian as an inferior people, and we find the French-Canadian in return consoling himself by the reflection that ... he had gifts which made him the real superior, a culture, a faith, a love of the things of the soul and of the home which gave him the deeper insight into the real value of life." *Ibid*, p.6.
[68] "[N]othing stirs more deeply the resolve of a people … than to try to check the use of their language.... Russia and Prussia might well have learned that lesson in Poland." *Ibid*, p.13.
[69] *Ibid*, p.6.
[70] *Ibid*, p.13.
[71] *Ibid*, p.13.

Wrong told his CHA audience that Anglo-Canadians must understand the historical roots of French-Canadian fears of assimilation. Low immigration, three hundred years of insular history, and 150 years cut off from France, had made them a tight-knit group, naturally apprehensive about their survival. Moreover, they were constantly reminded of their minority status – Canada operated mostly in English, British Canadians were wealthier, and English was everywhere, at work, in government, in print, on signage, on the radio, and now in film. As such, their aversion to majority rule and their strong attachment to their language and traditions were understandable, even commendable.[72] But Wrong was hopeful that Francophones would be able to broaden their horizons in Canada once Anglophones learned French or at least accepted French-Canadian culture.

For Wrong, cooperation and mutual understanding were the keys to national unity. Like Moore, Morley, and Hawkes before him, Wrong called for more positive interaction.[73] He provided an historical example: the Union of the Canadas. When forced to live and work together, Canadians discovered that they had more in common than they had thought, and managed to achieve a positive partnership.[74] The chief problem of the present was *British*-Canadian ignorance and insularity.

Ontarians were especially in need of coming into contact with their French-Canadian neighbours and escaping their narrow worldview. Not without his own conceit,

---

[72] "The French-speaking Canadian lives under a federal parliament in which English is usually spoken; the head of the state represents the British monarch; the great industries, the railways and other public utilities of his province, are largely under the control of English-speaking people. Thus we have the two states of mind: a numerous English-speaking element barely conscious that the French exist; a French element devoted to its own traditions but daily made aware that it constitutes a minority in the national life." *Ibid*, p.9.

[73] "[T]he two chief causes of antagonism are the lack of the friendly intercourse which leads to mutual understanding and, following upon this, the dread of absorption which is natural to a minority conscious of its own achievements and rights." *Ibid*, p.11.

[74] *Ibid*, pp.7-8.

Wrong counted himself among "the cultivated few who [had] develop[ed] the imagination needed to understand the point of view of others." But he took heart in the fact that in recent years "in English-speaking Canada, a considerable number of writers have studied carefully and expressed sympathy with the outlook of the French-Canadians."[75] Mercifully, the Anglo-Canadian mentality showed signs of change. The success of French-Canadian-inspired literature, such as Louis Hémon's novel, *Maria Chapdelaine* (1913), pointed to a burgeoning interest in French-Canadian culture. (Wrong hoped that French-Canadian writers might develop an equally romantic view of historic Upper Canada.[76]) But it was still up to the cultivated few to propel change among the masses: "The most serious aspect of the problem of the two races in Canada is that of leading these English-speaking people to understand the outlook of the French race occupying the valley of the St. Lawrence."[77] The first olive branch, then, must be genuine and sincere, and it must come from English-speaking Canada: "almost none of the French have … endeavour[ed] to find points of sympathy with the outlook of the English-speaking element. If this is regrettable, it is also entirely natural. The people in a beleaguered fortress are not likely to send out friendly enquiries to justify the point of view of their assailants." Even then, it would take great patience, and time: "no easy solution is possible," Wrong advised his audience.[78]

Wrong's histories of New France and Canada that he wrote during the interwar years reflected the themes put forward in his 1925 address to the CHA. Overall, his

---

[75] *Ibid*, p.10.
[76] "We may hope that some day a French Canadian writer will discover romance on an Ontario farm all unnoticed by those familiar with the apparent commonplace of its daily life. This would make for unity." *Ibid*, p.12.
[77] *Ibid*, p.9.
[78] *Ibid*, pp.10-11.

supportive treatment of Canada's French history and of cross-cultural relations differed from the narratives that had been published by other Anglophones before the war. To be sure, Wrong expressed some 'typical' British-Canadian views; for instance, the French Canadians had been denied democratic traditions by France and had thus benefited from British rights and liberties.[79] But on balance, he provided a highly sympathetic portrayal that, while avoiding being hagiographic, celebrated the French-Canadian capacity for survival. Wrong concluded that France had failed the people, and not the reverse.[80]

Two works are examined in some detail here. Wrong's *The Rise and Fall of New France*, published in two volumes in 1928, was the culmination of his decades of study of the Ancien Régime, and arguably the most important work on New France by any Anglo-Canadian during the interwar. *The Canadians: The Story of a People*, a popular history published in 1938, is also considered here. It provides a glimpse at Wrong's views by the end of the period and places his interpretation of French-Canadian history in the larger context of English/French relations and Canadian history generally.[81]

Wrong celebrated the role of early French explorers, settlers, and heroes. He praised the settlers' tenacity, sense of adventurism, and courage. The Jesuits and religious martyrs like Brébeuf were praised for having 'civilized' North America at great personal cost. The religious zeal and generous spirit of Marie de l'Incarnation and the Ursulines also won commendation. Dollard des Ormeaux was portrayed as a typically courageous

---

[79] See George Wrong, *The Rise and Fall of New France*, Vols. 1 & 2 (Toronto: The MacMillan Co. of Canada, Ltd., 1928), pp.658-660.

[80] "French leaders and French policy had been futile; but France's enemies have too often made the mistake of ignoring the unquenchable vitality of her people." *Ibid*, p.875.

[81] French-Canadian historian Gustave Lanctot praised the book for being "plutôt destiné au grand public qu'à l'élite des spécialistes. ...l'ouvrage renferme un excellent aperçu du passé canadien. ...il est solide de substance, et excelle par sa rédaction vivante, agréable et colorée." Gustave Lanctot, *Les historiens d'hier et l'histoire d'aujourd'hui* (Toronto: Canadian Historical Association, 1941), p.12.

courreur des bois, whose heroic sacrifice had saved Montreal.[82] Several local colonial authorities, too, were the subject of praise. Jacques Cartier was a "master-pilot," Samuel de Champlain a great Canadian whose ingenuity and diplomacy with Aboriginal peoples made the establishment of a colony possible. Laval was a great colonial organizer and educator, Jean Talon an administrative genius. Frontenac was among the most heroic figures of all, courageously resisting the pressure to surrender to the English.[83] Montcalm, despite his ultimate defeat, Wrong presented as a cunning figure, an adept military leader and a man of courage, a true hero. Wrong took care to note Montcalm's affinity for Canada itself. While British figures involved in the capture of Canada were also generally portrayed in a positive light, Wrong drew some attention to the harshness of their tactics and treatment of the habitants.[84]

In addition to the usual military and political history, *The Rise and Fall of New France* included several chapters that explored such themes as relations with First Nations, the role of the Church and religious orders, economic structure, the feudal system, the habitants' way of life and culture, and social structure. Wrong brought several primary and secondary sources to bear, including a significant number of works written by Francophone authors.[85] Moreover, his presentation lay in stark contrast to the one-dimensional studies common among British-Canadian authors of the pre-war and nineteenth century. For instance, while the French court garnered little commendation, Wrong explained that they had strategic reasons for focusing on European continental

[82] See Wrong, *The Rise and Fall of New France*, pp.269, 294, 315, 881.
[83] See *Ibid*, pp.46, 168-196, 343, 352, 381, 434.
[84] *Ibid*, pp.789, 824, 837.
[85] Among those authors consulted were F.X. Garneau, Hector Garneau, E. Salone, B. Sulte, as well as Anglophones like L.J. Burpee. See *Ibid*, pp.481. Camille Roy praised Wrong's scholarship. See Roy, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, pp.294.

interests instead of the colonies.[86] Wrong also defended New France's much-maligned brand of feudalism, calling it "not unsuited to pioneer work."[87]

What emerges in Wrong's work is a desire to appropriate French-Canadian history as *Canadian* history. It was a far cry from old assertions that true Canadians were English-speaking, or that Canada's true history began in 1759, and not 1608. Wrong presented French Canadians as the first Canadians. His section on "Nationalism in Canada" portrayed French-Canadians' growing self-awareness as the birth of pan-Canadian nationalism.[88] Wrong exhibited pride in French-Canadian accomplishments, notably in the opening up of western Canada:

> [They] knew native ways and native thought and were better liked than the more aloof English. In time the French pushed far west into regions where ... no Englishman had ever been. In time they so intermarried with the natives that in later years *Métis*, or half-breeds, played a conspicuous part in the history of the prairie country. The map of the Canadian West is still dotted with French names. *Chansons* which had crossed the sea form old France were heard on the prairie, and the natives learned to admire ... the gaiety, the good humour, and the endurance of the hardy *voyageurs*.[89]

English-language works like those of Wrong opened up Anglo-Canadians to the notion that this, too, was part of their history.

While taking more ownership over the successes of New France, Wrong also drew attention to some of the excesses committed against the people of New France by the British. Chief among these was the Acadian expulsion. Wrong provided much of the usual context to be found in other English-language histories, explaining dispassionately

---

[86] See Wrong, *The Rise and Fall of New France*, pp.352, 434, 880-881.
[87] *Ibid*, pp.397.
[88] "[L]ong before the final fall of New France the nationalism of Canada was asserting itself against even the mother-land." *Ibid*, pp.658-659.
[89] *Ibid*, pp.688-689. Wrong goes on, cataloguing the exploits of d'Iberville, LaVérendrye, "The imaginative French mind," the "fine tradition of brave men who had gone ever farther into the west." Pp. 687, 739.

the British rationale for the expulsion.[90] But he made no mistake about its injustice. The Acadians were *not* responsible for their own misfortune. They were innocent, caught in the middle of two warring great powers – they had every reason to insist on remaining neutral. The deportation was deplorable, a tragedy and a disaster of the highest order. Wrong provided all the harsh detail of the expulsion – the arrests, the burning of homes and belongings, the breakup of families, the disease, malnutrition, cold and countless deaths, and the near-destruction of a society that had taken 150 years of hard work to build: "in retrospect, the removal of the Acadians is so shocking as to cause the charge that in British history it ranks in cruelty with the [Huguenot] massacre of St. Bartholomew in French history." Moreover, The British Empire missed the opportunity of winning for itself a well-organized and productive society of potential subjects, much like their French-Canadian neighbours.[91] The main perpetrator, Colonel Charles Lawrence, was paranoid, "stern," "insolent," "an irascible man" who gave the Acadians an impossible choice when he demanded they take the oath of loyalty and then "inflict[ed] suffering and death" when they refused. Massachusetts Governor William Shirley, who led the campaign of terror up the Saint John River, had been driven by greed and fanatical Protestantism, bent on converting the Acadians and stealing their land for New England settlers.[92]

While taking nothing away from the heinous nature of the act, Wrong told the story of the Acadian expulsion in a way that allowed Anglo-Canadian readers to understand the tragedy as part of their shared history and incorporate it into a larger

---

[90] *Ibid*, pp.662, 761.
[91] "They had no great devotion to France, which had neglected them; and, left to themselves, they would have settled down quietly under British rule as did soon the French in Canada. …. [E]xperience taught them to suspect both French and English." *Ibid*, pp.773-774.
[92] *Ibid*, pp.764-780.

Canadian historical narrative. He largely absolved the British Crown and instead blamed individual actors and, most of all, the New Englanders in the Halifax Legislative Council who had pushed for full deportation.[93] Conveniently, this meant that Americans were mostly to blame – the deportation was an injury against Canada. Wrong made a direct comparison with the later expulsion of the Loyalists to Nova Scotia:

> Just twenty years after Lawrence expelled the Acadians, a fleet of boats sailed out of Boston harbour carrying many hundreds of its citizens who had been forced to abandon their homes and property, and, weeping and poverty-stricken, were going into exile to Nova Scotia. .... [These] thirty-five thousand loyalists [had been] driven from their houses by revolution in the English colonies, and with a sense of injury against the new republic as deep as that which the Acadians, whose lands they occupied, felt against the British.[94]

Such a telling of the story would doubtless have appealed to British-Canadian sensibilities (however dubious it might have seemed to Acadians). But Wrong was careful to remind his readers that the bitter memory of the injustice committed against the Acadians while under the British flag lived on their hearts – it, along with the excesses committed by Wolfe's troops along the St. Lawrence in 1759, was an historical injury that Anglo-Canadians must acknowledge in the interests of national unity.[95]

Wrong's final assessment of the British capture of Canada was nuanced. He was careful to point out that by surrendering to Britain, the French Canadians had given up none of their rights to their language, religion, and legal traditions.[96] Moreover, the history of French Canada did not simply end in 1760 and give way to British Canada: rather, it continued as a central thread of the national story. Wrong concluded *The Rise*

---

[93] *Ibid*, pp.772.
[94] *Ibid*, p.783.
[95] "The dispersion is ... an important episode in the life of the young nation which French and English later united to make. [I]n the maritime provinces of Canada, to which many Acadians in the end returned, the bitter sense of injury endures."*Ibid*, pp.782-783.
[96] "The treaty confirmed to the Canadians all the rights which Amherst had promised at the surrender of Montreal.... their language, their religion and their laws." *Ibid*, p.763.

and Fall of New France with a wistful, almost lamentful speculation of what a more strongly-supported New France would have looked like had it survived, "making French half of North America."[97]

Wrong's *The Canadians: The Story of a People* (1938) marked an attempt, implicit in its title, to draw together French- and Anglo-Canadian history. It was a general history, not overly long, and intended for a wide audience. The New France period figured prominently, occupying nearly half of the book as a condensed version of Wrong's *The Rise and Fall of New France*. Among other things he remarked on Ontario's French history, and once again spoke of the "barbarous" Acadian deportation.[98] Succeeding chapters emphasized how early British accommodation of French-Catholic rights had been rewarded with French-Canadian loyalty during the American War of Independence. French/English cooperation was a central theme. Wrong was highly critical of Lord Durham and his infamous Report. Only five months in the country, Wrong explained, Durham showed contempt for French Canadians and underestimated their will to survive. Once again, Wrong's pride in this French-Canadian story of tenacity was evident:

> To him they seemed to have no literature and no history. Not yet had the English-speaking world learned the vivid story of explorers, missionaries, and martyrs in New France, given to it later in the brilliant pages of Francis Parkman. The Canadians felt pride in the heroisms of their history. This fortified their sense of nationality. To the depths of their being they were French in social outlook, however much they might ... value their liberty under British rule.[99]

---

[97] *Ibid*, p.884.
[98] George Wrong, *The Canadians. The Story of a People* (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1938), pp.420, 424.
[99] *Ibid*, p.301.

Despite Durham's designs, Wrong pointed out, French Canadians remained, one hundred years later, "a living force in the life of Canada."[100]

Moreover, they had achieved this status by forging partnerships with moderate British Canadians. The example of Lafontaine and Baldwin, on the heels of Durham's lamentable Report, provided great inspiration. Together, two men had managed to create a liberal and progressive government that the colonial authorities had no choice but to accept:

> Accordingly, [Governor Bagot] invited Lafontaine to form a ministry in cooperation with Baldwin. Then, for the first time in its history, Canada had a cabinet with, it should be noted, at its head as prime minister a French Canadian, supported by a large majority of French and English members in the Assembly. The little city of Kingston thus became the scene of a victory for popular government that was of moment for the whole colonial empire.[101]

The success of this development, Wrong explained, created a Canadian political tradition, witnessed in the partnerships of Brown and Dorion, and Macdonald and Cartier. Wrong described it as an example of cross-cultural collaboration unprecedented in the modern world.[102] Confederation provided a similarly inspiring example of English/French cooperation in Wrong's estimation. He asserted that the French Canadians had secured for themselves important cultural, religious, and educational rights, including in Ontario.[103] Wrong's treatment of Laurier continued the narrative of French-Canadian leadership in the country's constitutional evolution. Laurier's quest for Canadian autonomy within the Commonwealth was the subject of an entire chapter. The Great

---

[100] "He failed to realize the tenacity of the French character. .... The French are ... a living force in the life of Canada." *Ibid*, p.302.
[101] *Ibid*, p.315.
[102] "Celt and Saxon in Ireland, German, Slav, and Magyar in Austria, were hardly more irreconcilable than French and English in Canada. Yet now that the Canadians had self-government, they had to unite to keep a cabinet in office." *Ibid*, p.335.
[103] "Cartier, a man of imperious will, was the driving force that won the support of the French, on the condition of safeguards for their French and Catholic culture." *Ibid*, p.345.

War, by contrast, was the focus of only a few pages (the Conscription Crisis received no treatment at all). Wrong was more concerned with describing the war as completing Laurier's vision for Canadian sovereignty.[104]

Wrong's final chapter in *The Canadians* turned from the past to the present. Canada's diversity was here to stay: "Like Britain herself, Canada can never have unity of race."[105] History itself had proved that French Canada was here to stay. Wrong went to great lengths to explain why Francophone Canadians would not "let themselves be absorbed by the culture of an English-speaking continent."[106] They had earned their place in all of Canada as the country's first (white) explorers, missionaries and settlers. Finding themselves at present in a sea of Anglophones, he explained, they were understandably apprehensive – resentful even – of their minority status in a land that had once been their own preserve.[107] Making an observation that, by 1938, seemed more pressing than ever before, Wrong looked to Canada's French heritage as the country's most distinguishing characteristic, and its best means of protection against the culturally homogenizing influences of the United States.[108] Wrong dedicated several paragraphs to describing the enduring connection of Canada's French-Catholic society, especially in Quebec, to its history, language, culture and traditions. He acknowledged that in many cases the divide between English and French, and the dearth of familiarity, persisted. But there was cause for optimism. Wrong noted that ever-growing numbers of Anglo-Canadians had come into contact with Canada's French heritage through tourism. The national capital, he

---

[104] See *Ibid*, pp.386, 405.
[105] *Ibid*, p.414.
[106] *Ibid*, p.433.
[107] "They will not let themselves be absorbed by the culture of an English-speaking continent. .... They never forget that the French were pioneers of civilization in Canada, and this not only in the east but in the west. .... They founded Canada and have the first right to be called Canadians." *Ibid*, pp.433-434.
[108] *Ibid*, p.411.

asserted, was finally coming into its own bilingualism: "At Ottawa we realize that Canada is bilingual."[109] Moreover, Canada could only benefit from its cultural duality, "the two most advanced cultures of Europe."[110]

Wrong's influence during the interwar period among the Anglo-Canadian intellectual élite, and even among the public, was considerable. In the early 1920s the Ontario Department of Education commissioned his *Canada: A Short History* for schools across the province. The work was illustrated by C.W. Jeffreys, and edited by Ryerson Press's Lorne Pierce. The three "shared the same vision of Canadian history as epic, heroic and stirring, the same desire to excite Canadians about their history, and to bring together French and English in Canada."[111] Wrong was a regular on the lecture circuit, including at Canadian Clubs where he promoted the idea that Canada could indeed be home to a "nationality within a nation."[112] Several of Wrong's students would go on to become leaders in the Anglo-Canadian community, including future National Liberal Federation president and Governor General Vincent Massey, and accomplished historians like W.P.M. Kennedy, Chester Martin, Frank H. Underhill, A.R.M. Lower, John Bartlet Brebner, and Donald G. Creighton.[113] Brebner studied Acadian history, and Kennedy, Martin and Lower, in particular, promoted Anglophone/Francophone understanding.

Alfred Leroy Burt was another professional Anglo-Canadian historian of the interwar period who studied Canada's French history. A graduate of the University of

---

[109] "In the spacious Parliament House, French and English unite to carry on the national affairs of Canada.... in French or English." *Ibid*, pp.423-425.
[110] "Most modern nations have a racial problem. England has Celtic Ireland. .... The United States has the difficult problem of the negro." *Ibid*, p.433.
[111] Sandra Campbell, "From Romantic History to Communications Theory: Lorne Pierce as Publisher of C.W. Jefferys and Harold Innis," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 30, 3 (Fall 1995), p.98.
[112] George Wrong, "Problems Issuing From Confederation," *Addresses Delivered Before the Canadian Club of Toronto, Season of 1927-28* (Toronto, 1928), p.9.
[113] Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, p.31; Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.193.

Toronto and an Oxford Rhodes Scholar, Burt chaired the University of Alberta History Department, and later taught at the University of Minnesota. He was interested in asserting a shared history and French Canada's role in constitutional evolution.[114] Like George Wrong, he had been inspired by Francis Parkman's history of New France. Burt emphasized English/French accommodation in the decades following the Conquest. In his most important work, *The Old Province of Quebec* (1933), Burt asserted that the post-Conquest period held deep significance not only for Canada, but for the entire British Empire, as it established the precedent whereby non-British people won for themselves British liberties and freedom of religion, several decades before it occurred in Britain itself. Remarkable for its nuance and "meticulous scholarship," Burt's work is examined in some detail here.[115]

Whereas prewar historians like Kingsford lamented the constitutional developments of the period for having discouraged French-Canadian assimilation, Burt celebrated them as a legacy of cross-cultural collaboration and the conceptual beginning of Canada's dual nationality. This interpretation reflected a more mature Canadian historiography. Burt took full advantage of the national archives' growing collection, and of the growing number of reputable works by other authors.[116] His was not another purely political history – Burt provided a separate section on the trade, education, tenures and finance of Quebec. His work also stood out as an example of the growing interest of some Anglophone authors in transcending romantic narratives by exploring Canada's French history *after* the fall of New France.

---

[114] See A.L. Burt, *Guy Carleton, Lord Dorchester, 1724-1808*, La société historique du Canada, brochure historique No 5, Ottawa, 1973, Translation from the English version (1937), p.2.
[115] See A.L. Burt, *The Old Province of Quebec* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1933), p.5; and Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, pp.43.
[116] Burt, *The Old Province of Quebec*, pp.499.

Burt challenged some of the prevailing British-Canadian myths about French-Canadian history. He debunked the popular assertion that Britain had saved the French Canadians from deprivation, destitution and dictatorship by 'introducing' freedom, liberty, and democracy. French-Canadian society at the time of the Conquest, Burt argued, was not backward – rather, it was a highly successful, well-ordered, contented, and stable society. The habitants were not the subjects of a tyrannical government, nor were they slaves to the King and the Church. Their relationship with both had amounted to a symbiotic paternalism: "English-speaking people generally have such a prejudice against paternalism that they are somewhat blind to its good side, its human quality," Burt explained. "The government of New France was neither a vague abstraction nor an impersonal machine. It had a heart as well as an intelligence, and was like a wise father who knows how to humour his children."[117] New France had been home to a justice system well tailored to the size of the community, the habitants enjoyed much economic and social freedom, and, by the 1750s, the French Canadians had already begun to exhibit democratic tendencies via the informal election of militia captains who in effect acted as local representatives. Burt rejected the 'social decapitation' thesis of the Conquest – the French Canadians were not a leaderless people after the Conquest. Few of the wealthy seigneurs and noblesse actually left, and "the real leaders of the people ... the curés and the captains of militia.... never for one moment dreamed of deserting their flocks."[118]

Moreover, Canada had not been a stagnant, unchanging society. It was dynamic, and at the time of the Conquest, the French Canadians had already begun to exhibit a distinct identity and sense of autonomy: "living under very different conditions from

[117] He adds: "The habitants' relations with the church were friendly and intimate, because the parish clergy were drawn mostly from their own ranks." *Ibid*, p.2.
[118] *Ibid*, p.12.

Frenchmen at home, the Canadians tended to become conscious that they were a distinct people. …. The Chief love of the Canadians was for Canada."[119] The French Canadians had always been and remained a polite, respectful and civil people, tempered with a healthy dose of joie de vivre that Burt greatly admired. British-Protestants were wrong if they mistook the latter for laziness or a lack of industry:

> [T]his accusation is easily explained away. Their wants were no greater than their needs, and nature was bountiful. Moreover, they possessed that enviable genius, an infinite capacity for enjoying life. .... The folk songs and folklore of old French Canada are eloquent testimony that no children of the earth ever had a gayer or more wholesome existence.[120]

Above all, the French Canadians of the post-Conquest era were tenacious, and determined to better their condition and the lives of their children.[121]

Burt's account of the Conquest itself also challenged the prevailing British-Canadian version of events. He went even further than Wrong in detailing for his readers the terrible toll the war had taken on the people. Burt provided an unconventional view of the surrender terms, arguing that their leniency was at least as much a product of the tactful negotiations at Montreal by the oft-maligned Governor Vaudreuil as they were the product of British magnanimity. These terms, Burt continued, which guaranteed certain religious rights, property rights, and a promise that "no Canadian was to be molested in any way" set a precedent for all of Canada, and not just Montreal.[122] It was in this spirit that the French Canadians became British subjects, and not in the spirit of an unconditional surrender.

---

[119] *Ibid*, pp.11-12.
[120] *Ibid*, pp.5-6.
[121] "It is one of the most important and abiding things in Canadian history." *Ibid*, p.11.
[122] *Ibid*, pp.9.

For Burt it was in the decades following the Conquest that the most inspiring examples of cross-cultural accommodation and the founding of a dual nationality took root. For Burt, the lenience and tact of Governors Murray, Amherst, and Carleton in their dealings with the habitants provided Canadians, both British and *Canadiens*, with a proud legacy and a shared history – an example to be followed. Burt's work on Carleton celebrated the Governor's refusal to adopt a policy of assimilation, and his appreciation for the need for a shared sentiment among all subjects in the colony, Francophone and Anglophone. Burt cited Carleton's refusal of London's instructions to apply common law to the ethnic British minority in Canada – Carleton thought it best to be consistent and have them subject to French civil law so as to avoid offending the sensibilities of French Canadians, and to establish a consistent legal environment. What was also new about Burt's analysis was that, unlike other authors, he celebrated Carleton not only for his magnanimity, but also for its recognition that there was no alternative practical or just course than cross-cultural accommodation.[123]

Burt's occasionally hagiographic descriptions of the post-Conquest era spoke to his conviction that it provided Canadians with some of their most inspiring shared history:

> Of all the glorious victories that British armies have to their credit, none is more glorious, none is more honourable, than the moral conquest that crowned the military conquest of Canada. The years of this military régime are of supreme importance in the history of Canada, for they planted in Canadian hearts that trust in British justice which has preserved the country with its dual nationality from splitting asunder.[124]

The 1774 *Quebec Act* marked the first culmination of this "moral conquest":

---

[123] See Burt, *Guy Carleton*, p.5. He criticised William Wood's 1916 biograhy of Carleton for being hagiographic.
[124] Burt*, The Old Province of Quebec*, p.56.

> For all its denial of an assembly, the *Quebec Act* embodied a new sovereign principle of the British Empire: the liberty of non-English peoples to be themselves. Given a government that was Canadian in character, a government that would leave no grievance to rankle in their breasts, the Canadians would be weaned from their old allegiance and thus, though they might never become English, they would become ... a strength rather than a weakness to the empire.[125]

In scathing terms, Burt addressed preceding historians "who deplore the existence of French Canadian self-consciousness [and] have denounced the Act for having made a real national unity impossible in Canada. …. It is idle to imagine that the French of Canada could have been assimilated."[126] Burt acknowledged that the *Quebec Act* was in part the result of realpolitik – the British needed to secure French-Canadian loyalty in the face of growing discontent to the south. But he insisted that the Act was also the result of British prudence, magnanimity, and principle, as it had been under development prior to the agitation in the thirteen colonies.[127]

For all of its foresight, the *Quebec Act*, Burt wrote, failed to satisfy the democratic impulse of the habitants with an elected assembly. Overall, many people resented that the British authorities had formalized the powers of both the seigneurs and the clergy at the expense of a nascent democracy.[128] The habitants, especially in the countryside, Burt carefully explained,

> were not hewers of wood and drawers of water for their feudal superiors, nor were they abject slaves of the church. The voyage across the Atlantic had emancipated their ancestors, and for generations the freedom of the forest had been breathing a spirit of liberty into Canadian society.[129]

Burt was again challenging the old English-language historiography that had asserted that the French Canadians had always been beholden to the clergy, and that the British

---

[125] *Ibid*, p.200.
[126] *Ibid*, p.200.
[127] *Ibid*, p.177.
[128] See Burt, *Guy Carleton*, pp.6.
[129] Burt, *The Old Province of Quebec*, p.205.

Conquest had "leavened the Canadian lump with ideas of British liberty."[130] For Burt, the notion of a British monopoly over representative democracy was preposterous. The desire for self-government existed in all peoples, and was already an inherent part of the French-Canadian social fabric. Unlike many previous writers, Burt did not exaggerate French-Canadian loyalty during the American Revolution. Most remained neutral, he explained, because the British continued to deny them an elected assembly, while some even fought alongside the rebels.[131]

The real achievement in cross-cultural compromise came with the 1791 *Constitution Act*. After the revolution, both Anglophones and Francophones in Canada were agitating for an elected assembly. The French Canadians also insisted that their educational needs were not being met.[132] For Burt, the division of the province into two sections, including one with a Francophone majority, and the granting of elected assemblies, was evidence that British officials at the time did not envision French-Canadian assimilation as their endgame. Burt also pointed out Carleton's insistence that the French-speaking minority in the new western section should have its rights and interests protected. Canada would be home to two peoples living side by side, each with their own majority in one section and representation in the other section. Neither people was to be subjugated to the will of the other. Thus was Canada's dual nationality born.[133]

There were limits, of course, to the extent to which the Anglo-Canadian historians as a whole would embrace a dualist vision of Canada's past and present. The *CHR* would not publish articles in French until the 1960s. Only a handful of Francophone historians,

---

[130] "[I]t is impossible to estimate the effect of these ideas, if indeed they had any appreciable effect, because it is so easily confused with the pioneer spirit carried over from the days of French rule." *Ibid*, p.206.
[131] *Ibid*, pp.201.
[132] *Ibid*, pp.462.
[133] *Ibid*, pp.484-488.

like Gustave Lanctot, wrote for the journal. But by the early 1930s, *CHR* editor George Brown was actively seeking out Francophones for translated articles, including Lanctot (who accepted) and Lionel Groulx (who refused).[134] The CHA made more of an effort to include Francophones. Its founding president, Lawrence Burpee, saw the CHA as a patriotic association that would, among other things, "'bring[] into more perfect harmony the two great races that constitute the Canadian people.'"[135] Then there was, of course, Wrong's notable CHA address in 1925. Burpee followed up on Wrong's lecture in the 1926 CHA *Annual Report*: "'The most effective way of breaking down the walls of prejudice and misunderstanding that still to some extent divide us is to bring members of the two races into intimate relationship, working together toward a common object, as we are doing in the Canadian Historical Association.'"[136] That same year the CHA began taking more formal steps to strengthen Francophone representation, including the establishment of an Anglophone and a Francophone secretary on the executive, a minimum of one Francophone on council, and the publication of at least one or two articles in French in the *Annual Report*. By 1929, the Association had its first French-Canadian president, long-time BEL member and Liberal MP, Rodolphe Lemieux. Lemieux had served in the Cabinet of Wilfrid Laurier, and was Speaker of the House of Commons from 1921 to 1929. In 1930 he was appointed Senator and made government leader in the Senate, joining the Cabinet of Mackenzie King. By 1950, four more Francophones had served as CHA President.[137]

---

[134] Rudin, *Making History in Twentieth-Century Quebec*, pp.239-240, note 140.
[135] From Burpee's inaugural presidential address to the CHA in 1922, in Wright, *The Professionalization of History*, p.66.
[136] In *Ibid*, p.69.
[137] *Ibid.*, pp.68-70. See also LAC, WLMK fonds, MG26-J1, Vol. 176, Lorans to Mackenzie King, December 19, 1930.

But the CHA, too, had its limitations. In practice the Association "conducted all of its business in English" until several years after the Second World War. Only a handful of Francophones presented at the annual meetings, with Gustave Lanctot, Francis-Joseph Audet and Arthur Maheux the most prominent among them.[138] Quebec historian and librarian Aegidius Fauteux, the CHA's French secretary in 1927, commended Lanctot for his efforts in promoting bilingualism within the Association. But he admitted to Lanctot that he was skeptical as to how far Anglophone and Francophone historians could work together: "'il y a trop d'incompatibilité entre les deux races pour qu'elles s'associent avec un peu de suite sur n'importe quel terrain, celui de l'histoire y compris. Cela se modifiera peut-être, mais Dieu sait quand.'"[139] Lawrence Burpee's goal of using the CHA to foster "'the development of the most friendly relations between the two great races,'" historian Donald Wright concludes, "was, no doubt, an honest effort, but he deluded himself."[140]

To be sure, not every budding Anglo-Canadian historian of the period was interested in promoting a narrative of cross-cultural collaboration. Frank Underhill, for instance, promoted an economic-realist interpretation of Canada's constitutional evolution and was generally opposed to the 1920s romanticized version of history that emphasized English/French collaboration. If anything, Underhill deemed French Canada's conservatism and lack of radicalism a hindrance to political and social progress. But he did blame the imperial connection for exacerbating hostilities.[141] Harold Innis, who rose to prominence in the 1930s with his emphasis on the importance of the

---

[138] Wright, *The Professionalization of History*, pp.70-71.
[139] *Ibid.*, p.70.
[140] *Ibid*., p.69.
[141] See Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, pp.55, 64; R. Douglas Francis, *Frank H. Underhill, Intellectual Provocateur* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), p.68. Underhill became more conscious of the need to accommodate French-Canadian sensibilities during and after WWII. See Francis, *Frank H. Underhill*, pp.138, 165-166.

economy in shaping the history of the country, was among those who advocated for a more detached, 'scientific' approach. "The implication of his analysis," explains Carl Berger, "was that cultural, linguistic, and religious differences were not important determinants of activity."[142]

But even these 'scientific' developments in the Canadian historiography lent themselves to a closer examination of the histories of New France and French Canada – not necessarily out of any sense of altruism or reconciliationism, but rather to understand the longer term trends in Canada's economic history. For Innis, like W.A. Mackintosh and Marion Newbiggin before him, Canada's economic history began with New France. The staples export trade that dominated the economy from the Ancien Régime, onward, reinforced dependence on the métropole (first France, then the UK, and increasingly the US), leaving the Canadian economy weak and subject to sharp declines.[143] Much like Underhill, Innis was skeptical of the imperial connection: Canada's connection with Britain was, at heart, an economic one, more than a sentimental one. Innis was widely respected among Francophone academics for his analysis, including such disparate figures as Camille Roy and Lionel Groulx. Moreover, the new economic histories of Canada legitimized the view of modern Canada as a continuation of New France. Even historians who were more ambivalent to French Canada, like Donald Creighton, emphasized the interconnectedness of Canada's French past and its more recent history.[144]

---

[142] Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, p.98.
[143] "New France was the real beginning of the country's history because French experience in the fur trade revealed regularities that endure ... in that history." *Ibid*., p.98
[144] Consider, for instance, Creighton, *The Commercial Empire of the St. Lawrence* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1937). Creighton was skeptical of biculturalism in his later years, but during the 1930s he was "a *bonne entente* nationalist." Donald A. Wright, "Donald Creighton and the French Fact, 1920s-1970s," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, vol. 6, no. 1 (1995): 243-272, p.248.

The emergence of a civic Canadian nationalism after the Great War made it possible for liberal-minded Anglo-Canadians to accept an identity that was more inclusive of Canada's French fact. Authors like William Moore, Percival Morley, Arthur Hawkes and George Wrong among others identified Canada's French heritage as one of the country's most unique characteristics, and so encouraged their readers to embrace it. Over time, their ideas infiltrated more popular discourse. It was efforts like these that were so crucial to achieving a semblance of rapprochement during the interwar years, especially at the level of civil society. Such rapprochement would not have been possible, however, without the concurrent contributions of like-minded moderate French-Canadian intellectuals. These moderates had been closely observing the evolution of Anglo-Canadian thought.

Chapter V: FRENCH-CANADIAN MODERATE INTELLECTUALS AND HISTORIANS RESPOND

Much has been made in the historiography of the changes that occurred among Quebec's French-Canadian intellectual élite during the interwar period. Disillusioned by the experiences of the Great War, several intellectuals apparently turned from a liberal pan-Canadian nationalism (as best articulated by George-Étienne Cartier and Henri Bourassa) to a Quebec-centred ultra-traditional clerical nationalism that emphasized the cultural separation of Anglophones and Francophones. Rightly or wrongly, this brand of nationalism was often associated with Canon Lionel Groulx, a leading member of the History Department at the Université de Montréal.[1] The intellectual climate was far more complex, however. The public prominence of Canon Groulx, resulting from his leadership of the Action Française movement and the periodical by the same name, has partially obscured the diversity of historical thought that existed in interwar Quebec.[2] Cultural isolationism did not represent the entire body of French-Canadian thought for the interwar period. Neither Groulx nor all of his supporters had given up on the French fact outside Quebec: "Le Canada français, c'est sans doute la province-mère, le Québec," remarked Hermas Bastien in 1938, "mais c'est aussi tous les centres où vivent les

[1] From 1905 onward, asserted Jean-Pierre Gaboury, Lionel Groulx "était 'indépendantiste.'" Gaboury, "L'État français ou Lionel Groulx et la souveraineté du Québec," *l'Action nationale*, vol. LVII, no. 1, June 1968, p.962.

[2] Ronald Rudin's *Making History in Twentieth-Century Quebec*, for instance, centres overwhelmingly and altogether sympathetically on Groulx for the interwar period. Arthur Maheux receives far less treatment, is the subject of severe criticism. Rudin echoes Groulx in asserting that Maheux "distinguish[ed] himself more by the strength of his anglophilia than by any new insight." P.51. Camille Roy, an important historiographical critic of the time, is mentioned only once, and in passing (p.80). Rudin maintains that Groulx was "a fairly accurate mirror of both the larger profession to which he belonged and the society in which he lived." P.11.

nôtres."[3] Nor was the thinking among the clerical intellectual élite monolithic – there was an important diversity of opinion as to French Canada's past and future. French-Canadian intellectuals did not convert wholesale from a pan-Canadian nationalism to a Quebec-centred ultramontane nationalism. Several important moderate individuals, discussed at length here, continued to infuse the broader French-Canadian opinion with the discourse of cross-cultural engagement. They had not given up on the dream of Cartier and Bourassa.

For their part, moderate French-Canadian intellectuals took heart in the ideas being promoted during and after the war by moderate Anglo-Canadians like Moore, Morley, Hawkes, Wrong, Squair, and several others. Some scholars might maintain that there was little meaningful interaction between the Anglo- and French-Canadian historians of the interwar.[4] But on balance, this Anglo-Canadian 'outreach' softened some Francophone intellectuals' apprehensions over Anglo-Canadian opinion, which in turn restored their hope in the possibility of finding rapprochement with their English-speaking countrymen.[5]

Jean-Charlemagne Bracq was among the first to write at length about the shift in Anglo-Canadian attitudes. "'Decidedly, the English Canadians have come to see their French-speaking compatriots from a broader and truer angle,'" he wrote in 1924.[6] A Protestant from France and a laureate of the Académie française in Paris, Bracq taught as a French professor at Vassar College in New York for over two decades. His keen

[3] Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, p.81.
[4] According to Rudin, "English Canadians ... exercised remarkably little influence over [French-Canadian historians]. English-Canadian historians and their French-language counterparts followed very different paths." He maintains that there is little need for "direct comparison between these two groups." Rudin, *Making History in Twentieth Century Quebec*, p.x.
[5] See Fraser, "Linguistic duality in Canada and narratives on language"; Maheux, *Canadian Unity. What Keeps Us Apart?*, pp.76; Camille Roy, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, pp.287-288.
[6] In Fraser, "Linguistic Duality, Language Narratives and the National Conversation."

interest in French-Canadian affairs led him to travel extensively in Quebec and throughout Canada, where he became well acquainted with the academic, intellectual and political élite of both communities. In 1918, upon Bracq's retirement from Vassar, the Canadian government commissioned him to "travel and study French-Canadian history and social life."[7] This resulted in the publication of *The Evolution of French Canada* (1924). It was intended to enlighten Anglophones not only about French Canada's past, but also about its dynamic culture and its important, ongoing contributions to the country as a whole. The book was translated for French-speaking audiences three years later by popular demand. It included a final chapter on Anglo-Canadian attitudes toward French Canadians.[8]

Bracq acknowledged that a number of "controverses inopportunes et dommageables entre les deux peuples" persisted.[9] Indeed, he was fiercely critical of the negative attitudes and stereotypes that many British Canadians had held against French Canadians over the decades. But he noted that on almost all fronts in recent years, relations had improved markedly. Bracq asserted that religious tensions had declined among all but a minority of Protestant and Catholic extremists. In Quebec, the Protestant and Catholic school boards, "autrefois hostiles, ont le sentiment croissant de leur solidarité."[10] He remarked, too, that Anglo-Canadian educators from Quebec had defended the French-Canadian schools of Ontario. British-Canadian calls for abolishing Quebec's Civil Code, Bracq continued, were a thing of the past. And while less educated British Canadians continued to harbour "l'attitude des conquérants, ... les hommes

[7] "Faculty Passes Minute On Death of Professor Bracq," *Vassar Miscellany News*, Vol. XIX, No. 24, 23 January 1935, pp.1, 3. See also Bracq, *L'évolution du Canada français*, pp.6-8.
[8] See Bracq, *L'évolution du Canada français*, pp.6-7, 283.
[9] *Ibid*., p.284.
[10] *Ibid*., p.284.

supérieurs sont arrivés à comprendre la valeur de la variété [culturelle] dans la Confédération."[11] French Canadians, Bracq went on, "ont de plus en plus l'estime de l'élite anglo-canadienne aux yeux de laquelle ils acquièrent un crédit croissant. .... D'un autre côté, les gallophobes: les Impérialistes violents et les Orangistes, s'ils existent encore, ont moins d'influence et de mordant qu'autrefois." Among the moderates, Bracq singled out Andrew Macphail from Montreal, "[qui] a constamment reconnu et mis en relief la haute échelle morale des Canadiens [français]," and longtime University of Toronto President Robert Falconer (1907-1932), "[qui] reconnaît l'importance grandissante de leurs [(French Canadians')] contributions à la civilisation du pays."[12]

Bracq was especially impressed at how changes in the Anglo-Canadian historiography, including popular and scholarly history, were serving to change attitudes for the better. Among others, Bracq cited the works of historians like Shortt, Doughty and Colby.[13] He also took heart in the recent publications by Boyd, Moore, Hawkes, Morley, and O.D. Skelton. Collectively, these works would contribute to "une mutuelle compréhension des citoyens et à la conciliation. .... Tous ces livres sont des indices d'une attitude nouvelle envers les [Canadiens français] et d'une croissante estime pour eux de l'élite anglo-canadienne."[14] A change in attitude among Anglo-Canadians, Bracq concluded, was the first step on the path toward reconciliation. Openness to the other, he counselled French-Canadian readers, would lead not to assimilation, but to national unity: "La persévérance et l'énergie créatrice, aidées de relations économiques plus vastes, de

[11] *Ibid*., p.284.
[12] Bracq, *L'évolution du Canada français*, p.291, 292.
[13] "Les progrès des études sur l'histoire anglo-canadienne ont aidé à mettre en un relief plus vrai le caractère du Canadien [français] et à éclairer son passé." This included "une interprétation plus juste des annales du Canada français." *Ibid*., p.292.
[14] *Ibid*., pp.292-293.

contacts internationaux plus larges, d'une vie plus intense, d'une conscience plus claire de leur valeur et de leurs droits réciproques, ne produiront pas la fusion, mais fortifieront les liens unissant les deux peuples, sur la base de la liberté et de l'égalité complètes."[15]

Camille Roy, arguably the most important French-Canadian literature professor in Canada at the time, had as much to say. He showered Moore, Morley, Squair and Lorne Pierce, in particular, with praise. This new breed of Anglo-Canadian authors, he explained in 1930, was "très sympathique d'une meilleure connaissance réciproque et d'une meilleure entente cordiale entre nos deux races."[16] Looking back on the interwar period, Roy took note of the many Anglo-Canadians who had worked closely with French Canadians at various levels to promote a more moderate popular opinion, restore French-language rights, and ensure better understanding: "il ne manque pas, chez nos compatriotes anglais, soit dans la politique, soit dans les universités, soit dans les affaires, d'esprits larges et justes qui travaillent avec nous pour que soient respectés tous nos droits historiques et constitutionnels, et pour qu'entre les deux races maîtresses du Canada règne l'entente cordiale."[17]

Collectively, the moderate French-Canadian intellectuals, like Camille Roy and Arthur Maheux, among others, promoted the values of mutual understanding and national unity. They were not without considerable influence. They included a number of prominent professors whose message would continue, in modified form, into the post-WWII era. They were anxious that Anglo-Canadians know that French Canada still included an important moderate element among its opinion makers and leaders, who sought to engage across cultural-linguistic lines. While keen to stand up for their

[15] Bracq, L'évolution du Canada français, p.293.
[16] Camille Roy, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, pp.287-288.
[17] Camille Roy, *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, pp.28-29.

linguistic, cultural and religious rights and to point out how Anglo-Canadian society must change, they promoted a decidedly bonne ententiste vision for Canadian society. Anglo-Canadian observers, in turn, took heart in the existence of such a moderate voice in Francophone society.

The 'Laval School' rewrites French Canada's past and present

Among Quebec French-Canadian historians, two schools of thought had begun to emerge around the time of the war. The first school, based at the Université de Montréal, promoted a French-Canadian clerico-ethnic nationalism centred on (but not limited to) Quebec, a nationalism that was highly skeptical of British Canadians for their assimilationist agenda. Led by Groulx, it promoted an interpretation of history that emphasized French-Canadian survival in the face of assimilation, and catalogued the several perceived injustices that British Canadians had committed against their people. For these historians, too much cross-cultural engagement led down a slippery slope toward assimilation.[18] They insisted that history had proved that French Canadians' best chance at survival was to limit contact with corrupting influences as much as possible. To that end, Groulx and his disciples were exceedingly pessimistic over the future of Confederation and of British Canada's willingness to accept the 'two founding nations' compact.[19] The second school, a less easily defined group of Quebec historians based largely but not exclusively at the Université Laval, emphasized the examples of cross-

[18] Groulx lumped "les bon-ententistes" with "les snobs" and "les défaitistes" – those who proclaimed "la dernière génération de Canadiens français!" Groulx, "Notre État français, nous l'aurons."
[19] Trofimenkoff, *Action Française*, p.56; Rudin, *Making History*, pp.37.

cultural collaboration that had preserved French Canada and allowed it to flourish after the Conquest of 1760.

The 'Laval School,' while mindful of French Canada's unique history and contemporary interests, remained open to the idea of a pan-Canadian political identity shared with Anglophones and to bonne entente-style rapprochement. The version of history it promoted was demonstrably proud of the French-Canadian struggle for survival and self-determination, and it did not shy away from the legacy of past British-Canadian transgressions. It shed light, however, on instances of English/French accommodation in Canada's past. This diverse group of moderate intellectuals believed that French-Canadian survival and self-determination were not incompatible with Confederation. Far from it. They believed that by taking an active role in Canadian life, engaging with Anglo-Canadians, and taking advantage of everything Confederation had to offer, the French-Canadian people could achieve their full potential. The 'Laval School' (to use the term loosely) found its greatest expression in such academics and intellectuals as Thomas Chapais, Abbé Camille Roy, Gustave Lanctot, and Abbé Arthur Maheux. It espoused a more 'neutral' reading of history that judged characters and events within the context of their time. In this way, it lent itself to a more forgiving assessment of the British regime and British-Canadian historical actors. The Laval School, including the liberal-minded Abbé Maheux in particular, in contrast to Abbé Groulx's assertion of 'scientific' history and method, emphasized literary style, and the writing of a more accessible history that could appeal to the public and reach a wider audience.[20]

[20] Rudin, *Making History in Twentieth-Century Quebec*, pp.37, 86.

Thomas Chapais, the Laval School's senior historian

Thomas Chapais was the Laval School's senior historian. Chapais taught post-Conquest Canadian history at Laval, with a focus on the years of the British regime (1760-1867). By 1907, he had become the principal instructor of history at Laval. He lectured there until 1930 and served on the university council until 1935. Chapais also sat as a Conservative member in both the Legislative Council of Quebec (beginning in 1892), and in the Senate (beginning in 1919). Chapais had wide contact with the English-speaking community, not only as a Senator, but also as a member of both the Royal Society of Canada and the Canadian Historical Association, serving as President of each during 1923-1924 and 1925-1926, respectively.[21]

Chapais was not a liberal, but he was an advocate of cross-cultural engagement, civic nationalism and the 'political nationality' that George-Étienne Cartier and other moderate French-Canadian political leaders had embraced at the time of Confederation.[22] Chapais's father, Jean-Charles, a Liberal-Conservative MP, had supported Confederation at the Quebec Conference of 1865.[23] In 1866, Jean-Charles Chapais introduced his son to Cartier, which left a deep impression on young Thomas. After being admitted to the Quebec Bar in 1879, Thomas Chapais served as personal secretary to Lieutenant-

[21] Assemblée nationale du Québec, "Thomas Chapais," accessed 3 April 2012, http://www.assnat.qc.ca/fr/patrimoine/anciens-parlementaires/chapais-thomas-97.html.

[22] Interestingly, Cartier and Macdonald's party had been the Liberal-Conservative Party, in reference to the alliance that emerged in the 1850s between the moderate Reformers from Canada West and the moderate Parti bleu from Canada East, inheritors of the cross-cultural collaboration established by Robert Baldwin and Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine. See Claude Bélanger, "Parti 'Bleu'," *L'Encyclopédie de l'histoire du Québec* (Marianopolis College, 2006), accessed 10 August 2013, http://faculty.marianopolis.edu/c.belanger/quebechistory/readings/partibleuparty.html; "Parti Bleu," *Canadian Encyclopedia* (Historica-Dominion, 2012), accessed (10 August 2013) at http://thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/parti-bleu.

[23] Andrée Désilets, "Jean-Charles Chapais," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, Vol. XI (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 1990), accessed 10 August 2013, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio.php?id_nbr=5431.

Governor Théodore Robitaille, another moderate of Macdonald and Cartier's "'old guard'" who was known for throwing "'lively dances condemned by the religious authority.'"[24] In 1884, Thomas Chapais married Hectorine Langevin, daughter of Sir Hector-Louis Langevin, another prominent Father of Confederation. Chapais made his first foray into politics when he ran, unsuccessfully, for Macdonald's Conservatives in 1891. The following year he was appointed to Quebec's Legislative Council. While remaining under the party banner throughout his political career, Chapais was no lackey of the increasingly imperialist federal Conservatives. As editor of *L'Événement* and a contributor to *Le Droit*, he opposed Regulation 17 and urged both Prime Minister Robert Borden and Ontario Conservative Premier James Whitney to be conciliatory for the sake of national unity. A member of the Saint Jean-Baptiste society, Chapais collaborated behind the scenes with the anti-Regulation 17 lobby of Napoléon Belcourt and the ACFÉO.[25] When Borden, desperate for French-Canadian representation in his Union Government, sought to appoint Chapais to the Senate, Chapais refused on the grounds of his opposition to conscription, accepting the position only after the war.[26] The party of cross-cultural accommodation of his youth was but a shell of its former self. By sitting among its ranks in 1919, Chapais hoped to do his part to construct a more positive relationship between French and British Canadians, and in so doing protect the interests of his people.

---

[24] Marc Desjardins, "Théodore Robitaille," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, Vol. XII, (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 1990), accessed 10 August 2013, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio.php?id_nbr=6403.

[25] CRCCF, "Thomas Chapais," (Université d'Ottawa, CRCCF, 2012), accessed 10 August 2013, http://www.crccf.uottawa.ca/reglement17/page/thomas-chapais.

[26] Assemblée nationale du Québec, "Thomas Chapais."

Chapais was a product of his time. He was a moderate, owing to his early connections to the old Liberal-Conservative Party, but he also embraced certain aspects of turn-of-the century ultramontanism. Chapais believed that the Church had a central role to play in people's lives, especially in terms of education. His reasons were both theological and pedagogical: children's education must be kept out of the hands of politicians intent on constructing a partisan historical narrative.[27] Chapais's ultramontanism was not unlike that of Henri Bourassa – catholicity was central to the French-Canadian identity and survival, but it did not preclude the possibility of establishing a shared civic identity with British Canadians. In 1916, at the height of the Regulation 17 controversy, Chapais wrote a piece on Quebec's historical magnanimity toward the British Protestant minority. He took pride in the fact that, at the eleventh hour before Confederation, the Liberal-Conservative moderates from both cultural-linguistic communities, led by Cartier, Langevin, Robert Bell, Macdonald and Galt, had engineered special protection for the educational rights of the British-Protestant and French-Catholic minorities of Ontario and Quebec.[28] To be sure, Chapais recognized that examples of British-Canadian intransigence abounded in the historical record – he decried the double-standard that had been applied to the Francophone minorities after Confederation. But

[27] Thus, Chapais vigorously opposed attempts at re-establishing a department of education (abolished in 1875) headed by a provincial cabinet minister: "Ah! La politique, cette politique de parti qui est inhérente à notre système de gouvernement parlementaire, mais qui nous a fait tant de mal, qui a sali tant de choses augustes et compromis tant de choses saintes, ne lui laissons pas mettre la main sur cette arche sacrée qui porte dans ses flancs les destinées de notre peuple et l'avenir de notre race. Non, non, l'éducation populaire et la politique ne doivent pas vivre sous le même toit. La politique, c'est la discorde, l'éducation, c'est l'harmonie; la politique, c'est l'ambition, l'éducation, c'est le dévouement; la politique, c'est trop souvent la haine, l'éducation, c'est la fraternité et l'amour; la politique habite un zône fertile en tourmentes et en naufrages, l'éducation doit planer toujours dans les sphères plus pures et plus sereines." Thomas Chapais, "Discours de Thomas Chapais au Conseil législatif, 10 janvier 1898," in *Quebec History, Documents in Quebec History* (Marianapolis College, 2000), accessed (10 August 2013) at http:// faculty.marianopolis.edu/c.belanger/quebechistory/docs/meq/31.htm.

[28] Thomas Chapais, "La Province de Québec et la minorité anglaise," *La Nouvelle France*, Vol. XV, No. 4, (April 1916): 145-164, accessed 11 August 2013, http://faculty.marianopolis.edu/c.belanger/quebechistory/ encyclopedia/Chapaisminoriteanglaise.html.

Chapais also recognized that moderate views prevailed among some British Canadians, including such important figures as Canada's first prime minister.[29] It was in this spirit of cross-cultural accommodation, "l'esprit de libéralité et de tolérance," Chapais argued, that "notre constitution canadienne" had been founded.[30]

Chapais's understanding of Canadian history reflected the cultural dualist influences of his formative years. Like his predecessor at Laval, the Abbé Ferland, Chapais gave relatively generous treatment to both the French and British imperial regimes that had governed New France and British North America. Chapais made these assessments out of a preference for a detached, neutral literary style. He believed that by attempting objectivity and rejecting personal biases, authors could come closer to the historical truth. The alternative was an enflamed, emotional approach that risked obscuring important historical context. Events and historical actors, he maintained, must be judged within the context of their time, and not through the lens of contemporary political agendas.[31] Chapais's approach made him very controversial in the eyes of those, like Groulx, who saw the Conquest as a historical disaster, and not an act of Providence.[32]

Somewhat forgotten in recent years, Chapais was very influential in his own time, and well respected by both French- and Anglo-Canadian intellectuals.[33] In 1924, for

---

[29] Those who asserted that all British Canadians opposed equality with French Canadians demonstrated "un grand amour de l'hyperbole." *Ibid*.

[30] "Il nous montre quelle a été la genèse d'un des articles les plus importants de notre constitution canadienne. Et il fait ressortir avec quelle largeur d'esprit, quelle libéralité, quelle générosité, la majorité bas-canadienne a toujours agi envers la minorité anglaise." *Ibid*., p.145.

[31] "En une matière où les passions peuvent influencer les recherches et les conclusions de l'historien, M. Chapais s'est appliqué à éviter tout esprit d'hostilité systématique ... il juge les homes et les événements d'après les ... conditions historiques du passé." Camille Roy, *Manuel d'Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne de Langue Française*, 14e édition (Montréal: Librairie Beauchemin Ltée., 1939), p.124.

[32] See Camille Roy, *Manuel d'Histoire de la Littérature Canadienne de Langue Française*, 21e édition (Montréal, Beauchemin, 1962), pp.126-140; Michel Bock, "Overcoming a National 'Catastrophe': The British Conquest in the Historical and Polemical Thought of Abbé Lionel Groulx," in Phillip Buckner and John G. Reid, *Remembering 1759*, pp.161-185.

[33] Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, p.26. Roy considered him Quebec's most eminent living historian.

instance, he gave an important speech to the Royal Society of Canada. He reminded his Anglo-Canadian audience of the historian's duty to be objective in his approach, 'scientific' in method, and meticulous in research. Still, he maintained that, "'while the historian needs to be impartial, this does not mean that he has to abandon all of his emotions.... Art and science, truth and beauty, these are the two paths followed by the historian.'"[34] In addition to teaching at Laval and imparting his accommodationist narrative on future historians, Chapais completed his eight-volume *Cours d'histoire du Canada*, published between 1919 and 1934. It became a key text for post-secondary history students in Quebec's Church run classical colleges and two Universities, Laval and Montreal.[35]

The several volumes of *Cours d'histoire du Canada* brought together the lessons that Chapais had taught at Laval for a quarter-century. As such, they brought to bear his contextualized approach to the British regime years. Neutrality, objectivity, source work, and historical context were key to understanding this period of history, especially since its memory was so emotionally charged in French Canada:

> Le passé a tant de prolongements, tant de repercussions dans le présent. Comment se dépouiller des sentiments, des impressions d'aujourd'hui pour le juger et l'apprécier avec le calme, la pondération et le discernement de la justice? Il faut cependant … degager de tout préjugé, de tout esprit de système, de toute conception *a priori*, si l'on veut faire oeuvre de sincérité, de loyauté intellectuelle et de probité historique.[36]

One could better understand the past, he argued, by detaching oneself from the passions and controversies of the present. Chapais believed that the neutrality of approach made

---

Roy, *Manuel d'Histoire de la Littérature*, 21e édition, p.126.
[34] Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, p.39.
[35] Roy, *Manuel d'Histoire de la Litérature,* 14e édition, p.124.
[36] Thomas Chapais, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada, Tome III, 1815-1833*, 2nd Edition (Québec: Librairie Garneau Ltée., 1933), p.6.

for a more useful study. Thus, it was more patriotic than simply giving in to emotionalism and producing an inaccurate reading of history: "l'effort énergique accompli par l'auteur pour chasser le préjugé de son esprit et bannir l'hostilité de son coeur ne fasse que rendre son oeuvre plus utile à la nationalité dont il est le fils très humble, mais très profondément dévoué."[37]

This did not preclude the historian from making value judgments of historical events and actors (provided such judgments were made according to the context of the time). To this end, Chapais tended to favour the moderates of Canadian history. When it came to the quest for responsible self-government, for instance, Chapais preferred the measured pragmatism of Étienne Parent, Louis-Hyppolite Lafontaine and Robert Baldwin over the brash radicalism of Robert Nelson and Louis-Joseph Papineau. The moderates, he maintained, made their gains through patient and peaceful means, while the radicals applied violence, putting people's lives and livelihoods at risk. "Allions-nous choisir … la tactique patiente et sûr," he asked readers, "ou celle de l'outrance aveugle et inefficace?"[38]

In this context, Chapais's treatment of the British regime itself, although not lacking criticism, was not unfavourable.[39] Significantly, his overall assessment of the

---

[37] Thomas Chapais, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada, Tome IV, 1833-1841*, 2nd Edition (Québec: Librairie Garneau Ltée., 1933), p. x.

[38] Chapais, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada, Tome III*, p.6.

Lionel Groulx also praised Lafontaine. But he argued that responsible government had been the result of self-interested changes to British colonial policy, and a 'conquête canadienne-française,' more so than the partnership between moderate French and British Canadians. "Après 1840, les Canadiens-français seuls restent irrévocablement fidèles au grand principe [de la responsabilité ministérielle]. .... On connaît au contraire les inconstances, les variations de principes et d'attitudes des Réformistes du Haut-Canada. .... C'est donc le bloc des députés canadiens-français qui rendit impossible le maintien des ministères irresponsables. C'est Lafontaine appuyé par les siens qui se refuse à faire le jeu de Sydenham. C'est Lafontaine qui tient tête à Metcalfe, de l'aveu même du gouverneur. C'est Lafontaine qui prend l'initiative." Lionel Groulx, *Nos luttes Constitutionnelles: La Responsabilité Ministérielle* (Québec: Le Devoir, 1916), p.22.

[39] See Chapais, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada, Tome IV*, pp.309.

British regime – good and bad – was not unlike that of the liberal civic nationalist Anglo-Canadian historians and intellectuals of the interwar era. Chapais celebrated, for instance, the progressive 1774 *Quebec Act* for having guaranteed French-Canadian religious rights some fifty-five years before Catholics in the United Kingdom gained such rights. He attributed this apparent magnanimity to the decision of the French-Canadian and Catholic leadership to remain loyal (or at least neutral) during the American War of Independence. Chapais also pointed out that life under the British Crown made it possible to avoid absorption into the US and thus subsequent assimilation – this was the providential theory of history shared by Henri Bourassa, infused with a measured loyalism to the British Crown in spite of its occasional transgressions.[40] Chapais presented the 1791 *Constitution Act* as an important step in providing French Canadians with a measure of representation. He celebrated the role of French Canadians in the War of 1812, notably at Chateauguay. It had been prudent, he argued, to remain loyal to a Crown that, on balance, had up to then been fairly lenient. But Chapais also lamented the limitations of the 1791 terms, and heavily criticized the Durham Report and 1840 *Act of Union*. Chapais's assessment of the rebels of 1837-1838 was critical. He argued that the moderates had already been working toward incremental self-government, and that while they may have had their reasons, the rebels' misguided actions had served only to interrupt this progress.[41] Still, the forced union of the Canadas gave other French-Canadian political leaders the determination, and the sense of pragmatism, to make alliances and to move gradually and methodically toward emancipation and self-government.

---

[40] See Henri Bourassa, "Discours à Notre-Dame," in Lamonde and Corbo, *Le rouge et le bleu*, pp.315-320.
[41] "1837 et 1838 infligèrent à notre cause un désastreux recul." Chapais, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada, Tome IV*, p.311.

Despite his measured treatment of the British regime, Chapais was no Anglophile. Like Henri Bourassa, Chapais was both a French-Canadian and a pan-Canadian patriot. For all his attempts at a neutral tone, Chapais at times gave French victories romantic treatment.[42] For all his generous handling of British colonial affairs in Canada, Chapais's overriding theme in *Cours d'histoire du Canada* remained: French Canada as master of its own destiny, driver of its own survival and progress. In spite of his attempt at neutrality, his work was marked by a genuine passion and sympathy for his people. "Le souci de l'équité [historiographique]," he explained, "n'est pas incompatible avec l'attachement pronfond à la foi, à la langue, aux institutions, aux libertés civiles et religieuses de la nationalité [de] l'historien."[43]

The context under which Chapais wrote his *Cours d'histoire du Canada* doubtless informed his analysis. Originally, Chapais intended only to cover 1760-1841, doing so in the first four volumes, completed between 1919 and 1923. These four volumes, written on the heels of the conscription and language crises of the Great War, examined the French-Canadian struggle for survival post-Conquest. He ended the series on a bitter note by pointing to the many injustices of 1840-1841 – the Durham Report and the program for assimilation, Lower Canada's assumption of Upper Canadian debt, the imposition of 'equal' representation in the legislative assembly to the detriment of French-Canadian representation, the establishment of an anti-democratic permanent civil list that tended to benefit British Canadians, and the adoption of English as the sole official language.[44] It was only later that Chapais decided to cover 1841-1867 in four more volumes.

---

[42] See Roy, *Manuel d'Histoire de la Litérature*, 14th edition, p.123.
[43] Chapais, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada, Tome IV*, pp.ix. Despite the title of his work, his focus was overwhelmingly on Lower Canada and French Canadians.
[44] Chapais, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada, Tome IV*, pp.275.

Completed in 1932-1934, after over a decade of bonne ententiste activities, they focussed on the progression toward the achievement of responsible self-government and Confederation, and the British- and French-Canadian partnerships among the moderate reformers that had made it possible.[45] The message of this narrative, ending in 1867 instead of 1841, was that moderation and cross-cultural partnership – and not cultural isolation – held out the greatest promise for the future of French Canada.

Camille Roy, the Laval School's spiritual and philosophical leader

If Thomas Chapais was the Laval School's senior historian, then Monsignor Camille Roy was arguably its spiritual and philosophical leader. Roy studied in Paris, where he was ordained a priest. He went on to teach philosophy and literature at the Séminaire de Québec and at Laval, where he later served as Rector for several years. He was eventually inducted into the Société Royale du Canada. Roy authored several books, most notably his critiques on Canadian literature. His best-known work was the long-running, multi-edition critical overview and educational manual of Canadian (mostly French-Canadian) literature, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*. By 1925, he had received honours from the Académie française for his work.[46]

Camille Roy was a proud French Canadian with a decidedly pan-Canadian outlook. To keep up with English-speaking Canada, Roy believed that French Canadians must be proactive and take advantage of the economic opportunities afforded by the country's growth, especially in the booming West. Moreover, the Francophone minority

[45] See Chapais, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada, Tome VI, 1847-1851* (Québec: Librairie Garneau, 1934); and Chapais, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada, Tome VIII, 1861-1867* (Québec: Librairie Garneau, 1934), for the volumes covering the Lafontaine-Baldwin and Macdonald-Cartier administrations.
[46] See Camille Roy, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, title page.

communities outside Quebec provided the foothold necessary to gain access to that opportunity. It was therefore crucial for Quebec's French-Canadian majority to support the Francophone minorities.[47] Fostering a collaborative relationship with moderate Anglo-Canadians would also help. Like Moore, Morley and other sympathetic Anglo-Canadian authors of the time, Roy invoked history to lend legitimacy to French Canada's contemporary aspiration to flourish in the West.[48] As a clergyman, he was also conscious of the fact that a strong French-Catholic population in Western Canada would help safeguard the interests of the Church in a region that was religiously diverse.[49]

Roy believed that by looking only to the borders of Quebec for survival French Canada would condemn itself to social and political isolation.[50] Like Henri Bourassa before him, Roy feared that under such a scenario the Francophone minority communities would be abandoned to their fate and likely disappearance and apostasy. The Quebec French-Canadian community would thus be shut off from the rest of Canada and the outside world, French Canada's influence and significance would inevitably diminish, and Canada as a whole would lose a crucial element of its uniqueness.[51] Roy believed that the promotion of the French language and the French-Canadian outlook throughout Canada would 'uplift' the national character: "C'est par tous les dons magnifiques de son

---

[47] He called for more "collaboration entre les groupes français qui sont disséminés depuis Québec jusqu'à l'Océan Pacifique." Camille Roy, "Le message de Québec à nos frères de l'Ouest," in Roy, *Études et Croquis, Pour faire mieux aimer la Patrie* (Montréal: Les Éditions du Mercure, 1928), p.162-163.
[48] La Vérandrye was "le premier sillon de l'apostolat franco-canadien" in the west. *Ibid.*, p.168.
[49] He hoped the French-Canadian minority communities in the western would provide a base for the Church in the entire region, and promote the interests of all Catholics, regardless of their language and culture. *Ibid.*, pp.163.
[50] "Le jour où il n'y aurait plus de fraternité ... entre les groupes français de ce pays, le jour où il n'y aurait que de l'indifférence les uns pour les autres, ce jour-là l'isolement succéderait." Roy, "Le message de Québec à nos frères de l'Ouest," p.164.
[51] *Ibid*., pp.165-166.

âme, c'est par le rayonnement de sa pensée, c'est par l'influence de ses hautes traditions intellectuelles et morales que notre race doit régner partout au Canada."[52]

Roy asserted that the promotion and continued existence of the Francophone minority communities was crucial to the long-term viability of Confederation. The country's French culture, he argued, softened Canadian culture as a whole. The existence across the West of a 'gentler' French-Canadian culture with harmony as one of its intrinsic values, he argued, could act as the common denominator keeping together the hodgepodge Aboriginal, British and immigrant population of that part of the country.[53] The Francophone minority communities were the crucial link – "des agents de liaison indispensables" – between East and West that held Confederation together:

> [N]os groupes canadiens-français sont les anneaux d'or de cette chaîne qui de l'Est à l'Ouest, d'un ocean à l'autre, de la Nouvelle-Écosse à la Colombie, attaché à une même fortune politique tant de races qui se partagent nos immenses territoires.[54]

Roy understood, like so many other moderate intellectuals of the time, that it was the Francophone and Anglophone minority communities who provided the 'missing link' of the 'two founding nations' Compact of Confederation. They held the country together in terms of sentiment – in asserting the relevance of bilingualism and biculturalism – and in terms of fostering positive interaction and understanding. Moreover, he understood the importance of maintaining positive relations between Anglo- and French Canadians in terms of protecting the rights of the minorities.

Roy had not always been this enthusiastic about cross-cultural collaboration. By the time of the Great War, his views of British-Canadian attitudes and the future of

---

[52] *Ibid*., p.175.
[53] *Ibid*., pp.170-171.
[54] *Ibid*., pp.172-173.

English/French relations in Canada had become decidedly pessimistic. British-Canadians, he warned in 1910, had begun to adopt the doctrines of racial and linguistic unity. This, he argued, was a betrayal of the principle of cultural federalism to which their forefathers had agreed in 1867.[55] After the war, however, and by the mid-1920s, he could take heart in the softening of Anglo-Canadian attitudes, and advocated cooperation with English-speaking Canadians who were open to the French-Canadian point of view.[56]

Roy gave his greatest expression of hope in Anglo-/French-Canadian rapprochement in his 1930 edition of *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*. The book had appeared in English as early as 1913.[57] But now, for the first time, it included a section devoted to English-language Canadian literature. Roy rejected the provincialism that had inhibited both linguistic groups from experiencing each other's literary culture:

> Nous souffrons, en toutes nos provinces, d'un provincialisme étroit qui nous fait trop nous ignorer les uns les autres. Ce provincialisme est, pour les deux grandes races française et anglaise, ... une faiblesse. .... C'est pour contribuer à abattre des cloisons trop étanches que nous avons voulu mettre sous les yeux de nos lecteurs les activités littéraires principales des Canadiens anglais.[58]

In part, Roy was reciprocating an earlier initiative by Lorne Pierce. For his *An Outline of Canadian Literature (French and English)* (1927), Pierce had insisted that the review give equal treatment to both French- and English-language Canadian literature, and sought out Camille Roy's expertise in order to complete the section on the French-language literature. Roy referred to it as "une précieuse collaboration." It was only fitting, he told readers, that his own book reciprocate toward an "entente cordiale."[59] These works were important not only for their symbolism, but also because they would have

---

[55] See Camille Roy, *Historiens de Chez Nous* (Montréal: Éditions Beauchemin, 1935), p.149.
[56] Camille Roy, "Le message de Québec à nos frères de l'Ouest," p.166.
[57] Camille Roy, *French-Canadian Literature* (Toronto: Glasgow, Brook, 1913).
[58] Camille Roy, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, pp.8-9.
[59] Camille Roy, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, pp.8-9.

reached the authors' young pupils. Roy, for instance, dedicated his book to his students, and took care to point out to readers that the initial collaboration had occurred on the initiative of an Anglo-Canadian publishing company, and in Toronto no less.[60]

Camille Roy reciprocated Pierce's avowed respect for French-Canadian literary culture by providing a generous assessment of Anglo-Canadian work. By the end of the nineteenth century, Roy explained, "La litérature anglo-canadienne … prend une valeur plus originale, elle apparaît davantage comme une littérature nationale."[61] The acknowledgement of an "Anglo-Canadian" nation with a unique culture of its own by a Francophone intellectual was noteworthy.[62] Roy commended the Anglo-Canadian authors of 1840-1880, "Le Groupe de la Confédération," who had written during a political period in which efforts were made "vers une meilleure entente entre les deux races française et anglaise."[63] He was not so kind to the authors of the High Imperialism era, from 1880 through to the Great War. He noted the efforts of some to depict a romantic French Canada to British-Canadian readers through historical fiction and novels, but most had employed a pejorative style.[64] Roy was similarly unimpressed by the late nineteenth-century and pre-war British-Canadian historiographical works,

---

[60] *Ibid.*, p.9
[61] *Ibid*., p.269.
[62] Roy's privileging of the term over the more simple "les anglais" spoke to the growing acceptance among the French-Canadian intellectual élite that Anglo-Canadians, too, were truly Canadian. Consider, for instance, Henri Bourassa's wartime exchange with Talbot M. Papineau, in which Bourassa questions the 'Canadianness' of British Canadians. Henri Bourassa, "Reply to Capt. Talbot Papineau, August 2, 1916," in *A Country Nourished in Self-Doubt: Documents in Post-Confederation Canadian History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), pp.150-153.
[63] Camille Roy, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, p.269.
[64] He referred, for instance, to Frederick George Scott (father of F.R. Scott), and Frances Harrison, "qui, dans l'Ontario, continue à faire connaître, en vers, comme elle le fit en prose, le Canada français." *Ibid*., p.282.

especially those that touched upon the history of New France, "qui contiennent beaucoup d'erreurs, [et qui] ont peu d'autorité."[65]

But the English-language literature, Roy explained, had shown signs of positive change after the war. There had been a resurgence in popular novels, such as W.H. Blake's translation of *Maria Chapdelaine*.[66] Even more important, Roy explained, were the works by bonne ententiste authors like William Moore, Percival Morley, John Squair and Lorne Pierce. Moore's *The Clash!* was "un livre fort bien inspiré et fort utile":

> L'auteur y étudie les causes des conflits qui ont trop souvent fait se heurter chez nous les races anglaise et française; il conclut à l'entente cordiale, non pas à la domination arbitraire d'une race sur l'autre, mais à l'harmonie politique et sociale dans la diversité des races.[67]

Morley's *Bridging the Chasm* had been inspired by "des mêmes pensées de justice et de tolérance":

> M. Morley étudie la question Ontario-Québec à la lumière des faits, d'une saine conception des droits des nationalités. Il conclut comme M.J. Squair, le regretté professeur de l'Université de Toronto, grand ami de Québec, [que] nos difficultés de races ne seront pas réglées par des coups de force, mais par l'esprit de tolérance.[68]

He saved the greatest flattery for his colleague, Pierce:

> Lorne Pierce, à qui nous devons une si précieuse collaboration, compte parmi les plus sûrs et les plus fertiles critiques de l'Ontario. Dans sa retraite de Toronto, il multiplie les articles, les monographies, les études qui font autorité. Nous lui devons … surtout *An Outline of Canadian Literature (French and English)* (1927). Ce dernier receuil contient la meilleure pensée, large et juste, de Lorne Pierce, et aussi son art de définir les oeuvres et d'en saisir la valeur. Il y fait une large place aux écrivains canadiens-français. Il s'y montre ouvrier très sympathique d'une meilleure connaissance réciproque et d'une meilleure entente cordiale entre nos deux races.[69]

---

[65] Camille Roy, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, p.293.
[66] See *Ibid*., p.286.
[67] *Ibid*., p.287.
[68] *Ibid*., p.288.
[69] *Ibid*., p.288.

The English-language historiography had experienced similar advances around this time, according to Roy, "et surtout" George Wrong.[70] Clearly, some among the French-Canadian intellectual élite took notice of the significant changes occurring in the Anglo-Canadian outlook.

Camille Roy's most forceful articulation of Anglophone/Francophone rapprochement came in his 1934 pamphlet, "Nos raisons canadiennes de rester français." The pamphlet is significant in that it was intended for a French (from France) audience – in other words, Roy's bonne ententiste rhetoric was not merely an attempt to pander to an Anglo-Canadian audience.[71] Roy expressed his wish for both national unity *and* the preservation of French-Canadian culture – he was not convinced by nationalistes who argued that the two were mutually exclusive. What is particularly striking is how Roy appeared to seek a middle ground between Groulx's French-Canadian nationalism and Henri-Bourassa's pan-Canadian nationalism. Roy expressed tremendous pride in Quebec as the bastion for the preservation of the French-Canadian Catholic people of North America. He was equally insistent, however, on the need for a meaningful place in the federation for French Canadians from throughout the country – for instance, through the creation of a more bilingual federal public service.[72]

Roy was proud of French Canada's place in Canada. The extent to which his pride of place echoed observations made by Moore, Morley, Hawkes and other moderate Anglo-Canadians was remarkable. Against all odds, Roy wrote, the tenacious French Canadians had survived and thrived for over 150 years, maintaining their unique culture

---

[70] Wrong's *The Rise and Fall of New France* (1928) was especially worth of praise. Roy, *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, p.294.
[71] The pamphlet is reproduced in Roy, *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, pp.6-33.
[72] Roy, "Nos raisons canadiennes de rester français," in *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, p.11.

and language: "nous sommes encore Français, par le sang, par l'esprit, par toutes nos ambitions les plus hautes, et nous voulons rester demain ce que nous sommes aujourd'hui."[73] Roy wrote at length about the filial, ancestral, sentimental, historical and cultural ties with the French culture that drove French Canadians to remain a French-speaking and Catholic people. He depicted the struggle against absorption and assimilation as a never-ending battle, from the Conquest to the present. French Canadians owed it to themselves and to their forefathers who had struggled to survive to keep up the fight. He underlined the role of the Catholic Church in preserving the people, celebrated the Patriotes of 1837-1838, and highlighted several other instances of both physical and passive resistance in defence of French-language education and religious rights.[74] French-Canadian resistance to assimilation, Roy explained, was grounded in the Compact of 'two founding nations' thesis of Confederation. Canada's two founding races, "des races composantes," had an inherent right to continue as distinct peoples.[75] Emboldened by the results of the 1931 census, Roy pointed out that the steady growth of the French population both in and outside Quebec ensured that the old British-Canadian dream of assimilation was a fantasy.

One gets a real sense that the census results of 1921 and 1931 gave some French-Canadian observers a greater confidence about their place in Canada, and thus, a willingness to look beyond Quebec's borders.[76] In the country as a whole, the number of Canadians of French ancestry had grown from roughly 2.5 million in 1921 to 3 million in

---

[73] *Ibid*., pp.6-7.
[74] *Ibid*., pp.24-29.
[75] Roy, "Nos raisons canadiennes de rester français," in *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, pp.16-17.
[76] See *Ibid*., p.8; and Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, pp.73, 193. The results in Ontario, Quebec and the Maritimes were especially pleasing. The Francophone minory in Ontario, for instance, felt more confident in asserting a stronger political presence. The French Canadians, the newly-appionted Franco-Ontarian Senator Gustave Lacasse told Ernest Lapointe in 1928, "'represent almost a third of the total Canadian population.'" In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.144.

1931. Proportionately, they represented 28% of the total population in 1931, up slightly from 1921.[77] During the 1920s, French-Canadian emigration to the US – once a major source of nationaliste anxiety – had slowed due to the economic boom in Quebec, which provided for relatively well-paying jobs within the province.[78] The proportion of Canadians of French ancestry in 1931 was up in New Brunswick (to 31.5%), Nova Scotia (11%), PEI (15%), and Ontario (9%).[79] Meanwhile, the secure majority in Quebec, the cradle of French civilization in North America, gave French Canada the base from which it could continue to expand across the continent. "[Au Québec nous] sommes l'immense majorité," Roy boasted. "C'est d'elle que sont sortis, comme du foyer surabondant de la race, les groupes français qui se sont répandus dans les autres provinces."[80] The 1931 census also served to reassure French Canadians that their place at the forefront of Canadian Catholicism was secure across the country.[81] The 1941 census results would prove even more encouraging. The French-Canadian population reached almost 3.5 million, or 30.4% of the total population that year – its highest proportion since Confederation. By comparison, the British-Canadian population (5.7 million in 1941) fell below 50% for the first time since Confederation.[82] Moreover, the census results allowed some moderate French-Canadian observers like Camille Roy to become more comfortable with the presence of Ethno-Cultural groups in that both French and Ethno-

---

[77] Leacy, *Historical Statistics*, Table A125-163; Bastien, *bilinguisme au Canada*, p.193.
[78] See Bernard Vigod, *Quebec Before Duplessis: the Political Career of Louis-Alexandre Taschereau* (Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1986) pp.122.
[79] Leacy, *Historical Statistics*, Table A125-163; Bastien, *bilinguisme au Canada*, p.193.
[80] "[S]auf les groupes acadiens," Roy was careful to point out. Roy, "Nos raisons canadiennes de rester français," in *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, p.8.
[81] By 1931, 97.3% of Canadians of French origin were Catholic, and 66.4% of Canadian Catholics were French Canadians (16.1% were British Canadians, including 8.9% who were Irish). French Catholics outnumbered British Catholics in every province except BC and PEI. See Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, p.193.
[82] Leacy, *Historical Statistics*, Table A125-163. Canadians of British ancestry represented 49.86% of the population.

Cultural Canadians were outpacing Anglo-Canadian growth, and that immigration had slowed to a more 'manageable' level as a result of the Great Depression.[83]

While proud of his people's accomplishments and his province's distinct character, Roy was anxious to remind readers that French Canadians, in and outside Quebec, were equally proud Canadians: "Nous voulons bien rester Français, mais nous voulons et surtout rester Canadiens, et pour cela, citoyens de la grande Confédération canadienne."[84] These identities were not mutually exclusive, but rather mutually reinforcing. French Canadians would continue to be partners in the great national project:

> Nous voulons être facteur dans la composition d'un grand peuple qui contiendra surtout deux grandes races: celle qui a fondé la patrie canadienne, c'est la nôtre; celle qui l'a conquise un jour sur la France, et qui ne peut-être que notre associée politique, c'est l'anglaise. Ce sont deux races qui doivent coopérer dans l'édification de la patrie commune et qui y doivent coopérer dans le respect mutuel de leurs droits.[85]

Roy quashed the idea of cultural isolation within or secession from Canada, asserting that these ideas, once popular among young radicals in the aftermath of the war, were now on the wane.[86]

Roy wanted his readers to see Quebec as a key economic and cultural contributor to contemporary Canadian life. It was prosperous, well-administered, and "aussi pratique que les Anglais."[87] Quebec was no longer the 'sick dog' of Confederation that so many British Canadians had once condemned it to be – it was the country's new economic

---

[83] Roy pointed to immigration's many potential benefits. He ascribed to the belief first articulated by George-Étienne Cartier, and later picked up on by Moore, Morley, Hawkes, and other multiculturalists like John Murray Gibbon, of achieving strength through diversity. "À ces deux races mères et maîtresses au Canada, que d'autres, immigrantes, viennent se joindre.... C'est d'une telle rencontre et d'une telle coopération vivante des races que se sont édifiées les plus puissantes nations de l'histoire." Roy, "Nos raisons canadiennes de rester français," in *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, p.15.
[84] Roy, "Nos raisons canadiennes de rester français," in *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, p.14.
[85] *Ibid*., p.15.
[86] *Ibid*., p.14.
[87] *Ibid*., p.9.

tiger. Even more, Catholic Quebec was Canada's surest bulwark against Communism, which Roy hoped would appeal to politically liberal but socially conservative Anglo-Canadians. Conversely, French-Canadian "humanisme traditionnel" helped limit across Canada the effects of vulgar North American materialism.[88] The values Roy ascribed to the French-Canadian people, both modern and traditional, were remarkably similar to those that had been voiced among moderate liberal Anglo-Canadian intellectuals.

It was important to Roy how Anglo-Canadians perceived French-speaking Canada: "Quel est maintenant, vis-à-vis du groupe français survivant, l'attitude du groupe anglais?"[89] By 1933, he believed that there was cause for optimism as far as national unity was concerned. It was a far cry from the pessimism he had expressed in his writing a decade earlier. Moreover, it marked a significant change not only in Anglo-Canadian attitudes, but also in how keen French-Canadian observers like Roy perceived Anglo-Canadians.[90] By now, Roy could confidently surmise that those who refused to get along – British Canadians who insisted on assimilation or French Canadians who insisted on cultural isolation – were in the minority. Most people, he believed, got along just fine, and simply wanted to get on with their lives instead of stoking the flames of racial animosity:

> Affirmons tout de suite qu'il y a entente cordiale, officielle et habituelle, entre ces deux groupes. S'il y eut, après la conquête anglaise, bien des heurts, bien des conflits pénibles, et si parfois encore il y a, de la part de certains élements assimilateurs, des sursauts d'intolérance, les Anglais bien pensants acceptent aujourd'hui le fait français comme un fait inévitable, et ils essayent de créer une atmosphère de plus en plus favorable de tolérance mutuelle.[91]

---

[88] *Ibid*., pp.31-32.
[89] Roy, "Nos raisons canadiennes de rester français," in *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, p.8.
[90] Roy's writings in the early 1920s were far less optimitstic about Anglo-/French-Canadian relations. See, for instance, Camille Roy, "L'Appel de la race, Par Alonié de Lestres," in Roy, *À l'ombre des érables* (Québec: Imprimerie de l'Action Sociale, Ltée., 1924), pp.273-296; Roy, "Le patriotisme de nos vieux maîtres," in *À l'ombre des érables*, pp. 297-311.
[91] Roy, "Nos raisons canadiennes de rester français," in *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, p.8.

The process of Anglophone/Francophone rapprochement, Roy explained, had been facilitated by the process of élite accommodation, especially. Members of the educated French-Canadian élite were increasingly bilingual,[92] while the educated, liberal-minded Anglo-Canadian élite increasingly supported French-language rights and federal bilingualism.[93] To be sure, Anglo- and French Canadians could do more to foster more positive interaction. Language remained something of a barrier, some Anglo-Canadians still saw Quebec as almost a 'foreign' province, and a handful of British-Canadian extremists continued to make noise on the margins.[94] But many Anglo-Canadians, Roy explained, wanted to learn more about French Canada. They recognized the need to reciprocate the magnanimous treatment granted to Quebec's Anglo-Canadian minority.[95]

Much like the Anglo-Canadian moderate liberals of the day, Roy invoked civic nationalism – a national identity based not on race but on a shared set of values, a common attachment to the land, and shared historical experiences.[96] In language reminiscent of Moore, Morley, Hawkes, Wrong, Pierce and others, Roy noted that French-Canadians' history of exploring, opening up, 'civilizing' and settling the untamed North was part of their contribution to the great national project of what was now Canada.[97] Like the sympathetic Anglo-Canadian historians, Roy invoked historical

---

[92] "Les Canadiens-Français instruits, ceux des classes dirigeantes, ... en général, parle[nt] les deux langues." *Ibid*., p.10.
[93] *Ibid*., p.11-12.
[94] "D'autre part, dans la vie sociale canadienne, les groupes anglais et français restent assez étrangers l'un à l'autre, la différence des langues et des tempéraments élevant entre eux une barrière toute naturelle, difficile à franchir." *Ibid*., p.8.
[95] "Cette élite comprend mieux cette harmonie quand elle étudie davantage la vie sociale, intellectuelle, politique de notre province française de Québec. Nous y donnons le spectacle du plus large *fair play* britannique, en ne privant la minorité anglaise d'aucun de ses droits scolaires et religieux, et en lui faisant plus que sa part dans la distribution des deniers, des emplois et des honneurs publics." *Ibid.*
[96] *Ibid*., pp.10-11.
[97] Roy, "Nos raisons canadiennes de rester français," in *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, p.15.

examples of past English/French cross-cultural collaboration to provide inspiration for the present. He referred to his ancestors' measured loyalty to a relatively lenient British Crown, and cited the shared struggle for responsible self-government and political equality:

> En 1842, ce sera, par l'action parlementaire combinée de Lafontaine et Baldwin, la conquête enfin assurée du gouvernement responsable. En 1867, ce sera, par l'alliance de Cartier et de MacDonald, la Confédération des provinces canadiennes avec le statu qui place sur un pied d'égalité définitive, au Canada, les deux races française et anglaise.[98]

The 1840-1867 period of cross-cultural collaboration was a source of inspiration for recent efforts by leading Anglo- and French Canadians to turn the corner. Roy explained that Anglo-Canadians in intellectual, business and political circles had been especially instrumental in improving relations.[99]

What had made the post-war process of rapprochement possible, Roy argued, was the fact that both peoples had changed – both were now uniquely Canadian: "Le Canadien-Anglais n'est plus l'Anglais d'Angleterre. Le Français du Canada ne ressemble pas tout à fait au Français de France."[100] A decade earlier, Roy, like Groulx, had referred to Anglo-Canadians as simply "les Anglais," and to French Canadians as "les Canadiens."[101] The acknowledgement from a leading French-Canadian intellectual like Roy that Anglo-Canadians were true Canadians and not simply transplanted British interlopers – only fifteen years after the height of British imperialist war-time zeal and

---

[98] *Ibid*., p.28.
[99] "Grâce à Dieu, ... il ne manque pas, chez nos compatriotes anglais, soit dans la politique, soit dans les universités, soit dans les affaires, d'esprits larges et justes qui travaillent avec nous pour que soient respectés tous nos droits historiques et constitutionnels, et pour qu'entre les deux races maîtresses du Canada règne l'entente cordiale." *Ibid*., pp.28-29.
[100] *Ibid*., pp.17-18.
[101] See Roy, "L'Appel de la race, Par Alonié de Lestres," p.293; Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, p.44.

hysteria – marked a real improvement in the emotional and intellectual climate of the period.

The Irascible Liberal, Jean-Charles Harvey

The ideas then being promoted by Roy transcended the political spectrum and the clerical boundaries of French Canada's intellectual class. Influential journalist, novelist and bonne ententiste Jean-Charles Harvey provides a good example. By 1915, Harvey had secured a job in Montreal writing for *La Patrie*, arguably the most reconciliationist paper in any language, and shortly thereafter he began working for the influential liberal paper, *La Presse*. From 1922 through the interwar he wrote for the Quebec Liberal Party-affiliated *Le Soleil* in Quebec City, becoming editor-in-chief in 1927.[102] Through *Le Soleil*, he maintained close contact with Quebec Premier Louis-Alexandre Taschereau.[103] Harvey believed that instead of trying to achieve retribution for the alleged wrongs of the past, French Canadians should look to the future. "Ne pensez pas à la patrie de vos ancètres," he wrote, "pensez à la patrie de vos enfants."[104] They could flourish, he argued, by taking full advantage of the opportunity that all of Canada had to offer, while at the same time upholding the principle of "bilinguisme et le droit de se faire servir dans sa langue maternelle."[105]

---

[102] Yves Lavertu, *Jean-Charles Harvey: Le Combattant* (Montréal: Boréal, 2000), pp.13; Guildo Rousseau, "Jean-Charles Harvey," *Canadian Encyclopedia* (Historica-Dominica, 2012), accessed 12 January 2013, http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/jeancharles-harvey.
[103] See Dupont, *Taschereau*, pp.308-309.
[104] Jean-Charles Harvey, *Pourquoi je suis anti-séparatiste* (Montréal: Les éditions de l'homme, 1962), back cover.
[105] David Éric Simard, "Jean-Charles Harvey, défenseur des libertés et promoteur de la modernité: *Le Jour* (1937-1946)," Master's thesis in Political Science (Université du Québec à Montréal, December 2007), p.79.

Harvey, whose work appeared in both languages, delivered a fierce critique of cultural isolationism and its supporters. Driven by their need for self-aggrandizement, he argued, these intellectuals prevented the French-Canadian people from realizing their full potential:

> There is one contribution French-speaking Canada could make right away to the cause of national unity which would in no sense run counter to the basic traditions of our nationality. We used to be one of the greatest pioneering races in the world. Practically the entire continent of North America ... was discovered and opened to civilization by men from what is now the Province of Quebec. ....
> The lapse of French Canada into defeatism, into exaggerated sensitiveness, into a sort of inferiority complex ... is comparatively a new thing in Canadian life. And it is a thing superimposed deliberately upon our people by inventors of all sorts of philosophical, political, and educational shibboleths who have themselves lost sight of the realistic aspects of the struggle for survival in North America.[106]

More to the point, Harvey was convinced that cultural and linguistic isolation led to stagnation and inhibited material progress. If French Canadians were going to survive the rapid changes of the modern era, they must continually engage in the political, economic, cultural and social life of the broader society. The alternative, he continued, was inevitable decline.

In doubtless reference to Groulx, Harvey alleged that support among the masses for such cultural isolation had been the product of deliberate manipulation on the part of nationaliste historians and intellectuals who relied on emotion instead of reason to make their case. French-Canadian youths who had been misguided in this way were not to blame, as they were especially vulnerable to appeals to emotion. Here, he merits citation at length:

> Nous savons que nombre d'étudiants et collégiens [ont été] égarés par des professeurs imbéciles et ignorants, ainsi qu'une poignée de journalistes logés à l'enseigne du fascisme et du corporatisme.... C'est pourquoi je voudrais leur dire: "Ce n'est pas tout de parler de la race et de la langue, de ressusciter les cadavres

[106] In Lorne Pierce, *A Canadian People* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1945), p.82.

> historiques, d'ergoter à l'infini sur les injustices, réelles ou supposées, de la majorité canadienne, de haïr tout ce qui n'est pas catholique et français. Non, ce n'est pas tout. Il faut vivre, compter avec les voisins, s'adapter au fait accompli de la grande réalité nord-américaine, éviter l'isolement racique; il faut savoir que trois millions d'hommes perdus dans un océan humain de 140 millions de population, ne peuvent se suffire à eux mêmes; il faut enfin penser en humain avant de penser en laurentien, réfléchir, agir, créer, commercer, produire, échanger.... O jeunesse, jeunesse! Si tu savais jusqu'à quel point on a abusé de ton honnêteté même, de tes élans vers l'idéal, de ta touchante crédulité...., jamais tu ne retournerais vers ces faux guides qui t'ont plongée dans l'absurde de la tête aux pieds!"[107]

Again and again, the themes of engagement over cultural isolation, adaptation over retrenchment, cooperation over opposition, and humanism over racialism, all of which Harvey deemed so crucial for French Canada's long-term success, came through in his writing.

Harvey believed that an appreciation by both Anglo- and French Canadians for their shared history would help the two communities more closely identify with each other. To that end, he called for a pan-Canadian standard in the teaching of history: "Il faudrait former un comité bilingue qui serait constitué des meilleurs historiens du pays, de façon à élaborer un seul et unique manuel d'histoire pour tous les enfants de ce pays."[108] In addition to using history as the basis for a shared identity, Harvey also looked to Canadian institutions and common liberal values, such as individual liberty, democracy, and bilingualism. Canadians of all origins, French, British, or otherwise, could ascribe to this identity:

> Il est souverainement important que les Canadiens de langue française comme ceux de langue anglaise s'attachent à la conception humaine de la société ou de la nation, se dépouillent de leur sectarisme, favorisent les associations honnêtement neutres, où les hommes s'affrontent et se comprennent parce qu'ils ont de

[107] Harvey was referring especially to the later 1930s, and to the rise of the Bloc populaire. In Pierce, *A Canadian People*, pp.57-58.
[108] In Simard, "Jean-Charles Harvey: défenseur des libertés," p.79.

> meilleur, c'est-à-dire l'humain. Tous les esprits vraiment libéraux comprendront ce que je veux dire. L'espoir de la patrie repose sur eux.[109]

To that end, Canadians should stop framing the national duality in ethnic and religious terms.

A liberal Freemason, Harvey was an ardent proponent of free thought and free speech. He criticized Catholic corporatism and the alleged alliance between civil, religious, and business authorities. His work was widely read by intellectuals, including supporters and opponents. In 1934, Harvey was denounced by Cardinal Jean-Marie Rodrigue Villeneuve for his beliefs and for his novel, *Les Demi-civilisés*, which had given voice to much of those convictions. Harvey subsequently lost his job at *Le Soleil*, but was taken on as a statistician by the Taschereau government. He was fired three years later by the new Duplessis government. With the help of Anglo-Montreal capital, Harvey founded *Le Jour* in 1937, a newspaper promoting a more modern, statist liberalism and cross-cultural collaboration. At heart, Harvey wanted to "faire échec à ce mouvement [séparatiste] dans toute la mesure de mes moyens. C'est pourquoi je mis l'unité canadienne en tête de mon programme de combat."[110] After the Second World War, he went on to work as a radio news commentator, lecturing across Canada and in the 1960s wrote against Quebec secessionism. Canada, not Quebec, and not just *French* Canada, he maintained, was the true nation of all French-speaking Canadians.[111]

Harvey encouraged his readers to build stronger ties with English-speaking Canada. Diversity was strength. By working together, Canadians could unlock "toutes les richesses désirables en hommes, en culture, en technique, en imagination, en ressources

---

[109] Jean-Charles Harvey, "Le Drame national," *Le Jour* (Montréal), 3 March 1945, p.1.
[110] Harvey, *Pourquoi je suis anti-séparatiste*, p.9. See also Victor Teboul, *Le Jour: émergence du libéralisme moderne au Québec* (Montréal: Éditions Hurtubise, 1984).
[111] Jean-Charles Harvey, "7e année, numéro I," *Le Jour*, 11 September 1943, p.1.

naturelles," leading to "une vie meilleure pour chacun des membres du corps social." Moreover, due recognition of both peoples "sera le plus rude coup que l'on ait jamais porté à cette pourriture qu'on appelle le nationalisme."[112] Harvey did not shy away from condemning the many collective faults and sins of British Canadians.[113] But he reminded readers that French Canadians had done their own part to strain relations: by being overly parochial, anti-modern, racialist in their identity, excessively traditionalistic and nationalistic, and anti-liberal as well as anti-English. Moreover, speaking from his own experience of having met Anglo-Canadians through work and professional life, Harvey explained in 1939 that French Canadians could find true compatriots in English-speaking Canada:

> 'Dans votre carrière, je souhaite de tout mon cœur que vous vous trouviez dans la nécessité de traiter aussi bien avec des Canadiens de langue anglaise que de langue française. Ce sera pour vous le salut, car vous y apprendrez qu'il suffit de se mieux connaître pour s'aimer et que, en fait de loyauté en affaires, de fidélité à la parole donnée, de générosité même, nous avons des leçons à apprendre de ceux qu'on nous a enseigné à combattre, sinon à détester.'[114]

Harvey's own work was certainly noticed in Anglo-Canadian intellectual circles. In addition to securing Anglo-Canadian support for his newspaper, Harvey had his writings translated by moderate intellectuals who were anxious for his perspective to reach unilingual Anglophones. To that end, he gained significant praise for his criticisms of both Anglo-Canadian and French-Canadian attitudes. In short, his example gave hope to moderate Anglo-Canadian observers that rapprochement with French Canada was possible: "Some of his compatriots call Harvey a renegade, a traitor to his race and other

---

[112] Jean-Charles Harvey, *Les grenouilles demandent un roi* (Montréal: Les Éditions du jour, 1943), p.83.
[113] "[T]rop souvent on a nié aux descendants des pionniers du Canada leur droit de garder leur personnalité dans toutes les parties du pays." Jean-Charles Harvey, "Culte de l'encens ou de la vérité," *Le Jour*, Montréal, 4 February 1939, p.1.
[114] In Simard, "Jean-Charles Harvey: défenseurs des libertés," p.78.

things," wrote Lorne Pierce, an admirer, "but we believe that only through such good sense as he has shown through the years will a Canadian nation be possible."[115]

Gustave Lanctot: Building Bridges with English-speaking Canada

Another prominent reconciliationist French-Canadian intellectual from outside the Catholic Church was Gustave Lanctot. An historian, he was highly respected for his professionalism. As Ronald Rudin explains, "Lanctot was arguably the best-trained historian in Quebec up to the start of the Second World War."[116] Lanctot was one of the first Francophone historians with a focus on Quebec and Canada to earn a PhD. A Rhodes scholar, he served in the Great War, and gained distinction in the 1920s while studying the writings of François-Xavier Garneau, whom he admired for his measured and contextualized assessment of Canada's post-Conquest history. In 1937, Lanctot reached the pinnacle of his career when he became Dominion Archivist. Lanctot was something of a successor to Chapais. He believed above all in the importance of research, primary source evidence, and in a neutral and contextualized approach.[117] He was also a pan-Canadian nationalist. Lanctot advocated for strong central government, and was often magnanimous in his treatment of British Canada and the British régime.[118]

Lanctot's influence also extended to the Anglo-Canadian intellectual community, in which he was well integrated and highly respected. A prolific writer, Lanctot had a number of his works on Canada's French history translated and published in English,

---

[115] Pierce, *A Canadian People*, p.58.
[116] Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, p.40.
[117] See Ronald Rudin, "Lionel Groulx and the Building of the Infrastructure for the Quebec Historical Profession," in Michael D. Behiels, ed., *Quebec Since 1880* (Toronto: Irwin Publishing, 2002) p.13; and Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, pp.40-41.
[118] Gustave Lanctot, *Le Canada d'Hier et Aujourd'hui* (Montréal: Éditions Albert Lévesque, 1934), p.211.

including collaborative work with Anglo-Canadian colleagues.[119] He was no stranger to the English-language publishing houses, having published his French-language biography of François-Xavier Garneau with Ryerson Press in Toronto in 1926. Lanctot would continue publishing well into the 1960s, in both French and English. During the Second World War, he called upon French-Canadian intellectuals to put aside their personal prejudices in favour of "'national unity.'"[120] Lanctot was uniquely positioned to understand British Canada. He was extremely proud of Canada's role in the Great War. He also understood that important emotional ties with Britain and the Empire persisted, but that these ties did not preclude a sincere attachment to Canada – an attachment that he recognized as having become stronger over the course of the interwar period.[121]

Lanctot most clearly expressed his views on Canada's past and present in *Le Canada d'Hier et Aujourd'hui* (1934). It was a condensed overview written in accessible language for a wide audience. The first half of the book provided an historical overview. The second half discussed contemporary Canada, covering Canadian geography, population, institutions, economy, and intellectual life. Unlike some French-Canadian intellectuals, he did not equate "Canada" and "les Canadiens" with French-speaking Canada. His book gave due coverage to both French Canada and Anglo-Canada. To this end, his historical overview did not simply start with Jacques Cartier like so many other French-language history texts, but instead began with major 'discoveries' pertinent to

[119] Including *Reports on the Laws of Quebec* with W.P.M. Kennedy (1931), *Dollard des Ormeaux and the Fight at the Long Sault* with E.R. Adair (1932), *Cartier's First Voyage to Canada* (1944), and collections of historical documents on Canada, Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.
[120] In Rudin, "Lionel Groulx and the Building of the Quebec Historical Profession," p.13.
[121] Lanctot, *Le Canada d'Hier et Aujourd'hui*, pp.7, 161.

British Canada, such as those of the Vikings and John Cabot. All regions, including the north, received their own historical overview.[122]

Lanctot was proud of Canada as a whole – for its past accomplishments, its present success, and its future potential. For the country's past, Lanctot cited the example of Canada's contribution of "six cent mille soldats" to the Great War, "pour [le Canada] véritable croisade." For contemporary successes he trumpeted the country's social progress, industry, commerce, agricultural output, and natural resource extraction, pointing to an economic recovery – things typical of Anglophone boosters of Canada. He also took notable pride in Canada's British parliamentary system: "il jouit d'un régime remarquablement stable et respectueux des droits du citoyen." He remarked on the country's prominent League of Nations delegation – headed by a French-Canadian no less – and its leading role as an equal member of the British Commonwealth. All of this, Lanctot explained, had been made possible by the combined energies of the two founding peoples.[123] Moreover, Lanctot believed that all Canadians should take pride in those things that French Canadians were typically proud of – perseverance, cultural preservation, and pride of place – and that Anglo-Canadians were typically proud of – material and industrial progress, (selective) immigration, international stature and military prowess.

Lanctot was demonstrably proud of the massive immigration that Canada had experienced leading up to and following the Great War. It was an exceptional position for a French Canadian, who might otherwise be expected to look negatively upon immigration for contributing to a surge in the Anglo-Canadian population. Lanctot went

---

[122] *Ibid*., pp.11.
[123] Lanctot, *Le Canada d'Hier et Aujourd'hui*, pp.8-9.

so far as to echo his Anglo-Canadian counterparts in lamenting the loss of potential immigrants to the US. Like his English-speaking colleagues, he saw this immigration as proof of Canada's desirability as a place with a thriving economy and social life, wealth, and international significance. He reminded readers that the vision for an economically strong, immigration-driven country had once belonged to a great French Canadian, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Lanctot understood that immigration to the under-populated Canadian West created wealth, and that this national wealth benefited the country as a whole, including Quebec. He even appeared to celebrate the diversity that immigration had brought, citing the "véritable ruée d'émigrants de l'Europe centrale, Ruthènes et Russes de l'Ukraine, Hollondais et Flamands, Bohêmes d'Autriche et Scandinaves, Allemands et Polonais."[124] He was highly critical of Groulx's "école raciste," as he called it.[125] Lanctot was confident that the Ethno-Cultural communities would integrate successfully into the larger Canadian politic, contributing "une industrie" that only immigrant peoples possessed.[126] Interestingly, several of the themes presented by Lanctot would be expanded upon a few years later by the Anglo-Canadian multiculturalist, John Murray Gibbon.[127]

Lanctot established a linear historical narrative for Canada that bordered on teleology. For him, the past was one unbroken story of progress, with events and achievements from the time of Cabot, Cartier and onward contributing to the making of present-day Canada. In this way, both Anglo- and French Canadians could take a

[124] Lanctot, *Le Canada d'Hier et Aujourd'hui*, p.142.
[125] Lanctot spoke to "les bénifices de l'immigration," pointing out that immigrants were hardworking, resourceful, and essential to the economy. *Ibid.*, pp.169, 195.
[126] "[D]ès la seconde génération, ces fils de l'Europe, formés à l'école nationale, s'attachent, en général, à devenir canadiens par le désir naturel de monter dans l'échelle sociale et de s'évader de la classe des étragers." *Ibid*., p.193.
[127] See John Murray Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic. The Making of a Northern Nation*, (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Ltd., 1938).

measure of ownership over each other's history and accomplishments. Canada was a collective project, in whose achievements, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, both principal peoples could take a share of the glory. It was a narrative remarkably similar to that established by sympathetic Anglo-Canadian intellectuals and historians like Moore, Morley and Wrong. This narrative began with the glories of New France, which, Lanctot told readers, had laid the foundation not only for a French-speaking North American society, but for the whole of modern-day Canada itself, from the Atlantic to the Rockies.[128] It continued with the (mostly) just rule of the British regime, which had secured the loyalty of French Canadians who for their part had ensured that Canada remained British during the American War of Independence. Lanctot gave a sympathetic, if brief, history of the Loyalist refugees and drew attention to the many injustices they had suffered, and credited them with the "juste demande" for legislative assemblies.[129] He referred to the glories of 1812 and, anachronistically, to the great victories of "l'armée canadienne" with its British- and French-Canadian soldiers.[130] The injustices and affronts which had sparked the rebellions of 1837-1838, he reminded readers, had been committed against both British and French Canadians in *both* of the Canadas – exceptional for a French-Canadian historiography that might otherwise only consider the Lower Canadian rebellion in its analysis.[131] The story thereafter was one of the gradual "conquête" of responsible self-government, made possible by the great Anglophone/Francophone partnerships of moderates like Lafontaine and Baldwin,

[128] "Elle avait ... ouvert à la civilisation huit des neuf provinces canadiennes." *Ibid*., p.71.
[129] *Ibid.*, pp.79.
[130] *Ibid.*, p.88.
[131] See Lanctot, *Le Canada d'hier et aujourd'hui*, pp.91.

Macdonald and Cartier, and by open-minded British statesmen like Lord Grey.[132] The use of the word "conquête" was deliberate – the achievement of self-government supplanted the humiliation of military conquest one hundred years earlier. Lanctot explained the third era of Canadian history, Confederation or the 'Canadian régime,' in terms of gradual territorial expansion, national progress, and the march toward full autonomy and independence. 1867 marked the end of a long period of colonial domination during which the country had existed first for French and then British interests. With Confederation, and the uniting of an immense country, Canada could exert its self-governance and take its rightful place in the international community.[133]

Notably, Lanctot's account of the cultural-linguistic divisions that characterized the 1880-1918 period was muted. His treatment of the schools question on the Prairies, for instance, was restrained. He described the Laurier-Greenway compromise of 1896 as "un *modus vivendi* assez tolérable."[134] The Conscription Crisis of 1917-1918, meanwhile, was completely glossed over. Instead, he gave a glorious history of Canada's wartime participation as though the entire country had been of one mind, united for the war effort.[135] To be sure, Lanctot doubtless wanted French Canadians to share in what he believed to be a justifiable British-Canadian pride in Canada's remarkable wartime achievements, and to remind French Canadians that this was a part of their recent history too. But Lanctot's treatment of the Anglophone/Francophone dynamic, and of past points of conflict in particular, was also indicative of the extent to which he had set out to establish a reconciliationist narrative for his Francophone readership. For someone like

[132] *Ibid*., p.103.
[133] *Ibid*., pp.9-10.
[134] *Ibid*., p.139.
[135] "Le pays fut dominé par une seule preoccupation: la victoire." *Ibid*., p.148.

Lanctot who had become socially and professionally integrated into both communities, and who had experienced the 'softer,' more magnanimous, and biculturalist side of English-speaking Canadian society, such a generous portrayal would not have seemed contradictory.

As far as Lanctot was concerned, both Anglo- and French Canadians had their fair share of faults. The challenge, he argued, was to make the most of the qualities of both. The country's bicultural character was its greatest asset:

> Seul en Amérique, le Canada présente l'intéressant phénomène d'une dualité de langue et de culture, anglaises et françaises. Source d'enrichissement intellectuel et social, il en résulte une double littérature, canadienne d'inspiration, mais différente de concept et d'expression.[136]

Lanctot was not uncritical of French Canada: "De formation dogmatique, se reposant trop sur ses chefs, il n'incline et ne s'intéresse que lentement aux initiatives sociales et aux disciplines nouvelles."[137] But he remained very proud of his people's contributions to Confederation: "À l'oeuvre nationale, il apporte la contribution de sa forte natalité, de sa santé économique et de son patriotisme autochtone, pendant que sa parole habitue l'esprit à plus de tolérance et de largeur de vue dans les directives politiques."[138]

Lanctot's observations about Anglo-Canadian society, the group "[qui] domine et dirige l'évolution du Dominion,"[139] were instructive. Collectively, his observations pointed to the extent to which the English-speaking society had 'improved' on the whole in the eyes of French-Canadian observers like Lanctot, and the changes that it would still have to undergo in order to further secure national unity. Moreover, Lanctot's example illustrates the fact that French-Canadian intellectuals were no longer simply lumping

---

[136] Lanctot, *Le Canada d'hier et aujourd'hui*, p.263.
[137] *Ibid.*, p.196.
[138] *Ibid.*, p.197.
[139] *Ibid.*, p.198.

English-speaking Canadians together with Americans or with Britons, and instead beginning to see them as a people in their own right, with their own set of values, strengths and weaknesses. It was a far cry from the days when Henri Bourassa doubted the 'Canadianness' of British Canadians altogether – a people not truly *of* this place.[140] Lanctot's description of Anglo-Canadians bears citation at length:

> Pris dans son ensemble, le Canadien britannique constitue, cependant, un type spécifique, mi-anglais et mi-américain par les habitudes. De la Grande-Bretagne, par ascendance, il retient des qualités foncières de rigorisme moral et de discipline sociale.... [et] une naturelle aptitude à la gestion publique et aux oeuvres communautaires. Aux États-Unis, par voie d'un contact incessant par la finance, le commerce, le voyage, le cinéma, le livre, le journal et le sport, le Canadien a emprunté ... le goût de l'existence standard et confortable. En apparence, il se rapproche plus de l'Américain que de l'Anglais, parce qu'il pratique ce qui est le plus visible, les habitudes de vie du premier, mais, en réalité, il s'apparente davantage à l'Anglais, parce qu'il partage, ce qui est plus essentiel, sa mentalité. En définitive, son américanisme résulte moins de l'influence américaine que de réactions similaires dans un milieu identique, c'est-à-dire dans une terre neuve sans traditions conventionnelles, où la richesse du pays et la liberté de l'homme provoquent une exubérance de force, une égalité dans la réussite et un optimisme audacieux.[141]

The last sentence was perhaps the most significant – here lay the basis for a shared experience and a shared identity on the part of Anglo- and French Canadians, North Americans both. Moreover, Lanctot was optimistic that the world-view of Anglo-Canadians, so narrow in the past, had begun to broaden, and in no small part as a result of the country's new international status and independence.

Lanctot recognized that this change in the Anglo-Canadian outlook was also the product of changes occurring among English-speaking civil society, including historians and writers in particular, who seemed more self-assured in the country's history and its bicultural heritage. Lanctot paid specific tribute to authors like George M. Wrong, A.G.

---

[140] See Bourassa, "Reply to Capt. Talbot Papineau, August 2, 1916," pp.150.

[141] Like French Canadians, he continued, most Anglo-Canadians simply wanted to build a better society for their children. Lanctot, *Le Canada d'hier et aujourd'hui*, pp.198-199.

Doughty, William Wood, Lawrence J. Burpee, H.P. Biggar, Chester Martin, O.D. Skelton, W.P.M. Kennedy, and Lorne Pierce.[142] Lanctot was evidently very well read in as far as English-language literature was concerned, and conscious of emerging trends in Anglo-Canadian thought.

The point here is that at least some leading French-Canadian intellectuals were taking notice of the change in Anglo-Canadian civil society following the Great War. Moreover, these Anglo-Canadian intellectuals were increasingly building bridges with their French-Canadian counterparts, notably through associations and literary societies.[143] Lanctot championed a historiography that could surmount the provincial, racialist and partisan opinions inherent in heterogeneous Canada. He called for a historiography that, using new European methodologies, would apply a more scientific approach, relying on documentation and a neutral interpretation of events. Moreover, historiography could be used for national unity – to instil "un sentiment et un éclat qui s'accordent aux grands événements et à l'avenir plus grand encore qui s'annonce."[144] He dreamed of a day when schools across the country would teach from the same textbook.

Abbé Arthur Maheux: Liberal civic nationalist history as a foundation for unity

Perhaps the most forceful French-Canadian proponent of using history to achieve national unity was the Abbé Arthur Maheux. Born in rural Quebec, he received his B.A. at Laval (1904), followed by a PhD in theology (1908). During the war Maheux earned a

[142] *Ibid*., p.279. See also Lanctot, *Les historiens d'hier et l'histoire d'aujourd'hui*, pp.12.
[143] Lanctot wrote at length about the various literary and intellectual societies, like the Royal Society of Canada, "la *Société d'histoire du Canada*, qui représente le pays au sein du *Comité international des sciences historiques*," the "*Champlain Society* de Toronto, (1905) qui publie régulièrement de magnifiques éditions de documents historiques," and "la *Canadian Authors' Association*, avec des sections françaises dans la province de Québec." Lanctot, *Le Canada d'hier et aujourd'hui*, pp.292-293.
[144] Lanctot, *Les historiens d'hier et l'histoire d'aujourd'hui*, p.14.

degree in philology at the Sorbonne in Paris. He returned to Quebec in 1918, and in 1923 obtained an M.A. at Laval. By then he was teaching courses and working as an administrator at both Laval and the Séminaire de Québec. His role at both institutions grew over the coming decades, whether serving on council, developing curriculum and archival collections, managing external relations, or simply teaching. By 1938, Maheux had formally succeeded the Abbé Albert Tessier as chief lecturer of history at Laval.[145] He demonstrated an early interest in the debate over Anglophone/Francophone relations (he was among those in the early 1920s who critiqued Lionel Groulx's sensational novel, *L'Appel de la race*).[146] From the outset, Maheux promoted a reading of history that focussed on the development of French-Canadian identity, along with the fostering of bonne entente with Anglo-Canadians.

Maheux's programme at Laval placed a strong emphasis on building bridges with the larger Canadian community. He insisted that his students take English-language courses, read in English, and even take summer jobs in English-language settings, "'so that they might eventually be able to read, speak and write English fluently,'" he explained. "'The knowledge of English is indispensible.'"[147] He even began establishing formal links with the Anglo-Canadian academic community, notably at the University of Toronto, which by then had become home to several Anglo-Canadians sympathetic toward French Canada.[148] Maheux eventually established a regular exchange of professors between Laval and Toronto in order to "'make French Canada better known in

[145] Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, p.51.
[146] Lucie Robert, "Camille Roy et Lionel Groulx: la querelle de l'Appel de la race," *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, Vol. 32, No 3 (décembre 1978), pp.400.
[147] In Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, p.81.
[148] See, for instance, *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto. Souvenir Booklet of the visit to Toronto of His Eminence Cardinal Villeneuve, O.M.I., Archbishop of Quebec, June 5-9, 1934* (Toronto: St. Michael's College, 1934), pp.46.

an English-speaking province.'"[149] In addition to his own experiences, Maheux took heart in the coming together of other elements of the Anglo- and French-Canadian civil societies during the interwar, with inroads and connections being made both formally and informally through various organizations.

Maheux was an academic of considerable influence, both during and after the interwar period. He was a prolific writer, and received several honours in both English- and French-speaking Canada, as well as in France and elsewhere in the Commonwealth.[150] In addition to Maheux's normal teaching responsibilities, Laval Rector Camille Roy commissioned him to give public courses on Canadian history. Maheux also gave lectures throughout Canada and the United States, culminating in a radio series for la Société Radio-Canada, which was published in both French and English. In the series, Rudin explains, "he insisted that Canadian unity was constantly being undermined by the teaching of history in Quebec in a fashion that encouraged hatred."[151]

Maheux told listeners of his radio series that the glass was half full. When taking the long view of history, he explained, the place of French Canadians had improved significantly:

> 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.[152]

---

[149] In Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, p.81.
[150] See Archives de l'Université Laval, 664, Fonds Arthur Maheux, archival description, accessed 8 July 2011, http://www.archivescanada.ca/english/search/ItemDisplay.asp?sessionKey=999999999_142&itm=162395.
[151] Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, p.52.
[152] Maheux, *What Keeps Us Apart?*, pp.80-81.

Given his interactions with moderate liberal Anglo-Canadians and the circles he kept among like-minded French Canadians, Maheux was convinced that the extremists on both sides were a tiny (if occasionally loud!) minority. Much like Moore, Morley, Hawkes, Wrong, and others, Maheux believed that it was incumbent upon the moderate liberal intellectuals, professionals, and educated citizens to speak up:

> 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.[153]

Moreover, and in challenging the Groulx school of thought, Maheux argued that the onus was on each cultural-linguistic community to change itself – to focus on addressing its own faults instead of focussing on those of the other.[154] He singled out the teaching of history as both a source of misunderstanding as well as a potential means to improve cross-cultural understanding:

> 'Certain of these obstacles are to be found in our treatment of history, especially in the history books which we place in the hands of our youth. When used by prejudiced teachers such textbooks instil hatred slowly but surely.... Get away from prejudice and you will banish hatred, and fear, too, though that may prove a more difficult task.'[155]

The French-Canadian obsession over survival, Maheux warned, understandable though it may be, threatened to stifle their society: "'To preserve [ourselves] just as [we] were, ...

---

[153] Maheux, *What Keeps Us Apart?*, p.82.
[154] "'Let us turn rather to our own task. Let us root out amongst ourselves whatever obstacles to good understanding between the two Canadian groups may be found.'" Maheux in Pierce, *A Canadian People*, p.45.
[155] In *Ibid*., p.45.

mean[s] making tradition, even prejudice, and the imitation of others, the masters of our destiny.'"[156]

Maheux's work provoked intense debate among Quebec academics. While some agreed with Maheux, his criticism of the Montreal School nationaliste historians made him the subject of particularly virulent attacks.[157] In English-speaking Canada, his lectures and writing were well received. Lorne Pierce, for instance, was impressed by Maheux's willingness to boldly state his opinions at the risk of such castigation:

> The Abbé Arthur Maheux has made a veritable apostolate of good will between French and English peoples in Canada that must bear good fruit in time. It is difficult for an outsider to understand the invective levelled against him, the bitterness of it, the malevolence and frightening rage of it. But in the end reason surely will prevail.[158]

The example of Maheux and other moderate French Canadians gave moderate Anglo-Canadians the hope not only that rapprochement with French Canada was possible, but that their own efforts at educating Anglo-Canadians and reaching out to French Canadians were not in vain.[159]

Maheux remained active and influential well after the war, teaching a number of scholars who would be among the leading minds of the Quebec historiography. His outlook, however, was formed during the interwar period; it was a product of the development of bonne ententiste narratives, and the extent to which some intellectuals

---

[156] In *Ibid*., p.45.
[157] "Towards Maheux, ... Groulx did not indicate the slightest hint of professional respect." Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, p.51.
[158] Pierce, *A Canadian People*, p.58.
[159] See, for instance, Charles E. Phillips, "The Schools of Quebec," *Canadian Education*, Vol.1, No. 2 (January 1946), pp.58-81. "We Canadians should instead make the most of the interests and customs we have in common, and of the sincere desire of the great majority of our people – English-speaking and French-speaking – to be friends. For this last digression, which is not without purpose even here, I may plead as an excuse the influence of the Abbé Maheux; I do so with appreciateive acknowledgment of the rightness and desireability of his point of view and of his admirable efforts to bring others to the same way of thinking." P.63.

had begun to tire of the nationaliste, anti-Anglophone discourse. On balance, then, Maheux's writings and ideas reflected those of an important element of moderates in Quebec's clerico-intellectual class during the interwar period.[160]

Challenging Abbé Groulx's pessimistic view of Francophone/Anglophone relations

The debate between the Montreal and Quebec schools of thought matured throughout the interwar years. While normally marked by a certain mutual respect, it was at times tense, and spoke to the fact that French-Canadian Quebecers were hardly uniform in supporting Groulx's thinking about Canada's past, present and future. Far from it. Several prominent thinkers, Camille Roy and Arthur Maheux among them, used the debate with the Groulx school to assert a far more accommodationist vision.

One of the earliest and most vociferous debates emerged after the release of Groulx's controversial novel, *L'Appel de la race* (1922), published under the pseudonym Alonié de Lestres. Groulx's book was loosely inspired by the life of Franco-Ontarian lawyer, Liberal Senator and prominent bonne ententiste, Napoléon Belcourt. The novel's protagonist, named Jules de Lantagnac, was a Quebec-born Franco-Ontarian Parliamentarian and Ottawa lawyer married to a British-Canadian convert to Catholicism, named Maud Fletcher, and whose Ontario-born children had been heavily Anglicized. In the book, the protagonist attempts to speak out against Regulation 17, but is opposed by his wife. His nationaliste priest advises the protagonist to carry on with his plan, despite the risk this may pose to family unity. Predictably, Groulx depicts the British-Canadian wife disowning her Franco-Ontarian husband, while the latter must leave Ontario and

[160] "Enfin, [Maheux] témoigne des idées qui circulent dans la cléricature canadienne et chez les fédéralistes de cette époque." Archives de l'Université Laval, 664, Fonds Arthur Maheux, archival description.

travel to Quebec in order to rediscover his roots and 'de-assimilate' his offspring. Among other things, Groulx's book heavily criticized the education system and the French-Canadian intellectual establishment for failing to instil French-Canadian patriotism.[161]

Members of French Canada's intellectual élite were divided over whether or not to support Groulx's very pessimistic view of French/British relations. Some, like the future Cardinal Villeneuve, at the time a soft secessionist, praised it.[162] Several other prominent French Canadians came out against Groulx's approach in the book. Among them were Louvigny de Montigny, a journalist, businessman and writer, and René du Roure, a writer and French professor at McGill, who criticized Groulx for having violated the private life of a living politician, Belcourt. Claude-Henri Grignon, who later penned *Un homme et son péché,* and Maheux also contested "les affirmations de Groulx quant à l'absence de patriotisme dans l'enseignement classique au XIXe siècle."[163] The most vociferous criticism, however, came from Camille Roy. Roy published two articles in the December 1922 and April 1923 issues of *Le Canada français,* critiquing the book.[164] The debate over *L'Appel de la race* provides a window into the competing ideologies that existed among French-Canadian intellectuals during the interwar period. It also served to demonstrate that the intellectuals who still believed in cross-cultural engagement were not mere 'vendus' or 'sell-outs' as depicted by some French-Canadian nationalistes. It is interesting to note that at precisely the same time that English-speaking Canadians were arguing over how to approach relations with the 'other' cultural-linguistic group –

[161] Lionel Groulx, *L'Appel de la race* (Montréal: Bibliothèque de l'Action française, 1922); Robert, "Camille Roy et Lionel Groulx: la querelle de l'Appel de la race," pp.399.
[162] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.233.
[163] Robert, "Camille Roy et Lionel Groulx," pp.400.
[164] Roy, "L'Appel de la race"; and Roy, "Le patriotisme de nos vieux maîtres."

whether through accommodation or retrenchment – a similar debate was occurring among French-speaking Canadians.

Roy's critique of *L'Appel de la race* was not without some commendation for Groulx's work. Roy praised Groulx's qualities as a writer, stating that the book provided an at times engaging read. There were some important lessons to be drawn from Groulx's work, he continued, not the least of which was the fact that French Canadians must remain vigilant in order to survive, and that British Canadians would have to change if rapprochement was going to be possible.[165] Roy agreed that the protagonist's cause – opposing Regulation 17 – was sound. He was just as outraged by the regulation as Groulx: "La question des écoles d'Ontario bat son plein." Roy described the situation as it had been in 1914:

> L'inique Règlement XVII tend à proscrire, à annihiler dans les écoles bilingues l'enseignement du français; et nos petits compatriotes de là-bas sont victims de la plus étroite, de la plus mesquine persécution. Il faut secourir ces opprimés, assurer par delà la frontière ontarienne où vivent plus de trois cent mille Canadiens français, la survivance du parler maternel; il faut pour les parents l'essentielle liberté de donner à leurs enfants l'éducation de leur choix, la liberté de perpétuer par l'enseignement, par l'école, les plus légitimes traditions de leur race et de leur religion.[166]

The actions of Ontario's British-Canadian majority constituted a "tyrannie stupide du plus fort."[167] Roy's sense of disillusionment and frustration with the British-Canadian community was palpable, and stood in contrast to the decided optimism that he would adopt by the early 1930s after a series of positive developments in Anglophone/Francophone relations. But even in 1923, he had not yet given up on the other 'solitude.'

---

[165] Roy, "L'Appel de la race," p.293.
[166] *Ibid*., p.279.
[167] *Ibid*., p.280. He referred to "des victims de l'intolérance ontarienne." P.290.

Roy disagreed with Groulx's fundamental assertion that English and French were incompatible. He objected, for instance, to the book's implicit assertion that interracial marriage was impossible, and that by marrying a British Canadian, the protagonist "'a fixé à son patriotisme éventuel une limite qu'il ne peut plus moralement dépasser,'" despite the fact that his wife was a Catholic convert.[168] Roy was highly skeptical of Groulx's depiction of interracial marriage as little more than a slew of "malheurs de famille" to which "les anglomanes qui vont jusqu'au marriage mixte" were supposedly inevitably condemned. This deliberate sensationalism and exaggeration, Roy continued, was the stuff "d'une fiction romanesque … peu vraisemblable."[169] Roy objected to the book's caricaturization of British Canadians. The British-Canadian characters were nefarious 'straw men' to be knocked down one-by-one. Roy complained that Groulx failed to explain or even try to understand the British-Canadian perspective – instead, he merely took for granted that it was inherently belligerent and mean-spirited. It was a cheap and easy means for establishing an atmosphere of conflict for the book.[170] Stylistically, such one-dimensional characters made for boring reading. What Roy also seemed to be asserting in rejecting such caricaturization was that, if ever French Canada was going to reach an understanding with British Canada, it must first try to understand the other's position. British Canadians, too, had their 'appel de la race' – each must try to *understand* the other's, and not simply condemn it as inherently evil.[171]

---

[168] In Robert, "Camille Roy et Lionel Groulx: la querelle de l'Appel de la race," p.402.
[169] Roy, "L'Appel de la race," p.287.
[170] "Il y a un Irlandais dans ce roman, William Duffin, beau-frère de Jules: c'est un goujat. Il y a un Anglais dans ce roman, Davis Fletcher, beau-père de Jules: c'est un rond-de-cuir ignoble." Roy, "L'Appel de la race," pp.288-289. Lucie Robert's article completely omits this crucial part of Roy's analysis.
[171] "[C]hacun des deux époux, l'un français d'origine, l'autre anglaise de naissance, doit à l'autre, pour l'accord du ménage et pour le Bonheur des enfants, de respecter ses atavisms légitimes, ses susceptibilités patriotique. S'il y a appel de la race chez Jules de Lantagnac, il y a aussi appel de la race chez Maud Fletcher." Roy, "L'Appel de la race," pp.284-285.

While Groulx believed that British- and French-Canadian mixed marriages were a threat to the survival of French Canada, Roy believed that a successful marriage was possible. Successful mixed marriages, he argued, provided a lesson for Anglophone/Francophone relations generally: "C'est à force de tact, de prudence et de charité que deux époux qui n'ont pas le même sang peuvent assurer la paix du foyer, leur Bonheur réciproque et celui de leurs enfants."[172] Moreover, it had been selfish of Groulx's protagonist to campaign for his race without any consideration for his wife; both partners in an inter-racial marriage must be conscious of the cultural sensitivities of the other, even in moments of great controversy and disagreement. The parallels with the larger British- and French-Canada dynamic were obvious: "chacun des deux époux, l'un français d'origine, l'autre anglaise de naissance, doit à l'autre, pour l'accord du ménage et pour le Bonheur des enfants, de respecter ses atavismes légitimes, ses susceptibilités patriotique."[173] In other words, a certain reciprocity was necessary. Roy also asserted that it was immoral of the book's priest character to, as Roy put it, effectively counsel divorce over a political cause, however just that cause may have been.

Even more erroneous, Roy believed, was Groulx's assertion that the ongoing integration of the Anglo- and French-Canadian bourgeoisies (by way of learning and speaking English) was "un signe de l'échec de la Confédération à permettre le développement d'une conscience nationale canadienne-française et … la conséquence d'une soumission prêchée par le clergé au XIXe siècle."[174] Increased interaction between Canada's Anglo- and French-Canadian élites, Roy argued, would help improve relations (as Henri Bourassa had argued twenty years earlier), and make a cultural federalism

[172] Roy, "L'Appel de la race," p.285.
[173] *Ibid*., pp.284-285. Lucie Robert also omits these nuances to Roy's argument.
[174] Robert, "Camille Roy et Lionel Groulx: la querelle de l'Appel de la race," pp.403-404.

based on civil society accommodation possible. While more educated Anglo-Canadians would do well to learn French, Roy continued, educated French Canadians were already opening themselves up to greater opportunity and a broader perspective by learning English.[175] Roy predicted that they would soon be at a competitive advantage for knowing two languages. Time, and the establishment of a bilingual federal bureaucracy decades later, would eventually vindicate this assertion

Roy rebuffed Groulx's skepticism of cross-cultural engagement. Moreover, he took issue with what he alleged was an implicit assertion that the French language and culture were doomed outside Quebec, and that they could only survive and thrive within the province. He objected to the book's portrayal of Ottawa as being dominated solely by Protestant British Canadians, and of the Quebec side of the river, in Hull, as being the only place where a truly Catholic, French-Canadian community existed in the national capital region.[176]

As a self-identified patriotic French-Canadian educator, Roy took offense to Groulx's assertion that the Quebec educational establishment was not doing enough to teach patriotism and pride of place to its students. Both he and Maheux cited the texts and teachings of the preceding four decades to demonstrate that Groulx's accusations of a nascent imperialism in the education system were simply erroneous.[177] Roy's own social formation had occurred amidst opposition to the rise of High Imperialism and the schools crises that had swept the country. As early as 1904, Roy had himself been among a group that called for an even more patriotic education at the colleges, and more study of

[175] This was especially the case in Ontario, where French Canadians gained access to better education after the amendment of Regulation 17 in 1927. See Amédée Bénéteau, "Il y a vingt-cinq ans," *Le Droit*, Ottawa, 13 novembre 1950. Université d'Ottawa, CRCCF, fonds ACFO (C2), C2/ 64/1.
[176] Roy, "L'Appel de la race," pp.276-277.
[177] See Roy, "Le patriotisme," pp.301, 309-310.

Canadian history and geography, predating Groulx's calls by a decade.[178] Roy was no British lackey.

This was important. Roy and Maheux were proud of the patriotic legacy of their teaching and of their forbearers' teaching. They were not naïve, pseudo-intellectuals cow-towing to the Crown. The vociferousness of their collective response to the accusations levelled against them by Groulx demonstrated that these, the bonne ententiste intellectuals of Quebec, were not merely a collection of anglophiles. There was a genuine and informed debate occurring among the clerical intellectual élite of the 1920s and '30s, a debate in which the skeptics of cross-cultural accommodation did not have a monopoly on intellectual leadership. Both sides genuinely held French-Canadian interests foremost in their hearts – the moderates' stance was not simply the result of meekness or intellectual vacuity, but rather well thought out and deliberate reasoning. As intellectual pragmatists, they believed that it was in French Canadians' best interest to foster bonne entente. By this same application of reason, they were flexible enough to recognize that not all British Canadians were nefarious, and that Anglo-Canada was genuinely changing for the better.

The disagreement between Roy and Groulx boiled down to a divergence in more fundamental convictions over how to best secure the place of French Canadians in North America. Roy rejected teaching militancy for its own sake. He believed that loyalty to authority was a valid lesson – only the most severe of constitutional injustices could ever justify secession (Groulx had not personally endorsed secession but *l'Action française* had flirted with it). Roy was unapologetic for acknowledging some of the benefits of

[178] Roy, "Le patriotisme," pp.300, 302.

British constitutionalism, pointing out that Confederation itself contained political and religious liberties that even the citizens of the French Republic did not enjoy.[179]

In this, Roy was critical of what he alleged to be Groulx's selective reading of history. He scoffed at Groulx's assertion that "[i]l est bien sevère pour ceux qui ont vécu dans la province de Québec au lendemain de la Confédération, et [que Groulx] accuse d'avoir dormi sur leurs devoirs de patriotes. …. Depuis Isocrate on ne compte plus les exaggérations de la Rhétorique."[180] What Groulx lacked in his analysis, Roy argued, was an appreciation for historical context:

> Il est si facile de s'emporter avec violence contre le passé, et d'y supprimer d'un trait de plume tout ce qui n'y correspond pas suffisamment à nos passions – ces passions fussent-elles patriotiques. Il faut, pour juger une époque avec impartialité, être capable de sortir de son temps et de se placer au milieu des circonstances, dans les conditions de vie qui furent faites aux homes de cette époque. Et cette transposition d'esprit n'empêche pas d'apercevoir les erreurs, ou les fautes ou les lacunes du passé, mais elle permet de mettre plus de justesse dans les appréciations que l'on fait de ce passé. Et ceci est un principe élémentaire de critique historique.[181]

It was on this principle of attempting a more objective view of the past that Roy praised Thomas Chapais and criticized Groulx. Of course, the moderates were attempting to develop a patriotic narrative of their own – pan-Canadian in scope, and based on tolerance and pluralism.

In his 1939 overview of French-Canadian literature, Roy described Groulx as Chapais's polar opposite in terms of approach: loaded with emotion, political agenda, bias, unscientific, using specific interpretations of history to serve a contemporary message, and leading to sensational accounts that might 'sell' but that were not properly

---

[179] See Robert, "Camille Roy et Lionel Groulx: la querelle de l'Appel de la race," p.403; Roy, "L'Appel de la race," p.295.
[180] Roy, "L'Appel de la race," pp.291, 292.
[181] Roy, "Le patriotisme," p.304.

situated in the historical context. While Groulx's writing benefitted from an impassioned eloquence and style, "un soufflé fervent de patriotisme," Roy explained, readers seeking "une histoire moins pénétrée d'éloquence et davantage objective" would do better to read Chapais.[182] Groulx's allegedly selective reading of history was not only problematic for academics, Roy argued, but it was also dangerous because it inflamed passions and quickly attracted "des disciples … qui prennent pour un dogme du maître ce qui n'est qu'une extravagante hyperbole."[183] In short, inflamed opinion was taken for fact. Roy was no flub. His assertions in favour of bonne entente were sincere and based on a deliberate, thought out assessment of things, and not out of some crass personal interest or simple naivety. He was a nationalist, but a pragmatic civic nationalist who saw cross-cultural engagement as necessary for the survival and success of all of French Canada.

For his part, Lanctot had also been a vocal critic of Groulx and of the nationaliste school's historical bias from the early 1920s onward. Lanctot criticized Groulx's negative and allegedly ahistorical approach to the French and British imperial regimes, and the tendency of his research toward the self-fulfilling prophecy. "'When he studies a document, he does not look for information, but for evidence to support his preconceived views,'" Lanctot complained. Moreover, he rejected Groulx's cultural isolationism, "'the new crusade ... which seeks to establish something like the Great Wall of China around the St. Lawrence valley in order to keep outside influences at bay.'"[184] Despite their differences, Lanctot and Groulx maintained cordial relations, for a time.[185]

---

[182] Roy, *Manuel d'Histoire,* p.127.
[183] Roy, "Le patriotisme," p.308.
[184] In Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, pp.40-41.
[185] *Ibid*., p.41.

Things came to a head between the two schools when, in the Fall of 1925, Groulx and Lanctot co-organized a major conference on Quebec history, the "Semaine d'histoire." The conference lasted five days and included twenty-four lecturers who presented a variety of opinions to the roughly eight thousand people who attended. It was clear from the outset that there were competing agendas at play. *La Presse* portrayed the conference as an opportunity to identify the values and historical experiences that French and British Canadians shared in common: "'it is by the careful study of history that we will manage to cultivate within Confederation the spirit of 'bonne entente' that we have spoken about for so long.'" By contrast, Groulx's journal, *l'Action française*, saw the conference as an opportunity to "provide a path towards liberation." In his opening address, Groulx denounced the federal government for being controlled solely by "'the dominant race'" and an arm of British-Canadian business interests.[186]

Groulx respected the professionalism of some of the historians with whom he deeply disagreed, like Chapais and Lanctot. But he nonetheless made attempts at excluding the bonne ententiste viewpoint from the discourse.[187] He refused, for instance, to have his work published in the conference proceedings because it would thusly appear alongside that of Mgr Émile Chartier, Vice-rector of the Université de Montréal and the dean of the faculty of letters. Chartier and Groulx had been good friends several years earlier, but had since fallen out over the former's bonne ententism. At the conference, Chartier spoke out against "'the combative history of some of our historians,'" namely those who constantly attacked British Canadians for their "'infamous manner.'" Chartier

[186] In *Ibid*., p.43.
[187] Rudin, "Lionel Groulx and the Building of the Quebec Historical Profession," p.16.

believed that nationalistes' writing gave priority to personal opinion over more "'impartial'" analysis.[188] Groulx was incensed.

Chartier called for greater understanding of cultural differences, and for official bilingualism across Canada, not only to safeguard the linguistic minorities, but also as a means to achieve bonne entente – much in the same manner that Moore, Morley and Hawkes had called for official bilingualism seven years earlier.[189] In short, it was an endorsement of cultural federalism. For this, Chartier was attacked by Émile Bruchési, Groulx's colleague at *l'Action française*. Bruchési believed that coast-to-coast bilingualism would have "'disastrous consequences.... Were our people, a small minority in North America, to become bilingual, it would be the beginning of a process of rapid assimilation.'"[190]

Moreover, as much as Groulx was the dominant figure in history at the Université de Montréal, the thinking among intellectuals there was hardly monolithic. Chartier was certainly a good example of this diversity of opinion. Édouard Montpetit provides another case-in-point. Trained as a lawyer, and having studied political and social science in Paris on a provincial scholarship, Montpetit returned to Canada to found the Université de Montréal's École de sciences sociales in 1920 and to become one of the province's most prominent social scientists. From then into the 1950s, Montpetit served as the university's secretary general and dean of social studies. He also taught during this period at the university's business and law schools.[191] Montpetit's foremost concern was the

---

[188] Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, pp.43-44.
[189] See Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.118-119; Hawkes, *The Birthright*, p.211.
[190] In Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, p.44.
[191] Université de Montréal (UM), Fonds Édouard-Montpetit, P004, archival description, accessed 25 November 2012, http://www2.hec.ca/archives/privees/P004.html; UM, "Exposition virtuelle: Édouard Montpetit," accessed 25 November 2012, http://www.archiv.umontreal.ca/exposition/montpetit/accueil.htm.

long-term success of French Canada. Still, he made important efforts to build links with English-speaking Canada as well. Montpetit's work inspired young, future leaders of the federalist cause in Quebec, including Claude Ryan, who later became the leader of the provincial Liberal Party.[192]

Like Jean-Charles Harvey, Montpetit believed that French Canadians should modernize their economic and professional outlook. This entailed a more positive engagement with Anglo-Canadians. Montpetit declared that it was his generation's task to provide the population with "des centres d'instruction adaptés aux progrès environnants; prendre place dans l'ensemble de l'avance canadienne et américaine vers la formation professionnelle."[193] Montpetit exported his message to English-speaking Canada, notably in 1928 at the University of Mount Allison in New Brunswick, where he gave lessons on the French-Canadian contribution to the creation of Canada. Montpetit had become well recognized in both French- and Anglo-Canadian circles by the early 1920s. In 1922, for instance, he helped represent Canada at the Congress of Universities of the Empire at Oxford and made a presentation on the study of social and political sciences. Later, he became a prominent public servant, representing Canada at the League of Nations in Geneva in the mid-1930s. Montpetit had been a member of the Royal Society of Canada since 1914, and in 1931 became the president of its French section. In 1935 he received the Society's Lorne Pierce Medal.[194]

---

[192] Ryan called Montpetit one of the "'great intellectual figures'" of his generation. In Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, p.16.
[193] UM, P004, GD0035100007, "Discours prononcé par Édouard Montpetit lors de l'inauguration du Pavillon principal," 3 June 1943, accessed 28 November 2012, http://www.archiv.umontreal.ca/exposition/montpetit/discours.htm.
[194] UM, "Exposition virtuelle: Édouard Montpetit."

Montpetit travelled and lectured across Canada, spreading his message for a more scientific study of society and politics. He served as VP of the Société canadienne pour l'enseignement commercial from 1932 to 1935. In May 1935 he travelled to Hamilton with the renowned botanist Abbé Marie-Victorin and Archbishop Olivier Maurault, the newly appointed Rector of the Université de Montréal, to meet with fellow academics in Ontario. One of his most noteworthy trips came in 1927, when he travelled as part of an Université de Montréal delegation to western Canada "dans un but d'études scientifiques, géographiques et économiques."[195] The trip to Western Canada, which went as far as Victoria, had the full support of Mgr Maurault. He was proud of the delegates, "qui portent à l'honneur dans l'Ouest Canadien le nom de l'Université de Montréal et celui de la province de Québec. Par les rapports des journalistes, nous les suivons avec intérêt et fierté. Nous les félicitons de faire sous une directions éclaircé et dans des conditions si agréables une précieuse étude de notre pays et un beau geste patriotique."[196] For Maurault, bonne entente and patriotism were one in the same.

By the late 1930s, important steps were being taken at Laval to help bring about the professionalization of the social sciences that Montpetit had been calling for. These efforts were led by Father Georges-Henri Lévesque. A young priest originally from the Lac St-Jean area, Lévesque studied at the Dominican college in Ottawa, graduating in 1930. Two years later, Lévesque began teaching economic philosophy at the college before moving on to Laval. In October 1938 he established the School of Social Sciences at Laval with the support of Camille Roy and Cardinal Villeneuve. Lévesque's time in

---

[195] *Ibid*.
[196] UM, P004, D0035, Maurault to Montpetit, 1927, accessed 30 November 2012, http:// www.archiv.umontreal.ca/exposition/montpetit/rayonnement/voyage.htm.

Ottawa brought him into contact with moderates within the Anglo-Canadian academic and intellectual élite.[197]

Lévesque was a liberal Catholic, Christian humanist, internationalist, and social democrat. Moreover, he stood as an example of the diversity of opinion that existed among the French-Canadian clerical élite by the late interwar period. Lévesque was a proud French Canadian but critical of ethno-centric clerico-nationalism – he was a self-described "antipatriotard."[198] He believed fundamentally that in order for French Canadians to flourish and to improve their socio-economic circumstances, they must become more open to the world outside Quebec, and adopt a more professional, scientific, and even secular education. "Tout ce qu'il souhaitait," explained his biographer, "c'est que nous prenions notre place sur l'échiquier canadien, que nous sortions du ghetto qui sclérose un peuple. Oui, voilà! Faire reculer les frontières du Québec, imposer les Québécois partout."[199]

Taking full advantage of the opportunities afforded by Confederation included better integration into both the provincial and federal public services. The benefits for French Canadians would be three-fold: access to higher paying professional careers; greater influence over the direction of the public service; and improved access to modernizing services including health and, especially, education. The opening of Lévesque's social sciences college at Laval in 1938 was a crucial step in this process as it provided young French Canadians with the professional skill set necessary for higher-

---

[197] See Michael D. Behiels, "Georges-Henri Lévesque: Father of Quebec's Lucid Integration into Confederation, 1930-1962," in Michael D. Behiels and Matthew Hayday, eds., *Contemporary Quebec: Selected Readings and Commentaries* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 2011), pp.165-181.
[198] Robert Parisé, *George-Henri Lévesque: Père de la renaissance québécoise* (Montréal: Alain Stanké, Ltée., 1976), p.131.
[199] *Ibid*., p.131.

level public service jobs. In the coming years, the college would churn out hundreds of social scientists, economists, administrators, policy analysts and technocrats of all variety ready to fill the public service positions of the emergent post-war social-welfare state.[200] Moreover, Lévesque's secular, pragmatic, social-democratic and pan-Canadian outlook was imparted on countless budding young intellectuals who would go on to become political leaders in Canada, like economist Maurice Lamontagne, future prime minister Pierre Trudeau, and other contributors to *Cité Libre*. "'Je ne peux me rappeler avoir entendu le Père Lévesque se servir du terme "unité nationale,"'" recalled one former student. "'Il ne parlait jamais de bonne entente ni d'aucun de ces vieux clichés. Mais une fois que vous aviez adopté son attitude ... vous découvriez que vous travailliez vous-même réellement pour l'unité nationale sur un plan pratique – la coopération avec les autres Canadiens.'"[201] Lévesque believed that universities and higher learning played a crucial role in fostering understanding. Cross-cultural exchange, he explained, would not weaken but rather enrich Canada's two major cultural-linguistic communities: "'Au contraire, car il en est de l'esprit comme de la terre elle-même; c'est en y croisant les cultures qu'on en rend plus belles les moissons.'"[202]

Unsurprisingly, Lévesque's promotion of cross-cultural accommodation and understanding exposed him to considerable criticism from the conservative and clerico-nationaliste élite, including from Union Nationale Premier Maurice Duplessis.[203] Nevertheless, Lévesque remained a strong pan-Canadian as a result of the connections he

[200] As Toronto journalist John Harbron would remark decades later, the Ottawa civil service list read "'like a WHO'S WHO of French Canadians prominent in our public life, permitting one to say that at last French-Canadian intellectuals and technocrats have a major role in directing the function and purpose of Canadian government, arts and letters.'" In *Ibid*., p.132.
[201] In *Ibid*., p.114. See also pp.75.
[202] In *Ibid*., p.137.
[203] Duplessis privately branded Lévesque a communist and threatened to withold funding from Laval unless they fired Lévesque. Lévesque kept his job. *Ibid*., pp.162.

made with Canadians from outside Quebec. During and after the Second World War, Lévesque looked to Western and Atlantic Canada to help establish Quebec's cooperative movement, sat on the Royal Commission on the National Development of the Arts, Letters and Sciences alongside Vincent Massey, and helped establish the Canada Council.[204] "'C'est en tant que consommateurs, ou producteurs, ou épargnants que les coopérateurs s'unissent,'" Lévesque explained in his 1940 policy statement on cooperatives, "'non pas en tant que catholiques ou protestants, libéraux ou conservateurs, Français ou Anglais.'"[205]

The interwar period brought several French-Canadian advocates of cross-cultural understanding to prominence. Longer-standing advocates of improving Anglo-/French-Canadian relations, however, remained on the scene, including Henri Bourassa. Unfortunately, it has become something of a commonplace to ignore the intellectual contributions made by Bourassa after the Great War and to replace him instead with Lionel Groulx as the spokesperson for French Canada during the interwar years.[206] To be sure, Bourassa had been disheartened by the setbacks of Regulation 17, the Conscription Crisis and Union Government. Nevertheless, he continued to campaign for French-Canadian interests, national unity and a moderate dialogue on both sides of the cultural-linguistic divide throughout the interwar period.

Bourassa was among those who criticized *l'Action Française* for its series of articles in 1922 advocating Quebec secessionism. In an address to the Catholic

---

[204] Behiels, "Georges-Henri Lévesque: Father of Quebec's Lucid Integration," pp.169.
[205] In Parisé, *Georges-Henri Lévesque:père de la renaissance québécoise*, p.83.
[206] See, for instance, Gilles Lesage, "D'août 1932 à avril 1947 - «Avant le pouvoir doit passer le devoir»," *Le Devoir*, 9 January 2010; Denis Saint-Jacques, Lucie Robert, *La vie littéraire au Québec, Tome VI, 1919-1933: Le Nationaliste, l'Individualiste et le Marchand* (Quebec: Université Laval, 2011). "Groulx est sans conteste le plus important essayiste des années 1920-1930. Progressivement, il remplace Henri Bourassa comme figure de proue du nationalisme en se dissociant de son idéal pancanadien et de ses thèses bon-ententistes." Saint-Jacques and Robert, *La vie littéraire*, p.267.

Commercial Traveller's Association in Montreal on 23 November 1923, Bourassa demonstrated his ongoing hope that Anglo-Canadian identity had begun to change for the better. He reminded his audience that secessionism was neither desirable nor realistic. *All* of Canada constituted the homeland of both peoples, French-Canadian and Anglo-Canadian, and they were bound together whether they liked it or not:

> 'Whatever may happen, the whole of the Canadian Confederation is, none the less, at the hour, the country of all Canadians, ours as well as that of the Anglo-Canadians.... To oppose the policy of England simply because it is English, or because it is displeasing to France, even if it favour our interests, even if it be just in itself, is not nationalism, extreme or moderate, nor nationalism of any sort; it is foolishness, the foolishness of hate, and all forms of hate are barren by nature.'[207]

Bourassa maintained that Groulx's militancy threatened to divide French Canadians and Catholics amongst themselves. Never, he wrote in 1929, should the Church sacrifice "'son principe d'unité et de catholicité pour satisfaire aux exigences nationalisantes ou aux tendances séparatistes des peuples et des races.'"[208] Bourassa denounced Groulx's brand of nationalism as "'ce particularisme qui tend à l'isolement, au séparatisme, à l'esprit de faction.'"[209] Anglo-Canadian intellectuals in tune to the debate in Quebec paid close attention to Bourassa's writings and speeches, and repeated them to their own readers. Some looked increasingly to Bourassa's ideal as their last best chance of salvaging national unity, and modelled their own biculturalism on that of Bourassa. It was a far cry from the days when British Canadians had denounced Bourassa as a separatist and a traitor. Now, they considered him a close intellectual ally.[210]

---

[207] In J. Addison Reid, "Secession in Canada: Quebec," *The Canadian Forum* (June 1924), in J.L. Granatstein and Peter Stevens, eds., *Forum: Canadian life and Letters, 1920-1970, Selections from* The Canadian Forum (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), p.25.
[208] In Yvan Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1896-1929*, p.187.
[209] In *Ibid*., p.187.
[210] With moderates like Bourassa, Reid explained, "it may be easier than we think to find a common ground." The alternative, he warned, was the secessionism of Lionel Groulx. Reid, "Secession in Canada: Quebec," p.26.

In addition to calling for moderation in both French- and Anglo-Canadian thought, Bourassa continued to advocate for French-Canadian rights, both at the provincial and federal levels, in and outside Quebec. He believed that if national unity was ever to be restored, French Canadians must be made to feel at home not only in Quebec but elsewhere in Canada. In the late 1920s, Bourassa was at the forefront of demands for greater inclusion of French Canadians in the upper echelons of the federal public service. Greater inclusion at Ottawa, and outside Quebec, was but one means of heading off the cultural isolationism promoted by the Groulx school, which insisted that English-speaking Canada would never adopt a more pluralistic view of the country.[211] Despite being an independent MP, Bourassa's influence could still be felt within the federal Liberal Party. Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King, whose interwar governments depended so heavily on political support from Quebec, continued to hold the elder statesman in high esteem. King met with Bourassa to confer on issues that were typically sensitive to French Canada, including external affairs, French-language minority and religious rights, and Quebec provincial politics.[212]

Indeed, it was at the political level, and among the Liberal parties of Quebec and Canada, especially, that some of the greatest advances toward rapprochement would be

---

[211] See Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*, pp.36-37.

[212] See, for instance, WLMK Diaries, 25 February 1926. "I read over ... Bourassa's pamphlet on a national [foreign] policy. He was most agreeable, talked rapidly and a great deal but always in a pleasant and kindly manner. .... He said he would like to help me in Quebec on different lines, having already done so on external relations." King agreed to persuade even the "extreme Imperialistic, ultra-Protestant" elements of his party that imperial conferences should be limited to "once in 5 yrs., that we should have ministers in England, France and US, ... [and] do away with idea of Governor General as representing Colonial office." At Bourassa's insistence, King also agreed to continue pressing Alberta to restore French-Catholic education rights in the province.

Bourassa also influenced Canadian external affairs through his friend the Liberal Senator Raoul Dandurand, Canada's representative to the League of Nations. See Stéphane Paquin, "Raoul Dandurand: porte-parole de la conscience universelle," in Greg Donaghy and Kim Richard Nossal, eds. *Architects and Innovators: Building the Department of External Affairs and International Trade, 1909-2009* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 2009), p.46.

achieved. But politics is the art of the possible – change would only become politically possible if the ideas that had been percolating among intellectuals, scholars and academics since shortly after the war also gained acceptance among other elements of civil society and the public. From this combined pressure, 'bonne entente' could gradually be put into action by interested politicians, lobbyists, bureaucrats and statesmen.

Chapter VI: CIVIL SOCIETY AND CROSS-CULTURAL RAPPROCHEMENT

Anglo- and French-Canadian civil society experienced an increased level of interaction after the war. This was a by-product of the proliferation of national fraternal, professional, commercial and trade associations, which in turn flowed from the expansion of the middle- and upper-middle class professions and trades.[1] Several of these associations came to include prominent Francophone members and executives. Some deliberately attempted to reach out to French Canadians in their activities and in the discourse of cultural pluralism that they promoted, while others simply brought pragmatic Anglophones and Francophones together to pursue shared professional interests.[2] New and rejuvenated professional organizations held their annual meetings across the country, including in Quebec. Religious orders also attempted to contribute to Anglophone/Francophone rapprochement. Through the expansion of civil society, people from across the cultural-linguistic divide had a chance to meet and interact with each other.

The Canadian Fraternal Association provides a good illustration. Formed in the 1890s, the CFA was an umbrella organization for a variety of clubs and social organizations such as the Ancient Order of United Workmen, l'Alliance Nationale, the Loyal Orange Lodge, and l'Union St. Joseph du Canada, among several others. The CFA's executive included both Francophones and Anglophones. Its president was William Charles Mikel, the liberal Anglo-Canadian moderate who had founded the Better Understanding Association in 1918 in an attempt to undo the damage of the conscription

[1] See Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada*, p.xvi.
[2] See Maheux, *What Keeps Us Apart?*, pp.76; LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169; LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62; LAC, Canadian Medical Association fonds, MG28-I343; LAC, Canadian Dental Association fonds, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441.

crisis. The CFA was not without influence among the middle-classes and the commercial and political élite throughout Canada, counting some 400,000 members among its associate groups, including Francophones and Anglophones, Protestants and Catholics.[3] In addition, Mikel hoped to reach the broader public with programmes that would, for instance, create opportunities for exchanges between young people from Quebec and the other provinces. Over the course of a few years, he argued, such events "suffirai[en]t à modifier la mentalité actuelle."[4]

Looking back on the period, Arthur Maheux, ever the keen observer of Anglophone/Francophone relations, took heart in the potential of the fraternal and professional associations to encourage rapprochement:

> [W]e have an army of Canadians ready to get together.... Suppose we could bring together in a large national Association all the members of the Societies ... and the social clubs, and the Canadian clubs and various Leagues, such an Association would be very powerful. …. Well, then, men of all professions and trades, …. 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![5]

The Canadian movement

With the rise in civic nationalism after 1918, the country witnessed a proliferation of fraternal organizations concerned with national identity and Canada's place in an ever-changing global community. A number of these organizations and their members saw the rebuilding of the Anglophone/Francophone relationship after the disastrous conscription

---

[3] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, Mikel to CFA members, July 18, 1918.
[4] See LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, press clippings, *Le Droit*, September 2, 1920.
[5] Maheux, *What Keeps Us Apart?*, pp.80-82. "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." Maheux, *What Keeps us Apart?*, p.76. Gustave Lanctot, another Francophone who made important connections with English-speaking Canada, made similar observations, especially in relation to the various literary and intellectual societies. Lanctot, *Le Canada d'Hier et Aujourd'hui*, pp.292-293.

and language crises as crucial for the country's future. Collectively, this non-partisan interwar movement has been dubbed the 'Canadian movement.' It included four key organizations: the Association of Canadian Clubs (ACC), the Canadian League, the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, and the League of Nations Society. These organizations were formed in the early to mid-1920s. They were officially separate but effectively linked as "a network of public-spirited men and women" through their memberships, programmes and activities.[6] Above all, the Canadian movement sought to advance the country's constitutional status and its role in the international community, define the national identity, and promote cross-cultural understanding. Moreover, the emergence of the movement suggested that Moore, Morley, and Hawkes, among others, had indeed been the bellwether authors for an important element of Canadian civil society.

The Canadian movement was highly influential. Prominent intellectuals, politicians and academics were regularly featured as speakers, disseminating new ideas on the future direction of the nation. These included advocates of Canadian autonomy and national unity, like O.D. Skelton, Arthur Hawkes, and George Wrong. They influenced the powers that be by way of their audience, which could include governors general, prime ministers, premiers, ministers, and business leaders at any given moment, and by infiltrating government itself. Skelton, for instance, would become the most powerful bureaucrat in Ottawa as a personal advisor to Prime Ministers King and Bennett. Hawkes went on to become a Liberal Party organiser. In 1934, Canadian Club

[6] "The Canadian movement was dominated by academics and journalists, but professional and business people were also present in large numbers." The ACC was founded in 1893, but had been moribund until revived in 1925. Headquartered in Ottawa under Graham Spry, it had 40,000 members by the end of the 1920s. David Bercuson, *True Patriot: the Life of Brooke Claxton, 1898-1960* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), pp.60-63.

member Ernest Lapointe became President of the League of Nations Society.[7] Future federal cabinet minister Brooke Claxton was another prominent member and advocate of cross-cultural accommodation. He believed that the clubs could "'do more for the country than any other agency outside of the government.'"[8]

The associations had tens of thousands of members by the late 1920s. Among these were numerous leading civic and political figures of the day, as well as members of the business, professional and middle classes. For many who would go on to become Canada's policy-makers, the movement proved formative. "Given the small size of Canadian political and bureaucratic establishment," explains David Bercuson, "their ambition to influence events was not unachievable. Political leaders were almost completely accessible, especially to men of high station, while the bureaucracy was a small group that closely mirrored the members of the Canadian movement in composition."[9]

Of the four principal associations of the Canadian movement, the ideas promoted by the Canadian League, founded in November 1925, are of particular interest here. Above all, the League declared its aim was to foster "'the national spirit as opposed to sectionalism.'"[10] Restoring Anglo-/French-Canadian relations was its chief concern. Canadian League members promoted bilingualism and voiced their opposition to Regulation 17 for obstructing Canadian unity. Interestingly, this pro-bilingualism movement was formed in Winnipeg, where the French-language minority rights debate had exploded onto the national scene a generation earlier. Both the Canadian League and

---

[7] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.193.
[8] Claxton, writing in 1928, in Bercuson, *True Patriot*, p.62.
[9] Bercuson, *True Patriot*, p.60. See also Hillmer, "O.D. Skelton: Innovating for Independence," pp.71-72.
[10] In Bercuson, *True Patriot*, p.62. The League had originated before the war, with Arthur Hawkes, but was revived in 1925. O.D. Skelton was one of its earliest supporters. See Crowley, *Marriage of Minds*, p.60.

the ACC made attempts at ensuring geographical representation and Canadian diversity, holding national meetings in Ottawa in 1927 and in Calgary and Quebec City in 1928. There was significant overlap in both the ideas and the membership of these bonne ententiste organizations. Among the League's more influential members were Arthur Lower, Brooke Claxton, *Manitoba Free-Press* editor and Manitoba Club president John W. Dafoe, Arthur Terroux, and F.R. Scott, the latter two serving as national secretaries in 1926. Both the ACC and the Canadian League brought together influential thinkers on Canadian autonomy, like Frank Underhill and J.S. Ewart.[11]

The influence of the bonne ententistes within the ACC was made plain at its September 1927 convention in Ottawa. Early on, delegates drafted a motion for "the fostering of full co-operation between the two great races in Canada."[12] After three days of discussion, they decided that the motion did not go far enough, adopting instead the following declaration of principle:

> To foster friendly and equitable relationships between the two great races of the Dominion in the full recognition that each race is equally entitled to express and preserve its own identity and culture.[13]

Le Devoir correspondent Omer Héroux, heretofore skeptical of bonne entente, was both surprised and optimistic at this new development.[14] The declaration marked a dramatic change from British-Canadian attitudes in the past: "qu'elle ait été faite, et d'une telle façon, cela est, en soi, une chose considérable. Cela témoigne d'un état d'esprit qu'il

---

[11] Michael Nolan, *Foundations: Alan Plaunt and the Early Days of CBC Radio* (Montreal: CBC Enterprises, 1986), pp.95; Bercuson, *True Patriot*, pp.61-64.

[12] Omer Héroux, "Les 'Canadian Clubs' et la coopération des races: la cause des difficultés, le moyen d'aboutir," *Le Devoir*, 17 septembre 1927, p.1.

[13] Omer Héroux, "La constitution des 'Canadian Clubs' et la question des races: Un texte nouveau et plus remarquable encore que le premier – Une juste attitude et les devoirs qu'elle nous impose," *Le Devoir*, 20 septembre 1927, p.1.

[14] The 16 September 1927 resolution had been welcomed by Héroux, but he deemed it far too weak. Héroux, "Les 'Canadian Clubs' et la coopération des races: la cause des difficultés, le moyen d'aboutir," *Le Devoir*, 17 septembre 1927, p.1.

serait injuste et profondément malhabile de méconnaître."[15] The bonne entente movement, he predicted, was moving from vague words of cooperation to concrete recognition of Francophone minority rights:

> La déclaration marque clairement que ses auteurs savent qu'il existe un mal, savent où est ce mal et quel reméde il convient d'y apporter. .... Et comme la quasi-totalité des auteurs de la déclaration sont des anglophones qui savent parfaitement que, nulle part dans ce pays, ils ne se heurtent, dans le maintien de leur personnalité ethnique ou de leur culture, à un obstacle quelconque, il est non moins clair que ce texte se rattache, sans conteste possible, à la situation et aux plaintes des diverses minorités françaises.[16]

Now was the time, Héroux hoped, to work with "nos amis de langue anglaise, ... anglophones de bonne volonté," to restore French-Catholic rights, beginning with Ontario.[17]

A smaller, but highly influential organization that reflected the civic nationalist impulse driving the Canadian movement was 'The Group.' It was founded in 1924 in Montreal by young intellectuals like Scott, Claxton, Terroux and Graham Spry who, like many after the war, struggled to define their Canadian identity. As Scott explained, The Group was formed for "'studying and endeavouring to better Canadian social and political life.'"[18] For five years, the men and women of The Group gathered to socialize and debate the serious issues of the day, "especially those pertaining to Canada."[19] These included Canada's place in the Empire, foreign policy, immigration and colonization, and the development of Canadian autonomy up to the period of Lord Elgin. As Sandra Djwa explains, "The Group was one of many manifestations of the prevailing nationalism of

---

[15] Héroux, "La constitution des 'Canadian Clubs,'" *Le Devoir*, 20 septembre 1927, p.1.
[16] *Ibid*.
[17] Experts like "M. le sénateur Belcourt," for instance, would be well equipped to give Anglo-Canadians in positions of influence "l'essentiel de la situation ontarienne." *Ibid*.
[18] Sandra Djwa, *The Politics of the Imagination: a Life of F.R. Scott* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1987), p.76.
[19] Bercuson, *True Patriot*, p.56

the twenties." This civic nationalism manifested in several ways, especially in art and literature, from the founding of the *Canadian Forum* in 1920 to the Group of Seven.[20]

For many members, The Group became a gateway for more social engagement. As Bercuson explains, it "awakened the public consciousness of several of its members."[21] By the late 1920s, Scott, Claxton and other members had joined the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, which focussed on Canada's relations with Britain and the US. The Institute pushed for Canadian autonomy and equality with Britain. (Interestingly, it had been sponsored by former Prime Minister Robert Borden and by the wartime commander of the Canadian Corps Sir Arthur Currie.) In the 1930s, the possibility of renewed war in Europe and the intensification of French-Canadian nationalism in Quebec would make these young Anglo-Canadian intellectuals even more conscious of French Canadians' unease with the British connection.[22]

Indeed, these Anglo-Canadian moderates recognized that the British-Canadian commitment to the Empire had become a major obstacle to the development of a shared identity with French Canadians. That commitment would have to be reconsidered, if not jettisoned altogether.[23] Moreover, the post-war sentimental and constitutional distancing from Britain, and the corresponding search for a new national identity, had encouraged Anglo-Canadians to adopt a more dualist conceptualization of Canada. If Britishness was no longer Canadians' defining characteristic, then perhaps it was pluralism. Graham

[20] Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, p.76.
[21] "By the late 1920s most members were involving themselves in public affairs." Bercuson, *True Patriot*, p.56.
[22] Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, pp.158-159.
[23] See Nolan, *Foundations*, p.50; Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, p.158.

Spry's motto for the Canadian movement, written in 1927, suggested as much: "One nation, two cultures; one nationality, two races; one loyalty, two tongues."[24]

Business and professional associations help bridge the cultural-linguistic divide

In addition to the fraternal organizations, several business and professional associations were founded or became more active during the interwar period. Collectively, they provided an informal means for positive interaction between upper- and middle-class Anglo- and French Canadians, both federally and at the provincial level in Quebec. On the one hand, it was a simple question of pragmatism. In business, for instance, French-Canadian entrepreneurs were anxious to make in-roads with the Anglo-Canadian business community, both in terms of securing investment and to lobby on behalf of a shared interest; against, for example, taxation and government regulation that had sprung up during and after the war. Several Anglo-Canadian businessmen, too, recognized that cross-cultural collaboration was more profitable than the alternative. The coming together of the business and professional associations was also in part the product of post-war civic nationalism. Association executives were often driven by the conviction that, as a self-governing nation, Canada was due its own national association of businessmen, doctors, lawyers, architects, or other professionals as the case may be. Moreover, they recognized that in order to be truly national in scope, any such association required meaningful representation from both cultural-linguistic communities.

Local business associations had been around for some time. After the war, however, they became more numerous, and larger associations like the Montreal Board of

[24] Graham Spry, *Passion and Conviction: The Letters of Graham Spry*, Rose Potvin, ed. (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1992), p.47.

Trade became more national in their focus. In 1925, Canada got its first truly national business association, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. The post-war growth of the professional associations, meanwhile, reflected the expansion of the professions themselves – in no small part the result of increasing access to education and technological change. In 1926, for instance, radio interests from across the country came together to form the Canadian Association of Broadcasters. Its executive was made up of four Anglophones and two Francophones, including CNR Vice-President Gerard Ruel, who was "the guiding legal spirit behind the group."[25]

The new associations covered a wide variety of professional backgrounds. An increasing number of Francophone druggists, for instance, joined the national Canadian pharmacists' association by the end of the interwar. The pharmacists' periodical, Arthur Maheux noted with satisfaction, had "started the printing of at least one French page in each issue." The Quebec provincial association of pharmacists was also successful in bringing "the druggists of both languages" together in shared professional interest.[26] While the Conseil de l'Association pharmaceutique de la province de Québec was headed overwhelmingly by Francophones, it also included a few Anglophones.[27] Some French-Canadian pharmacy students, meanwhile, received their education in Ontario.[28] Canadian opticians and optometrists, who initially "had their difficulties," also came together in association, and adopted a bilingual periodical.[29] The Nursing Sisters of Canada Association, which grew out of the war, brought Canadian nurses together in 1926 to

[25] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.115.
[26] Maheux, *What Keeps Us Apart?*, p.78.
[27] See, for instance, Bibliothèque et archives nationales du Québec (BANQ), Côte P175, Centre Montreal, Fonds Dupras et Colas, P175, P11, Membres du Conseil de l'Association pharmaceutique de la province de Québec 1922-1923; P175, P204, Conseil 1920-1921 de l'Association pharmaceutique de la province de Québec; P175, P270, Conseil 1930-31 de l'Association pharmaceutique de la province de Québec.
[28] See, for instance, BANQ, Cote P113, Centre Gatineau, Fonds Théophile Éthier.
[29] Maheux, *What Keeps Us Apart?*, p.78.

lobby for a parliamentary memorial that paid homage to Canada's French and British past, depicting nurses from New France to the Great War.[30] The Canadian Institute of Chemistry assembled "chemists of both languages," who "meet with perfect harmony." By WWII both its president and treasurer were Francophones, and the institute's periodical included articles in both French and English. The relations between Anglo- and French-Canadian architects also became "most cordial," with the Royal Institute of Architecture for Canada chairmanship alternating between "a French and an English speaking member."[31] Important architectural achievements of the interwar, notably in Ottawa, made use of dualist symbolism. Canadian surveyors, retailers, accountants, pilots, engineers, forestry workers, postmasters and sportsmen, among others, all had their myriad of associations in which both Anglophones and Francophones held memberships and sat as executives, contributing their part, both formally and informally, to what Maheux called "the same good work of Entente."[32]

The list of business and professional associations of the interwar period was indeed long. Five of the most important of these associations will be explored in some detail here. Collectively, the activities of the Montreal Board of Trade, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Bar Association, the Canadian Medical Association and the Canadian Dental Association spoke to the increased level of informal, positive interaction experienced by Canadian civil society during the interwar years.

---

[30] See LAC, Nursing Sisters of Canada Association fond, 1885-1998, R9986-0-1-E, Vol. 1, files 22-25, Memorial Committee minutes and reports, design competition, 1925-1932, files 22-25.
[31] Maheux, *What Keeps Us Apart?*, p.78.
[32] Maheux, *What Keeps Us Apart?*, pp.78-84.

Montreal Board of Trade

The Montreal Board of Trade provides a useful example of how pragmatism helped drive increased professional contact between Anglo- and French Canadians. In 1919, the Montreal Board was the most important board of trade in Canada – based at the very centre of Canadian commerce, it was the largest, and had members from across the country. Its annual reports contained all variety of business and commerce information for the entire country, and not just Montreal. The focus of its activities and meetings was to promote not only business for the port of Montreal, but for the province and country as a whole, including new trading initiatives at home and abroad, along with government activity in support of business.[33] Yet, collaboration with Francophones, and French-Canadian membership, had historically been marginal. In the context of the times, this is not surprising given that French Canadians had been disproportionately underrepresented in business since the Conquest. Moreover, French-Canadian businessmen had tended to join the Chambre de Commerce de Montréal, as the Montreal Board of Trade had long been the near-exclusive preserve of the wealthy British-Canadian business élite. But even this British-Canadian institution would experience some change during the interwar period.

Part of this change came in the form of increased French-Canadian membership. Even if some of the British-Canadian members did not necessarily interact much on a daily basis with French Canadians, at least a few would have regularly read Canada's

[33] See LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1914 Annual Report, pp.3; and LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2807, *The Montreal Board of Trade Review*, January 1939.

French-language newspapers.[34] Moreover, by 1914, the Board could already count some 175 Francophone members, roughly 15% of the overall membership (which included 959 Anglophones and even a few Allophones, such as Italians and Jews). Some of the members, like John Boyd and Zépherin Hébert, would go on to become prominent and energetic members of the bonne entente movement.[35] In 1919, after the war and in the wake of the national unity crisis, the Board started a new initiative to increase its membership so that it might be "more proportionate to the population and importance of the City," putting French-Canadian businessman Alphonse Racine at the head of one of its recruiting teams.[36] The initiative proved effective early on – in 1920, half of the new members were Francophones.[37] Between 1916 and 1926, the Anglo-Canadian membership grew by roughly 50% (boosted by more and more members from out-of-province who increasingly recognized the national importance of the Board), while the Francophone membership, now over 300-strong and representing nearly 20% of the Board, grew by roughly 75%. This included men who owned and operated their own businesses as well as others who had worked their way up to prominent managerial positions in larger companies.[38] By then, Anglo-Canadian observers had begun to take notice of the newfound business success of several French Canadians.[39]

---

[34] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1914 Annual Report, list of newspapers.
[35] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1914 Annual Report, list of members.
[36] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1919 Annual Report (Montreal, 1920), p.43.
[37] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1920 Annual Report (Montreal, 1921), p.73.
[38] See LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1926 Annual Report (Montreal, 1927), membership lists. Altogether there were 1418 Anglophones and 308 Francophones. This count is based on the names of members. In instances of ambiguity, I have counted members from outside Quebec as Anglophones, and members from inside Quebec as Francophones.
[39] See Moore, *The Clash!*, pp.89.

The Montreal Board of Trade became involved in the activities of the Bonne Entente League early on. This was natural, given the League's emphasis on bringing Ontario and Quebec business leaders together. "Ontario and Quebec Men Declare their Oneness as Canadians Whether of French or English Extraction," read a headline in the 1916 Annual Report. First Vice-President Zépherin Hébert, a respected boot and shoe magnate,[40] "was the prime mover in this movement" for the Board. Its aim, the report read, was "to demonstrate to the people of Canada and to the world at large the cordial relations of the two races which constitute the bulk of the population of this Dominion."[41]

The Board genuinely saw industry as being a key vehicle to help bring the country together.[42] Moreover, it was in their material interest. National unity allowed the wheels of inter-provincial commerce to turn, put money in their pockets, kept working people employed, and put food on the table. Business leaders saw no irony or duplicity in this. If national unity served business and *vice versa*, then what of it? To show its support, the Board's Executive Council moved to "congratulate Mr. Hébert on the success which had attended the visit to this Province of a delegation of representative Ontario men for the purpose of meeting their French-Canadian fellow citizens." It noted with satisfaction that Ontario had reciprocated by hosting the Quebecers "with marked and enthusiastic cordiality." The Board told its membership that all "true citizens of this Dominion" would back the movement.[43]

---

[40] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1916 Annual Report (Montreal, 1917), p.90.
[41] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, "Ontario and Quebec Men Declare their Oneness as Canadians Whether of French or English Extraction," in 1916 Annual Report (Montreal, 1917), pp.52.
[42] See LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1917 Annual Report (Montreal, 1918), p.6.
[43] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, "Ontario and Quebec Men Declare their Oneness," in 1916 Annual Report (Montreal, 1917), pp.52.

The Board passed a special resolution supporting the government's efforts to recruit and register Canadian men under the National Service Campaign, but it denounced undue coercion on the part of employers, and avoided supporting conscription. Several French-Canadian members were involved in adopting this resolution. In 1917, as a means to avoid conscription being implemented for overseas service, the Board urged the government to compel men to train and serve for the defence of Canada in the hope that they would subsequently become more likely to volunteer for overseas service.[44] (Mackenzie King would attempt a similar solution nearly thirty years later to avoid a full-blown conscription crisis during the Second World War.) Shortly after the war, the Board mused on the possibility of "the abolition of conscription and of other factors making for national jealousies and enmities."[45] In short, by 1918 the Board had become very mindful of the acrimony and division caused by conscription – it was mindful of the views of the French Canadians in its province, and conscious that British Canadians had gone too far in their wartime fervour. Moreover, it was worried about the potential damage of inter-provincial boycotts stemming from cultural-linguistic animosity – indeed, the context of post-war recession meant that poor Anglo-/French-Canadian relations could be especially bad for business if allowed to fester. Interwar rapprochement, and the return to a normal rhythm of life – the restoration of normal trade, commerce and industry so that people could return to their jobs and get on with their lives – was an absolute necessity.[46]

---

[44] See *Ibid*.
[45] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1918 Annual Report (Montreal, 1919), p.3.
[46] *Ibid*., p.4.

In addition to its involvement in bonne entente initiatives and attempts at playing a mediating role over the conscription crisis, the Board brought people together in common purpose to lobby for business interests. During the later stages of the war, the Board petitioned the Canadian government to coordinate labour needs for business, and lobbied against government price fixing and the War Tax Bill on business profits. By early 1918, the Board had grown hostile to the amount of wartime government control, regulation, and outright ownership of industry: "Something in the nature of a revolution has taken place in the conduct of the commercial business of the country," it complained. "In short, the hand of the Government is seen in practically every branch of the commercial and business life of the country."[47] Leading the charge against the War Tax Bill was Hébert.[48] In a similar vein, Anglophones and Francophones worked together to monitor new Quebec legislation so as to protect their shared commercial interests.[49] For instance, Anglo-Canadians and French Canadians of various Boards of Trade came together to lobby the government to form a commission to promote trade between Canada and France in light of the latter's untapped post-war reconstruction needs. Anglophone businessmen recognized the obvious need for fluent French speakers in any such mission.[50] The Montreal Board promoted business transportation and trade between Quebec and Ontario, and lobbied the federal government for the establishment of an Internal Trade Commission.[51] By now, it had become standard practice to have at least one Francophone on the Montreal Board of Trade Executive Council.[52]

---

[47] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1917 Annual Report (Montreal, 1918), pp.6.
[48] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1916 Annual Report (Montreal, 1917), pp.19.
[49] See *Ibid*., pp.27-30.
[50] See *Ibid*., pp.22.
[51] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1917 Annual Report (Montreal,

In addition to this more general work, by 1920 the Montreal Board had various sub-committees, affiliated guilds and associations focussing on more specific issues, in which a number of French Canadians took an active role. The Montreal Wholesale Grocers' Guild, for instance, was dominated by Francophones, both in its membership and its executive. For its part, the national Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association, which held its annual meetings across the country, had two Francophones at the head of its executive. The activities of the grocers spoke to the need for solidarity when lobbying government – be it on wharfage rates, freight rates, or new legislation, even combating new regulations requiring canned goods with syrup to have the percentage of sugar on the label! It may have seemed mundane, but it was illustrative of the day-to-day business concerns that brought pragmatic Anglo- and French Canadians together in the protection of shared interests in increasing numbers after the Great War. Just about every other affiliated guild or association of the Montreal Board had at least a few Francophones involved, including on the executive, from the Produce Merchants' Association with its French-Canadian president, Arthur Vaillancourt, to the Montreal Lumber Association, the Montreal Egg Dealers Association, Wholesale Millinery Association, and others. Even the "Banker's Section" of the Montreal Board had one or two Francophones on its executive.[53]

Over the course of the interwar period the Montreal Board of Trade became more involved in the life of the city. This included involvement with youth. In 1931 it helped create a Junior Montreal Board of Trade. In addition, members of the Montreal Board sat

---

1918), pp.14, 20, 23.

[52] Zépherin Hébert until 1920 and Alphonse Racine thereafter. LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1920 Annual Report (Montreal, 1921).

[53] In 1920 they were F.G. Leduc and M.S. Bogert. See *Ibid*., pp.78. LAC.

on the city's various education boards throughout the period, including the Catholic boards.[54] The Board also supported the activities of the new Montreal Technical School, which brought both Anglophone and Francophone students together to study as "workmen and apprentices at work in one or other of the various manufacturing and building trades." This initiative brought together a mix of various associations' Anglo- and French-Canadian members to sit on the school's Board of Directors, including from the provincial and municipal governments, manufacturers' associations, labour organizations, the Chambre de Commerce and the Board itself.[55] By 1919, the Board had begun to expand the number of initiatives on which it collaborated with the Chambre de Commerce.[56] The Montreal Board became increasingly integrated with the French-Canadian business community, eventually taking out membership in La Fédération des Chambres de Commerce de la Province de Québec.[57]

Canadian Chamber of Commerce

If the Montreal Board of Trade helped bring about a modest but important interaction between Anglo- and French-Canadian businessmen in Quebec, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce fulfilled a similar function at the national level. Founded in 1925 with a staff of eighteen, the CCC was very much the product of the post-war proliferation of business, professional, intellectual and fraternal associations. Its founders considered

[54] LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1919 Annual Report (Montreal, 1920), pp.38-39.
[55] See LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1916 Annual Report (Montreal, 1917), pp.40.
[56] Such as promotion of trade with France. LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, 1919 Annual Report (Montreal, 1920), p.32.
[57] See LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2807, 1942 Annual Report (Montreal, 1943), pp.20-21.

theirs to be a mission of nation-building, and not just enterprise:[58] "The object of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce," declared the first edition of its new periodical, *The Commerce of the Nation*, "shall be to stimulate and maintain a vigorous Canadian national sentiment."[59] A stronger sense of nationalism would also encourage greater consumption of Canadian products. In keeping with its mission, one of the CCC's stated policy goals was for "Increasing Inter-Provincial Trade," and another was to promote "Good-Will Trips" of Boards of Trade within and between provinces.[60]

Originally named the Dominion Board of Trade, the organization asserted a connection with the history of the old Boards of Trade that had long been established in places like Halifax, Saint John, Montreal and Quebec City. Its founding meeting in Winnipeg in October 1925 brought together over sixty boards of trade and chambers of commerce from across Canada, and saw the secretary of the Montreal Board of Trade appointed as its acting National Secretary. The following year, the executive decided to locate the organization's headquarters in the Board of Trade Building in Montreal.[61]

The CCC was formed to represent businesses big and small from across the country, in both rural and urban Canada. It was "a voluntary federation of Boards of Trade and Chambers of Commerce representing many shades of opinion from all sections of the country."[62] Headquartered in Montreal with a regional office established in

---

[58] LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 16, official history, *The Canadian Chamber of Commerce. Its History, Policy, Departments and Operations, and You!* Montreal: CCC [1949-50?], pp.1-10, 23.
[59] LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 16, periodicals, "The Commerce of the Nation, Official Organ of The Canadian Chamber of Commerce," vol. I, no.1 (February1928), p.1.
[60] *Ibid*., pp.3-4.
[61] In 1927, Wendell McLeod Clarke became National Secretary with an operating budget of $34,000. LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 16, official history, *The Canadian Chamber of Commerce. Its History, Policy, Departments and Operations, and You!* Montreal: CCC [1949-50?], pp.1-3, 22.
[62] *Ibid*., p.1.

Toronto in 1936, it took pride in being "a national organization" with "roots in all the provinces."[63] The CCC promoted Canadian business and trade both in Canada and internationally, through radio, publications with a circulation of over 10,000, magazine and newspaper articles, meetings and coordination, and education and training services. The Chamber placed additional emphasis on lobbying for natural resource development, training men to establish local boards of trade, and on promoting individual rights (in opposition to the closed shop union and the communist bogeyman). Throughout the interwar period it brought together business interests from across Canada to work toward common goals, such as lower taxation, limited regulation, generating more readily available (and thus, cheaper) labour, and to coordinate for the promotion of inter-provincial and international trade. In short, it brought about an increased interaction between Canadian businesspeople in the pursuit of shared interests that, as in so many other fields, crossed cultural and linguistic boundaries. Born in the boom years of the 1920s, it worked to reap the benefits of prosperity and, during the Great Depression, attempted to assist businesses in getting by in difficult times.

The Chamber acquired considerable influence. It was able to lobby the federal government directly – every year its policy declarations were presented to the federal Cabinet.[64] By the mid-1940s it boasted 190 Member Organizations and 750 Associate Corporation and Individual Members.[65] Over 100 of these were from Quebec, and another 20 represented Francophone businesses from outside Quebec. As more medium-sized French-Canadian companies were formed, they sought markets in other parts of Canada. Like any other business, they joined the CCC to extend the reach of their

[63] *Ibid*., p.3.
[64] *Ibid*., pp.1-10.
[65] *Ibid*., p.15.

enterprise.[66] The CCC also followed the example of the Montreal Board of Trade, and became regularly involved in developing and promoting the Junior Chambers of Commerce for young men, beginning in 1935.[67]

At its inception, the organization was overwhelmingly British-Canadian in its membership and executive. Even then, it still collaborated with Quebec and Francophone business interests, and their influence within the CCC gradually increased. The Anglo- and French-Canadian members of both the Montreal Board of Trade and the Chambre de Commerce de Montréal, for instance, had collaborated to help spearhead the creation of the national board.[68] Over time, the names on the CCC membership and executive lists suggested a growing level of French-Canadian participation in various companies during the interwar years, from directors of banks and managers of investment and insurance firms, to presidents of hydro-electric and manufacturing companies.[69]

From early on, the Anglo- and French-Canadian members of the CCC worked to adopt policy positions that were of mutual interest. At the founding convention in 1925, for instance, the association called for governments to promote immigration and colonization ("the most important problem facing Canada today"), to develop road and rail infrastructure to open up the country's most remote regions, including northern Quebec, and to recognize "the need of replenishing the rural population of the Maritime Provinces and repatriation of former Canadians and their descendants now living in other countries with special reference to former French Canadians now resident in the New

---

[66] *Ibid*., pp.13.
[67] *Ibid*., pp.17.
[68] See LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 17, policy declarations, Winnipeg Convention, 1925, p.3.
[69] See, for instance, LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 5, Board of Directors nominal lists, 1926-1940; LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 16, periodicals. "The Commerce of the nation," vol. I, no. 1 (February 1928), list of new affiliates, p.3.

England and Atlantic States."[70] This last policy initiative was especially important to the Francophone membership. Moreover, it was of mutual interest for Anglo- and French-Canadian businessmen because it would enhance demand in the marketplace as well as Montreal's central position in the economy. The following year, at the national meeting held in Saint John, the CCC called on the federal and provincial governments to encourage tourism through advertising and relaxed regulations – for Quebec especially, tourism was seen as a means for small businesses to make money and to attract big business investors in the natural resources sector. To further the cause of interprovincial trade, the Saint John meeting established a special committee to facilitate contact between the various boards of trade and chambers of commerce, and to identify and coordinate the needs and demands of the several provinces.[71] At the 1927 Vancouver meeting, delegates called for a national highway to help "cement the union of the Canadian Provinces," and to standardize roads, car ownership, and driving regulations, and to meet the increasing demands of motor traffic: "every type of motor traffic is rapidly increasing, thus multiplying opportunities for travel and closer unity and harmony between our widely separated communities."[72]

Five of the CCC's first twenty annual meetings were held in Quebec. The 1928 annual meeting, held in Quebec City, was the first. It featured lobbying on behalf of allegedly-overtaxed wholesalers – a business in which French Canadians were well-represented. The Quebec hosts impressed their Anglo-Canadian guests with their

[70] LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 17, policy declarations, Winnipeg Convention, 1925, pp.2-3.
[71] LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 17, policy declarations, Saint John, 1926, pp.6-7.
[72] Ten years later, at the 1937 Vancouver meeting, delegates praised the federal and provincial governments' efforts at promoting tourism, and at improving the highways that made tourism possible. LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 17, policy declarations, Vancouver, 1927, pp.8, 48.

hospitality.[73] Of common interest, too, was the call for action at the 1929 Edmonton meeting toward the construction of a St. Lawrence sea-way, and for government sponsorship of more scientific research into agricultural practices.[74] Individual Chambres de Commerce also had their voices heard at the national level, such as the Chambre de Commerce de Lévis, which raised the need to promote shipbuilding at the 1932 meeting in Halifax.[75] At the 1938 meeting at the Seigniory Club in Montebello, Quebec, delegates lobbied for greater support for agriculture through the reduction of farm implement costs, farm transportation costs, reduction of taxation on farmers, and altering relief schemes so as to not 'discourage' farm labourers from working, and the ongoing promotion of immigration and tourism, especially through highways.[76] The meetings in Quebec, as elsewhere, received extensive and positive coverage in the national press and, later, on radio via the CBC.[77] Throughout, CCC members were united in their opposition to communism and leftist movements like the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation.[78]

Several of the CCC's policy declarations reflected its pan-Canadian nationalist self-image. At Saint John in 1926 delegates called on the federal government to arrange celebrations for the upcoming sixtieth anniversary of Confederation.[79] Three years later at Edmonton they called for the creation of a Canadian citizenship, along with an

---

[73] LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 17, policy declarations, Quebec City, 1928, pp.14-15.
[74] LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 17, policy declarations, Edmonton, 1929, pp.19-20.
[75] LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 17, policy declarations, Halifax, 1932, p.31.
[76] LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 17, policy declarations, Seigniory Club, Montebello, Quebec, p.54.
[77] See, for instance, LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 17, policy declarations, Quebec City, 1928, pp.14-15, 57; and, same file, Seigniory Club, 1938, p.8.
[78] See LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 74, files 601-603, pamphlets to 1940s.
[79] LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 17, policy declarations, Saint John, 1926, pp.6-7.

appropriate citizenship ceremony for new arrivals.[80] At the same meeting the Montreal Board of Trade led the call for the provincial and federal governments to review the over-reliance of schools and universities on foreign-authored textbooks on Canadian history.[81] At the 1938 meeting at the Seigniory Club in Montebello, Quebec, the CCC argued "That the sense of Canadian citizenship and Canadian nationhood could be developed by a more general and formal celebration of all national holidays."[82] Throughout the interwar years the CCC constantly promoted interprovincial trade and positive interaction between businessmen from across the country. Moreover, while some of its early policy declarations emphasized intra-imperial trade, the concern over things imperial declined over time, and by the end of the interwar period, it was altogether muted. With the renewed threat of war in Europe, the CCC reminded its member-organizations of the importance of national unity, "the free movement of trade across the country ... and that this Canadian nationhood can best be served through the abandonment of conflicting sectional interests."[83]

Interest in and interest from Canada's French-language businesses to reap the benefits of the association eventually motivated the CCC to establish its "French Language Services" by the mid-1930s. It appointed a "French-speaking Regional Representative for the Province of Quebec" whose office would "assist all chambers in the Province to strengthen their organizations and to keep in close contact with the national chamber .... through correspondence, personal visits and regular releases and by

[80] The original proposal was submitted by the Regina Board of Trade. LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 17, policy declarations, Edmonton, p.20.
[81] LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 17, policy declarations, Edmonton, 1929, p.21.
[82] LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 17, policy declarations, Seigniory Club, Montebello, Quebec, 1938, p.57.
[83] *Ibid*., p.51.

ensuring that French-speaking organizations receive in that language the chamber's releases from all departments." These services extended to Francophone organizations outside Quebec as well. They were overseen by the Executive Secretary at national headquarters in Montreal, who was second only to the General Manager. The programme was a success – the Quebec membership more than quintupled and more associations representing Francophone businesses elsewhere in Canada joined. The establishment of this service was a particular point of pride for the CCC, which by now had accepted the principle of cultural federalism: "Thus the Chamber through this bilingual nature lays a further claim to being truly a national organization," declared the official history.[84]

Canadian Bar Association

The legal community played an especially important role in bringing Anglophone and Francophone professionals together, notably with the Quebec and Canadian Bar Associations. Arthur Maheux explained the prominence of the lawyers in helping bring about rapprochement during the interwar years:

> 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. …. But times have changed; lawyers and jurists of both groups have learned to get together.... They have explained to each other their particular views; they have discovered the merits of both Laws. And the old strife has vanished. The 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.[85]

[84] LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 16, official history, *The Canadian Chamber of Commerce*, pp.5, 13.
[85] Maheux, *What Keeps Us Apart?*, p.77.

The cross-cultural impetus of the lawyers' associations was important, given the historical links between Canada's legal and political professions. Seven out of ten Canadian prime ministers by 1921, for instance, had at one point or another been lawyers. Louis St. Laurent, a prominent interwar figure in the Canadian Bar Association, would go on to serve as prime minister from 1948 to 1957.[86]

The Canadian Bar Association was front-and-centre in promoting positive interaction between Anglophone and Francophone professionals. Formed in 1914 to bring together the disparate legal associations from across the country, the CBA's activities would not really take off until its incorporation in 1921, under the stewardship of its first president, Sir James Aikins (1914-1927). In addition to its aim to "advance the science of jurisprudence, promote the administration of justice and the uniformity of legislation throughout Canada," and to uphold "the honour of the profession of law" through "a high standard of legal education, training and ethics," the Association aimed to "foster harmonious relationships and social intercourse among members of the Canadian Bar."[87] Canadian lawyers finally had an association in which they could come together in professional and collegial interest, in effect facilitating interaction between Canada's Anglophone and Francophone lawyers. This was in part the product of altruism, but it was also the product of simple pragmatism. From the beginning, CBA activities included joint efforts to achieve uniform standards for legal education and lobbying for

[86] R.B. Bennett also played a prominent role in the CBA from the early 1920s, acting as its VP for Alberta. See LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol. 38, File 514, "Sir James Aikins – Scrapbook, 1924," part 1 of 2.
[87] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, archival description.

more consistent business and commercial laws across the provinces. Advice from the Quebec lawyers was especially sought after on insolvency and succession laws.[88]

Quebec and French-speaking Canada were well represented in the CBA – in its constitution, activities, membership and executive. From early on, Aikins insisted on representation from all of the provinces, but especially Ontario and Quebec. He recognized that "it would be well" to have strong representation from Quebec, and in particular from Montreal.[89] In the context of increasing animosities during the Great War, Aikins, a western Canadian,[90] was particularly anxious that Francophones be involved: "I know that you earnestly desire, as I do, greater unity of feeling between the English and the French speaking peoples of Canada," he wrote to Montreal lawyer R.C. Smith in May 1917,

> I think it would be a wise thing if it can be arranged to have Sir Lomer Gouin present at our annual meeting in Winnipeg and give us an address. The West does not understand Quebec; perhaps Quebec does not understand the West. Therefore, the desire to have some strong representative of the French speaking people present at the annual meeting.[91]

From the beginning, Aikins hoped that the CBA could act as a bridge between the legal professions of both cultural-linguistic communities. Like many other conscientious observers, Aikins was increasingly concerned that the severity of the British-/French-Canadian divide might destroy the country. All efforts would have to be made to repair the relationship after the war.[92] Through the influence of Better Understanding

---

[88] See LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.1, File 2, "Correspondence - Sir James Aikins," parts 3 and 4, various correspondence, early 1917.
[89] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.1, File 2, part 13, J.A.M. Aikins to R.C. Smith, 18 Sept 1914, in part 13. See also same file, part 2, Aikins to Smith, Mtl., 19 July 1917.
[90] From Winnipeg, he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba in 1917.
[91] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.1, File 2, part 2, Aikins to Smith, 17 May 1917.
[92] "I do not know how you feel in Quebec, but we in Manitoba have 'a solemnizing sense' of the very serious situation, not only in Canada, but in the world. We are depressed about the situation in Quebec concerning conscription.... In any event, we must, so far as the Canadian Bar Association is concerned,

Association founder and Ontario lawyer William Charles Mikel, the CBA adopted a resolution at its annual meeting in 1921 "urging the Members of the legal profession to exercise their influence to bring about a better understanding between the English and French speaking Canadians."[93]

The CBA did attract the notice of prominent Francophones, including Lomer Gouin, early on.[94] French Canadians played an important role in its founding.[95] In addition, the constitution determined that the association was to be based in Ottawa, and guaranteed extra representation for the sister provinces of Quebec and Ontario.[96] Of the eight men who served as president after Aikins and before the Second World War, two were Francophones: L.E. Beaulieu (1938-1939) and future Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent (1929-1932). The first article of the CBA's constitution gave implicit protection for Quebec's civil law, and "encourage[d] cordial intercourse among the members of the Canadian Bar."[97] Significantly, a number of CBA members were directly involved in the bonne entente movement, including Mikel, William Nesbitt Ponton, C.P. Beaubien, and Napoléon Belcourt (not to mention those who developed informal ties with the movement).[98]

The many activities and initiatives of the CBA during the interwar years are too many to chronicle here, but one series of events in particular highlighted the association's

---

'carry on,' for Canada will in the end come out all right." LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.1, File 2, part 2, Aikins to Smith, 2 June 1917.

[93] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, Meighen to Mikel, August 18, 1921, p.37.

[94] See LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.1, File 2, part 4, Aikins to Lomer Gouin, 2 February 1917.

[95] See LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.1, File 2, part 1, Aikins and John F. Orde to prospective members of the CBA, 23 Feb 1914; same file, part 1, "Minutes of a Meeting of Members of the Bars of all the Provinces of Canada held at the Chateau Laurier, Ottawa, 13 February 1914," pp.1-2.

[96] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.1, File 2, part 1, Constitution of the CBA, Article 3, "Officers and Council," p.2.

[97] *Ibid*., Article 1, "Name and Object."

[98] See LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.1, File 2, part 2, "Telegrams exchanged concerning suggested postponement of the annual meeting," July 1917, p.2.

role in promoting Anglophone/Francophone rapprochement: the 1924 CBA tour of Quebec, London, Edinburgh, Paris and Dublin. Prior to journeying across the Atlantic to meet with European members of the profession, the CBA decided to hold a large-scale version of its annual meeting for its own members in Quebec City as something of a grand 'send off.' Aikins kept a detailed scrapbook of newspaper clippings to record the event for posterity.[99]

The Quebec City event was above all about promoting interaction between its members, more so than the settling of the many mundane details of Canadian law (normally left for the association's day-to-day activities throughout the year). The membership had also assembled to define the common goals, ethics, and principles of their profession – to establish a shared professional identity through shared values.[100] The meeting opened at the Château Frontenac with much pomp, including a reception hosting some "two hundred visiting jurists and members of the local bar accompanied by their wives" – altogether over three hundred people: lawyers, notaries, provincial superior court justices, judges, and Supreme Court justices, Lieutenant-Governors, past, present and future executives of the CBA, and their wives, from across the country.[101] It was a veritable 'who's who' of the legal community. The organizers were careful to ensure that the great ballroom was "décorée aux couleurs anglaise, française et canadienne."[102] The list of attendees indicated strong representation from the bonne entente movement and

[99] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, Files 514 and 515, "Scrapbook – Canadian Bar Association Meetings, 1924."
[100] See, for instance, LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, "Canada Belongs to Whole of Population of Dominion, Says Sir James Aikins To Lawyers. …. Praised Quebec Civil Code," *Quebec Chronicle*, 8 July 1924.
[101] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, Quebec *Daily Telegraph*, 8 July 1924; same file, *Winnipeg Tribune*, 9 July 1924.
[102] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, "Memorable Convention Au Barreau – L'Association du Barreau Canadien tient sa 9e reunion annuelle à Québec," *L'Événement*, 8 July 1924

from both Quebec's French- and Anglo-Canadian communities (including far more Francophones than had been involved during the CBA's first years), as did the newly-elected executive.[103] The event received extensive coverage in English- and French-language newspapers from across the country.

Speeches from both Anglo- and French-Canadian participants attempted to play to each other's sensibilities. Several Anglo-Canadian speakers, and Aikins in particular, adopted ideas that had previously been typical of French-Canadian thinkers, including notions of protecting Canadian sovereignty, of Canada no longer being British nor French, of 'Ancient Quebec' being the historic capital of *all* of Canada, and so on. In short, the ideas presented at the great meeting of the CBA were evocative of the bonne entente movement itself. Moreover, it suggested that bonne ententiste ideas were becoming part of a more mainstream discourse, and not just the preserve of historians and intellectuals.

The French-Canadian members and executives were especially proud to play host. Their province and legal system were finally receiving the due attention and respect of Canadians from across the country. "In addressing you," declared Quebec Superior Court Chief Justice Sir Francois Lemieux, "I am voicing the feelings not only of the Bench and Bar of the Province of Quebec, but of the whole Province, which wishes you a cordial, a fraternal, and, better still, a Frenchie (*sic*) welcome, in this old French city which was the cradle of civilization in America." Playing to the sensibilities of the British Canadians in his audience, he reminded them that the great historic city of Quebec had played host to both "the representatives of the King of France" and "men who personified the greatness

[103] See LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, "Light, Law, And Levity, Marked Convention of Can. Bar Association," Quebec *Daily Telegraph*, 8 July 1924; same file, *Manitoba Free-Press*, 8 July 1924.

and majesty of the British Empire." The event and the CBA itself were especially important, he continued, given their "mission" to promote "Concord and Union among the Citizens of Canada." The CBA was well positioned to accomplish this goal, given the intimate relations of the lawyerly classes with Canadians at large and with the political classes.[104]

In his opening address, L.A. Cannon, Batonnier of the Quebec Bar, was particularly thrilled to bring together lawyers from across the country. Cannon spoke with pride of Quebec's contributions to Canada's legal traditions. Asserting a shared history, he reminded his audience that:

> the civilization of the St. Lawrence and ... the Great Lakes Country was started from the city of Quebec, the ancient capital of all Canada, from the Atlantic to the Rockies; from here was directed the enforcement of law and order throughout a vast Empire.

He was equally proud of the contributions of Quebec's legal community to Confederation as a whole:

> The Quebec section of the Bar have contributed to the welfare and good government of Canada. One of its members, Hon. Telesphore Fournier, as Minister of Justice, organized the Supreme Court of Canada, whose bench he adorned, as well as Jean Thomas and Sir Elzear Taschereau and his successor in office, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, who were all members of the Quebec section of the Bar. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was also registered on our roll … and our present Attorney General of Canada, Hon. Ernest Lapointe, a good friend of your association, is also one of those confreres, of whom we are proud and the lustre of whose names will surely never fade. …. [R]eal legislators should not forget that traditions and customs should be preserved. Quebec [i]s trying to do that.[105]

---

[104] Rodolphe Lemieux certainly thought so: "But never did Quebec have the honor of receiving within her walls such a remarkable intellectual élite as that represented by hundreds of judges and lawyers, all members of that most useful and patriotic association: The Canadian Bar Association, whose mission is to raise the standard of the legal profession and whose motto is: Concord and Union among the Citizens of Canada. ….the lawyer is a social necessity and an indispensable element in the nation, owing to his mental superiority acquired in managing the most intricate affairs and in rubbing up against all kinds of men, under the most difficult and trying circumstances." In See LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, "Canada Belongs to Whole of Population of Dominion," *Quebec Chronicle*, 8 July 1924.

[105] In LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings,

Cannon emphasized the role of the CBA in helping foster national unity and respect for cultural differences, such as Quebec's civil law tradition.[106] Further to the notion of a shared history, Cannon told his audience that Quebec was the seat of Canadian (and not just French-Canadian) history. Canadians of all backgrounds had a shared experience in that they or their predecessors had been newcomers to this land, with countless of them first setting foot on Canadian soil at Quebec. They were words that William Moore and Camille Roy would have been pleased to hear:

> Is it not an inspiration to think that from this historic spot, from Quebec, Canadian lawyers, the descendants of immigrants who landed in Quebec some generations ago, will now leave the ancient capital of Canada on a pilgrimage to the homes of their ancestors and bring to the older civilizations of Europe a message of hope and filial devotion, and also the benefit of our own experience in nation building, which may be useful in their laborious task of reconstructing the war-scarred nations of Europe?[107]

Indeed, the trip abroad would encourage these Canadian professionals to look for commonalities amongst themselves.

The Anglo-Canadians were impressed by the welcome they received at Quebec. Justice Clarke, of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of Alberta, for instance, reflecting on that warm welcome, repeated the themes of his hosts and referred to both their shared 'ancient' history and their more recent shared legal history.[108] In a symbolic

---

"Light, Law, And Levity, Marked Convention of Can. Bar Association," Quebec *Daily Telegraph*, 8 July 1924.

[106] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, "Canada Belongs to the Whole Population," Quebec *Chronicle*, 8 July 1924.

[107] In *Ibid*.

[108] *Ibid*. Clarke "considered it very fitting that the meeting should be held in the historic city of Quebec, where, in 1875 an ordinance was passed by which nobody could be admitted to practise as barrister unless he had served five years under articles and had been examined. …. [He stated] that the association was meeting on sacred ground, for it was in Quebec that the two rival nations agreed to bury the hatchet and unite their efforts towards building up the country on this side of the Atlantic." The Wolfe-Montcalm monument was "an object lesson to the whole of the people of Canada to bury their differences and to love and respect one another."

gesture, the Quebec organizers had asked the Albertan to give the official reply to the hosts' welcome. Clarke had been particularly struck by the city's historic character, and its commemoration of the Battle of the Plains of Abraham in particular. Visiting the old battlefield out of a sense of curiosity to see where the British had 'conquered' Canada, he had instead come across the Wolfe and Montcalm monuments that paid homage to the heroism of both peoples. Coming to visit the site of Wolfe's great victory, and expecting the commemoration of British conquest, he instead took away a message of cross-cultural collaboration and peaceful coexistence. His remarks were well received in the French-language press:

> 'Dans cette vieille cité de Québec,' dit le juge Clark, 'deux grandes nations vivent côte à côte, travaillent la main dans la main à l'agrandissement de leur patrimoine national et donnent au reste du pays un éloquent exemple de justice et de fraternité. On peut le constater, comme je l'ai fait moi-même, en visitant Québec, en voyant, par exemple, l'hommage qui a été rendu à la mémoire de deux grands héros de l'histoire canadienne, Wolfe et Montcalm.'[109]

Like so many others in attendance, Clarke saw the CBA's primary role as a decidedly patriotic one: to help establish the basis for a new, shared Canadian identity.

For his part, Aikins spoke with pride of Quebec's tradition of civil law, of its unique contribution to the overall Canadian legal tradition and, where previous generations of British Canadians had seen it as an inconvenience to be done away with,[110] pledged that it must be protected. In this, he addressed what must have been a concern for some French-Canadian members upon the formation of a national bar association.[111] Like Cannon, Aikins also promoted the notion of a shared French history, stretching from

---

[109] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, "Mémorable Convention Au Barreau," *L'Événement*, 8 July 1924.

[110] See, for instance, Robert Talbot, *Negotiating the Numbered Treaties: An Intellectual and Political Biography of Alexander Morris* (Saskatoon: Purich, 2009), pp.36-37.

[111] Aikins was adament that "'There was no intention of any lawyer in the Dominion being allowed to lay hands on Quebec's Civil Code.'" In LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, "Light, Law, And Levity," Quebec *Daily Telegraph*, 8 July 1924.

Cape Breton to the Rockies.[112] In language that mirrored the policies then being promoted by the CBA's honorary president, Ernest Lapointe, Aikins asserted the principle of Canadian sovereignty, and evoked the creation of a new, Canadian political nationality. "Canadians were of America, but were not Americans," he said.[113] Canada was neither British nor French, nor Aboriginal, for that matter – it was *Canadian*:

> 'Canada,' he declared, 'has ceased to belong to the people of Britain and the people of France, while neither does it belong to the aborigines, who have never been treated with any degree of courtesy, but it does belong from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from north to south, and from the warmth below to the starry skies above, to the population of Canada.'[114]

Aikins was "loudly applauded" for his remarks.[115] The speeches of Lemieux, Cannon, Clarke and Aikins reflected those of several other notable Anglo- and French-Canadian speakers at the CBA meeting in Quebec City.

One theme raised by Aikins that resonated with the French-Canadian Catholics in particular was the perceived threat of socialism. Aikins took the invention of a common history to new heights, making the anachronistic assertion that Wolfe and Montcalm had died not only so that future French and British Canadians could live in peace and prosperity, but also to safeguard the spirit of free enterprise. He was cited at length in the French-language newspapers:

---

[112] *Ibid*. "Jacques Cartier, he declared, came here in 1535, and was the first man from France who spent a winter in Canada. Then came Champlain, who came to Cape Breton in 1603, and to Quebec in 1608. Later, in 1615, he went farther west to the Georgian Bay. ….[I]t was a Three Rivers man who discovered Alberta, when he went west. ….[Aikins] reviewed the whole history of Canada."

[113] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 2, newspaper clippings, "American Lawyers at Guildhall Banquet," London *Daily Telegraph*, 24 July 1924.

[114] "'Shall we allow,' he asked, 'any sovereignty of any country, shall we allow them to have a say as to what we shall do ... in any shape or form? …. Heaven forbid.'" In LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, "Light, Levity, and Law," Quebec *Daily Telegraph*, 8 July 1924.

[115] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, "Canada Belongs to Whole of Population," *Quebec Chronicle*, 8 July 1924.

> ...il appartient à l'État d'exiger un loyal service de ses citoyens, d'encourager, et non de supprimer leur initiative, de les garder pour le Canada. L'État doit aider les citoyens, soit, mais ce n'est pas à lui de les faire vivre. C'est là la doctrine des militaristes et des bolchéviks. .... Les Canadiens laborieux peuvent se réjouir de l'héritage qu'ils ont reçu et pour lesquels Wolfe et Montcalm ont sacrifié si noblement leur vie sur les Plaines d'Abraham.[116]

Apprehension over socialism, paternalistic law and state interventionism, then, appear to have brought the lawyerly classes of English- and French-speaking Canada together in a common interest.

The theme of Anglo- and French-Canadian 'bonhommie' followed the delegates on their journey across the Atlantic. At least twenty of the one hundred-and-forty delegates who boarded the *Montlaurier* in Quebec for London were Francophones, including a few from outside Quebec.[117] In Britain, the Quebecers were distinguished not only for their language but also their Civil Code, and "French-Canadian Loyalty" was much trumpeted.[118] At the impressive gathering of some two thousand British, Canadian, and American legal officials in London, the Canadian section of the committee was a veritable mix of Anglophones and Francophones, several of whom had been active in bonne ententiste initiatives.[119] Senator Belcourt, among others, occupied a "distinguished" place in the Canadian delegation.[120] A meeting for Canadian delegates

---

[116] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, "Mémorable Convention Au Barreau," *L'Événement*, 8 July 1924.

[117] See LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 2, "Souvenir List of Members of the Canadian Bar Association on Board S.S. 'Montlaurier,' July 8th-16th, 1924."

[118] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, "Unique Assembly of Legal Brethren. Canadian Arrivals," London *Daily Telegraph*, 17 July 1924.

[119] Notable participants included James Aikins, Napoléon Belcourt, N.W. Rowell, R.B. Bennett, Chief Justice Martin, Justice Mignault, Isaac Pitblado, J.W. Cook (Batonnier-General of the Bar of the Province of Quebec, L.A. Cannon (Batonnier of the Bar of the District of Quebec City), Ésioff Patenaude, Justice Lamon, Juistice Duclos, Justice Rinfret, Justice Forin, Justice Constantineau and Justice Tessier. See LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, "Welcome to US Lawyers. Link of Common Heritage. The British Spirit," London *Times*, 22 July 1924, in Part 1, File 514, Vol. 38, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169; same file, part 2, "American Lawyers at Guildhall Banquet," London *Daily Telegraph*, 24 July 1924.

[120] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 2, newspaper clippings,

attended by the Duke of Connaught at the Canadian Club in London included speeches that went on at length as to how "both the English and French" had been instrumental to the "upbuilding of Canada."[121] Jacob Nicol, K.C., Treasurer of Quebec, gave an address in which he invited "British capital" to invest further in his province, especially in hydro-electricity, and defended the right of appeal to the JCPC, which doubtless pleased British jurists in attendance. At the Club, Aikins gave another speech highlighting the country's history, in which he detailed the shared "struggle for self-government [that] had succeeded at confederation. Canada was now reaping the benefit of the union of two races and was proud of her liberty."[122] During the CBA's visit to Edinburgh, Aikins again invoked history to draw closer filial links between Scots and French, and the role played by the Scottish-born Governor Murray in preserving French-Catholic rights after the surrender of Quebec.[123] Moreover, what is interesting in the context of the overseas visit is that both the Anglophone and Francophone delegates of the CBA were demonstrably proud to project a pluralistic, bicultural image of Canada abroad. It was a thing to boast about, not to suppress. The voyage doubtless had an impression on many CBA delegates. Aikins deemed it "the most thrilling and enjoyable experience he had ever had."[124]

Canadian Medical Association

Elizabeth Montizambert, "American Bar Welcomed in London by Canadian and English Law Lords," Manitoba *Free-Press*, 7 Aug 1924.

[121] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, "Canada Club. Lawyer Visitors Honoured," London *Daily Telegraph*, 23 July 1924.

[122] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 1, newspaper clippings, *Canadian Gazette*, 24 July 1924.

[123] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 2, newspaper clippings, "Lawyers' Visit to Edinburgh," *Scotsman*, 29 July 1924.

[124] LAC, Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol.38, File 514, part 2, newspaper clippings, "Delegates to London Narrate Experiences," Manitoba *Free-Press*, 15 Nov 1924.

Another upper- and middle-class profession that brought together French and Anglo-Canadians in pragmatic partnership during the interwar years was the medical profession. This had not always been the case. The Canadian Medical Association, founded in 1867 and initially dominated by British Canadians, was slow to adopt a more collaborative approach with French Canadians. "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," explained Maheux. "Common discussions were not possible." Things changed after the Great War. By the late 1920s, the CMA had begun encouraging greater partnership between English- and French-speaking medical practitioners. Maheux:

> But time has passed. The Physicians and Surgeons, I mean in Québec, have organized their College, held meetings together, worked in the same hospitals, and talking together they took a better knowledge of the other's views. .... 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.[125]

The CMA played an important role in giving a shared voice to the medical professionals from across Canada. In 1919, the CMA operated as a loose association of the nine separate, autonomous provincial associations. By 1939, it had become a more effective association, acting as a centralized federation for what had become nine different provincial 'divisions.'

As with other national associations around the time of the Great War, the CMA's membership and executive were overwhelmingly British-Canadian. But over the years, its French-Canadian membership and representation on the executive increased, and

[125] Maheux, *What Keeps Us Apart?* pp.77-78.

those Francophones who did play an active role in the association succeeded in having their voices heard. The CMA was effectively in hiatus from the beginning of the Great War until June 1917, when it reconvened at a national meeting in Montreal. Roughly half of the approximately three hundred in attendance were from the host province, but only about thirty were French Canadians. Still, the meeting, as with later national meetings, succeeded in bringing together doctors from across Canada (all nine provinces and even Newfoundland) and from across Quebec (from Montreal, Trois Rivières, Sherbrooke, Quebec City and elsewhere), including Anglo-Canadians, French Canadians and Jewish Quebecers.[126]

By the mid-1920s, the CMA had begun to place a greater emphasis on ensuring meaningful cooperation with members from all of Canada's regions, including Quebec. Initially, the association suffered from organizational problems – provincial executives did not take enough of an active role in the CMA: "The Canadian Medical Association is not getting from the practitioners throughout Canada the support it deserves," declared the Committee on Intra-Canadian Relations at the June 1926 meeting in Victoria. "If the CMA is going to increase in strength and usefulness, it should have the cooperation of the various Provincial Associations in securing increased membership for the CMA."[127]

Significantly, increasing exposure to and membership from Canada's French-speaking medical community became a priority for the Anglo-Canadian leadership of the association by the late 1920s. In its first ten years after the Great War, the CMA held three annual meetings in Quebec: two in Montreal and one in Quebec City. At the June

[126] LAC, Canadian Medical Association fonds (CMAF), MG28-I343, Vol. 4, file 1, "Register of attendance to AGMs, 1867-1917" (M-7585), attendance sheet for Montreal meeting, June 13-15, 1917, pp. 277-288.
[127] LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes, 1926-1945 (M-7486), Report of the Committee on Intra-Canadian Relations, p.31, June 1926 Annual Meeting, Victoria, BC.

1927 annual meeting in Toronto, and a year later at the annual meeting in Montreal, Dr. Mullin of Hamilton pressed for the publication of the CMA journal "in the French language." The journal's editor, Dr. Blackader, suggested that, at the very least, "a section of the Journal be printed in French."[128] Like other national professional associations of the interwar, the CMA was increasingly conscious of the need to include French Canadians if it was going to claim to be truly national in scope. The next few years brought encouraging signs of change. By 1928, the membership included well over five hundred Quebecers – more than any other province except Ontario.[129] By 1929 the Executive Council included five French Canadians, one Acadian, and one French citizen, and of the fifteen Executive Committee members, two were Francophones.[130] Still, Francophone membership remained relatively weak, in part because the Quebec medical profession still lacked proper organization, and the CMA journal found itself competing with other French-language publications. Nonetheless, the CMA continued with its efforts to attract French-speaking members.

Although Anglo-Canadians remained the vast majority, the French-speaking members of the executive played a meaningful role, notably Dr. Gérin-Lajoie. The 1929 meeting, held in Montreal, gave dozens of leading Anglo-Canadian medical professionals from across the country the chance to witness the ongoing developments of the Quebec medical profession and to visit the heart of French-speaking society in Canada.

---

[128] Their proposals were greeted with some reticence, not from Anglophones outside Quebec, but from Quebecers, including Francophones. Drs. Bazin and Gérin-Lajoie from Quebec were optimistic that such a measure might stimulate the interest of "the French speaking members of the medical profession," but were concerned about the cost of translation, the ongoing need to first properly organize the Quebec medical profession, and competition from other French-language journals. LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes, 1926-1945 (M-7486), June 1927 Annual Meeting, Toronto, p.87.

[129] Out of some 3,500 individuals. See LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes, 1926-1945 (M-7486), 18-23 June 1928, Annual Meeting, Charlottetown, PEI, p.131.

[130] See LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, Executive Council minutes, 1924-1938, (M-7486).

Throughout the interwar period, the CMA executive included three representatives for each of Quebec and Ontario, and one for each of the other provinces.[131]

Over the years the scope of CMA activities broadened. Overcoming the problems inherent in federalism and the fact that medical care fell under provincial jurisdiction brought the diverse CMA membership together in their lobbying efforts, both Anglophones and Francophones. The CMA's Intra-Canadian Relations Committee was established for just this purpose. From the mid-1920s onward, for instance, the CMA lobbied against barriers to doctors practising outside their province, and lobbied for more uniform instruction of medical students across the country. It also called on provincial governments to adopt more concurrent medical legislation.[132]

Then there was the ongoing challenge that the CMA was initially a loose association of provincial organizations, and not a truly federated, centralized body. At its annual meeting in June 1929 in Montreal, the CMA instituted measures to better organize at the provincial level, more closely associate provincial organizations with the national body, encourage communications between provinces on important medical developments, and increase membership, appointing Field Secretaries to each region. The apparent reticence of some doctors in Quebec in particular toward joining the CMA made things difficult.[133] Still, by 1933, more than one in ten CMA members attending annual meetings were Francophones – a meaningful improvement from the days when they had

---

[131] See LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes, 1926-1945 (M-7486), 17-21 June 1929, 60th Annual Meeting of the CMA, Windsor Hotel (Montreal), pp.174-175; same reel, Executive Committee meeting for 1929-1930, p.207; and, same reel, 17-18 June General Council, 1940, Toronto, p.219.

[132] LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes, 1926-1945 (M-7486), Report of the Committee on Intra-Canadian Relations, June 1926 Annual Meeting, Victoria, BC, pp.31-32; same reel, Report of the Committee on Intra-Canadian Relations, June 1927 Annual Meeting, Toronto, pp.90.

[133] See LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes, 1926-1945 (M-7486), 17-21 June 1929, 60th Annual Meeting of the CMA, Windsor Hotel (Montreal), p.189; same reel, Executive Council minutes, 1924-1938.

been almost entirely absent.[134] Interestingly, for those French-speaking doctors who were engaged in the CMA, making it a truly federated body – a centralized organization with a measure of sway over its provincial divisions – was a high priority. As Dr. J.S. McEachern, Chair of the Inter-Provincial Relations Committee reported in 1931, it was not for any lack of interest on the part of the Quebec members that such efforts had met with difficulty:

> It was thought that the Province of Quebec would never conform, owing to language conditions and its scattered population. The Province of Quebec has come in and has appointed delegates from their Provincial Executive to attend the Council of the CMA year after year, thus ensuring continuity. The Province of Ontario has also conformed. As far as the other provinces are concerned, there has been no active cooperation.[135]

Both Dr. Veniot from New Brunswick and Dr. Gérin-Lajoie from Montreal voiced strong support for federation. The pressures of the Great Depression – leading to wide disparities between the provinces in the funding of hospitals and medical education – made it clear to the Canadian medical profession that a stronger, centralized lobbying body was necessary. In 1934, the CMA adopted a proposal to become a truly national medical association by federating all of the then-independent provincial medical associations, making them each a Division of the CMA so as to better coordinate the activities and priorities of the entire profession. The Quebec provincial association, along with those of BC, Ontario and Nova Scotia, was among the early supporters, sending delegates to criss-cross the country in a lobbying effort. By 1939, all nine provincial

---

[134] LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes, 1926-1945 (M-7486), 1933 Annual Meeting, Saint John, pp.373-374. Of the 74 in attendance, at least eight were 8 Francophones (7 from Quebec and one from New Brunswick).

[135] LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes, 1926-1945 (M-7486), 1931 Annual Meeting, Vancouver, p.362.

medical associations had agreed to become divisions of the CMA, formally completing the process.[136]

Even before it became a formally federated body, the CMA had begun to bring Anglo- and French-Canadian doctors together to deliberate on all variety of matters of shared interest and concern. These included questions of public health, medical education, legislation, inter-provincial coordination, standardization of techniques and terminology, pharmaceuticals, measures against "quacks" (false doctors and purveyors of dubious medical products), and early discussions about a public healthcare system.[137] By 1933, at the height of the Great Depression, the CMA doctors had resolved to work together to lobby the federal government and their respective provincial governments to recognize the need for the federal government to fund medical care, especially for those Canadians on relief – provincial autonomy in this instance was deemed a hindrance. The Quebec doctors, including French Canadians, were especially supportive of this measure, and lobbied both their provincial organization and provincial government accordingly.[138]

One example of successful professional collaboration between French- and English-speaking doctors was on the question of establishing "conjoint examinations," or standardized testing for future doctors across all provinces. This would improve respect for the profession. The challenge was to acknowledge provincial autonomy while at the same time moving toward national standards: "In this Province the French-Canadian majority demands that there should be a certain amount of autonomy," explained Dr.

---

[136] LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes, 1926-1945 (M-7486), 17-18 June 1940 General Council, Toronto, p.203.
[137] LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes, 1926-1945 (M-7486), 17-21 June 1929, 60th Annual Meeting of the CMA, Windsor Hotel (Montreal), pp.191, 203.
[138] LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes, 1926-1945 (M-7486), 1933 Meeting, Saint John, pp.373-386.

Charles F. Martin, of Montreal. Still, the Francophone medical professionals were also in favour of sensible professional collaboration. Martin:

> When it comes to a question of cooperation on anything that means progress, I think, if our French Canadian Colleges were approached, they would be very sympathetic. …. [T]he College of Physicians and Surgeons of the Province of Quebec would be perfectly willing to send assessors to any examination, and, with these working in harmony with the Universities, the desired end might be attained. The Universities should first get together and present their case before the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Quebec. I am of the opinion that, if this were done, we would obtain more than many of you now seem even to hope for.[139]

The Anglo-Canadian doctors genuinely wanted to reach out to French-speaking Quebec, even if their early efforts were somewhat clumsy at times. A series of special CMA-sponsored post-graduate sessions held in Quebec, for instance, were attended by over one thousand young professionals, but would have done even better if more of the CMA speakers had been "local men." In hindsight, CMA executives from both inside and outside Quebec agreed that this should have been done.[140] Over the next two years, they took appropriate measures, and were so successful that, as the CMA's Post-Graduate Committee reported, "many of the [Quebec Medical] Societies want more speakers than it is possible for us to send them.[141]

CMA outreach to French-speaking Canadians took on other forms. By 1930, the CMA Journal began printing articles in French. Its editor, A.G. Nicholls, who succeeded Blackader in 1929, "stressed the point that ... the Journal [should] be truly representative of every province of Canada."[142] Getting input from Canada's French-speaking "medical

---

[139] LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes, 1926-1945 (M-7486), 17-21 June 1929, 60th Annual Meeting, Windsor Hotel, Montreal, pp.211-212.
[140] *Ibid*., pp.212-213.
[141] LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes (M-7486), Post-Graduate Comttee report, 1931 Annual Meeting, Vancouver, p.312.
[142] LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes (M-7486), Report of the CMA Journal Editor, A.G. Nicholls, 1930 Annual Meeting, Winnipeg, p.250.

men" on "the important questions which come up from time to time" was central to this policy. "Several articles have been contributed by our French colleagues," Nicolls reported with pride. The Journal's bilingual character, Nicolls observed, was one of those things that helped make it "distinctive" from the other medical journals of the day.[143]

Reaching members of the public, both English- and French-speaking, was also a priority for the CMA. This was made possible in part by the interwar proliferation of both newspapers and radio. By 1931, the CMA's Health Service Department, led by Dr. Grant Fleming, began publishing "Health Service Articles" in hundreds of English- and French-language newspapers from across the country. The Department also replied to some two thousand letters annually, including health-related inquiries from members of the public, "from every part of Canada and from readers of both English and French language newspapers" who might not otherwise be able to afford medical care and advice. The Department ensured that "letters received written in French have, as in the past, been replied to in that language." So successful was their program that the Canadian Council on Child and Family Welfare asked the Department to handle "their correspondence concerning pre-natal care for the Province of Quebec."[144] In addition to the newspaper and letter initiatives, the CMA Executive made plans to publish health pamphlets for the public in both French and English. By the late 1930s the CMA was giving medical talks on trans-Canadian radio in both English and French via the CBC.[145] Its activities had expanded to include various committees and divisions reporting on all variety of topics, from cancer to nutrition to medical education and policy.

---

[143] *Ibid*., p.250.
[144] LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes (M-7486), Public Health Committee, 1931 Annual Meeting, Vancouver, pp.302-303. See also, same reel, 17-18 June General Council, 1940, Toronto.
[145] See LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes (M-7486), 17-18 June General Council, 1940, pp.208-209.

By the end of the interwar period, the CMA had taken positive steps in bringing together Canada's French- and English-speaking doctors in common cause, but there was still room for improvement. Interestingly, paid membership to the CMA declined somewhat during the Great Depression, but in Quebec it increased.[146] By 1940, some 649 doctors from Quebec were members, although over 2000 still were not. Francophone doctors had come to "appreciate the enormous amount of activities this Association is rendering in the interest of the medical profession of Canada as a whole," the association reported. But the CMA Journal still needed more French-language content in order to attract more Francophone subscribers. "For years, at the Executive and at Council, we have discussed ways and means of bringing about an increase in membership of French-speaking Doctors and arouse more interest for them," stated Gérin-Lajoie, looking back on the previous two decades. But the effect of their measures had been mixed. He took inspiration in a solution suggested to him by an Anglo-Canadian from Winnipeg: greater recognition of Canadian bilingualism and biculturalism. Gérin-Lajoie's explanation merits citation at length:

> Some form of scheme or plan to solve this problem lies somewhere. It occurred to me the other day upon receiving an unsolicited letter from an English-speaking doctor living in Winnipeg…. Since the establishment of Federation, no more should we think in provincial terms. The Association to represent the medical profession of the Dominion must embrace all racial groups and French-speaking Doctors constitute a very important one of these groups. We are scattered all over the country and we belong to every province. .... Our country is bilingual; it is ours and it is yours. I believe that now more than ever ... we feel better than we have ever felt how closely related we are to each other.... Our interests are your interests. We may differ on certain questions which in the face of circumstances reveal themselves but petty questions, for we fully realize today how our hearts

[146] Total membership declined from 3652 in 1937 to 3359 in 1938, but Quebec membership rose substantially during this period, from 347 to 421. LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, Executive Council minutes, 1938-1948 (M-7487), Membership Report, 15-16 April 1938 Meeting, Ottawa, p.117.

> are synchronized to the same beat, our souls long for the same recompense, our tongues, till we die, pray the same God.[147]

Gérin-Lajoie's comments are interesting not only in that they convey the ongoing CMA priority to increased its French-speaking membership, but also the extent to which support for pan-Canadian bicultural federalism had begun to permeate civil society.

Canadian Dental Association

The Canadian Dental Association had even greater success than the CMA at integrating English- and French-speaking professionals. "The Dentists have gone further," Maheux summarized, looking back on the period. "[T]he relations between the two groups of dentists are excellent."[148] From early on, interactions between the Canadian dentists rose above the racialized politics of the day – the vast majority were simply concerned with exchanging information, best practices, and new techniques. From early on, there was a significant involvement of both Anglo- and French Canadians working alongside each other in the best interests of the profession.

The CDA had its beginnings in 1902, but it was only during the war and afterward that it became more active organizing the profession.[149] Floundering during the early stages of the war, the CDA was re-launched at a national meeting in September 1916 at the Laval Dental College in Montreal. There, organizers consisting of an even mix of Anglo- and French Canadians hoped that the association could be reorganized to bring

---

[147] LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes, 1926-1945 (M-7486), 17-18 June General Council, 1940, Toronto, p.205.
[148] Maheux, *What Keeps Us Apart?*, p.78.
[149] See LAC, Canadian Dental Association fonds (CDAF), MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 32, "Summary history of Canadian Dental Association, 1902 to 1940, compiled by J. Stanley Bagnall," p.4.

about greater collaboration between dentists from private practices and universities from across the country, especially Laval (Montreal), McGill, Dalhousie and Toronto.[150] The invitation to the conference by Dr. Alcide L. Larose, the CDA's Local Executive Secretary in Montreal, spoke to the pragmatic motives behind bringing Anglophone and Francophone dentists together:

> To go forward or to go backward – that is the question that every thoughtful Dentist must keep continually asking himself. …. To go forward, a man must think and work and associate with those who think and work along similar lines. The Thinkers and Workers of the Dental profession of Canada will meet in Montreal…. A visit to Montreal, the chief commercial city of Canada, would in itself be sufficient reward for the time and expense incurred in attending the convention.[151]

Larose's invitation also revealed a more altruistic thrust – a desire to better familiarize Anglo-Canadians with his own culture. His pride in showing off his hometown to other Canadians was evident:

> [I]n addition to the attractions of the city itself, the Dentists of Montreal City and the Province of Quebec are making preparations to give their confreres from every part of the Dominion an enjoyable time. …. Nowhere in Canada can one see a great city in its entirety so well as from the Mountain overlooking the City of Montreal, the mighty river and the great harbour, head of Ocean Navigation. To those who live West, the trip to Montreal will be a delightful experience. The Cosmopolitan nature of the City is perhaps nowhere equalled on the American Continent.[152]

Visitors were sure to enjoy a warm welcome. While part of the meeting's purpose was pragmatic – focussing on professional development and the consolidation of shared professional interests and priorities –, it was also "an opportunity for enjoyment, which comes but rarely to the average business man." In short, progress required professional

---

[150] LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 21, Eighth Biennial Meeting of Canadian Dental Association, Montreal 1916, programme and proceedings, pp.2, 6, 54-55, 59.
[151] LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 21, Invitation from Dr. Alcide L. Larose, CDA Local Executive Secretary, Montreal, July 1916.
[152] *Ibid*.

interaction between dentists from across cultural-linguistic boundaries... and perhaps a little fun, too.[153]

The results of the 1916 meeting were quite successful. Out of some three hundred participants from across the country (mostly from Quebec and Ontario), nearly half were Francophones, including a few from outside Quebec.[154] CDA membership from Quebec was already strong, but holding such a prominent meeting in Montreal provided an opportunity to reach out to even more Francophones from the profession.[155] The conference included clinics, papers, and presentations from "the best men in Canada,"[156] and lengthy meetings in which both Anglophones and Francophones played a prominent part in the CDA discussions.[157] The conference programme was bilingual, as was the signage, and presentations were given in English and in French.[158] Eighteen of the clinics were hosted by Anglophones, and twenty-four by Francophones. For those Anglo-Canadians who did not understand the French presentations, Anglo-Quebecers were ready to translate.[159] Things had come a long way from the CDA meeting that had been held in Montreal ten years earlier, when only four out of twenty-eight clinics were given in French, and the conference programme had been printed only in English.[160]

---

[153] *Ibid*.
[154] LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 21, Eighth Bienneial Meeting, Montreal, 1916, list of participants, pp.64.
[155] Nationally, of 82 of 316 subscriptions to the CDA come from Quebec (second only to Ontario, with 172). See LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 21, Eighth Bienneial Meeting, Montreal, 1916, p.58.
[156] LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 21, Invitation from Dr. Alcide L. Larose, CDA Local Executive Secretary, Montreal, July 1916.
[157] LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 21, Eight Biennial Meeting, Montreal, 1916, minutes of meeting, pp.65.
[158] See *Ibid*., pp.67, 71.
[159] See, for instance, Prof. J. D'Argent, DDS, of the École Dentaire of Paris, "The Work of the French Dentists from August 1914, to July 1916, During the Great European War," Translated from French for delivery before the Canadian Dental Association, Montreal, September 1916, by William McLaren, MA, B.Sc., for the College of Dental Surgeons of the Province of Quebec, in *Ibid*., pp.10.
[160] See LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 25, "Canadian Dental Association

The hospitality of the host city impressed. The (mostly) Anglo-Canadian visitors were taken on a lengthy drive around the city and harbour, along with "an exciting trip down the [Lachine] Rapids," by their (mostly) French-Canadian colleagues while their wives and "other visiting ladies" shopped, and attended banquets hosted by the Dental Profession of the Province of Quebec.[161] Moreover, the conference provided ample opportunities for networking and hobnobbing with colleagues from both cultural-linguistic communities.

Within the Quebec dental community itself, the French-Canadian majority worked closely with the Anglo-Canadian minority in the interests of the profession and out of a simple pragmatism. By the early 1920s, the board of governors of the Collège des Chirurgiens Dentistes de la Province de Québec, for instance, included ten French Canadians and two Anglo-Canadians, and published its reports in both languages.[162] The 1923 annual meeting of the Collège in Montreal was attended by a representative mix of Francophones and Anglophones.[163] Delegates deliberated on lobbying the province for legislation to regulate the dental practice and to put a stop to illegal dental practices, and on the accreditation of new dentists. They also stressed the importance of encouraging collaboration between the universities and within the profession in general. French Canadians were the most prominent in these discussions, given their numbers, but Anglo-Canadians also played on an important role, indicating a high level of professional

---

Third Biennial Meeting To be held in the City of Montreal, September 5th to 8th, 1906 – programme.

[161] LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 21, Eight Biennial Meeting, Montreal, 1916, minutes of meeting, pp.65.

[162] See LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 31, "College Des Chirurgiens Dentistes de la Province de Québec, Bureau Des Gouverneurs, Rapport du Secrétaire et du Trésorier. Régistre des Licenciés, 1923-1924 / College of Dental Surgeons of the Province of Quebec, Board of Governors, Secretary's and Treasurer's Reports, Register of Licentiates, 1923-1924," p.9.

[163] 87 Francophones and 23 Anglophones. See *Ibid*., pp.9-10.

collaboration and cordial relations across cultural-linguistic lines within the profession.[164] Moreover, the dental profession was one in which Franco-Quebecers particularly excelled. The number of dentists in Quebec grew significantly after the war. In the five years preceding the war, some 56 Franco-Quebecers graduated from dental college, while in the five years immediately following the war, 158 graduated. Interestingly, a few Francophone students attended McGill, while even more Anglophones graduated from Laval.[165] In short, cross-cultural collaboration was simply a day-to-day fact of life in the dental profession, as it was in others.

By 1930, the Collège had taken on a more active role within the CDA. In October of that year the Collège invited the CDA to jointly host its annual fall series of clinics and sessions in Montreal, along with a "Dîner-Danse offert aux délégués" and their ladies. French- and Anglo-Canadian officials from both organizations worked together to organize and run the even. The programme material was bilingual, and the event proved a veritable schmooze-fest, complete with wining, dining, a golf tournament, and even a football game.[166]

The CDA maintained its emphasis on acting as an agent for positive interaction between professionals and on being a force for national unity throughout the interwar period. Even meetings held in far-flung British Columbia, while being conducted entirely in English (given its overwhelming Anglo-Canadian majority and the costs and time constraints associated with travel from central and eastern Canadian), emphasized

---

[164] *Ibid*., pp.9.
[165] *Ibid*., pp.24-39.
[166] LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 37, "Diner-Danse offert aux délégués de l'Association Dentaire Canadienne par les Membres du Collège, 1930"; and, same file, "Canadian Dental Association and The College of Dental Surgeons of the Province of Quebec with Sixth Annual Fall Clinic. Programme," 15-18 October, 1930, Windsor Hotel, Montreal.

national unity and pan-Canadian collaboration on the part of dentists for the general betterment of the profession.[167] After the war, the CDA had worked to bring the provincial dental associations under its wing, but those of BC and Quebec initially resisted. By the late 1920s, it had begun reorganizing and became more active, attempting to strengthen its membership across the country, lobbying the federal and provincial governments to support dental legislation, regulation and other initiatives, and working to overcome provincial discrepancies in the profession by establishing national standards in training and service delivery. The CDA also engaged the public by promoting dental hygiene and education through pamphlets, newspaper ads, and other publications. By 1930, things had smoothed over with Quebec – doubtless in no small part because of the successful joint meeting held that year with the Collège.[168] The CDA also worked to solidify relations with the formerly reticent Ontario Dental Association by co-hosting a similarly amicable meeting in Toronto in May 1934, which was presided over by the congenial University of Toronto President, Dr. H.J. Cody.[169] (The following month, Cody would play an important role in ensuring a warm welcome for Cardinal Villeneuve's bonne ententiste visit to Ontario.[170])

Reaching both English- and French-speaking Canadians remained a priority, both as a matter of principle and as a simple matter of necessity in order for the CDA to spread its message of dental hygiene across the country and to get more customers into the

---

[167] LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 30, "Bulletin of the Twelfth Biennial Meeting, Canadian Dental Association, Vancouver, BC, August 4-9, 1924," p.2.
[168] See LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 32, "Summary history of Canadian Dental Association, 1902 to 1940, compiled by J. Stanley Bagnall," pp.1, 6-8.
[169] LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 38, Meeting of Canadian Dental Association at Toronto in cooperation with Ontario Dental Association, May 1934.
[170] See *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto. Souvenir Booklet of the visit to Toronto of His Eminence Cardinal Villeneuve, O.M.I., Archbishop of Quebec, June 5-9, 1934* (Toronto: St. Michael's College, 1934).

dentist's chair. At the 1930 annual meeting in Montreal, CDA President Dr. M.H. Garvin moved that the CDA take over the *Dominion Dental Journal*, and "[t]he Delegates agreed on the necessity of a high class journal, which should include a French section."[171] At that same Montreal meeting, Dr. Philippe Hamel from Quebec was elected to replace the outgoing Garvin, becoming the first of two Francophone CDA presidents who would serve during the interwar.[172] At the Toronto meeting of 1932, the executive decided that the new CDA journal should be more fully bilingual so that it could be sent "to every dentist in Canada." A committee established for this purpose made up of Anglo- and French-Canadians recommended the publication of "a monthly journal to contain English and French sections, to have the title in both languages, [with a] minimum number of pages in each section," to be funded by advertising dollars and increased membership and fees.[173] The journal's title was amended to *Dominion Dental Journal* / *Revue Dentaire Canadienne*, and the CDA accepted "in each issue of their periodical as many French contributions as are offered" in order to boost the French-language content.[174]

The membership drive was a cross-country success. By 1929, the CDA counted nearly two thousand registered members. By 1934, with Hamel still at the helm, there were 2,192 paid members,[175] and by 1938 some 4,000 professionals from all parts of Canada were registered, "more than 99% of dentists practising in Canada." The CDA's ongoing objective remained: "To promote mutual improvement, social intercourse and

---

[171] LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 32, "Summary history of Canadian Dental Association, 1902 to 1940, compiled by J. Stanley Bagnall," p.12.
[172] Canadian Dental Associaion, "List of past presidents," (n.d.) http://www.cda-adc.ca/en/cda/about_cda/past_presidents/default.asp, accessed 12 November 2011.
[173] See LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 32, "Summary history of Canadian Dental Association, 1902 to 1940, compiled by J. Stanley Bagnall," p.19.
[174] Maheux, *What Keeps Us Apart?*, p.78.
[175] LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 32, "Summary history of Canadian Dental Association, 1902 to 1940, compiled by J. Stanley Bagnall," p.21.

goodwill among members of the profession."[176] Having reorganized, grown its membership and strengthened ties to the provincial dental organizations, in 1938 the CDA lobbied the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations to place health care, including dental care, under the federal residual power. At the very least, the CDA insisted, the federal government must take a leading roll in coordinating dental health matters between the several provinces. Interestingly, the CDA also called for a public health insurance plan that would cover dental work.[177] That a cross-cultural consensus could be achieved on such controversial issues spoke to the CDA's ability to bring both Anglo- and French-Canadian professionals together in common interest.

Religious orders and cross-cultural rapprochement

While professional interests can bring people together out of simple pragmatism, religious animosities die hard. The legacy of centuries of bitter rivalry between Catholic and Protestant Christians in Europe had accompanied the many generations of immigrants who made the trans-Atlantic journey to Canada. This discord became a central theme of Protestant British-Canadian and Catholic French-Canadian discord. Divisions persisted, too, between French-Canadian Catholics and British-Canadian Catholics, especially Irish Catholics. The rhetoric of animosity was all the more significant due to religion's influence at all levels of society, rich and poor, professional and working class. Religious division would not disappear in a mere matter of decades. After the Great War, however, the discourse showed signs of change.

[176] LAC, CDAF, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441, Vol. 1, file 51, Submission made by Canadian Dental Association to the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations, 1938, p.3.
[177] *Ibid*., pp.5, 12.

Leading the way in changing the discourse among Protestants were, once again, William Moore, Percival Morley and Arthur Hawkes, writing in 1918-1919. Moore openly chided British-Canadian ambitions to convert French-Canadian Catholics to Protestantism, and criticized assertions in the press that sectional difficulties would disappear if only the French Canadians had been Protestant. He summed up prevailing British-Canadian attitudes as they stood in 1918: "The average Ontario Protestant firmly believes that the French of Canada are priest-ridden…. The average English-Canadian believes that the French priest takes a hand in politics, and perhaps he does."[178] But what of it, Moore asked? He pointed out that Protestants also spent considerable sums on their religion, and that Protestant ministers, pastors and priests, especially in Ontario, were equally zealous in instructing their congregations on how to vote. Hawkes, too, implored British-Canadian Protestants to give up their accusations of French-Catholic plots.[179] He reminded his readers that it was the French-Canadian Catholic priests who had first 'Christianized' the country, and thus paved the way for others to practise the religion in Canada.[180] Moore insisted that it was absurd to believe that French Canadians were unable to think for themselves due to their devout Catholicism: "I refuse to believe that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Lomer Gouin, Judge Maréchal, Senator Belcourt, Senator Beaubien, the Hon. Thos. Chapais, ... and many other strong, able, French-Canadians that anybody can think of, are priest-ridden."[181]

[178] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.256, see also pp.252, 255.
[179] See Hawkes, *The Birthright,* p.xvii.
[180] See Hawkes, *The Birthright,* p.196.
[181] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.257.

Morley held a similar disdain for "those orgies of vilification and abuse that have almost become a Canadian institution."[182] He complained that "the Protestant English-Canadian has pigeon-holed [Catholicism] under such convenient labels as 'mediaevalism,' 'superstition,' 'idolatry.'"[183] The differences between the two streams of faith had been exaggerated, he argued. Both groups were Christians, plain and simple.[184] Claims of French-Canadian prejudice against British-Canadian Protestantism had also been exaggerated. If anything, Morley asserted, French-Canadians disliked British Canadians because of their intransigence, not their Protestant faith:

> In the literature of the French-Canadian people it is not our obnoxious creed that is continually referred to. What one finds over and over again in their columns is plaint of 'injustice,' 'insult,' 'persecution.' Their pet name for us is not *hérétiques* but *Boches*.[185]

To that end, Morley condemned the unholy alliance of the Orange extremists and Bishop Fallon and his ilk. Still, Morley held out the hope that the extremists did not represent a majority of Ontarians. Most people, he insisted, were reasonable and harboured no serious animosity against French-Canadian Catholics.[186]

These ideas against anti-Catholicism made their way into the discourse promoted by other leaders of Protestant Anglo-Canadian civil society. The Unity League of Ontario, which lobbied forcefully to restore French-language rights in Ontario, was overwhelmingly made up of Protestants.[187] Historians, too, picked up the cause. During

---

[182] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.125.
[183] Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, p.116. Morley acknowledged the centrality of religion to the French-Canadian self-conscience. But it had been exaggerated as the chief cause of strife between Anglo-Canadians and French Canadians: "potent though the difference of faith must be both as a social barrier and as a source of prejudice and suspicion, it is not the real cause of our troubles in Canada." P.37
[184] *Ibid*., p.118.
[185] *Ibid*., p.37.
[186] "We do not believe that the policy that has been adopted represents the real wishes of the majority in this province." *Ibid*., p.75. See also pp.48, 50.
[187] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/21/6, "Rapport des activités du comité exécutif, 12 et 13 avril,

his 1925 address to the CHA, Wrong disabused British-Canadian Protestants of the notion that French Canadians should convert: history had proved that they would continue to resist any such pressures.[188] Wrong's histories of Canada and Quebec debunked the myths of a 'priest-ridden' society. He even betrayed an admiration for French-Canadian Roman Catholicism.[189] Arthur Lower, another rising Anglo-Canadian historian of the 1930s and '40s, went even further. He blamed "the missionary fervour of 19th century Protestantism" for the Catholic/Protestant discord in Canada.[190] Having been subjected to a stern Methodist upbringing himself, Lower had been turned off of Protestantism's 'excesses,' including its obsession with work ethic that led to materialism and exploitative capitalism. He also accused Protestantism of harbouring an emotional coldness and excessive social conservatism, in contrast to the more admirable French-Canadian Catholic 'joie de vivre.'[191]

These ideas found their way into more popular discourse. Visitors to Quebec, like the travel-writer Kennedy Crone, helped debunk the myth of Catholic oppression of Protestants in Quebec. "'To the Protestant who wonders how the poor Protestant minority can get along with the awful Roman Catholic majority,'" Crone wrote, tongue-in-cheek, "'it can honestly be said that the majority is just as tolerant as any Protestant majority has ever been.'" Religious tension in Quebec in the 1930s, Crone surmised, had been exaggerated: "'Much more religious trouble is credited to Montreal than actually

---

1923."

[188] The French Canadians had not and would not ""in time be assimilated to the British type." Wrong, "The Two Races in Canada," p.6.

[189] "'In Quebec her traditions have a vitality and vigour lost perhaps in communities more initiated.'" In Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, pp.18-19.

[190] Arthur Lower, *Colony to Nation: A History of Canada* (Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., 1946), pp.465-466.

[191] See Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, pp.114, 123-124. This is not to say that Lower was not critical of Catholicism's excesses.

exists.'"[192] In his popular book and radio programme on Canadian multiculturalism in the late 1930s, John Gibbon pointed out that Catholicism had provided French Canadians with the social cohesion necessary to withstand absorption into the more powerful and "militant Protestant" United States in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Had it not been for the Catholic Church, then, Confederation would never have come into being.[193]

By the late 1930s and early '40s, Protestant Anglo-Canadian liberal intellectuals, like publisher and former Methodist minister Lorne Pierce, for instance, had little patience for the old anti-Catholic vitriol. "If there are any Protestant wild men itching for a religious war may they perish. If there are any English spellbinders fooling around with warmed up memories of the Boyne and St. Bartholomew's may they too perish miserably."[194] Pierce had made it his life's work "to build a covered bridge between East and West, between Catholic and Protestant, between French and English, in the hope that our nation might be invincible."[195] He warned that "any glib nonsense about a Protestant and English Ontario or British Columbia" risked destroying that nation-building process. It was "silly and suicidal."[196] Pierce remained confident, however, that by the end of the interwar years the British-Canadian Protestant extremists were but a truculent few: "No English-speaking [Canadian] ever thinks .... of himself, except it be at some extremist club that is paltry in numbers and power, as having a racial or British mission."[197]

---

[192] In Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.486.
[193] Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, p.35.
[194] Pierce was referring to the famous victory of the Protestant King William of Orange over Catholic Ireland at the Boyne in 1690 and to the infamous massacre of French Huguenots in 1572 on Saint Bartholomew's Day. Pierce, *A Canadian People*, p.48.
[195] *Ibid*., p.vii.
[196] *Ibid*., p.51.
[197] *Ibid*., p.44.

At the same time, religious authorities within the Canadian Catholic hierarchy were busy promoting rapprochement between English- and French-speaking parishioners and clergy, especially in Ontario and Quebec.[198] During the Great War and shortly afterwards, relations between Irish Catholics and French Catholics in Quebec were generally positive and lacked the acrimony of intra-faith relations in Ontario. There were several reasons for this. The very small proportion of Irish Catholics in Quebec meant fewer points of conflict. In Ontario, French Catholics and Irish Catholics were roughly equivalent in numbers by 1911, a power struggle within the Church had ensued.[199] Having grown accustomed to controlling the local Church, some Ontario Irish Catholics suddenly felt threatened. In Quebec, by contrast, Irish Catholics were a dwindling minority by 1911 – they had never controlled the local Church, and thus had little choice but to get along with the overwhelming French-Catholic majority.[200] Quebec Irish Catholics also found common cause within a provincial Catholic majority that was sympathetic to Irish Home Rule.[201] In 1918 Quebec got its first Irish-Catholic Lieutenant-Governor, Charles Fitzpatrick, further cementing ties between the two communities.

The immediate post-war period brought both groups in Quebec closer in sentimental terms than perhaps at any other point in their shared history.[202] French- and

---

[198] See, for instance, *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto*, pp.1.

[199] Neither group constituted a majority of Catholics in the province, but Ontario's French-Catholics held a slight edge, and their numbers were increasing at a faster rate. See Canada, *Fifth Census of Canada, 1911*, Vol. II, pp.1, 340.

[200] See Jolivet, *Le vert et le bleu*, pp.13-15, 233-234. In Quebec in 1911, there were 103,147 residents of Irish origin (including Catholics and Protestants), fewer than a decade earlier. The Irish Quebecers now constituted 5.1% of the provincial population, less by comparison than Franco-Ontarians. Even in the urban centres of Montreal and Quebec City, where the Irish had been historically strong, their numbers were relatively low, although by no means negligible: 36,943 in Montreal (7.8% of the city's population), and 5,024 in Quebec City (6.4%).

[201] In Ontario, Irish Home Rule was not a rallying point as the Irish-Catholic population sought to demonstrate its loyalty alongside the Protestant majority. McGowan, *Waning of the Green*, pp.285.

[202] "Pendant ces quelques années, on peut dire que les relations entre coreligionnaires québécois frôlent une entente jamais vue." Jolivet, *Le vert et le bleu*, p.214.

Irish-Catholic Quebecers had been united in their opposition to conscription during the Great War.[203] During the war and shortly after, French-Canadian and Irish-Catholic nationalists in Quebec made common cause. In January 1919, a large pro-Sinn Féin rally in Montreal gained the support of prominent French-Canadian leaders, including Wilfrid Laurier, Rodolphe Lemieux, Henri Bourassa, Raoul Dandurand, Lomer Gouin and Athanase David. This was no small gesture – Ireland's War of Independence from Britain began that same month.[204] The French-Canadian leaders developed contacts in the Irish-Catholic community, including one of the demonstration's principal organizers, Ottawa-based lawyer J.K. Foran. Foran reciprocated by supporting the campaign against Regulation 17 in Ontario. Warm relations developed between nationalist Irish- and French-Canadian leaders, like Chubby Power, Lucien Cannon, Henri Bourassa, Omer Héroux and Armand Lavergne. Héroux, for instance, saw in the Irish Catholics a potential ally in combatting the Anglicization of their respective cultures. The French-language press was also supportive of the pro-Irish rallies, and admired the Irish-Catholics' sense of solidarity.[205] The Saint Patrick's Day parades of 1919-1921 in Montreal and Quebec City drew especially large crowds of both French and Irish Catholics, occurring as they did at the height of the war in Ireland (1919-1921).[206] For their part, Irish Catholics in Quebec grew more supportive of the anti-imperialist rhetoric of French-Canadian nationalistes – before the war their demands had been limited to "Home Rule" for Ireland.[207]

---

[203] See *Ibid*., pp.169.
[204] On 21 January 1919. Michael Hopkinson, *The Irish War of Independence* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 2002), pp.25.
[205] Jolivet, *Le vert et le bleu*, pp.123, 223, 233-235.
[206] *Ibid*., p.27. See also pp.243, 245.
[207] Intensification of the Anglo-Irish War and disillusionment shared over the terrible costs of the Great War contributed to this development. See *Ibid*., pp.221.

French-Canadian nationalists of both the pan-Canadian and Québécois stripes generally sympathized with the cause of Irish Home Rule in the hope that autonomy for Ireland would lend legitimacy to their own calls for Canadian or French-Canadian autonomy from Britain. To that end, some joined the Self-Determination for Ireland League of Canada and Newfoundland. Thousands of French Canadians attended League meetings and events in Quebec City, Montreal, Sherbrooke and Ottawa during 1919-1921. In what was truly an example of cross-cultural collaboration, a number of nationaliste élite became directly involved in organizing for the League or speaking at its events, including Bourassa, Groulx and Lavergne. Bourassa was especially popular within the League. Even the French-Catholic hierarchy, including Cardinal Bégin and Archbishop Bruchési, spoke out in favour of Irish autonomy within the Empire. French-Canadian sentiments were mixed, however, on the question of republicanism, and especially reticent when it came to the IRA's use of violence for political ends.[208] They sympathized with the call for autonomy, but there were limits as to how far French Canadians were willing to push the nationaliste agenda.

In Ontario, by contrast, the Irish-Catholic clergy was initially supportive of Regulation 17. There were early signs of dissent, however. Ottawa Irish-Catholic lawyer J.K. Foran had campaigned against the regulation from early on. Another Ontarian, the Irish-Catholic Father Thomas Quinn, took inspiration from Foran and urged other laymen to "'rise from the crowd in order to preach respect for the constitution of [t]his country.... It is the act of a good citizen and of a convicted patriot.'"[209] While Bishop Fallon's group railed against French Ontario from London, Toronto Archbishop Neil McNeil attempted

[208] *Ibid*., pp.236-243.
[209] December 1913. In Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.219. Several other prominent Anglo-Canadian Ontario Catholics had spoken publicy and forcefully against the Regulation since its inception. Pp.215-222.

to play the role of behind-the-scenes mediator. Shortly after its implementation, McNeil publicly urged Franco-Ontarians to accept Regulation 17 so as to calm the waters. Privately, however, he urged Ottawa Catholic authorities at the centre of the crisis to drop their lawsuit against Samuel Genest of the Ottawa Separate School Board (the suit would have put Genest in prison for having paid French teachers with public funds in spite of the Regulation). McNeil successfully prompted Archbishop Stagni, the Papal Nuncio sent by the Vatican to assess the crisis, to intervene and the lawsuit was not enforced.[210]

Shortly after the war, support for Regulation 17 among the Irish-Catholic clergy began to break down. In June 1918 the Pope issued a statement calling for moderation on both sides, which resulted in the election of some conciliatory Irish-Catholic school trustees, notably in Ottawa.[211] In April 1919, archbishops from across the country met with the new Papal Nuncio to Canada, Monsignor Pietro di Maria, in Quebec City to forge some sort of compromise. The archbishops adopted a proposal by Samuel Genest whereby Anglo-Ontarian children would attend English-language public or Catholic schools and Franco-Ontarian children would attend bilingual Catholic schools, with the Catholic schools being administered by the same local boards. As Choquette has explained, "the French Canadians had won one important battle: the Canadian hierarchy now supported them."[212] Ottawa Trustee and Oblate priest E.J. Cornell went further, proposing the legal separation of French- and English-Catholic schools in Ottawa, where the crisis was the most visible. Cornell had been acting as a mediator between English- and French-speaking Catholics in Ottawa since 1917, organizing meetings and discussions between both sides, and later collaborated with the Unity League of

[210] See *Ibid*., p.217.
[211] Terrien, *Quinze années de lutte*, pp.21, 24.
[212] Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.220.

Ontario.[213] His efforts won him the praise of Pietro di Maria in February 1920: "'Not only do we approve,'" wrote di Maria, "'but we highly praise your merit.'"[214] It was a significant nod of approval from the highest authorities in the Catholic Church.

Cornell put the legal separation proposal to Ontario Minister of Education H.J. Cody, who would later develop a reputation for being sympathetic to French Canada as President of the University of Toronto (1932-1944).[215] It was rebuffed, however, by Premier Hearst, who still saw the creation of "a third system of 'racial' schools" as too costly.[216] In 1920, the trustees of the Ottawa Separate School Board agreed among themselves on an internal financial split. Authorities in other localities with sizeable French-Catholic populations in Ontario also attempted to reach informal compromises in the interim, albeit with mixed results.[217] By early 1921, Toronto Archbishop McNeil published a pamphlet in which he told his flock that "'in countries like Canada and Belgium, in which different races live side by side, with two or more official languages, moral unity in mutual good-will becomes an object of supreme national importance.'"[218]

Attrition and new postings within the Ontario Catholic hierarchy also contributed to a change in perspective, and to the growing influence of those sympathetic to the Franco-Ontarian cause. In 1918, Rome created a new Apostolic Vicariate of Northern Ontario, headed by Father Joseph Hallé, a Quebecer intent on asserting Franco-Ontarian rights. When the Anglophone Bishop of the overwhelmingly Francophone Alexandria

---

[213] Terrien, *Quinze années de lutte*, p.23.
[214] In Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.234. The ACFÉO would recognize his efforts in the late 1940s with their Ordre du Mérite scolaire, writing: "'The school liberties enjoyed today by our separate schools we owe in great part to Father Cornell and to brave men like him.'"
[215] See Robert M. Stamp, "Henry John Cody," *The Canadian Encyclopedia* (Historica-Dominion, 2012), accessed 10 October 2012, http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/ articles/henry-john-cody; *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto*, pp.5.
[216] Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.220.
[217] See Cloutier, *Quinze années de lutte! 1910-1925*, pp.36-38, 42-46.
[218] In Choquette, *Language and Religion*, pp.229-230.

Diocese in Eastern Ontario died in 1921, he was replaced by a French Canadian, Félix Couturier. M.J. Whelan, a prominent Ottawa priest who had opposed the 1919 proposal to create an independent school board for Franco-Ontarians, also met his maker, in 1920. When Ottawa Archbishop Charles-Hughes Gauthier died in 1922, at least four English-speaking priests joined the call for a French-Canadian replacement. Their request was met with the appointment of Joseph-Médard Émard that year. For Franco-Ontarians, the appointment of a Francophone Bishop for Ottawa "represent[ed] a major victory," especially in light of the vicious campaign of opposition that Fallon had mounted against the appointment of a French-Canadian ten years earlier – that conflict had inflamed animosity and helped bring about Regulation 17 in the first place.[219] Moreover, Émard's appointment stood as recognition from Vatican and local authorities alike that the bilingual and bicultural character of Ontario Catholicism was there to stay.[220]

Bishop Fallon, the flag-bearer and most vitriolic opponent of the Franco-Ontarians, finally died in 1931.[221] By then, his influence had already diminished considerably. In 1920, after direct lobbying from Franco-Ontarian Catholic authorities, the Vatican instructed Fallon to curb his rhetoric. In addition to the reprimand from Rome, Fallon fell out of favour with the Ontario government. In 1919 he privately threatened the provincial Conservatives that he would "'set fire'" should any changes to Regulation 17 be made. Both the Hearst and succeeding Drury ministries were unimpressed.[222] While staunch Anglophiles remained within elements of the Irish-

[219] *Ibid*., p.235, see also p.221, 229, 254.
[220] "[I]t was now admitted that bilingualism and biculturalism did exist in Ontario, and that no amount of repression would eliminate it. The ecclesiastical battle was won by Canada's French Canadians." *Ibid*., p.235.
[221] For Liberal Leader Mackenzie King, Fallon's death had not come soon enough. See WLMK Diaries, 26 February 1931.
[222] See Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.221-222.

Catholic clergy in Ontario, "by the autumn of 1921 the fights centred around Regulation 17 and the Bishop of London's [Fallon's] policies were largely over."[223] To be sure, periodical infighting over resources (teachers, residences, materials, etc.) persisted between Irish Catholics and French Catholics in Ottawa until Regulation 17 was amended. But opposition to the principle of bilingualism had declined. In November 1923, explains Robert Choquette, "Archbishop McNeil, in the heart of English Ontario, informed an ACFÉO representative that both he and the Toronto Separate School Board were very favourable to the establishment of bilingual schools with bilingual teachers within their jurisdiction. They gave the Franco-Ontarians carte blanche in this regard."[224]

Moreover, Ontario's Irish-Catholic population had by now become significantly integrated with the general population through inter-marriage and through their success in the urban and rural economies of the province. They no longer represented a single Ethno-Cultural or socio-economic block with well-defined and uniform interests that only the Church could speak to. They were British subjects like any other who held a diversity of opinions, including on bilingualism, and who happened to be Catholics. Sectional conflicts no longer resonated as Bishop Fallon had once believed they did.[225]

Rapprochement between Irish Catholics and French Catholics, and between French Catholics and Anglo-Protestants, was given a further symbolic boost by the highly publicized visit by Canada's Cardinal Jean-Marie-Rodrigue Villeneuve to Ontario in June 1934. The visit included stops across the province, including Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton, Galt, and London, the former seat of the notorious Bishop Fallon. Notably, it was the first visit to the Ontario capital by a Canadian cardinal (historically a French

[223] *Ibid*., p.229.
[224] *Ibid*., p.235, see also pp.240.
[225] See Akenson, *The Irish in Ontario*, pp.3-47; and McGowan, *The Waning of The Green*, pp.285.

Canadian from Quebec) in nearly half a century.[226] It also coincided with the four hundredth anniversary of Jacques Cartier's 'discovery' of Canada. In addition to being well-attended by the broader public, the visit brought together clerical, intellectual and political leaders from both Ontario and Quebec. The Toronto events alone were attended by the likes of Ontario's Lieutenant-Governor Bruce, members of Ontario's provincial cabinet, numerous MPPs, members of the Superior and County Courts of Ontario, heads of the University of Toronto administration as well as the several colleges of the university and academics, heads of public and private school boards including Upper Canada College, and the Catholic hierarchy of Ontario.[227] Among others, Villeneuve was accompanied on his trip by the Honourable Cyrille Delage, Superintendent of Public Instruction in Quebec, Reverend Canon Émile Chartier, Vice-Rector of the Université de Montréal, Reverend Father Marchand, Rector of the Université d'Ottawa, and Reverend Monsignor Camille Roy, Rector of the Université Laval.[228] Roy and Chartier, especially, were known by Anglo- and French Canadians alike for their bonne ententiste sympathies. Villeneuve and those who helped organize the event were intent on healing the rift between Anglo- and French Canadians, and also between French-Canadian and Irish Catholics. It marked a real effort on the part of Anglophone Catholics in Ontario to reconnect with the French-Canadian Catholic community. Moreover, the visit was significant in that it was as much about promoting national unity as religious rapprochement – it suggested that the bonne ententiste discourse had made its way onto the pulpit, and thus to the public.

---

[226] The last two Cardinals to visit had been from Chicago and Belgium! *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto*, p.24.
[227] *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto*, p.57.
[228] *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto*, p.35.

The visit was front-page news in Toronto. The Liberal *Toronto Daily Star* reported widely on the visit of "His Eminence Jean Marie Rodrigue Villeneuve, [the] only Canadian Prince of the Roman Catholic church." The paper's correspondent described the Cardinal as "a man possessing great personal charm," and excitedly pointed out that "This is the first time that a cardinal ever celebrated mass in [Toronto's] St. Basil's church."[229] Indeed, Villeneuve's arrival was likened to that of royalty: "A special 'throne' was erected at the head table of the banquet hall at the Royal York hotel today. On the 'throne,' towering over high dignitaries of the Catholic Church, sat His Eminence…. There were two toasts at today's luncheon, one to the King and the other to Cardinal Villeneuve."[230] The *Star* reminded readers that "His Eminence Jean-Marie Rodrigue Villeneuve of Quebec occupies a position in his church second only to that of the pope, and his career has been … colourful [and] illustrious."[231] In a sense, Villeneuve was as close as any Canadian to becoming royalty. He was, after all, a Toronto priest remarked, a "'prince of the church.... It would be improper to describe him as anything else.'"[232] Readers were told that Villeneuve's prospects for becoming the first Canadian pope were more than promising. The newspapers gushed with descriptions of his flowing red robes and elaborate procession.[233] Even more, Villeneuve was portrayed as a man of the people, with humble beginnings in his father's shoe shop, and a man for all Christian

[229] "Prince of the Church; Cardinal Villeneuve in Toronto," *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 June 1934, p.1.
[230] "Special 'Throne' at Table for Catholic Church Prince," *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 June 1934, p.1.
[231] *Ibid*., p.3.
[232] In *Ibid*., p.3.
[233] "He made a striking picture in his flowing robes as he swept, with his trainbearers and guard of honour, through the city hall corridors." From "Cardinal Villeneuve Welcomed by Mayor," *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 June 1934, p.2. Even the more ardently Protestant Toronto *Globe* featured pictures of the Cardinal in his flowing robes and remarked on the historic nature of the visit. See *Globe*, 6 June 1934, p.4; *Globe*, 7 June, p.5.

faiths.[234] It was a far cry from the situation sixteen years earlier, when William Moore had lamented that the Ontario press was unreservedly hostile to the French-Canadian Cardinal Begin.[235] The 1934 events were well attended: Torontonians "representing every parish" had "welcomed the prince of the church to Toronto" upon his arrival. During the Cardinal's drive from Union Station through the city "the police had to hold in check a mass of thousands of people," diverting the procession right through Queen's Park.[236]

Villeneuve had been appointed Cardinal only a year earlier, in 1933. Originally from Montreal, Villeneuve had some exposure to Canada outside Quebec. He studied at the University of Ottawa, worked as a professor there, and was Bishop of Gravelbourg in Saskatchewan for a year in 1930.[237] Villeneuve had at one point been highly sympathetic to the clerico-nationaliste views expressed a decade earlier by Lionel Groulx in his *L'Appel de la race* (1922) – indeed, they had been good friends for many years.[238] But time spent outside Quebec and his appointment as head of the Church in Canada had apparently softened his views toward English-speaking Canada. Villeneuve's adoption of the message of pan-Canadian cooperation spoke to the diversity of opinion that existed among the French-Canadian clerical élite – support for Groulx in one instance did not necessarily equate to agreement in all things.

Anglo-Canadians played a central role in making Villeneuve's Ontario tour happen. The visit had been initiated by Toronto Catholic clergy and laymen, notably from St. Michael's Catholic college at the University of Toronto. Organizers ensured that the

---

[234] "[M]en and women of all creeds were there to pay their respects to one whom they hailed not only as a Catholic cardinal, but foremost among the religious leaders of the day." From "Cardinal Villeneuve Welcomed by Mayor," *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 June 1934, p.2.
[235] "It is contended in the press of Ontario that Cardinal Begin and the hierarchy are keeping the French-Canadians ignorant of the English language to keep them Catholic." Moore, *The Clash!* (1918), p.252.
[236] "Special 'Throne' at Table for Catholic Church Prince," *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 June 1934, pp.1, 3.
[237] *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto,* p.6.
[238] See Lucie Robert, "Camille Roy et Lionel Groulx," pp.400.

visit would be accompanied by pomp and ceremony, marked by several events at different sites, and attended by a plethora of local dignitaries and large crowds to greet the cardinal. Frank P. O'Connor, chairman of the reception committee, called the visit of "our own Canadian Cardinal" a "once in a life-time" event that would "go down in history."[239] Organizers repeatedly pointed out that Villeneuve was *Canada*'s Cardinal, and not just the Cardinal of Quebec or of French-speaking Canadians. He was "the Prince of the Church on whom Canadians have a special claim."[240]

Arriving at Toronto's Union Station, Villeneuve was greeted by a full delegation of local Catholic hierarchy and clergy, the Knights of Columbus, and even a boys' choir among the swelling crowds. Villeneuve "looked magnificent in his scarlet robes as he walked with his attendant clergy, page boys and personal bodyguard, Chevalier Bourne," reported the *Star*.[241] Villeneuve proceeded to the University of Toronto's Hart House – the informal heart of liberal civic nationalism on campus[242] – for a visit with former Liberal Cabinet Minister Vincent Massey before moving on to City Hall for a civic reception in the Council Chamber. During his stay, Villeneuve gave mass at St. Michael's, met with the Ontario Catholic hierarchy, attended or gave mass at several churches, visited monasteries, seminaries, primary and secondary schools, hospitals, the Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Government House and the Lieutenant-Governor, and, in a gesture surely appreciated by the Ontarians, placed a wreath at the cenotaph. The cardinal was also wined and dined at the Royal York Hotel and at Hart House by

[239] In *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto,* p.24.
[240] In *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto,* p.5.
[241] "Prince of the Church; Cardinal Villeneuve in Toronto," *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 June 1934, p.1.
[242] Encounters with moderate Anglo-Canadian professors and students at Hart House contributed to the de-radicalization of a young Paul Martin. Greg Donaghy, "A Catholic Journey: Paul Martin, Politics & Faith," lecture delivered to the Ottawa Historical Association, 9 April 2013.

University of Toronto President Dr. H.J. Cody, and attended convocation as the guest of honour, receiving an honorary Doctorate of Laws.[243]

Villeneuve was given a warm reception by other civic leaders, including non-Catholics. Toronto Mayor W.J. Stewart welcomed him both as a representative of French Canada, and as Canada's Cardinal: "The charity of your Eminence extends beyond your own native Province and embraces with fatherly solicitude the people of the entire Dominion." Stewart, a Protestant, evoked Anglo- and French Canadians' shared history, citing the 400th anniversary of Jacques Cartier's arrival "upon Canadian shores," and a shared Christianity, the country's "God-fearing, Church-going and law abiding people," as a basis for common sentiment.[244]

In his reply, Villeneuve acknowledged his place as the Cardinal of all Catholic Canadians, from coast-to-coast, "from all parts of Canada, and not only from my own people." He was also careful to pay homage to the Crown and to flatter his host city. "I deeply appreciate the great honour the Queen City of Canada is bestowing upon me today," he told the "citizens of this beautiful city."[245] Visiting other parts of the country, he explained, had instilled in him a deep sense of pan-Canadian pride that was rooted in the land, its economic potential, and in cultural pluralism:

> [T]he more I see of Canada, the prouder I become of being a Canadian and indeed we have good reason to be proud of our country what an immense and magnificent domain we possess! Millions of acres of virgin soil awaiting cultivation, rich and almost inexhaustible mineral wealth, extensive forests, unrivalled fisheries, and great water powers to transform all these potential resources into useful commodities. .... And in addition to these unparalleled natural advantages we are fortunate in having a population chiefly composed of

[243] *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto,* pp.5.
[244] In *Ibid.*, p.16.
[245] In *Ibid.*, pp.18-19.

> the sons of three illustrious nations: Great Britain, France, and Ireland. What other country in the world can claim to have such a promising future as we have?[246]

Villeneuve also evoked Canadians' shared history as a source of pride and shared identity: "we should be proud of our history. It is a record of great deeds done and great things suffered, but unfortunately too little known." He cited the sacrifice and religious devotion of Brébeuf, "the patient self-denial, serene courage and dauntless heroism [of] the first missionaries to Canada in carrying the Gospel to the heathen savages," as an example for all Canadians.[247] Replying to Stewart's evocation of Cartier, Villeneuve also made pan-Canadian reference to the history of New France, and the explorers who "opened the door of Canada to the Europeans," and not just the French.[248]

Villeneuve believed that national unity could be achieved through Canadians' shared Christian values, common interests and beliefs, and through the mutual commitment to social order:

> The feeling that the people of a country live a common life and have a common interest in its welfare leads to patriotism, which may be defined as an internal principle of order and of unity and an organic bond of the members of a Nation.

Villeneuve described pan-Canadian patriotism as a Christian value: "there is no perfect Christian, who is not also a perfect patriot. …. [Our patriotism] must not be confined to our village or town but must extend to our province and country." Playing to the sensibilities of his ecumenical Toronto audience, Villeneuve asserted that pan-Canadian patriotism "should be accompanied by a deep feeling of loyalty to His Majesty the King and to that world wide Empire, of which we are happy to form part."[249]

---

[246] In *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto*, p.19.
[247] In *Ibid.*, p.19.
[248] In *Ibid.*, p.21.
[249] In *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto*, pp.21-22.

The Royal York Hotel luncheon on 5 June brought together the leaders of Toronto's Catholic community. It provided an opportunity to reconcile Irish- and French-Canadian Catholics. High Court of Ontario Justice Hugh Thomas Kelly, an Irish Catholic, heaped praise on the new Cardinal, including for his work in Western Canada and in higher education, and lauded Villeneuve's expression of Canadian pride: "we are aware of his extensive knowledge of prevailing conditions in Canada and his readiness to do his part in his capacity as a great Churchman and as an influential and patriotic native Canadian citizen."[250] Kelly was proud of the role Francophones had played in establishing Canadian Catholicism, and in contributing to Canadian history generally. His interpretation of Canadian history suggested a wider acceptance of the narrative that had been established by the likes of Moore, Morley, Wrong and others. Kelly reminded his audience that Laval, Canada's first Bishop in 1659, "landed in Quebec to take possession of his See which about that time was declared to comprise all the possessions of ... New France from the Atlantic Ocean to the vast plains of the far west."[251] The French missionaries, he explained, had been crucial in opening up the country and establishing the foundations both for modern Canada and for a Catholicism that stretched to the Pacific Ocean. It was a far cry from the anti-French sentiments exhibited by Ontario Irish-Catholics scarcely fifteen years earlier.

Villeneuve reciprocated the cordial sentiments to his largely Irish-Catholic audience, and called for unity among Canada's Catholics:

> [W]e are too much divided amongst ourselves. Maybe we are French or Irish or something else before being Catholics, and this is lamentable, pernicious, and the

[250] In *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto*, p.30.
[251] In *Ibid.*, p.27.

> cause of our social weakness. …. [W]hat a much stronger force we would be, in the guidance of the affairs of our country if we were to unite our efforts….[252]

As part of the country's Catholic majority, Villeneuve explained, French Canadians did not have to think of themselves as a minority. Moreover, as a united front, Canadian Catholics, English- and French-speaking, could be a bulwark against communism and other nefarious leftist ideals creeping into Canadian thought. Only they, Villeneuve preached, could "fortify the masses against the invasion of communism, thus to save them at once from economic ruin and from moral and religious destruction." Villeneuve recommended other Catholic alternatives that had worked in Quebec to keep the Left at bay, such as Catholic labour unions and credit unions. In a message that was not unlike that of the Protestant social gospellers, Villeneuve called for "Catholic Action," or more Christianity in daily life – more social outreach to create God's Kingdom on Earth: "to establish in a country the Kingdom of Christ is to render happy such a country."[253]

The University of Toronto Convocation, also held on 5 June, was presided over by University of Toronto President H.J. Cody and Chancellor Sir William Mulock, who both had strong reputations for bonne ententiste sentiments. Mulock, especially, was known as a friend of French Canada, not least of all by Villeneuve himself, who adulated the "Grand Old Man" of ninety-one years:

> [I]nspired with true Canadianism ... you have many times openly asserted ... that the French must not be looked upon as strangers in a country founded and opened to civilization by them, and who have reacted and will always react more strongly than the other Provinces against political and social penetration of Americanism, and against the penetration of the revolutionary ideas of communistic agents.[254]

---

[252] In *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto*, pp.39, 41.
[253] In *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto*, p.38.
[254] In *Ibid.*, pp.46, 48.

Mulock was a prominent Liberal, having been in Laurier's Cabinet and a close acquaintance of Mackenzie King.[255]

For his part, Cody's remarks to the assembled young graduating students of the university[256] emphasised his pride in the national duality; in Anglophones' and Francophones' shared history and in their shared devotion to Christianity. Cody described Villeneuve as "an outstanding representative of our fellow-Canadians of French race and tongue." He granted the Cardinal an honorary law degree to mark the "national significance" of the four hundredth anniversary of the arrival of Jacques Cartier, "the 'Discoverer of Canada.'"[257] It was, Cody explained, "in commemoration of a great event in our history, as an outward and visible sign of goodwill towards our sister Province of Quebec and our French-Canadian fellow-citizens and of our steadfast purpose to strike together for the upbuilding of our Canadian nation."[258] The policy of rapprochement, it seemed, permeated the University of Toronto, from the president and chancellor on down. Villeneuve certainly appreciated the university's outlook: "I cannot refrain from admiring such a spirit of toleration and mutual good will … of this University," he replied.[259]

Cody's convocation speech established a linear historical narrative. He described Cartier's accomplishments and goals in terms of the larger project of creating a unique, bicultural nation based on the principle of cross-cultural collaboration:

---

[255] See WLMK Diaries, 8 June 1934.
[256] Some 677 students received diplommas that year, and another 6,374 received degrees, out of a student body of 7,809, including 5,019 men and 2,790 women. H.J. Cody, *President's Report for the Year Ending 30th June 1934* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1934), p.2. University of Toronto Library.
[257] In *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto*, pp.42, 44.
[258] In *Ibid*., p.45.
[259] In *Ibid*., p.48. Villeneuve spoke of "the envious and well deserved reputation the University enjoys throughout the Dominion and the meaning of *bonne entente* attached to it," and of its "scholars for whom I have a very deep admiration." From Villeneuve's address to the pontifical mass on 7 June 1934, in *Ibid*., p.68.

> Jacques Cartier's achievements … were but the beginning of a far-reaching work, whose completion fell to other hands. The Christian faith and Western European civilization came thus into this new land, vast and beautiful beyond his dreams. But it is Cartier's proud distinction to have discovered a country which was to witness a long-drawn conflict in arms between Great Britain and France – a conflict which provided noble examples of heroism and patriotic inspiration for the future; a country upon whose soil was to be built a commonwealth, based upon the union, cooperation and mutual respect of the two great races who had fought for its control.[260]

Cody's version of history left little room for the "wandering savages." His narrative was obviously anachronistic: Jacques Cartier certainly would not have envisioned a nation of Anglophones and Francophones living side by side in harmony. But that was beside the point. What mattered was that by 1934 the head of the leading academic and educational institution of English-speaking Ontario (if not Canada) had clearly embraced cultural federalism, a dualist vision of the country, and a reading of history that promoted cross-cultural collaboration as a natural and logical continuation of the national story, and not a story of one people dominating another. Moreover, it was a version of history that had found greater traction in both Anglo- and French-Canadian circles throughout the interwar period. Indeed, Cody found Quebec's remembrance of this shared history to be particularly inspiring:

> The motto of the sister province of Quebec, '*Je me souviens,*' challenges us to keep in mind the four centuries of history that have hallowed our land with rich associations. English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians may alike feel they have a share in recalling the day of beginnings in our national history. Together we are called of God to possess and use this goodly heritage of Canada.[261]

For Cody, like other Anglo-Canadians, appropriating the history of French Canada had allowed him to feel as though he had a more ancient (and thus a more legitimate) connection to the land. It was this message of a shared heritage that he hoped the young

[260] In *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto*, pp.42, 44.
[261] In *Ibid.*, p.44.

graduates would carry with them as they became leaders of civil society in their own communities.

Villeneuve also spoke to Canadians' shared heritage at the convocation; as a means of looking to a shared past and also as a means to work together for the present and future. Villeneuve called for a more Christian Canada, especially in the face of creeping modernity, what he described as "the slavery of mechanism which tends to carry away new generations from faith in God into the darkness of un-belief."[262] All Christian Canadians, regardless of language, Villeneuve insisted, should look to Jacques Cartier as their forbearer in this country: "Jacques Cartier has set us an example which we should follow, if we wish Canada to remain faithful to its glorious traditions of Christianity."[263]

These themes were equally present in the Solemn Pontifical Mass at St. Basil's Church, held 7 June. In addition to Villeneuve, it was attended by Ontario Catholic leaders, several prominent Protestants, and so many members of the public that the church "was filled to overcrowding."[264] The Reverend Francis Carroll, President of St. Augustine's Seminary and Administrator of the Archdiocese of Toronto, gave the welcoming address: "[We] salute with Catholic fervour and Canadian loyalty, the Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec." His Excellency had won "the admiration of every Canadian," including "the Catholic laity and our non-Catholic friends."[265] Like Cody, Carroll played on the theme of a shared history – a shared *French* history. He linked Quebec's Catholic heritage with that of Ontario:

> We Catholics of Toronto, Your Excellency, cannot help seeing in your gracious visit, an historic background rich in memories. It was from your Archiepiscopal

[262] In *Ibid.*, p.51.
[263] In *Ibid.*, pp.51-52.
[264] "Special 'Throne' at Table for Catholic Church Prince," *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 June 1934, p.1.
[265] In *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto,* pp.61, 64.

> city there came the first priests who evangelized this territory, and who sealed their labours with their blood.... For many a long year, this diocese was part and parcel of the diocese of Quebec; and several of our ecclesiastical privileges … were granted us by your Eminence's predecessors, the successors of the great Laval. We look upon your Eminence's See as our mother, and upon ourselves as her children.[266]

Where in the past Toronto Catholics might have looked to Chicago or New York for leadership, they now looked increasingly to Quebec.

In his address to the reception following the mass, Villeneuve expanded on the themes to which he had spoken a few days earlier. The histories of the Church in both Quebec and Ontario, he explained, were intertwined. Theirs was a shared religious heritage in a new land, where "zealous Priests" had "laboured incessantly to spread the light of our religion among the Indians."[267] Villeneuve did his utmost to tie together the histories of French and Irish Catholics in Canada. "[T]here is another nation to which we also owe a debt of gratitude…. Ireland." The countless Irish immigrants who had swelled the ranks of Catholic Canada, he reminded his audience, had helped secure the Church's majority in the country. Their arrival in the nineteenth century, he continued, had been facilitated by French-Canadian Catholics who had cared for the sick and destitute masses escaping famine in Ireland.[268] The message from this history, Villeneuve continued, was that English- and French-speaking Catholics must work together to establish and maintain harmony, in contrast to more recent decades. Villeneuve was intent on healing the rift between French-Canadians and Irish Catholics by invoking historical examples of collaboration. More broadly, Villeneuve preached that Christian Canada must be united, both to heal the wounds of the last war, and to face the prospect of renewed war in

---

[266] In *Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto*, p.62.
[267] In *Ibid.*, p.70.
[268] *Ibid.,* p.71.

Europe. Christians, both Catholic and Protestant, must show solidarity in facing down the increasingly popular and subversive ideas of Soviet-style "Atheism, that mental monstrosity," and "communism which has gained a foothold in some parts of Canada."[269]

The ongoing activities of the Bonne Entente League

While cross-cultural rapprochement occurred among academics, fraternal associations, business figures, professionals, and religious leaders, the old Bonne Entente League had not disappeared. By 1926 it had shifted its focus from organizing grand, high-profile inter-provincial assemblies to engaging various levels of civil society and the public through less formal activities. The change was in part the result of the new leadership of Ottawa homemaker Eugénie Lorans, League President from late 1925. It was the first time that the BEL's operations were to be directed significantly by women. Lorans's original executive, comprising Anglo- and French Canadians, included seven other women: five homemakers, a civil servant and a teacher. There were four men on the executive as well: two civil servants and two barristers. The entire executive hailed from Ottawa. Most had not been involved in directing the old League. They had nonetheless been inspired by its goal "to accomplish the unity of the French and English speaking races of Canada" and "to promote the spirit of patriotism and equity."[270]

Under Lorans's stewardship, the League evolved into a prominent Ottawa social club for Anglophones and Francophones. Its membership included an impressive array of political figures, including governors general, prime ministers and premiers, opposition

---

[269] In *Ibid.*, pp.69, 72.
[270] LAC, Corporations Branch fonds (CBF), RG95, Vol.1172, Memorandum of Agreement of the 'Bonne Entente' League, 26 November, 1925, p.1. See also Application for incorporation, 26 November 1925, same file.

leaders, federal and provincial ministers, MPs, Ontario and Quebec MPPs and MLAs, and Senators, both conservative and liberal.[271] The BEL's new leadership believed that more could be accomplished through subtle persuasion than direct confrontation, which made it easier for politicians to take part in its activities. The BEL became a forum for speeches on history and culture, musical performances, and literary presentations that underlined the valuable contributions of Canada's two major cultural-linguistic communities.[272] The League also engaged in ongoing public outreach, producing educational material for the purpose of "sew[ing] the seed of unity within the masses of the people."[273] As the Great Depression wore on, it transformed further, beginning to focus on unemployment relief.[274] The archival record for this stage of the League's history is extremely thin, but it does show that its lower-profile activities continued through the 1930s and into the 1940s.[275]

Historian Patrice A. Dutil has suggested that the more sincere bonne ententistes – people like Hawkes, Mikel, Lorans and others – "quietly provided the glue that ultimately held the country together."[276] They had provided a forum for friendly interaction between the leading figures of two provinces where virtually none had existed before. Even the League's detractors admit that "'Bonne Entente' afforded the Ontarians a rare close-up

---

[271] Mackenzie King, Arthur Meighen, Rodolphe Lemieux, Ernest Lapointe, Raoul Dandurand, and Premiers Tascherau and Ferguson, to name a few. See LAC, MP, MG26-I, Vol.178, Eugènie Lorans to Meighen, 1 February 1933.
[272] See LAC, William Lyon Mackenzie King papers, MG26-J1, vol.176, Lorans to Mackenzie King, December 19, 1930.
[273] LAC, Arthur Meighen papers, MG26-I, Vol.178, Lorans to Meighen, 1 February 1933.
[274] *Ibid*.
[275] LAC, CBF, RG95, Vol.1172, various dates, 1927-1947. Lorans, by then the heart and soul of the organization, died in 1942. Its operations ceased a few years later.
[276] Patrice A. Dutil, "Against Isolationism: Napoléon Belcourt, French Canada, and 'La grande guerre,'" in David Mackenzie, ed. *Canada and the First World War: Essays in Honour of Robert Craig Brown*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), p.128.

glimpse of French Canadians that could only have had a beneficial effect on existing prejudices."[277] As much might be said of the League's effect on some Francophones.[278]

At the very least, the BEL bore a symbolic significance for its creators. At a ceremony in Ottawa on 14 March 1928, the League presented Eugénie Lorans with a Lifetime Membership certificate. The document was beautifully painted and replete with symbolism. At the centre was a large, deep-rooted tree, supporting, on branches right and left, two large maple leaves. One maple leaf contained the French fleur de lys, whilst the other contained the rose, thistle and shamrock of the British Isles. Inscribed on either side of the painting, in French and English, was the motto: "Se comprendre et s'aimer pour s'entr'aider – To Love, to Help and to Understand each Other."[279] For Lorans and other members of the BEL, cross-cultural understanding had become central to their identity as Canadians.

By the late 1920s and early 1930s, the rhetoric of cross-cultural accommodation appeared to have infiltrated both Anglo- and French-Canadian civil society. It was picked up in the writings of academics, in the policy declarations of fraternal associations, in the practices of business and professional organizations, in the teachings of religious leaders, and, as will be seen, in the speeches of politicians. It also appears to have made its way into a more public discourse – through a combination of formal initiatives and informal developments – to which we now turn our attention.

---

[277] Cameron, "The Bonne Entente Movement," p.50.
[278] Former BEL President John Godfrey, for instance, recalled how a 'Bonne Entente' team collected over $800,000 for wartime patriotic funds from some 106,000 mostly Francophone "working men" in Montreal. LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol. 2, Godfrey, "History of the Bonne Entente," 1917, pp.21-22.
[279] LAC, MG28-I339, "Certificat de membre de la Ligue 'Bonne Entente du Canada' (Inc.)," March 14, 1928.

Chapter VII: OFFICIAL MEASURES TO PROMOTE CULTURAL DUALISM AMONG THE PUBLIC

While civil society organizations like the Bonne Entente League had their own initiatives for reaching the public, formal government-sponsored initiatives played an important role in helping promote cultural dualism to a wider audience. Notable initiatives included the celebrations of the sixtieth anniversary of Confederation, and greater official acknowledgement of federal bilingualism through the adoption of bilingual postage, attempts at greater bilingualism in the federal public service and the creation of a bilingual currency. Significantly, much of the pressure for these initiatives had originated from members of civil society who were already steeped in the rhetoric of cross-cultural accommodation. These initiatives helped convince at least some politicians and members of the public that the Canadian duality was, indeed, worth preserving.

The Sixtieth Anniversary of Confederation celebrations

Government-sponsored anniversary celebrations, pageants and coronations achieved new popularity in the early twentieth century as outward displays of patriotism. Governor General Grey's 1908 celebrations of the tercentenary of the founding of Quebec, for instance, had left an impression on many who participated.[1] Grey's goal had been to engender national unity through a common loyalty to the Empire. Nearly twenty years later, the sixtieth anniversary of Confederation provided the Mackenzie King Liberals with an ideal opportunity to promote both their government and national unity, but through a common French- and Anglo-Canadian loyalty to Canada. The 1927

[1] Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building*, pp.301.

celebrations were exceptional; the Parliament Hill festivities familiar to Ottawans today only became an annual occurrence in the 1950s.[2] The Diamond Jubilee was also significant because, by all accounts, it reached a large segment of the population.

Interested individuals had been calling for a sixtieth anniversary celebration for some time. This included a network of lobbyists for Canadian culture that had emerged after the war, and whose ideas had become popular by the late 1920s. Artists, writers, and musicians had an obvious interest in pressing for the celebration of the Diamond Jubilee and the commissioned work that was sure to accompany it.[3] Even the Canadian Chamber of Commerce had begun lobbying in 1926 for such an event.[4] Moreover, the country had missed its opportunity to use the fiftieth anniversary in 1917 to celebrate national unity – the war in Europe had provided ample distraction, the country had been bitterly divided over conscription, and Parliament had been reduced to a burnt-out husk the year before.

The Association of Canadian Clubs, led by National Secretary Graham Spry (also a founding member of the LSR), played the most important role in bringing about the Diamond Jubilee celebrations. Indeed, its members deemed it one of the Association's greatest achievements.[5] Of both British and French background, Spry had been a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford from 1922 to 1925, and had been impressed by the nation-building potential of government-run radio in the UK. When Spry became National Secretary in 1926, ACC Chairman C.G. Gowan instructed him to present a program for national Diamond Jubilee celebrations to the prime minister. Spry's proposal, a three-day long

---

[2] Matthew Hayday, "Fireworks, Folk-dancing and Fostering a National Identity: The Politics of Canada Day," *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. 91, No. 2 (June 2010), p.287.
[3] Maria Tippett, *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts Before the Massey Commission* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), p.77.
[4] LAC, Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, vol. 17, policy declarations, 1926-1948, Saint John, 1926, pp.6-7.
[5] Mary Vipond, *Listening In: the First Decade of Canadian Broadcasting, 1922-1932* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1992), p.207; Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting in Canada*, p.222.

celebration, included as its centrepiece "the formation of a radio hook-up of Canadian stations from coast to coast on July 1, 1927."[6]

In March 1927, Parliament established a national committee to organize the festivities both in Ottawa and throughout the country. The House's resolution made clear its nation-building and civic nationalist objectives: "'this commemoration will ... afford a clearer vision of our aspirations and ideals to the end that from sea to sea there may be developed a robust Canadian spirit and in all things Canadian a profounder national unity.'"[7] Liberal Senator George Graham, who had served in both the Laurier and King Cabinets, chaired the organizing committee. The committee collaborated with officials in business, industry, the public service and universities to come up with ideas on how to celebrate, coordinate events, and reach as much of the public as possible.

The committee planned a large celebration for Ottawa, along with simultaneous celebrations in cities and towns across the country, to be composed of a series of pageants, parades, speeches, musical performances and the awarding of commemorative medals and ribbons from local dignitaries.[8] Virtually "every village, no matter how small, mustered a band concert, a militia march past or parade, and a picnic in the park."[9] In June the heirs to the throne, the future Edward VIII and George VI, visited Ottawa to dedicate the newly completed Peace Tower and to unveil the new statue of Sir Wilfrid

---

[6] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.118. See also Hayday, "Fireworks, Folk-dancing and Fostering a National Identity," p.289.
[7] In Robert Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern: The Jubilee Broadcast of 1927," *International Journal of Canadian Studies*, 26 (Fall 2002), p.108.
[8] Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern," pp.117-118.
[9] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.135.

Laurier.[10] The federal government also marked the occasion by issuing bilingual stamps for the first time.[11]

Local celebrations catered to local tastes, but also reflected an appreciation for Canadian diversity. In Winnipeg, for instance, the 30,000 in attendance were treated to a multicultural pageant featuring the traditional costume, music and dance of its increasingly ethnically diverse population, while in Toronto, some 140,000 spectators witnessed pageants, flotillas and military parades that emphasized Canada's past, its present prosperity and its growing prominence within the Empire.[12] Notable among the historical floats at Toronto was the elaborate rendition of Jacques Cartier's landing at Hochelaga in 1534, "a tableau of great historical significance," according to the *Globe*, and another depicting "New Canadians, symbolic of the never-ending stream of newcomers to the Land of the Maple Leaf, bringing with them their own habits and costumes, but quickly acquiring Canadian ways and loyalty."[13] For these Torontonians, Canada's French past was a part of their history too, and pluralism a part of their future. At Montreal, speakers Henri Bourassa and Father Olivier Maurault of Notre-Dame Basilica emphasized "l'égalité absolue que les Pères de la Confédération ont voulue pour les deux grandes races qui la composent" and their hope that the rest of the country might also uphold these values, especially toward the Francophone minorities in the Anglo-majority provinces.[14] Bourassa and Maurault also encouraged French Canadians to look beyond Quebec's borders and to contribute to all aspects of Canadian life, and reminded them of George-Étienne Cartier's vision for a Canada "*a mari usque ad mare*." Bourassa,

---

[10] *Ibid.*, p.135.
[11] See WLMK Diaries, 16 June 1929.
[12] Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern," pp.117-118.
[13] "Toronto Rejoices on Canada's Sixtieth Birthday," *Globe*, 2 July 1927, p.13.
[14] "Examen de conscience national au parc Jeanne Mance," *Le Devoir*, 2 July 1927, p.1.

the featured speaker, went so far as to depict the upholding of this equality and the spirit of pluralism in all parts of Canada as the collective mission of French Canadians under the terms of Confederation.[15] He also took care, of course, to speak at length against the excesses of imperialism. The Ottawa celebrations, meanwhile, ensured that a message more national in scope would be conveyed across the country. This would be achieved through a nation-wide radio broadcast of the festivities on Parliament Hill.

The most important means of reaching the far-flung communities from coast-to-coast was, indeed, radio. Through much effort, the sixtieth anniversary was broadcast nation-wide through the CNR radio network and in cooperation with several local stations and telephone companies.[16] As one organizer put it, they had to "'beg borrow and steal'" equipment from across the continent, including some 23,000 miles of telephone and telegraph wire infrastructure, in order to traverse the country.[17] At the time it was the longest distance single transmission in history, and Canada's first truly national broadcast, made available in virtually every region of the country with radio access. Like the completion of the transcontinental railway forty years earlier, the national broadcast was a milestone in what Maurice Charland has termed "technological nationalism," or "the construction and legitimation of a nation-state through publicly funded and sponsored transportation and communications systems."[18]

---

[15] He congratulated the St. Jean-Baptiste society for organising the gathering "non pas parce que les Canadiens français doivent s'isoler dans la Confédération, car étant données les origines et les destinées de cette Confédération il est conforme à l'histoire que le peuple canadien-français ait une part, de corps et d'esprit, à toutes les manifestations de la vie canadienne, mais pour marquer qu'ils sont bien déterminés à conserver leur caractère propre; ce n'est pas par égoïsme mais pour garder à la nation canadienne une chose essentielle à sa grandeur, l'égalité des deux grandes races qui la composent, telle que l'ont voulue les pères de la Confédération. Dans la Confédération, les Canadiens français doivent prendre part d'associés, gardant leur personnalité distincte, décidés à servir la patrie à leur manière." *Ibid*.
[16] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.48.
[17] In Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern," p.106.
[18] *Ibid*., p.104.

Led by Spry, the national committee was determined to reach those who did not own radios or who were out of their homes enjoying local festivities. In over two hundred communities, from Halifax to Victoria, organizers set up open-air broadcasts on loudspeakers in parks and public spaces. These were apparently well attended by audiences enraptured by the modern miracle of the transcontinental broadcast. In Montreal alone, an estimated crowd of 20,000 assembled around the George-Étienne Cartier monument in Jeanne Mance Park, where amplifiers had been placed so that they could listen to the broadcast from Ottawa.[19]

By all accounts, the Jubilee celebrations on Parliament Hill were a success. Some sixty thousand locals and visitors congregated on the Hill and on nearby balconies. It was "by far the largest crowd ever seen in the capital" (the previous census had pegged Ottawa's population at just over one hundred thousand).[20] In addition to onlookers and passers-by, organized groups of veterans, Boy Scouts, Girl Guides, high-school cadets and some ten thousand school children were also in attendance.[21] The focal point of celebrations was a large temporary podium placed at the foot of the new Peace Tower. The podium was adorned with maple leaves, the Union flag, and the Dominion and provincial coats of arms, and the dates 1867 and 1927. It was from here that a long series of speeches and musical and theatrical performances took place. Governor General Willingdon, Prime Minister King, and Leader of the Official Opposition T.C. Guthrie, dressed in Windsor uniforms, headlined the list of "'notable public men'" seated on the podium awaiting their turn to speak. Events began at noon, shortly after the great bells of

[19] "Examen de conscience national au parc Jeanne Mance," *Le Devoir*, 2 July 1927, p.1.
[20] Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern," p.107. See also Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, Vol. I, p.542.
[21] Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern," p.107.

the tower rang out the hour, and opened with a performance of *O Canada*, followed by *The Maple Leaf Forever* and *God Save the King* (still more familiar to Anglo-Canadian ears) by Parliamentary carilloner and Montreal native, Percival Price. With that, a coordinated series of church bells, factory whistles, canon fire and cheers from the crowd signalled the sixtieth anniversary of Confederation. The Toronto *Globe*'s correspondent was especially struck by the carillon's rendition of *O Canada*, which he proudly told readers was "your National Anthem," and that it had been project though the "wizardry of radio" across the globe.[22]

The Parliament Hill celebrations projected a message that connected pluralism and, more specifically, bilingualism and biculturalism with a new civic nationalism that organizers hoped would "subsume older, more traditional loci of collective allegiance found in the British Empire or the province of Quebec."[23] The broadcast was hosted by two experienced radio announcers who provided commentary in English and in French: A.W. Ryan, from Ottawa, and Jacques N. Cartier (apparently a descendant of Cartier the explorer), from Montreal. Ryan and Cartier read from a lengthy and detailed script in-between speeches and performances so as to translate, summarize and describe events for people listening in at home or at public gatherings. As Robert Cupido has explained, their presence "serve[d] the official purpose of underlining the bilingual nature of the occasion, and by extension of the new Canadian nationality that was being proclaimed from Ottawa."[24]

---

[22] M.E. James, "Jubilant Message of Glorious Music," *Globe*, 2 July 1927, p.1.
[23] It "represented the first major attempt by the federal state to foster social and political unity, inculcate modern notions of democratic citizenship, and develop a distinct, pan-Canadian sense of national identity through the use of commemorative ritual." Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern," pp.103, 104.
[24] *Ibid.,* p.107.

The program of events for Parliament Hill was remarkable for its bilingual and bicultural content. All announcements were made in both English and French, and the list of speakers alternated between English and French. Governor General Willingdon opened with a bilingual welcoming address that celebrated the country's diversity and Canadians' ability to share a common "'devotion to the land of their birth or adoption.'"[25] Willingdon was commended in the press for his fluency in both languages.[26] His speech emphasized British/French partnership:

> This is particularly an occasion when our citizens of British and French origin, who have been mainly responsible for the development of this country in past years, can join together with pride and gratitude to pay a tribute to the memory of those early pioneers by whose spirit of adventure and enterprise the vast resources of this country first became known; those great explorers, soldiers and statesmen of our two races, who, with splendid courage and clear-sighted wisdom, laid the foundations of our national life.[27]

Willingdon was not the only speaker to connect Confederation with Canada's earlier post-Contact history. In his speech, King referred to the coming together of British and French in Canada as a matter of prophecy:

> When ... John Cabot, under royal charter from Henry VII, planted on the Canadian mainland the banner of England and the first cross, and when, early in the following century, Jacques Cartier erected a great cross on which were the Fleur-de-lis, and the words, 'Long Live the King of France,' these intrepid mariners bequeathed their names to our country as its discoverers. .... Their presence at the dawn of our history was ... strangely prophetic of the two great races that were to develop settlement and government in our midst. ... [But] it was not until Champlain in 1608 erected a small fort at Quebec, felled trees and planted wheat, that order and permanency, the essentials of nationhood, had their beginnings. That day our Canada, daughter of the woods and mother of the fields, was born. ....
>
> The monument erected at Quebec to the honour and memory of Montcalm and Wolfe is a fitting symbol of the spirit which has made our nation; a spirit which,

[25] In *Ibid*., pp.107, 111.
[26] *Ibid*., p. 111.
[27] In "Canada's Story of Achievement," *Globe*, 2 July 1927, p.3.

> in preserving the heroisms, has buried the animosities of the races which have shaped its destiny.[28]

Pluralism, King continued, had been the object of Confederation. The Fathers of Confederation had sought to create "a nation to which all would belong."[29] Lomer Gouin, speaking on behalf of those who had pushed for the Diamond Jubilee celebrations in the House of Commons, quoted in French and in English nationalist selections from the Confederation speeches of Macdonald, Cartier, Brown and McGee. Gouin emphasized Canada's achievement of self-government and its increasing equality with Britain as a member of the Commonwealth, linking Liberal foreign policy to civic nationalism. L.P.D. Tilley, a New Brunswick provincial Conservative and descendant of Leonard Tilley, emphasized the country's ongoing loyalty to the Empire, but also its increasing political maturity and importance. Senator and historian Thomas Chapais emphasized national unity and the new, pan-Canadian political nationality to which Confederation had given birth:

> '[After 1867] a national spirit was born, formed of various elements, and thus this Confederation has grown and become in northern America a political, economic and social entity to be reckoned with.... May Canada, our beloved country, gloriously fulfill its destiny and become one of the happiest and greatest nations of the world!'[30]

One of the great advantages of this political nationality, Chapais continued, was that it allowed for multiple identities: "'we have in Canada what I would term a 'provincial' and a 'federal' patriotism. Both are justified. They need not clash nor exclude each other. Rather they should unite and harmonize to work together.'"[31] Chapais implored British Canadians to shed their imperial identity and embrace instead the new political

---

[28] In *Ibid*, p.3.
[29] In *Ibid*, p.3.
[30] In Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern," p.108.
[31] In *Ibid*., p.108.

nationality. He emphasized shared Christian values, a shared history, and a common attachment to the land as the basis for a shared civic nationalism.[32]

The theme of national unity was picked up, too, by the newspapers. In anticipation of the event, the Toronto *Globe*'s 1 July 1927 edition picked up on the themes of civic nationalism and national unity between English and French, East and West:

> Not since Jacques Cartier and his adventurous mariners landed on the picturesque shores of the St. Lawrence has such harmony prevailed. In old Quebec, where the momentous [Confederation] conference of sixty years ago was held, English voices are lost amid those of the people who still speak the language of France. On the Western plains are heard the tongues of many races, but from the Ancient Capital – the Sentinel City of the St. Lawrence – and from the far-flung outposts of the prairies come reports of happy relations and pride in the Dominion. The remote fishing villages of Gaspé vie with isolated hamlets of the snow-clad Rockies to show the world that Canada must be reckoned with in the march of the nations. On the morning of the Diamond Jubilee, the vision of the Fathers of Confederation has been realized.[33]

The *Globe* took note, too, of the bilingual nature of the Ottawa proceedings. "Anthems in the language of the two great races were broadcast to the world."[34]

The musical performances also reflected the bicultural theme.[35] The Governor General's opening remarks were followed by a performance of thousands of Ottawa school children singing *O Canada* in unison, in both French and English. The prime minister's speech was preceded by English and French renditions of *Canada My Home*. Other anthems and poetry composed and performed specifically for the occasion also reflected bicultural themes, including *Canada Land of My Heart's Adoration* and Bliss

---

[32] *Ibid*., p.109.
[33] William Marchington, "From Ocean Unto Ocean Canadians Link Hands in Pride of Their Country," *Globe*, 1 July 1927, p.1.
[34] William Marchington, "Thousands at Ottawa Attend Great Pageant to Observe Jubilee," *Globe*, 2 July 1927, p.1.
[35] Tippett, *Making Culture*, p.77.

Carmen's *Dominion Day 1927* and *Confederation Ode*. Performances of songs that were of a specifically British-Canadian character, like *Land of Hope and Glory* or *God Save the King*, alternated with traditional French-Canadian pieces such as *Vive la Canadienne* and *Un Canadien errant*, an ode to the rebels of 1837-1838.[36] Interestingly, a later choral performance of *The Maple Leaf Forever* demonstrated sensitivity to French-Canadians by omitting the song's opening reference to "Wolfe, the dauntless hero" conquering Canada for the British.[37] Charles Marchand, a French-Canadian folklore revivalist who had helped popularize the music, and his Ottawa-based Bytown Troubadours, dressed up as voyageurs and performed lively versions of *En roulant ma boule*, *Youp youp sur la rivière* and *Alouette*, considered the most "'characteristic'" of habitant songs.[38] Anglo-Canadians in search of genuinely Canadian music appropriated the lively, upbeat and catchy tunes out of a sense of nationalism. By the mid- to late-1920s, observed CNR radio-man Earnest Austin Weir, Anglo-Canadians were becoming more familiar with French-Canadian music; it had become "'as well known in English Canada as Quebec ... heard in the college halls and practically every public assembly ... not unknown in the House of Commons'" itself.[39] Indeed, the Hart House String Quartet played arrangements of French-Canadian folk songs arranged by well-known Anglo-Canadian composers Ernest MacMillan and Leo Smith.[40]

This was not simply a callous Anglo-Canadian appropriation of French-Canadian culture – many French Canadians welcomed the newfound attention their culture was

---

[36] Hélène Plouffe, "Un Canadien errant," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, (Historica-Dominion, 2012), accessed 4 September 2012, http:// www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/emc/un-canadien-errant.
[37] Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern," p.108.
[38] "The Diamond Jubilee officially incorporated the surviving fragments of Quebec's folk culture ... into a common, pan-Canadian national identity." *Ibid*., p.112.
[39] In *Ibid.,* p.112.
[40] Tippett, *Making Culture*, p.77.

receiving in English-speaking circles. Indeed, the French-Canadian organizers of the Diamond Jubilee celebrations had hoped to use it to provide greater exposure for both Anglo-Canadians and French Canadians to each other's cultures and perspective. Rodolphe Lemieux, for instance, had envisioned "'un grand concert populaire où les vieilles chansons canadiennes-françaises seraient à l'affiche. Il me semble qu'alternant avec les chansons anglaises ces bons vieux refrains canadiens plairaient au publique. Le grand festival aurait un cachet vraiment national.'"[41] Indeed, they were quite proud of their contribution to the larger Canadian cultural fabric. In one of the more highly anticipated performances of the day, internationally-renowned singer Eva Gauthier, accompanied by the Hiawatha Quartet, sang a selection that reflected what Robert Cupido has called "the official boundaries of cultural pluralism in 1927," that is, Canada's French, English, Scottish, Welsh and Irish roots: *À la claire fontaine*, from French Canada, *O Dear What Can the Matter Be*, from England, *Loch Lomond* from Scotland, *All Through the Night* from Wales, and *The Last Rose of Summer* from Ireland.[42] The celebrations continued into the evening, concluding after 1:00am with fireworks and a final ringing out of *O Canada*, *The Maple Leaf Forever*, and *God Save the King* from the new Peace Tower bells. As Maria Tippett explains, "the occasion ... was a success and a very clear indication of the kind of relationship existing between the state and culture."[43]

One objective of the civic nationalist message was to help Canadians develop a closer, sentimental attachment to Ottawa as their national capital. King was hopeful that a stronger representation of Canada's cultural duality in the city's architecture would help

[41] In Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern," p.112.
[42] *Ibid*., p.111.
[43] Tippett, *Making Culture*, p.77.

accomplish this goal, including with the new Centre Block of Parliament. The original building, having been completed in 1866 in the popular British neo-gothic asymmetrical style, had burned down in 1916. The new building, completed in 1922, was neo-gothic in its aesthetic and exterior, but borrowed from the French Beaux-Arts style in the symmetry of its layout. Its exterior and interior were replete with British, French, and other Canadian symbols, in the sculptures, grotesques, friezes and paintings.[44] The tower of the original Centre Block, the building's focal point, had been named after Queen Victoria. The new tower, completed in 1927 and unveiled at the Confederation anniversary celebrations, was instead named the Peace Tower. It was thus neither exclusively British nor French, but instead commemorated Canada's war dead and conveyed the importance of sacrifice and harmony between peoples.

King believed that the new Centre Block and the Peace Tower, especially, embodied a new civic nationalism. He said as much during his Diamond Jubilee speech from Parliament Hill inaugurating the new tower. Ever attached to symbolism and to clocks, King believed that, much like the war itself, the 1916 disaster had both literally and figuratively burned away the old order, purified the nation, and allowed for the "resurrection and birth" of a new Canada. The new Peace Tower symbolized "the spirit of this nation, bearing in its breast the sacrifice made by our country for the world's peace." King identified the Peace Tower's message of cross-cultural harmony as one of

[44] See Parliament of Canada, "The Parliament Buildings," (December 2006), accessed 6 June 2011, http://www.parl.gc.ca/About/Parliament/Publications/parliamentbuildings/ parlblgs-e.asp; Alan Gowans, "Parliament Buildings," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, (Historica-Dominion, 2012), accessed 10 July 2012, http:// www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/parliament-buildings.

the most important civic values that united Canadians in their political nationality, which, he explained was only now coming of age.[45]

Other new public buildings and monuments commissioned for the capital by the federal government placed less emphasis on purely British and imperial symbolism, and instead did more to incorporate French symbols and imagery. The massive Confederation Building, down the street from Parliament and begun in 1927 (it was completed in 1931), was built to create more office space for the growing public service. It too incorporated dualist symbolism and other Canadiana in its design and decoration. One notable frieze, for instance, located at the front of the building, depicted two boy scouts, one with an English rose, the other with a French fleur-de-lys, and a Canadian maple leaf between them. The rose, maple leaf and fleur-de-lys featured elsewhere on the building. The upper reaches of the building were replete with reproductions of Canadian fauna, emphasizing Canadians' shared North American heritage. The building combined the British neo-gothic aesthetic for its exterior and the popular French Château style in its structure – an architectural combination that was increasingly in vogue across the country.[46] Around the same time, King personally invited the famous French urban planner and architect Jacques Gréber to draw up plans for the beautification of the capital, including a reinvigorated, Beaux Arts-style Confederation Square to serve as a focal point. Dualist imagery was also present in the new post office adjoining the new Square. Designed in the Château style, the building was completed in 1937 according to Gréber's personal

[45] William Lyon Mackenzie King, *The Message of the Carillon and Other Addresses* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1928), pp.3-14.

[46] Ottawa's best example of Château style was the Chateau Laurier, named after Canada's first Francophone prime minister and completed in 1912. The interwar witnessed the construction of a number of grand railway hotels in the Château style that became landmarks across the country: Winnipeg's Fort Garry Hotel (1913), Hotel Macdonald in Edmonton (1915), the Banff Springs Hotel (completed 1928), Toronto's Royal York Hotel (1929), and the Bessborough Hotel in Saskatoon (1932). See Barbara Chisholm, *Castles of the North: Canada's Grand Hotels* (Toronto: Lynx Images, 2001).

specifications. Flanking the doors of the impressive building was a pair of large lions, each holding a shield – one emblazoned with the Union Flag, the other with fleurs-de-lys. King referred to the entire works on the square as "my Champs Élysées, Arc de Triomphe & Place de la Concorde."[47]

Speaking at the Canadian National Exhibition in August 1927, King quoted Christopher Dunkin, who, during the Confederation Debates, had cast doubt as to whether Canadians, whose "'national feelings turn towards London ... [or] centre here in Quebec,'" would be able to develop sentimental ties "'with any earnestness to the city of Ottawa, the centre of the new nationality that is to be created.'"[48] After the success of the Dominion Day celebrations, King felt confident enough to assert that "'this doubt has been dispelled and the question has been answered by the voice of the Canadian people united in the celebration of the Diamond Jubilee of Confederation.'"[49] For some listeners, the coast-to-coast Dominion Day broadcast had indeed made them feel closer to the rest of the country than ever before. Through the intimate setting of radio, and listening to the voices of their national leaders for the first time, Canadians "'from the furthest east to the

[47] WLMK Diaries, 13 August 1937. King was directly involved in the planning stages, and obviously quite taken by the French architect. See, for instance WLMK Diaries, 14-15 October 1936, 13 and 26 November 1936.

The Vimy Memorial (1936), Canada's most significant national monument, also evoked Canada's historical links with France. The monument, with its mournful theme and commemoration of over 11,000 of Canada's missing war dead, was bereft of bombastic imperialist symbolism. Instead, its sculptures conveyed lamentful themes. The monument's two immense pilons, adorned with a maple leaf and fleur-de-lis, symbolized the unity and sacrifice of Canada and France. Inscriptions on the monument were bilingual – a point that the Toronto *Globe* thought noteworthy. See "Vimy Memorial Inscriptions Bilingual," *Globe*, 16 June 1936, p.1. The monument's designer, Toronto-born artist Walter Allward, had two decades earlier completed a monument on Parliament Hill commemorating the political partnership of Lafontaine and Baldwin.

[48] In Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern," p.105. See also King's statement in "Canada's Story of Achievement," *Globe*, 2 July 1927, p.3.

[49] In Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern," p.105.

furthest west,'" *Saturday Night* magazine proclaimed rather optimistically, had "'annihilated'" the geographical and cultural boundaries that had set them apart.[50]

The national broadcast of events in Ottawa and its civic nationalist message appear to have been well received across the country.[51] The entire event, from noon until one-thirty in the morning, was broadcast. Newspaper coverage of the Confederation celebrations, and of the Ottawa broadcast in particular, was extensive. In addition to repeating the broadcast's message, the papers reported on the positive reception of the crowds that gathered to hear it in public spaces.[52] The twenty thousand listening to the open-air broadcast in Montreal rewarded the speech of Governor General Willingdon with "'great and long applause,'" according to one pleasantly surprised organiser who was on hand.[53] Many who missed the radio broadcast doubtless heard about it from family, friends, or the newspapers. In the weeks that followed, the organizing committee was flooded with over thirty thousand congratulatory letters and telegrams from Canadians across the country. Collectively, they spoke to radio's ability to reach a diverse and geographically dispersed population. A woman from Summerside, Prince Edward Island wrote to express the sense of closeness that she had felt with the country through listening to the broadcast: it was, she explained, "'splendid how much radio has done and will continue to do in making us nearer to one another.'" One listener from Windsor, Ontario hoped the broadcast would "'foster a better national spirit and love of country,'" and called for "more of such national programs.'" Speaking to the extent to

[50] In *Ibid*., p.104. As David Cannadine has amply demonstrated in his study of the British Empire, symbols, pomp and pageantry mattered to the public, and allowed people to feel connected to a broader, imagined community. Cannadine, *Ornamentalism*, p.1.
[51] Nolan asserts the broadcast was "heard by millions" in "crowded living rooms and public places ... nation-wide." Nolan, Foundations, p.49.
[52] See, for instance, *Toronto Daily Star*, *Toronto Globe*, *Manitoba Free-Press*, *Le Devoir*, *La Presse*, *Calgary Herald*, *Halifax Chronicle*, 2 July 1927.
[53] Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern," pp.116-117.

which *O Canada* had gained traction among some Anglo-Canadian audiences by 1927, a newspaper correspondent from Saskatoon revelled in the "'thrilling experience'" of being connected "'so audibly though unseen with such a vast multitude in the singing of both our national anthems.'" Countless letters from French-speaking listeners expressed their appreciation for the bilingualism of the broadcast. "'Vos programmes,'" wrote a priest from Lauzon, Quebec, "'ont plu tout particulièrement par leur caractère bilingue.'"[54]

Expanding official bilingualism

Other important federal government initiatives evoked Canada's cultural dualism, giving hope to civil society advocates of Anglophone/Francophone rapprochement. Notable were the adoption of bilingual stamps in 1927 and bilingual currency in 1936, the creation of the Translation Bureau by an Act of Parliament in 1934, and attempts to open up more prominent federal public service positions to French speakers.[55]

French-Canadian nationalistes had long decried the federal government's failure to institute true bilingualism.[56] Pressure had mounted, too, from more moderate observers like William Moore and Camille Roy who were anxious that French-Canadians be afforded all the advantages that Confederation had to offer. Indeed, the recent track record of bilingualism at the federal level had been dismal. "Le minimum eût été de respecter le caractère officiellement bilingue de la constitution," complained the

[54] A seventy-nine year-old man from Montreal explained how the Peace Tower bells had given him "'a thrill that passed right through my body'" – he stayed up until 1:34am to listen to the entire extended program. Another denizen of rural Saskatchewan expressed "'how much it meant to the people of the west…. [For] the first time many of us have heard our premier's voice … it seemed almost as if we were present in Ottawa.'" In *Ibid*., pp.112-113.
[55] See Canadian Heritage, "History of Bilingualism in Canada" (November 2008), accessed 2 February 2011, http://www.pch.gc.ca/pgm/lo-ol/bllng/hist-eng.cfm.
[56] Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, p.69.

nationaliste Groulx disciple, Hermas Bastien. "Tel caractère est tellement affaibli qu'il accuse une parcimonie révélatrice."[57] Service delivery in French was irregular at best, the debates in the House of Commons were overwhelmingly conducted in English, and French Canadians were underrepresented in the federal public service.

Adopting bilingual postage

Bilingual stamps were an early proposal of Postmaster General Peter Veniot. After serving as New Brunswick's first Acadian premier (1923-1925), Veniot won a federal seat in Bathurst in 1926 and was appointed to cabinet. As an Acadian and a Francophone from outside Quebec, the question of federal bilingualism was close Veniot's heart. The design and language of stamps had long been left to the discretion of the Postmaster General. As such, stamps had been printed almost exclusively in English. To be sure, there had been a few stamps with French-language text, including for special occasions such as the tercentenary of Quebec. But even these had not been fully bilingual.[58] They had been one-time issues – no other stamps featured both French and English until 1927.[59]

In the lead-up to the Confederation anniversary celebrations in 1927, Veniot proposed issuing bilingual stamps. King approved the measure in keeping with the official celebrations' emphasis on biculturalism. The prime minister was under the

[57] *Ibid*., p.70.
[58] The text on the 1908 stamp depicting Cartier's landing at Quebec read: "Canada Postage – Twenty Cents. L'arrivé de Cartier – Québec 1535. IIIe Centenaire de Québec." Victor Seary, *A Postage Stamp History of Canada* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1972), p.11.
[59] Winthrop S. Boggs, *The Postage Stamps and Postal History of Canada* (Chambers Publishing Company, 1945), p.425.

impression, however, that the stamps would be a one-off, printed specifically for the occasion. Veniot had different ideas. He instituted the printing of all postage – domestic and international – from regular ground service to airmail, in a bilingual format that eliminated the English spelling of monetary value (using numerals exclusively instead), and replaced "Canada Postage" with the bilingual title of "Postes Canada Postage" on stamps.[60] From 1927 onward, bilingual postage would be the established norm. In June 1929, with an election on the horizon, King worried that the stamps might leave Liberals susceptible to an "anti-French & anti-Catholic agitation." He suggested to Cabinet that the bilingual postage be scaled back.[61] The French-speaking ministers, led by Veniot and Ernest Lapointe, responded by threatening to block a recent proposal that King had made for an imperial trade conference. The prime minister was taken aback: "The French members are very sensitive on this on the one hand & very resentful of criticism, also very pressing in their demands."[62] Veniot and Lapointe gained the support of sympathetic Anglo-Canadian members of King's inner circle, including O.D. Skelton and P.J.A. Cardin.[63]

King brought the issue up a month later in a meeting with Veniot, urging him to print at least some issues of unilingual stamps "so that it could not be said [that] <u>all</u> stamps were bilingual."[64] But for the Acadian Veniot, that was the whole point: English and French must be seen as the two, equal languages of the federal government. King was not opposed to bilingual stamps – he recognized that printing them was but one in a

[60] See Seary, *A Postage Stamp History of Canada*, pp.11, 19, 55, 144.
[61] "I fear it is going to injure us irreparably – if it becomes the centre around which an anti-French & anti-Catholic agitation arises." WLMK Diaries, 17 June 1929. See also entries for 18 June 1929 and 16 July 1929.
[62] WLMK Diaries, 17 June 1929.
[63] WLMK Diaries, 17 June 1929, 18 June 1929.
[64] WLMK Diaries, 16 July 1929.

plethora of measures the government must take in order to break down prejudice. But for King, politics was the art of the possible. If pressed too quickly and with too great an intensity, the fight against prejudice risked serious blowback. Moreover, King felt that he had already been fairly magnanimous under the circumstances: "I pointed out I had been the first PM to agree & had done so for a special edition of Jubilee stamps, but urged strongly the mistake politically to press the bilingual business too far – Liberalism is continually obliged to be fighting prejudice."[65] Despite King's insistence, Veniot remained non-committal. In the following months, he avoided King and simply continued the bilingual printing format.[66] King confronted the "rather obstinate" Veniot one final time in early September 1929, accompanied by Ministers J.A. Robb from Quebec and Charles Dunning from Saskatchewan, who were concerned about Liberal Party support in the West. They "spoke out plainly about [the] danger of defeating the Govt. thro (*sic*) pressing the matter."[67] For King, it was a reminder of both the asset and liability that was French-Canadian political support. The issue also spoke to the degree of autonomy of King's Francophone ministers.[68] King would not press the matter again. A few weeks later, the world's economy plunged into depression; the attention of both government and the press was drawn to more urgent matters, and bilingual postage was left alone as a fait accompli.

In an age when the post office provided the most accessible and affordable means of day-to-day communication, the adoption of bilingual stamps was not insignificant.

---

[65] WLMK Diaries, 16 July 1929.
[66] See WLMK Diaries, 16 July 1929, 11 September 1929.
[67] King was especially concerned about accusations of pro-French bias in light of an upcoming visit to Quebec. "I confess to having felt irritated at this, and at the publicity given to my intention to go to Quebec tomorrow." WLMK Diaries, 11 September 1929.
[68] "There is no doubt the French are a handicap in many ways politically, as well as an asset. Their race & religious prejudices are strong and at times difficult to control." WLMK Diaries, 11 September 1929.

Regular daily mail, facilitated by the expansion of railways, had been extended to rural areas across the country in 1908. The first airmail flight occurred in 1918, between Toronto and Montreal. The automobile also facilitated mail delivery for rural postmasters. By 1920, few places in the country were without mail services.[69] As such, Canadians from across the country who might not have otherwise had any contact with the other official language would now come into day-to-day contact with this example of Canadian biculturalism. For younger Canadians, bilingual stamps would become as ubiquitous as the bilingual cereal boxes of later generations of Canadian children. Moreover, bilingual stamps were symbolically important – the French-speaking members of King's Cabinet certainly saw it that way.[70] The bilingual stamp signalled to Canadians rich and middling, and perhaps even poor, that their government placed a certain priority on cultural federalism.

In addition to being bilingual, the stamps of the interwar increasingly depicted important historical French-Canadian personalities and other notable political figures who had cooperated across cultural lines. British-Canadian fare was equally represented on the stamps of the period, of course, including images of the Loyalists as well as royalty. Stamps depicting Canadian agriculture and industry were also prominent. Together, these stamps projected an image of a transcontinental, prosperous, modern, bicultural nation and self-governing constitutional monarchy.[71]

The 1927 series was noteworthy for its commemoration of cross-cultural political collaboration. Before 1927, the post had relied on stamp designs from before the Great

---

[69] Chantal Amyot and John Willis, *Country Post: Rural Postal Service in Canada, 1880 to 1945* (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 2003), pp.40.
[70] See WLMK Diaries, 16 July 1929.
[71] Pre-1908 stamp designs were limited in variety, and mostly depicted royalty. See Boggs, *Postage Stamps and Postal History*, pp.795.

War. With the Confederation celebrations, however, a flurry of new designs followed.[72] The 1927 series included a 12¢ stamp depicting both Laurier and Macdonald, a 20¢ stamp depicting Baldwin and Lafontaine, and individual portraits of Macdonald, D'Arcy McGee, George-Étienne Cartier and Laurier on stamps ranging from 1¢ to 10¢.[73] The 1927 series also included a reprint of a special 3¢ 1917 stamp that had been commissioned for the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, depicting Robert Harris's famous painting, *The Fathers of Confederation* (1884). While the original 1917 stamp had been Engish-unilingual, the 1927 version featured bilingual text, and cost 2¢.[74] A number of stamps were dedicated specifically to Canada's French past. These included a 50¢ stamp depicting the Grand Pré and Évangeline memorial commemorating the Acadian Deportation (1930), a 3¢ stamp depicting the arrival of Jacques Cartier in commemoration of the quadricentenary of that event (1934), a $1 stamp featuring Quebec City's Champlain monument (1935), and a $1 stamp with an image of the Chateau de Ramezay in Montreal (1938).[75]

The adoption of bilingual stamps gave French-Canadian observers new hope in the federal government's ability and willingness to both represent and serve them. Camille Roy pointed to the adoption of bilingual stamps as a tangible, recognizable symbol of the country's biculturalism, and as evidence for Francophones that recognition from and relations with English-speaking Canadians was improving.[76] He had cause for optimism: that same year, the government had put on a bicultural celebration of

---

[72] *Ibid.*, pp.799.
[73] Seary, *A Postage Stamp History*, pp.79, 85; Boggs, *Postage Stamps and Postal History*, p.426.
[74] There was also a 13¢ stamp depicting the 1864 Charlottetown Conference (1935). Seary, *A Postage Stamp History*, pp.55, 82.
[75] See *Ibid*., pp.11, 19; Boggs, *Postage Stamps and Postal History*, pp.430, 806.
[76] Roy's comments were made in January 1933. See Camille Roy, *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, p.11.

Confederation's sixtieth anniversary, and a resolution to the language crisis in Ontario seemed to be just around the corner (see Chapter 11).

Biculturalism and bilingualism in the federal public service

The concessions over bilingual stamps encouraged French Canadians to demand additional recognition of biculturalism at the federal level. Much like Moore and Morley before them, Camille Roy, Jean-Charles Harvey, Henri Bourassa, Georges-Henri Lévesque and countless others called for a functionally bilingual federal public service, and for more French Canadians in senior positions within the public service.[77] As Roy was happy to report in 1934, they were assisted in their lobby by other sympathetic members of civil society, including Anglo-Canadians:

> Il a fallu, il faut encore du temps pour faire passer dans les faits, dans toute la vie publique fédérale, cette reconnaissance officielle de la langue française. Nous y mettrons tout le temps qu'il faudra, aidés, d'ailleurs, de plus en plus, par des concitoyens anglais, par toute une élite de langue anglaise, élite politique, universitaire, sociale, qui voit une harmonie plutôt qu'une difformité dans la coexistence, au Canada, de deux langues, de deux races, de deux cultures, de deux civilisations.[78]

At heart, what they sought was official bilingualism at the federal level and recognition of French-language and religious minority rights outside Quebec. Roy: "Nous estimons que ce bilinguisme complet dans les services publics fédéraux n'est que la conséquence légitime du fait que la constitution canadienne de la Confédération décréta, en 1867, que

[77] "[T]rop souvent on [nous] a maintenus à des postes inférieurs tant dans le service civil que dans les industries importantes." Jean-Charles Harvey, "Culte de l'encens ou de la vérité," *Le Jour*, Montréal, 4 February 1939, p.1.
[78] Roy, *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, p.11-12.

la langue française est au Canada ... une langue officielle de la nation."[79] Not only would a more functionally bilingual federal public service allow French Canadians to advance their socio-economic condition – by way of greater access to government jobs and services – but it would also shore up national unity by allowing them to identify more closely with the Canadian State.

Since the end of the Great War, the proportion of French-speaking public servants had dropped significantly. This was a product of two developments. First, in an age when bureaucracies were relatively small and patronage played a central role in the functioning of government, positions had simply been doled out by Cabinet ministers. French-Canadian and British-Canadian ministers had tended to appoint public servants from their own cultural-linguistic background, ensuring a roughly proportionate representation within the civil service.[80] The Union government that came to power in 1917, however, had virtually no representation from French Canada. In practice, this meant a steep drop in appointments of French Canadians to the public service. Second, Prime Minister Robert Borden's reforms of the federal public service required that employees be hired on the basis of merit, and not as patronage appointments. In addition to removing corruption and graft inherent in the political patronage system, the change was designed to allow for a more efficient and competent public service that had ballooned in size over the course of the war. To that end, the Civil Service Act of 1918 gave the Civil Service Commission (created in 1908) the power to oversee hiring for the approximately 50,000

[79] "Nous luttons encore actuellement pour le bilinguisme complet dans tous les services fédéraux; il existe déjà en grande mesure; il n'est pas encore complet. Il y a quelques années, nous y avons gagné le timbre postal bilingue; nous pressons maintenant Ottawa de nous donner la monnaie bilingue." *Ibid*., p.11.

[80] Christopher Beattie, Jacques Désy and Stephen Longstaff, *Bureaucratic Careers: Anglophones and Francophones in the Canadian Public Service*, Documents of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (Ottawa: Information Canada, 1972), pp.3-5.

federal civil service jobs across the country, and to enforce the merit system. Prospective civil servants had to pass competitive examinations in order to demonstrate their merit.[81] A much less stringent examination system established in 1882 had given formal recognition to the bilingual principle by allowing candidates to choose the language of their examination. Part of the new examination process, however, included an evaluation of the ability to work in English. Even for jobs demanding regular contact with French speakers, the Commission did not apply ability to communicate in French as one of the criteria of merit – experience and a technical educational background, which reflected British-Canadian educational traditions, were used to establish ability. Naturally, this put most French-Canadian candidates at a disadvantage, and the proportion of French-speaking federal public servants declined.[82] Discrimination in the hiring process also played its part. As Beattie et al. explain, "the fact is that considerations of ethnicity and religion weighed somewhat more heavily on men's minds then than they do now." Such discrimination was "discreetly covered under the rhetoric of finding the best man for the job. Any representational claims put forward by Francophones could be and repeatedly were attacked as endangering the merit system."[83]

The language of the federal public service, both between employees and with the public, had not been formally established in 1867.[84] With the establishment of primarily

---

[81] Canada, *The 100 Years of the Public Service Commission of Canada, 1908-2008* (Ottawa: Public Service Commission of Canada, July 2008), pp.6-8; Hodgetts, *The Canadian Public Service: a Physiology of Government, 1867-1970* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), p.33.
[82] See Beattie et al., *Bureaucratic Careers*, p.4; Hodgetts, *Canadian Public Service*, p.38.
[83] Beattie et al., *Bureaucratic Careers*, pp.5-6.
[84] Both the *British North America Act, 1867* and the *Civil Service Act, 1868* were silent on the matter. Given that Canada's bureaucracy in 1867 was inherited from those of Canada West and Canada East, however, there was a reasonable level of bilingualism and French-Canadian representation built into place. In 1882, the government implemented a system of periodic examinations for civil servants. While these could effectively be by-passed by the patronage system, the new legislation stipulated that "'all examinations ... shall be held in the English or French language or both at the option of the candidate.'"

English-speaking Ottawa as the new capital, the migration of some French-speaking civil servants to Quebec City, and as a result of simple demographics, the language of communication gravitated more and more toward English. This was reinforced with the changes brought in by the Civil Service Commission, which had jurisdiction in hiring for both the headquarters in Ottawa and regional appointments.[85] From 1914 to the Second World War, the French-Canadian ratio within the federal public service dropped from 22% to 13%. Among the top civil servants with a salary of $6,000 or more, only 10% were French Canadians.[86] By the 1930s, French-Canadian MPs and Senators, pressured by their own constituencies, complained that even in Quebec some federal posts had been filled by English-unilingual public servants.[87] (For its part, the Quebec provincial public service had operated in both languages since Confederation and continued to do so.[88]) Moreover, a hiring freeze during the Depression would make improving the ratio virtually impossible.[89]

The campaign for a more bilingual federal public service had its official beginnings in 1927, with the introduction in the House of Commons of a private member's motion proposing preferential treatment for bilingual candidates applying for government positions. Coming in the same year that funding for bilingual Franco-Ontarian schools had been restored and bilingual stamps introduced, the private

---

This was "the first formal recognition of bilingual considerations in the staffing policies of the Public Service." See Beattie et al., *Bureaucratic Careers*, pp.3-4.

[85] Hodgetts, *The Canadian Public Service*, p.37.

[86] Beattie et al., *Bureaucratic Careers*, p.5.

[87] See Cardin in Émile Benoit, "Le gouvernement King le fait voter," *Le Devoir*, 17 June 1936, p.1; Beattie et al. *Bureaucratic Careers*, confirms that this was the case, at p.6. See also Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.77. An exposé by *Le Devoir* in 1923 revealed that only 79 of Montreal's 229 federal income tax collectors were French-Canadian.

[88] Hodgetts, *The Canadian Public Service*, p.37.

[89] There were roughly 25,000 federal civil servants in 1914, 50,000 by 1920 (owing to the war), and 46,000 in 1931 (unchanged in 1939). Canada, *Report of the Royal Commission on Administrative Classifications in the Public Service*, Chief Commissioner Walter L. Gordon (Ottawa: E. Cloutier, 1946), pp.9-10, 13.

member's bill stirred the emotions of Conservative Ontarians like Toronto West Centre MP Horatio Hocken:

> '...it must be plain to anyone who understands English that this is not a bilingual country.... We contend that this proposal is an attack upon the English-speaking people of Canada, an attack upon the rights of every English-speaking young man and young woman, for it forces them either to learn French or to keep out of the civil service.... Ontario and the other provinces are not aggressive against their sister province of Quebec. It is that certain leaders in Quebec are aggressive against the other provinces, and will not observe the conditions of the act of confederation.'[90]

Henri Bourassa countered Hocken's assertions in the House by insisting that French/English equality was in keeping with the spirit of Confederation. He referred to the magnanimity of Quebec's French-speaking majority toward the English-speaking minority, and explained that a meaningfully bilingual federal public service was necessary to prevent French-Canadian cultural isolationism within Quebec:

> 'The province of Quebec is not a French province.... The vast majority of its people speak French, but they grant to the English-speaking minority the right to speak English freely, and they accord them in the local administrations, municipal or provincial, those facilities which we ask in federal affairs, not merely as a matter of right but as a matter of common sense, and true Canadian spirit.'[91]

Hocken had his share of sympathizers, but he did not represent all Anglo-Canadians. Indeed, he had a reputation for being "one Conservative member who caused his own party more trouble than he did the Liberals."[92] The bill did not pass, as is often the case with private members' bills. Moreover, the issue of French-Canadian representation in the federal public service was simply not on the government's radar before 1930.[93]

---

[90] In Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*, p.36.
[91] In *Ibid*., pp.36-37.
[92] *Ibid*., p.41.
[93] A 1930 government report on salaries and the structure of the civil service omitted any recommendation on the issue of bilingualism and French-Canadian representation. See Canada, *Report of the Royal Commission on Technical and Professional Services* (Ottawa: F.A. Acland, 1930), pp.3-4.

The embarrassingly low ratio of top-level French-Canadian bureaucrats received new attention as a result of preparations for the Imperial Conference in Ottawa in July and August of 1932. In the lead-up to the meetings, Prime Minister Bennett asked some twenty-five top bureaucrats to prepare background materials and appointed them as official advisors for the conference, with O.D. Skelton, still serving as Under Secretary of State for External Affairs, as chief advisor.[94] These appointments were not insignificant. The 1932 conference held a great deal of prestige for Bennett and the Conservatives; as host to the self-governing nations of the Commonwealth, Canada temporarily became the centre of the Empire. Even more, the conference was the centrepiece of the Conservative government's economic plan to bring the country out of the Great Depression.[95] Pleased with his preparations, Bennett presented the list of appointees to Cabinet. His Quebec ministers were unimpressed – the list did not include a single French Canadian. Embarrassed, Bennett and Skelton hastily added half a dozen French-Canadians to the list, but the internal political damage had already been done. Bennett responded to the ongoing criticism from Cabinet in knee-jerk fashion. He accused his French-Canadian colleagues en masse of attempting to subvert the merit system to make up for the lack of French-Canadian talent in the civil service.[96]

As an Anglo-Canadian who considered himself sympathetic to Canada's French fact, Skelton was deeply troubled by the incident. He resolved to use the tools at his own disposal to improve things as best he could. From then on, "he made a great point of attempting to recruit from the French-language universities for the relatively new

[94] Beattie et al., *Bureaucratic Careers*, pp.6-7.
[95] See David S. Jacks, "Defying Gravity: The 1932 Imperial Economic Conference and the Reorientation of Canadian Trade," working paper 17242 of the National Bureau of Economic Research (Cambridge, 2011), pp.4.
[96] Beattie et al., *Bureaucratic Careers*, pp.6-7.

department of External Affairs." Over time, the department became "the entry point for many Francophones who went on to senior positions in other areas of the federal administration."[97] For their part, French-Canadian ministers also did what they could to bypass the Civil Service Commission and ensure the hiring of more French Canadians.

The campaign by Camille Roy and Henri Bourassa for greater bilingualism in the federal public service intensified in early 1933. It was covered extensively in *Le Devoir* and the newly launched *Action nationale*.[98] In 1934, the federal government responded by establishing an official Bureau for Translations to provide greater access to services in French.[99] Formal translation services had existed in Canada since 1792, with the creation of a representative Assembly in Lower Canada, providing many French Canadians with public service positions over the decades. But these services had always been highly decentralized, with different departments having their own translators working independently from one another. Some departments lacked their own translators, having to improvise, hire translators from outside, or rely on translators from other departments who lacked familiarity with the material being translated. As such, quality control and the use of consistent terminology, especially for translations into French, were lacking and subjected to complaints from civil servants, politicians and the public alike. With nineteen different departments by 1910, translation had become an uncoordinated mess. The decline of the ratio of French Canadians in the public service meant that informal

[97] Beattie et al., *Bureaucratic Careers*, p.7. Skelton had tried to hire bilingual staff from early on. See Hillmer, "National Independence and the National Interest," p.15.
[98] See Camille Roy, *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, pp.11.
[99] Canadian Heritage, "History of Bilingualism in Canada."

translation also suffered. In 1933 the government had 91 translators, but these were clearly too few.[100]

The new *Act Respecting the Bureau for Translations*, which came into effect 1 August 1934, centralized all federal translators under one authority, the Secretary of State. It also made the new Bureau for Translations subject to the provisions of the *Civil Service Act*, ensuring that translators would be subject to rigorous examinations so as to improve the quality of work.[101] The Bureau's first Superintendent was Domitien T. Robichaud, an Acadian teacher and journalist from New Brunswick who had been in the federal public service since 1910, and had been President of the Institut canadien-français d'Ottawa (1928-1929). Robichaud served as Superintendent until 1946.[102]

The quality of government translation also improved as a result of the ongoing work of the Association technologique de langue française d'Ottawa, a non-governmental professional association founded in 1920. Several government translators joined the association upon its founding. The association facilitated the development and sharing of English and French technical terms, kept members informed of ongoing trends and changes in language and style, and "organized discussions on translation."[103] The University of Ottawa, only a few minutes' walk from Parliament, also helped improve quality when it began offering the first university courses in translation in 1936, which

---

[100] Translation Bureau, PWGSC, Canada, "Directors of Translation in the Government of Canada" (June 2012), accessed 27 October 2012, http://www.btb.gc.ca/btb.php?lang=eng&cont=1472; and Translation Bureau, PWGSC, Canada, "Translation before the Bureau" (June 2012), accessed 27 October 2012, http://www.btb.gc.ca/btb.php?lang=eng&cont=1153; Beattie et al., *Bureaucratic Careers*, p.5.

[101] Translation Bureau, PWGSC, Canada, "Training and Development of Professional Translators in the Government of Canada Over the Years" (June 2012), accessed 27 October 2012, http://www.btb.gc.ca/btb.php?lang=eng&cont=1189.

[102] Translation Bureau, "Directors of Translation in the Government of Canada"; Jeff Keshen and Nicole St-Onge, *Ottawa: Making a Capital* (University of Ottawa Press, 2001), p.142.

[103] "The ATLFO played an invaluable role in the professional development of translators." In Translation Bureau, PWGSC, Canada, "Our History" (June 2012), accessed 27 October 2012, http:// www.btb.gc.ca/btb.php?lang=eng&cont=841.

were regularly attended by government translators as they prepared for exams for promotion.[104] On balance, the creation of the Bureau would significantly improve translation: it "streamlined procedures, ensured better service for all departments and agencies, and allowed for the establishment of a staffing, training and development centre for translation."[105] It also provided a central agency to which translators could issue complaints and make recommendations of change across the practice, such as the improvement of reference materials including dictionaries, grammar guides, books on specialized terminology, and encyclopaedias.[106]

The principle of bilingualism at the federal level received further recognition with the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *R. v. DuBois*, 1935. It held that, by virtue of Section 133 of the *BNAA*, both English and French versions of federal laws and statutes were equally valid, including in instances where a law had clearly been drafted in one language and then translated into the other. The "Equal Authenticity Rule" held even when inconsistencies or incompatibilities between the original version of a statute or law and its translation were apparent.[107] The federal government accepted the principle and did not appeal the ruling to the JCPC. It was an important symbolic victory for bilingualism in the federal public service over the argument for a more 'practical' unilingualism.

---

[104] *Ibid*.
[105] Translation Bureau, "Translation before the Bureau." See also Jean Delisle, *Au coeur du trialogue canadien. Croissance et évolution du Bureau des traductions du gouvernement canadien, 1934-1984* (Ottawa: Secretary of State, 1984), part I.
[106] Interestingly, National Defence was one of the better-equipped departments when it came to translation by the late 1930s. Translation Bureau, PWGSC, Canada. "Libraries and Reference Materials at the Translation Bureau" (June 2012), http://www.btb.gc.ca/btb.php?lang=eng&cont=1180, accessed 27 October 2012.
[107] See Michel Bastarache et al., *The Law of Bilingual Interpretation* (Markham: Lexis Nexis, 2008), pp.17.

To be sure, these changes alone would not fully address French-Canadian dissatisfaction with the federal public service.[108] Moderate French-Canadian observers like Camille Roy, however, took heart in the concessions, modest though they may have seemed. Roy understood that official bilingualism and biculturalism could not be achieved overnight. He was encouraged by the gradual change exhibited in Anglo-Canadian attitudes, and recognized that transforming new attitudes into new policies would take time. In the meantime, it was up to French Canadians to make the most of that change, and to continue pushing the envelope. Roy believed that more good could be accomplished by making the most of the concessions toward biculturalism than by rejecting them outright as inadequate and unacceptable.[109]

After the Liberals returned to power in October 1935, Ernest Lapointe's position within Cabinet became all the more important. He was now indisputably the senior leader of a large and influential Quebec caucus, and Mackenzie King's first advisor on questions relating to biculturalism. Lapointe doubled his efforts to improve the level of bilingualism within the federal government. Moreover, Lapointe was responding to growing pressure from the Quebec caucus, and from "a wave of protests and demands on language questions from all parts of French Canada, chiefly involving the lack of facilities and services in French provided by the federal administration."[110] Liberal Senator Raoul Dandurand, for instance, was particularly adamant that the place of French in the national capital had to be improved.[111] Lapointe took it upon himself to personally address the plethora of individual complaints and petitions from politicians and members

[108] Ryerson, *French Canada*, p.234.
[109] Camille Roy, *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, p.11.
[110] Beattie et al., *Bureaucratic Careers*, p.7.
[111] King called Dandurand "'a little fanatical on these questions.'" In Paquin, "Raoul Dandurand: porte-parole de la conscience universelle," p.47.

of the public alike. On the whole, the federal government's level of bilingual services and representation of French Canadians within the public service would remain grossly inadequate. Expectations – and therefore dissatisfaction – within the French-language press only intensified after the Liberals returned to power.[112]

Still, Lapointe managed to score a number of small yet symbolic victories against the bureaucratic inertia. He continuously pressured his colleagues to hire French Canadians to important posts, achieving some successes such as the appointment of Gustave Lanctot as chief archivist, and half a dozen appointments to the boards of the Bank of Canada, CBC, and CNR. Still, French-Canadian representation within these bodies remained disproportionately low. After a year of haranguing, Lapointe got Cabinet approval to provide both French- and English-language telephone books to the Quebec offices of the federal public service. Acting on complaints from Quebec MPs and members of the public, Lapointe also had a French-language telephone answering service established for the Civil Service Commission.[113]

The poor level of French-language service from the federal government achieved significant publicity during a major strike at Trois-Rivères in 1937. The federal department of Labour responded by sending three mediators to the city to handle arbitration. All three officials, however, were unilingual Anglophones. The strikers and management were both unimpressed, leading to "bitter complaints in the House of Commons" against the "startled" Minister of Labour Norman McLeod Rogers. To be sure, English had long been the established language of Canadian industrial and labour

---

[112] While nationaliste papers like *Le Devoir*, *L'Action catholique*, and *Le Droit* were more critical, *La Presse* and *Le Soleil*, "Quebec's most widely read newspapers," paid more attention to the progress being made toward greater French-Canadian representation and bilingualism within the federal public service. Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.223.

[113] Beattie et al., *Bureaucratic Careers*, pp.8-9.

relations, and the insistence on the use of French in this area was "unprecedented."[114] But the times – and French-Canadians' expectations of the level of services they were due from the federal government – were changing. Rogers agreed to take on more bilingual staff and to ensure that, in future, French-speaking officials would handle labour disputes involving French-speaking workers.[115]

The combined pressure of Lapointe's behind-the-scenes efforts and the publicity given the Trois-Rivières incident led to the passage of the Lacrois Bill of 1938. The bill amended the *Civil Service Act* (1918) to ensure that French-speakers were hired for jobs in localities where they would come into regular contact with other French-speakers (or English-speaking employees with English-speaking members of the public as the case may be). As amended, the act read:

> 'no appointment ... shall be made to a local position within a province, and no employee shall be transferred ... until and unless the candidate or employee has qualified, by examination, in the knowledge and use of the language, being the French or the English language, of the majority of the persons with whom he is required to do business.'[116]

Officially, this meant that public servants would be required to have a strong ability in French in areas where French was spoken by the majority – *i.e.* Quebec. But in practice, and over time, the commission "amplified this provision to require a knowledge of both English and French for a locality where both languages were spoken."[117] While

---

[114] *Ibid*., p.8.
[115] *Ibid*., p.8.
[116] In Hodgetts, *The Canadian Public Service*, p.37.
[117] *Ibid*., p.37.

Despite these measures, the proportion of French Canadians in federal public service jobs, especially outside Quebec, was slow to improve. This was in part the result of the flurry of hiring that occurred during the Second World War, as regulations went by the wayside and Anglophones drew from "informal networks of personal acquaintances and professional contacts" to expedite hiring. Beattie et al., *Bureaucratic Careers*, p.8.

Still, the sum total of Francophones in the public service did rise. A lengthy brief from the Montreal Chamber of Commerce to the 1946 Royal Commission on Administrative Classifications, for

imperfect, the 1938 amendment was nevertheless a symbolically important concession – the first formal recognition of bilingualism in the hiring process of the federal civil service since Confederation.[118]

The country's highest office of public service, the governor-generalship, also began to show greater recognition of cultural federalism. Certainly, Governor General Earl Grey had demonstrated his enthusiasm for cross-cultural rapprochement with his energetic backing of the elaborate tercentenary celebrations at Quebec in 1908.[119] During the 1927 Confederation Diamond Jubilee celebrations, Governor General Willingdon made a point of speaking in both languages and acknowledging the historical and cultural contributions of both peoples.[120] And when they first landed in Canada at Halifax at the beginning of their appointment in April 1931, the Earl and Lady Bessborough made the point of opening with a bilingual greeting: "'I am pleased at last to be on Canadian soil and to make the acquaintance of Canadians,'" stated the Earl – "'J'ai enfin l'honneur de faire la connaissance du peuple canadien,'" declared his wife.[121] The Bessboroughs' remarks were broadcast nationwide on CNR radio – the company made sure that the transmission would make Montreal by employing a backup line running from Halifax to the Quebec metropolis.[122] By now, it had become established convention for Governors General to read the Speech from the Throne in both languages.[123] Bilingualism and

---

instance, forced the government to hire several more high-level French-Canadian bureaucrats. See Beattie et al., *Bureaucratic Careers*, p.11; Kenneth D. McRae, *The Federal Capital: Government Institutions*, Studies of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Volume 1 (Ottawa: Roger Duhamel, Queen's Printer, 1969), pp.132-135.

[118] See Beattie et al., Bureaucratic Careers, p.8; Émile Gosselin, "Perspective historique," *Canadian Public Administration* 6 (December 1963), pp.407.

[119] Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building*, p.67.

[120] Cupido, "The Medium, the Message and the Modern," pp.107, 111.

[121] In Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.75.

[122] *Ibid*., p.75

[123] See Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, p.71.

biculturalism received further recognition when it came to the Crown with the accession of Edward VIII to the throne on 20 January 1936. At the request of federal employees and Francophone organizations, Lapointe arranged for the civil servants' oath of allegiance to the new king to be taken in French. The President of the St. Jean-Baptiste Society conveyed his approval for Lapointe's efforts in affirming "'le principe du bilinguisme officiel dans le gouvernement fédéral.'"[124] For the first time, in 1935, Canadian politicians alone decided who would be the next Governor General, owing to the recent passing of the Statute of Westminster. Prime Minister Bennett met with Mackenzie King and they agreed upon John Buchan, the Lord Tweedsmuir. Tweedsmuir took great interest in Canada's cultural diversity and on its emerging identity and constitutional autonomy. As a Scot who had been an administrator in South Africa, with its two dominant cultural-linguistic groups, Afrikaner and Anglo-South African, he appreciated the principle of biculturalism. For the sake of national unity, Tweedsmuir carefully played down Canada's imperial affiliations: "'a Canadian's first loyalty is not to the British Commonwealth of Nations, but to Canada and Canada's King,'" he declared in Montreal in 1937.[125]

Adopting bilingual currency

Perhaps the most important symbolic recognition of bilingualism and biculturalism to reach the masses was the adoption of bilingual currency, in 1936. The bilingual currency question was not a new one, having been debated in 1905 and

[124] In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.216.
[125] In Janet Adam Smith, *John Buchan: a Biography* (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1965), p.423.

carefully avoided by Prime Minister Laurier. His official response at the time was that changes in printing would be too costly.[126] The debate over language and currency re-emerged in the early 1930s. Since Confederation, Canadian currency had been printed unilingually, in English. For Francophones, a bilingual currency would provide meaningful recognition of official bilingualism and biculturalism. Emboldened by the adoption of bilingual stamps, in January 1933 Camille Roy called for the adoption of bilingual currency in recognition of the principle of official bilingualism at the federal level, and, notably, recognition of French-language minority rights outside Quebec. Moreover, it would be in keeping with the spirit of 1867, whereby "la langue française est au Canada, et au même titre que la langue anglaise, une langue officielle de la nation."[127] French Canadians were not alone in advocating for a bilingual currency. Only months after Roy's call for such a measure, at the founding meeting of the CCF in July 1933 at Regina, F.R. Scott told his largely British-Canadian audience that "'there is no reason why we might not come out with a bilingual currency.'" Such a measure, he argued, would encourage Anglo-Canadians to accept the principle of bilingualism, and maybe even to learn French. The party adopted Scott's position.[128]

The 1934 *Bank of Canada Act*, which led to the creation of a national central bank, allowed advocates to put the question of bilingual currency before Parliament. Before 1934, there was no official law determining the language of printing for bank notes. Most notes were printed in-house by chartered banks, and almost exclusively in English (with a very small and inconsistent number of French bills distributed only in Quebec by the French-Canadian banks). The new Bank of Canada was to have exclusive

[126] Émile Benoit, "Le gouvernement King le fait voter," *Le Devoir*, 17 June 1936, p.7.
[127] Camille Roy, *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, p.11.
[128] In Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, p.144.

rights to issue bank notes, but the language of printing had not yet been officially established.[129]

Closely followed in the press, the debate was highly charged and highly symbolic – at heart, it revolved around the question of whether Canada was a bilingual and bicultural country. A few British-Canadian Conservative MPs called for unilingual English bills only. Their rationale was ostensibly practical, as unilingual bills would be simpler to produce. But it was also predicated on the notion that Canada, as a whole, was an *English*-speaking country – its bills should reflect the majority. More Conservatives, however, were willing to accept both exclusively English and exclusively French bills, with the latter to be distributed only in Quebec along with English notes (with coins to remain English-unilingual). This scheme would symbolically recognize Canada's French fact, but limit it to one province. In Quebec, went the implicit assertion, people could speak French, but in the rest of Canada, the only language that really mattered was English. Two Liberal MPs from Quebec, Ernest Lapointe and Charles Benjamin Howard, a British-Canadian businessman and lumber merchant from Sherbrooke,[130] led the call in the House for the printing of bilingual bills. Their rationale was both symbolic and pragmatic – bilingual bills would remind all Canadians of the country's cultural-linguistic duality, and they would simplify the printing and distribution processes.[131] In short, their proposal privileged cultural federalism over territorial federalism. King, then-Leader of the Official Opposition, worried that the Lapointe-Howard proposal might spark a British-Canadian backlash in some parts of the country. "'The French are apt to push this

[129] Bank of Canada, "Fact Sheet" (2010), accessed 12 December 2011, http://www.bankofcanada.ca/2010/07/secondary-page/fact-sheet-bank-of-canada-celebrates-75-years.
[130] Parliament of Canada, "The Hon. Charles Benjamin Howard," accessed 2 February 2011, www.parl.gc.ca.
[131] *Le Devoir*, 6 June 1934, pp.1, and 7 June 1934, pp.1.

side too far,'" he wrote in his diary.[132] Lapointe persisted, and convinced King to allow him to present an amendment to the Bank of Canada bill for bilingual currency.

This led to a "headline-making 'clash'" with Prime Minister Bennett, with newspapers reporting on the "'tense scene in the Commons.'"[133] King also took to the floor to speak out in favour of Lapointe's amendment. The currency language question spoke to politicians' and Canadians' divergent conceptualizations of Confederation – was Canada a bicultural nation, or was it not? "Les libéraux canadiens-français reprochaient à la mesure gouvernementale de vouloir restreindre l'emploi du français à la seule province de Québec," explains Bernard Saint-Aubin. "Ils exigeaient la monnaie bilingue qui, à leurs yeux, reconnaissait l'égalité linguistique."[134] The motion was doomed to failure given the Conservative majority (although four of the Quebec caucus voted in favour of it). Nevertheless, the French-language press gave broad approval to the Liberal proposal.[135]

The final version of the 1934 Act stipulated that "notes in either the English or the French language shall be available as required," with discretion left to the Minister of Finance.[136] The first issue of Bank of Canada notes in 1935 thus included unilingual English notes for distribution across the country, and a much smaller number of unilingual French notes for Quebec distribution only.[137] Bennett believed that it was a reasonable compromise. The issue having emerged around the same time as the development of more bilingual national radio broadcasts (discussed in Chapter VIII),

---

[132] In Blair Neatby, *William Lyon Mackenzie King*, p.56.
[133] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.195.
[134] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.253.
[135] Neatby, *William Lyon Mackenzie King*, p.56.
[136] Section 24, 4. Canada, *Bank of Canada Act, 1934*, accessed 10 October 2012, http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/B-2/.
[137] Bank of Canada, *Art and Design of Canadian Bank Notes* (Ottawa, 2006), pp.37.

Bennett was trying to avoid more controversy among conservatives in overwhelmingly English-speaking parts of Canada who were already upset over biculturalism being allegedly forced down their throats.[138] It was a nod to both his conservative British-Canadian constituency, and to the party's need to restore its credibility in Quebec. Moreover, while an important acknowledgement of Canada's French fact, the bill fell short of acknowledging the bilingual and bicultural nature of the country. It symbolically ignored the French-Canadian and Acadian minorities outside Quebec, and privileged territorial federalism over cultural federalism. It was the first, and only, Bank of Canada series, however, to feature separate notes for the two languages.[139]

Returned to power in October 1935, the Liberals honoured their pledge to introduce bilingual currency and amended the *Bank of Canada Act* in June 1936. The revised act would state that "each note shall be printed in both the English and French language." Coins would also be bilingual. The design of currency would be left up to the Minister of Finance, but he no longer had discretion over language.[140] Lapointe had been anxious to address the matter, both out of personal conviction and to address continuing pressure from the Quebec Liberal caucus.[141] Once again, Lapointe led the charge with a lengthy, bilingual and, according to King, "effective speech."[142] He argued first on practical grounds. Bilingual bills were common to bilingual countries around the globe. Printing one series of bilingual bills would be cheaper. Moreover, changing the series

---

[138] The bilingual currency issue was "even more controversial" than the question of who should be appointed to run the bank: Canadians conscious of the national interest, or British bankers with greater experience. Neatby, *Mackenzie King*, p.56.
[139] James Powell, *A History of the Canadian Dollar* (Ottawa: Bank of Canada, 1999), p.49.
[140] *Bank of Canada Act, 1985*, Section 25, 4.
[141] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.215.
[142] "There was a considerable discussion on bilingual currency during which time Lapointe made an effective speech. I made a slight contribution in the early part of the debate, feeling impelled to say something because of the intolerant attitude of the opposition." WLMK Diaries, 16 June 1936.

only a year after the 1935 edition would be no different than the change that occurred when a new sovereign had to appear on a bill. More importantly, he argued, unilingual English and French bills did not accurately reflect the society – Canada was neither a unilingual English nor a unilingual French society.[143]

Lapointe then began to argue on principle. He warned that the continued rejection of bilingualism and biculturalism would incite secessionism among radicals in Quebec. Lapointe insisted that bilingualism should be a point of pride for all Canadians, and that every Canadian should be able to carry it with them wherever they went, at home or abroad:

> Les deux langues du Canada sont les deux premières de toutes les langues du monde. Ce sont les deux langues parlées à Genève, les deux langues officielles de la Société des Nations. Les délégués canadiens sont fiers d'aller là-bas comme les représentants du seul pays au monde où le français et l'anglais sont également officiels. Ne sommes nous pas fièrs de notre pays? Nos billets de banque qui circulent à l'étranger doivent le représenter pour ce qu'il est, pays fondé par les Français, passé ensuite à l'Angleterre, pays où des représentants de deux grandes races ont oublié leurs divergences, effacé leur différences pour s'unir et édifier une grande nation. Les citoyens de ce pays ne craignent certainement pas de faire savoir au monde qu'il s'y parle deux langues, le français et l'anglais, deux langues dont n'importe qui pourrait être fier.[144]

Lapointe concluded by pointing out that "il n'y a pas de race conquérente et de race conquise dans notre pays."[145]

Bennett, now on the Opposition benches, warned that the introduction of bilingual currency would pose a serious threat to national unity, especially in regions where very little French was spoken: "'Each one in his own conscience,'" he told the House, "'must

---

[143] "'Croit-on qu'un billet de la Banque du Canada, en français seulement, comme il y en a actuellement, peut donner en France, en Belgique ou ailleurs, une véritable idée de ce qu'est le Canada? Dans ces pays on croira que le Canada est un pays entièrement français. S'il s'agissait d'un billet anglais de la Banque de Canada, l'étranger pourrait crore que notre pays n'est qu'anglais.'" Lapointe in Émile Benoit, "Le gouvernement King le fait voter," *Le Devoir*, 17 June 1936, p.7.
[144] In *Ibid*.
[145] In *Ibid*.

answer whether or not in a community that is overwhelmingly British, the circulation of notes of that kind is not fraught with the gravest danger to harmony between races in other parts of Canada.'"[146] He argued, too, that the bill was unconstitutional in that it exceeded the provisions of Section 133 of the *BNA Act*. He also warned that other ethnic minorities might begin claiming certain language rights, including in the West.[147]

King had originally intended to stay out of the debate, but felt "impelled to say something because of the intolerant attitude of the opposition."[148] French Canadians' full rights to citizenship must be honoured, he argued, and Anglo-Canadians' reputation defended against accusations of intolerance. The amendment, King told the chamber, was:

> a gesture of good will toward the French Canadians and a matter of fair play to all races in this country by all those who believe in fair play. I believe the attitude of the people of Canada is one of tolerance, and not of intolerance and bigotry, which is the attitude exemplified by members on the other side.[149]

King rejected the notion that the majority necessarily had the right to impose its will on the minority. In a reversal of his earlier, private position, King also invoked the precedent of Canada's bilingual postage. He was quoted at length in the French-language press:

> La majorité n'a pas plus droit d'exiger une monnaie rien qu'en anglais que la minorité n'aurrait droit d'exiger une monnaie rien qu'en français. .... Il n'y a pas de gens plus généreux que les Canadiens français et, pour ma part, en tant que Canadien de langue anglaise, j'aurais honte d'être moins généreux qu'ils ne le sont, en invoquant simplement pour raison que je fais partie de la majorité. .... Quant à la concorde, à l'harmonie, entre les groupes, le billet bilingue sera bien plus de nature à les aider que la double série de billets que nous avons actuellement. .... Le timbre poste bilingue, les mandats postaux bilingues, ce ne sont pas des concessions. Ils existent parce que le Parlement permet que des citoyens libres puissent exercer un droit. .... Le gouvernement veut maintenir au

[146] In Neatby, *Mackenzie King*, p.165.
[147] Émile Benoit, "Le gouvernement King le fait voter," *Le Devoir*, 17 June 1936, p.7.
[148] WLMK Diaries, 16 June 1936.
[149] In "Bilingual Bank Notes Approved by Vote 160-43," *Globe*, 17 June 1936, p.1.

> Canada une politique de concorde et d'harmonie, une politique libérale de tolérance.[150]

King accused the Opposition of intolerance, citing their previous attitudes toward bilingual stamps.[151] His Saskatchewan lieutenant, Agriculture Minister James Gardiner, also stood up to vigorously defend bilingual currency. Gardiner's attack brought the tension in the chamber to its peak. He accused the Conservatives of "raising sectional and racial cries every time they were in Opposition," and likened their attitude to that which had "divided Europe into armed camps, led to powerful armies, universal mistrust, sufferings and war."[152] P.J.A. Cardin also made a speech on the occasion, reminding Tories of the magnanimity that French Canadians had repeatedly shown toward the English-speaking minority, and their patience regarding the persistent unilingualism within parts of the civil service.[153]

Instead of harming national unity, the Liberals believed that greater coast-to-coast recognition of biculturalism was essential to it. The currency issue revealed the clash between Conservative British Canadians who wanted to limit French language and cultural rights to Quebec and liberal-minded French and Anglo-Canadians who supported minority rights across the country. Moreover, King's support of bilingual currency in 1936 spoke to the extent to which attitudes had begun to change in Canada at large. As Canada's longest-serving prime minister, King always had his 'ear to the ground' when it came to gauging what the public would (and would not) accept. Where official recognition of biculturalism through such means as postage and currency was perceived by King as a potential liability in 1927, in 1936, the prime minister considered it

---

[150] Translated in Émile Benoit, "Le gouvernement King le fait voter," *Le Devoir*, 17 June 1936, p.7.
[151] In *Ibid*.
[152] In "Bilingual Bank Notes Approved by Vote 160-43," *Globe*, 17 June 1936, p.1.
[153] Émile Benoit, "Le gouvernement King le fait voter," *Le Devoir*, 17 June 1936, p.1

politically 'safe.' Dunning, for instance, who had opposed bilingual stamps in the late 1920s out of a fear of the electoral consequences in Saskatchewan, now came out in support of bilingual bills.[154]

The debate was at times an intensely bitter affair, and lasted the entire day. The galleries were filled to standing. At one point, members on opposite sides of the House competed with renditions of "Loch Lomond" and "Alouette."[155] Tommy Church was left red in the face after shouting to Ontario Liberals that they would never have won their seats had they run on the bilingual currency issue in 1935. Some backbench Tory MPs called for the abolition of bilingual postage, asserting to the Chamber that "This is a British Country!" and accused the Liberal Party of being run by a coterie of French-Canadian nationalistes.[156] The correspondent for *Le Devoir* reported that it was the most intense parliamentary debate he had witnessed in a decade. He was reassured, however, by the statements of King, Lapointe, Gardiner and Cardin.[157]

Such a highly symbolic issue cut to the heart of parliamentarians' conceptions of the Canadian politic. Was Canada to be a bicultural society: a heterogeneous society with one principal cultural-linguistic group; or a homogeneous society? Moreover, the debate had laid bare the anxieties that die-hard conservative British Canadians had about the ethnic composition of the country, and the extent to which they had lost their grip on popular opinion. Bennett and a few other Conservative MPs responded by trying to

---

[154] WLMK Diaries, 12 December 1936.
[155] "Bilingual Bank Notes Approved by Vote 160-43," *Globe*, 17 June 1936, p.1.
[156] Émile Benoit, "Le gouvernement King le fait voter," *Le Devoir*, 17 June 1936, p.1
[157] "La meute orangiste et tory s'est déchainé, hier après-midi, aux Communes, à propos de la monnaie bilingue. Trois heures d'affilèe, ce fut une crise de rage ou d'hystérie, peut-être une crise conjuguée des deux. .... Ils y ont mis une tell frénésie que jamais depuis dix ans qu'il m'est donné de suivre les débats parlementaire fédéraux, les Communies n'avaient été le théâtre d'un pareil spectacle. Toute la gamme du fanatisme, avec tons et demi-tons, y a passé." Émile Benoit, "Le gouvernement King le fait voter," *Le Devoir*, 17 June 1936, p.1.

moderate the party's tone, asserting that they simply wanted to avoid a crisis from erupting.[158] The CCF and Social Credit parties, meanwhile, were divided, having put forward their own proposals. Sensing the winds of change, however, they tended to sympathize with the motion.[159] Winnipeg CCF MP Abraham Heaps, for instance, a Jew, supported bilingual currency in the spirit of tolerance, and used the occasion to call upon French Canadians to combat anti-Semitism in Quebec.[160]

When it came time to vote, every single Liberal member voted in favour of bilingual currency. The bill passed by an overwhelming majority of 160 to 43. The CCF and Social Credit caucuses split their votes, and four Conservative MPs – three Anglo-Canadians from Montreal ridings and the MP for Yukon – voted in favour. Significantly, an overwhelming majority of Anglo-Canadian MPs (104 to 43) voted in favour of bilingual currency. Opposition members who had accused the "minority" of imposing its will on the "majority" were forced to eat crow.[161] The unanimous Liberal vote was no small feat, considering that party discipline was not as rigid as it is today, and given that much of the party's base was in western Canada. King was especially proud of his western MPs: "Our party voted as a unit.... This I think was a real achievement, having regard to the size of the party and what one knows of the efforts to defeat Liberal candidates in Saskatchewan and elsewhere in previous elections on the bilingual

---

[158] *Ibid*.
[159] *Ibid*. The CCF'ers who voted for bilingual currency were Woodsworth, Taylor and Heaps, and the Socreds who voted for it were Jaques, Hayhurst, Mitchel, Landeryou, Quelch, Elliott and René Pelletier. The CCF and Social Credit had earlier proposed bills that solely had the word "Canada" and used numerals only.
[160] Émile Benoit, "Le gouvernement King le fait voter," *Le Devoir*, 17 June 1936, p.7.
[161] "Bilingual Bank Notes Approved by Vote 160-43," *Globe*, 17 June 1936, p.1.

issue."[162] The following year, in 1937, the Bank of Canada issued a new, universal and bilingual series of currency, and the coins and bills have been bilingual ever since.[163]

On balance, the public appeared supportive of the change. This was reflected not only by the parliamentary vote, but also by the fact that most English-language newspapers were either supportive or at least neutral on the issue, while the French-language press certainly welcomed the change.[164] If "money talks," then what Canada's currency said about the country was that it was a nation of two languages.

The achievement of bilingual stamps and currency became a particular point of pride for some Francophones, and generated optimism that federal public services, jobs, and Anglo-Canadian attitudes generally were truly opening up to them.[165] Still, others remained skeptical.[166] At the very least, it was an important symbolic measure against the image of Canada as an English-only country with a begrudgingly recognized, territorially confined Francophone Quebec. Every Canadian, from every province and territory, from

---

[162] WLMK Diaries, 16 June 1936.

[163] Coins also switched that year from the unilingual "one cent," "five cents," etc., to "1 cent," "5 cents," and so forth. Canadian Heritage, "History of Bilingualism in Canada"; Bank of Canada, "1937 Series" (n.d.), accessed 26 September 2011, http://www.bankofcanada.ca/banknotes/bank-note-series/past-series/1937-series/.

[164] Bank of Canada, *Art and Design of Canadian Bank Notes*, p.37.

[165] Michel Brunet, for instance, who would have been ten years old and nineteen years old when bilingual stamps and currency were introduced, remembered these as positive measures, and connected them to broader developments in cross-cultural relations during the period: "Dans le domaine fédéral, le bilinguisme réalisa de grands progrès. Les Canadiens, pour lesquels les luttes linguistiques ont toujours revêtu une grande importance, avaient obtenu les timbres-poste et la monnaie bilingues. La *Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission* établit un réseau français au bénéfice de la population du Québec. L'anti-impérialisme avait perdu de son ancienne intensité. Canadiens et *Canadians* étaient unis par l'isolationnisme nord-américain. Le Statut de Westminster fit croire aux Canadiens français que le pays était à la veille de se retirer de l'empire britannique." Brunet, *La présence anglaise*, pp.261-262. See also Camille Roy, *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, p.11.

[166] As André Laurendeau glibly explained in late 1940, "if an Acadian, or a French Canadian in Edmonton can theoretically obtain bilingual bank notes, he owes it not to some nebulous Article 133, nor to the promises of a sympathetic Governor-General, but to the existence in Quebec of three million farmers and labourers all capable of voting." In Cook and Behiels, *The Essential Laurendeau* (Toronto: Copp Clarke, 1976), p.62.

coast-to-coast-to-coast, would now use bilingual stamps and bilingual currency in their day-to-day lives.

Chapter VIII: THE 'FRENCH KISS' – ANGLO-CANADIANS ENCOUNTER THE 'OTHER' THROUGH POPULAR CULTURE

During the interwar period, the Anglo-Canadian public that historian George Wrong had been so anxious to lift out of ignorance was given greater exposure to Canada's French fact and to the idea of a more inclusive patriotism. As mediums of popular culture changed, Anglo-Canadian perceptions of French Canada became informed by a large variety of "novels, films, school readers, newspaper or magazine articles and [tourism] guidebooks."[1] Overall, these media began to project a more positive (if at times stereotypical) image of French-Canadian society for Anglo-Canadian consumption. French Canadians, too, gained greater access to 'Anglo' culture. Developments in sport and in tourism also provided a means for more interaction between the two solitudes.

Sport

After the Great War, Canada experienced a proliferation of popular professional spectator sports, accompanied by the establishment of more formalized competitive leagues and the construction of large stadiums, arenas and other related facilities. At a time when spectator sports could only be experienced live and in person – television did not yet exist, popular sports radio broadcasting would not really take off until the 1930s, and newspaper reports had to be read the day after an event – attendance at such events was often strong.[2] In Montreal, especially, spectator sports like hockey, football,

[1] Nicole Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.468.
[2] Tourist material included images of full baseball, hockey, and racetrack stadiums. See, for example, Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World* (Montreal: 1937), LAC, Amicus no. 2724413, pp.15, 26-27; Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec"* (Québec:

horseracing, boxing and baseball provided the Anglo- and French-Canadian masses with a forum for generally positive interaction, as supporters from both cultural-linguistic communities gathered to cheer on teams and competitors representing their city. Hockey, baseball and football were considered "the triumvirate of mass and exhibitional – or spectacle – sports of Quebec."[3] It was in part a product of an Americanization of Canadian culture that took hold during the interwar period that also included American consumer goods, popular literature and cinema.[4]

In addition to attending these sports, more and more Anglo- and French Canadians were beginning to play them as well. "There are few forms of amusement to be found anywhere which are not to be found here," wrote sports observer Edwin P. Conklin in 1931, "games, sports, recreations – whatever one likes to do is done in Quebec."[5] Conklin celebrated French Canadians' proclivity for sport and physical activity. The sport and leisure influences of both communities had been reciprocal. British immigrants to Canada, especially Quebec, Conklin explained, both "introduced some of the sports and pleasures of their home land, and took up with interest the pleasures of the French."[6] This was the case, for instance, with the winter carnivals and competitions in Ottawa, Montreal and, most notably, Quebec City. The skating, snowshoeing, tobogganing, sleigh riding, skiing, historical pageantry and general revelry,

---

1939), Amicus no. 12748967; Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal* (Montreal: 1940), Amicus no. 12363658, p.16.

[3] Edwin P. Conklin, "Sports," in Wood, William, ed. et al., *The Storied Province of Quebec: Past* and *Present*, Volume II (Toronto: Dominion Publishing Company, Ltd., 1931), p.1022.

[4] "Aux États-Unis, par voie d'un contact incessant par la finance, le commerce, le voyage, le cinéma, le livre, le journal et le sport, le Canadien a emprunté ... le goût de l'existence standard et confortable." Lanctot, *Le Canada*, pp.198-199. Others, notably those in the Groulx camp, were more alarmist when it came to this perceived Americanization: "Le film, le magazine, la mode, la presse en sont les agents multiples qui altèrent nos moeurs. La démoralisation est quelque chose d'humain, semblable sous toutes les latitudes." Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, p.114.

[5] Conklin, "Sports," p.1026.

[6] French Canadians proved keen on adopting many Anglo-Saxon sports: "The French Canadian has proved himself an adept in present day sports, quick to learn and skilled in play." *Ibid*. p.1018.

Conklin continued, had made this "French-English society the most charming brotherhood that ever shook hands with the past."[7] In Quebec, sports and recreation had become a unifying force:

> Quebeckers know how to make the most of their seasons and their pleasures; they take the time needed for recreation and play long and hard at the thing which appeals. It is the French-Canadian tradition to make merry; the British are world known for their love of sports. The long continued association of the two national strains has made for a liking of action, competition, enjoyment of sports indoors and out which has won the admiration of the visitor and added greatly to the health and enjoyment of life.[8]

By playing and cheering together, went the hope, perhaps Anglo- and French Canadians could also learn to live together.

No other sport was more emblematic of the interwar convergence of Anglo- and French-Canadian sports interests than baseball. Baseball had begun to make headway in English-speaking Canada around the turn of the century, and grew in popularity among French Canadians after the war. From schoolboys to politicians, by the late 1920s baseball had become as popular among French Canadians as it had among Anglo-Canadians.[9] Conklin:

> Baseball has spread into all parts of the country, and one of the most interesting of sights to an English-speaking newcomer, is a group of French-Canadian boys in the long frocked uniforms of their school, playing baseball. The American terms have been carried over unchanged, and some of the slang expressions as well, but the chatter, without which this game cannot be played, is all in French, and the reactions to the play are typically French-Canadian.[10]

This was in part the result of more Franco-Americans playing the game (descendants of French-Canadian emigrants), many of whom ended up on Canadian teams at their own

---

[7] *Ibid*. p.1019.
[8] *Ibid*., p.1018.
[9] Maurice Duplessis, for instance, was a long-time fan. Robert Rumilly, *Maurice Duplessis et son Temps, Tome II, 1944-1959* (Montréal: Fides, 1973), p.496.
[10] Conklin, "Sports," p.1026.

request. Other French Canadians who had played in English-speaking Canada and in the US also helped bring the game back to their home province.[11] Quebec in the 1920s and '30s and Montreal especially were home to professional and semi-professional teams that played in leagues centred variously in Ontario, Quebec, the Maritimes and the northeastern US. The numerous local players, both French- and Anglo-Canadian, were popular among fans, including the likes of Rosaire Larivière, Louis Miller, Rodolphe Papineau, Mac Silver, Pamphile Yvon, Ray Cutter, Frank Delisle and Arthur Mullen. A few hockey players also made the transition to baseball, including Howie Morenz and Babe Siebert, further contributing to its popularity.[12] The Eastern Canadian leagues developed a reputation of greater cultural openness for including Black players on their squads and even an all-Black team headed by Chappie Johnson from the American Negro League. The subsequent rise in quality of play helped make baseball one of the biggest draws for spectator sports in Montreal by 1927, when attendance reached as many as 3500.[13]

Baseball in Quebec received its biggest boost in 1928, when Montreal completed construction of a brand new baseball stadium covering an entire city block between Delorimier Avenue, Ontario Street, Parthenais Street and Larivière Street, in predominantly French-speaking East Montreal. It was, the provincial government boasted, "the largest and most expensive baseball stadium of any minor league city on the

---

[11] See *Spalding Official Baseball Guide, Canadian Edition, 1925* (Montreal: Canadian Sports Publishing Co., 1925), online at Society for American Baseball Research, accessed 3 October 2012, http://quebec.sabr.org/1920.htm; Christian Trudeau, "Le baseball à Montréal en 1927," Society for American Baseball Research (2007), accessed 3 October 2012, http://quebec.sabr.org/1920.htm.
[12] Several Franco-Americans also joined Canadian teams. See Christian Trudeau, "Le baseball à Montréal en 1927."
[13] *Ibid*.

continent."[14] The new stadium allowed for the resurrection of the Montreal Royals (defunct since before the end of the war). Beginning in 1928, the Royals played in the Double-AA International League, "one of the senior leagues on the continent," against teams from Toronto and the northeastern US.[15] With a seating capacity of 23,600 and tickets costing as little as 85¢, attendance was made accessible to all variety of Montrealers.[16] The resurrection of the Royals had begun as a joint venture between American businessman George Stallings, affluent Montreal stockbroker J. Ernest Savard, and Athanase David, the provincial Liberal Cabinet member, sports aficionado and, from 1921, President of the Montreal Canadiens hockey club. The trio secured the support of a number of other French-Canadian investors, including Charles Trudeau, father of Pierre Trudeau.[17] While several of the semi-professional teams were forced to fold with the onset of the Great Depression, the Montreal Royals' strong fan-base allowed it to survive. The creation of the Ligue Provinciale in 1935 further strengthened interest among French Canadians – more teams meant more opportunity for local athletes to play and profit from their skills.[18]

Baseball was not alone among the typically 'Anglo' sports that became more popular among French Canadians during the interwar years. Croquet and racket sports, including tennis, for instance, developed "a strong hold upon the affections of the French

[14] Province of Quebec Tourist Association, "How to Visit Montreal, 'The Gate-Way City' to Old France in North America, 'The Playground of the North,'" Official Guide (Montreal, 1928), LAC, Amicus no. 2630143, p.iv.
[15] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, p.16.
[16] Province of Quebec Tourist Association, "How to Visit Montreal," pp.iv, 73.
[17] See William Brown, *Baseball's Fabulous Montreal Royals: The Minor League Team That Made Major League History* (Montreal: R. Davies, 1996).
[18] David Simons, "The Man Behind the Scene," Society for American Baseball Research (2007), accessed 3 October 2012, http://quebec.sabr.org/1930.htm.

Canadian."[19] Conklin boasted that a higher proportion of people played croquet in Quebec than anywhere else in North America. As for tennis: "If the English introduced the game in Quebec, the French Canadian was prompt to take it up and, at the present time quite outnumber the players of English descent."[20] In addition to its recreational popularity, tennis enjoyed a strong reputation as a spectator sport, with Montreal contributing players to the Canadian team to compete for the Davis Cup, "the high honour in world tennis."[21] Skiing, both in terms of recreation and formal competitions, also became highly popular with both Anglo-Canadians and French Canadians after the war, with the development of ski hills across Quebec. Golf, too, grew in popularity, with the expansion of courses throughout the province and especially around Montreal. To be sure, certain clubs remained exclusive and culturally segregated, but the public links were regularly busy with both Anglo- and French Canadians.[22] There were signs that even the sport of curling, ever the cultural preserve of British Canada, had begun to attract a few French-Canadian participants. By the late 1920s, a dozen curling clubs throughout Quebec and Eastern Ontario had French Canadians serving on their executives. Conklin cheekily speculated on the historical French-Canadian origins of the sport: "The claim is made that blocks of wood with bent handles were skittered across the ice after the fashion of curling, some time before 1760, but this is surely a heresy!"[23]

Other spectator sports grew in popularity. In addition to hosting eighty-four baseball games every year, the new baseball stadium also hosted "a series of high class

[19] Conklin, "Sports," p.1026.
[20] *Ibid*.
[21] Conklin, "Sports," p.1026.
[22] *Ibid*., pp.1021, 1029.
[23] *Ibid*., p.1018, 1024-1025.

boxing shows," including several championship bouts.[24] By the mid-1920s, Montreal boasted four different racetracks.[25] "You'll have lots of fun at any of the race tracks in Montréal, and there are a number, all in attractive settings," patrons were promised in the promotional material of the day. "The racing horses, the laughing crowds and a bright blue sky will make a day at the races a day of real pleasure."[26] Football and rugby, played primarily at the varsity level, also drew large crowds, especially at McGill.[27]

In the winter, hockey was becoming an increasingly popular spectator sport. The formation of a more stable top-tier professional hockey league had only occurred in late 1917, with the establishment of the National Hockey League. In 1920, the new Mount Royal Arena was completed, with a capacity for 6,000. New technologies in the mechanical freezing of ice – an imported American innovation[28] – allowed for the construction of even larger and improved venues. In 1924, the Montreal Forum was completed, with an initial seating capacity of nearly ten thousand. It hosted both of the city's NHL teams, the Montreal Maroons and the Montreal Canadiens, and regularly drew large crowds.[29] In Ottawa, meanwhile, both Anglophones and Francophones cheered on the Senators hockey club against rivals Toronto and Montreal, with their team winning a string of Stanley Cups in the 1920s.[30] The sport rapidly professionalized and

---

[24] Province of Quebec Tourist Association, "How to Visit Montreal," pp.iv, p.73.
[25] Montreal Historical Guides Association, "How to Visit Montreal: Old France in North America, the Playground of the North," Official Tourist Map (Montreal, 1920), LAC, Amicus no. 2685055.
[26] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, p.16.
[27] See Conklin, "Sports," p.1027.
[28] See *Ibid*., p.1023.
[29] See Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, p.19.
Maroons fans were primarily Anglo-Canadian while Canadiens fans were typically French-Canadian, creating an at times intense rivalry, but the arena and both teams were backed by the same ownership group. Ultimately, the English/French rivalry proved inadequate to support two opposing teams. The Maroons folded in 1938 and their legacy and fan base were gradually inherited by the Canadiens, who were now the team of all Montrealers. See William Brown, *The Montreal Maroons: the Forgotten Stanley Cup Champions* (Montreal: Véhicule Press, 1999), ch.1.
[30] "Ottawa a de bonnes chances d'augmenter son fort avantage: Les sénateurs envahissent Toronto, jeudi

the quality of the game increased as investors bought teams and provided the funds necessary to acquire the best players, especially from Ontario and Quebec. By now, hockey had achieved a "remarkable popularity" – during the 1930-1931 season alone, the NHL's ten clubs, including its four Canadian teams, had attracted over a million spectators.[31] Increased radio broadcasts of professional sports also contributed to their rise in popularity, including hockey. Hockey broadcasts had begun as early as 1923. The first broadcast of a Stanley Cup game on a radio network came in March 1924, covering the final game between the Montreal Canadiens and Ottawa Senators, on CNR radio. By 1931-1932, hockey games had become a regular feature of radio broadcasts on a number of stations.[32]

New technologies also made it possible for more people to partake in skating. The growth of towns and cities and the municipal water infrastructure that came with it "made it possible to flood artificial ice rinks." This allowed skating to become "more than an incidental pleasure on streams and ponds during the short periods before the ice was buried under its load of snow." By the late 1920s, skating was "second nature to a Quebecker."[33] The new popularity of hockey and skating also allowed for more elaborate winter carnivals that "characterized the pleasures of the French Régime."[34] Amateur hockey soon began to flourish. The primary and secondary schools established their own leagues, and the Université de Montréal and McGill regularly assembled teams that dominated at the college level.[35] Young people were becoming more implicated in

---

soir – le Canadien a besoin de sécouer sa torpeur," *Le Droit*, 24 novembre 1926, p.2.
[31] Conklin, "Sports," p.1023.
[32] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, pp.85-86.
[33] Conklin, "Sports," p.1022.
[34] *Ibid*.
[35] *Ibid*., p.1023.

organized sport generally. In the mid-1930s, Anglo-Canadian and French-Canadian youth advocates joined forces to lobby for greater access to recreational and sports facilities.[36]

The increasing popularity of spectator sports in Canada was in part the product of the increased Americanization of Canadian culture, both among Anglophones and Francophones. Canadian teams sprung up after the Great War as part of larger international leagues, most noticeably with the more popular sports of hockey and baseball. Canadian spectators watched American athletes play on their teams alongside Canadian players, while Canadian sports fans could also follow their favourite Canadian players who had signed with American teams. Cultural Americanization came in several forms beyond sports.[37] Moreover, it was in part the product of "the internationalization of culture made possible by innovations in travel and communication systems," and of the close proximity and sheer volume of American cultural production.[38] "'Life was much Americanized, and the public gaze was concentrated on New York rather than on Europe, as the source of everything worth considering in art, fashion, and literature,'" recalled Mark Hambourg in 1931, a British pianist who toured Canada shortly before and after the

---

[36] LAC, Frank and Libbie Park fonds, Canadian Youth Congress, 1935-1940 (hereafter referred to as CYC fonds), MG31-K9, Vol 7, file 128A, "Declaration of rights of Canadian youth / Déclaration des droits de la jeunesse canadienne," Ottawa, May 1936 (Toronto: Canadian Youth Congress Continuations Committee, 1936), p.6.

[37] It did not entail the complete abandonment of British cultural norms, but Americanization occured all the same. Maria Tippett provides several examples, from drama, dance, musical and literary clubs that were "off-shoots" of similar associations in the US, to magazines and journals that reflected ideas and topics of concern in both American and British publications. See Tippet, *Making Culture*, p.130. Either way, it was clear that the pendulum of cultural influence was beginning to swing southward.

As much might be said of the cultural Americanization occuring in French Canada: "[Le Québec] connaît aussi une 'américanisation' par ses importations de biens, de services et de formules de connsommation. Des parcs d'attractions – le Sohmer, le Dominion, le Riverside – aux spectacles de burlesque en passant par le baseball, le jazz et même l'art lyrique, le loisir américain commence à s'imposer au Québec comme ailleurs, surtout après la Première Guerre mondiale. Au temps des 'vues animées parlantes,' les 'majors' étatsuniens contrôlent le parc des salles de cinéma à Montréal et les projections commerciales déroulent des bonbines de films produits à plus de 95% à Hollywood." Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1896-1929*, p.256.

[38] Tippett, *Making Culture*, p.127.

Great War.[39] Like athletes, Canadian playwrights, authors, musicians and painters also travelled to the United States to achieve greater exposure and a means of living. They returned to Canada informed by their exposure to the culture of the US. American performers and artists also toured Canada in increasing numbers, including choirs, individual vocalists and musicians, orchestras, and actors.[40] The American cultural influence could also be felt increasingly through radio and film.[41] To be sure, this influence was a source of anxiety among Anglo- and French-Canadian intellectuals alike. Some, however, welcomed the new cosmopolitanism it engendered: "'The days of isolation have passed," announced Norman McLean Rogers in *The Canadian Forum* in 1932.[42]

Whether or not Americanization of Canadian culture between the World Wars was a positive or negative development is not of interest here so much as its implications for Anglo-/French-Canadian relations. "[A]s nationalism became more self-conscious," explained Frank Underhill in 1940, "more and more Canadians began to realize that socially and culturally they resembled Americans."[43] Moreover, Americanization paradoxically served to create more similarities between the respective *popular* cultures of Anglo- and French Canada. For Anglo-Canadians, it reinforced the slow development of a more North American outlook.[44] For French Canadians, it challenged cultural-

---

[39] In Maria Tippett, *The Making of English-Canadian Culture, 1900-1939: The External Influences* (Toronto: Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies Lecture Series, 1988), p.3.
[40] Tippett, *Making Culture*, p.128.
[41] See Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1896-1929*, p.256; Pierre Berton, *Hollywood's Canada: the Americanization of Our National Image* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975).
[42] In Tippett, *The Making of English-Canadian Culture, 1900-1939,* p.3.
[43] Frank Underhill, "North American Front," *The Canadian Forum*, September 1940, in Granatstein and Stevens, eds., *Forum: Canadian life and Letters*, pp.192-193.
[44] "What most of all united [us] with the Americans and distinguished [us] from everybody else was the common North American standard of living. True, the citizens of Ontario did not ... consume quite as many gallons of ice cream..., but essentially it was a common standard of living." *Ibid*.

linguistic insularity and provided greater exposure to the English language, and to Anglo-Saxon cultural norms.[45] Indeed, For French-Canadian moderates, Confederation became all the more worthwhile as a common front against the combined cultural, economic, and even political influence of the United States.[46] Similarly, Anglo-Canadians realized that, "to remain distinct from the Americans," they would have to adopt "a dynamic native Canadianism" and forego "the vestigial remains of British elements in Canadian life."[47] Together, Canadians could offer an alternative model for the North American experience.

Popular literature, language acquisition, and film

English-speaking Canadians learned an idealized version of French-Canadian society from popular literature and film.[48] Classics set in historical French-Canadian society like William Kirby's *The Golden Dog* (1877) achieved newfound popularity in the interwar years, while new novels like Louis Hémon's *Maria Chapdelaine* (1913),

---

[45] *L'Action française*'s anxiety over these developments spoke to the degree to which Americanization pervaded French-Canadian culture. In 1924 the journal mounted its own inquiry of sorts into the process of Americanization, "'[dites] l'annexion morale, mentale économique du Canada et du Canada français.'" Groulx denounced "'l'effroyable pourriture de son théâtre, le débraillé de ses magazines, le dévergondage de ses journaux monstres et de ses *tabloïds*.'" Groulx was especially fearful of American cinema, "'catéchisme de déformation populaire'" and "'corrupteur'" of the young. In Yvan Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1896-1929*, pp.150-151.

Gustave Lanctot, by contrast, was prepared to deal with the subject more evenhandedly. See Gustave Lanctot, *Les Canadiens français et leurs voisins du Sud* (Montreal: Bernard Valiquette, 1941), p.298.

[46] Avoiding annexation was "un des principaux argument des partisans de la Confédération." Lanctot, *Les Canadiens français et leurs voisins du Sud*, p.229.

[47] Frank Underhill, "North American Front," pp.192-193.

[48] While French Canadians were not necessarily reading more about Anglo-Canada, their popular literature was becoming more Americanized. This doubtless made some readers less hostile to Anglophone culture and influences overall. Groulx-school nationalistes were certainly frustrated by the popularity of such literature: "On ne lit pas suffisamment de livres [nationalistes] au Québec. Les *comics* dispersent et distraient tellement l'esprit de nos gens qu'ils n'ont plus le goût ni le loisir de réfléchir. Le temps passe et nous faisons fi de nos principales planches de salut: la culture française, la culture générale." Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, p.197.

which later appeared as a film, garnered significant attention.[49] *Maria Chapdelaine* won praise in French-Canadian circles as well.[50] Andrew Macphail, the editor for *University Magazine*, and William Hume Blake, a lawyer from Toronto, both independently translated the work for Anglo-Canadian consumption. Communicating French-Canadian culture to British Canadians was important for both Macphail and Blake because they "envisaged Quebec as a solid anchor of a sane conservatism that was more resistant to the millennial enthusiasms, especially prohibition, than other parts of the country."[51] Hume Wrong, George Wrong's son and an influential diplomat within External Affairs, remarked in 1925 that the book "'had a tremendous vogue here a couple of years ago, and there is a great deal of truth in it.'"[52] Other influential popular novels at the time included Gilbert Parker's *The Battle of the Strong* (1898), Jean M. McIlwraith's *A Diana of Quebec* (1912), Kenneth A. Roberts's *Arundel* (1930), Willa Cather's *Shadows on the Rock* (1931), and Ralph Connor's *The Rock and the River* (1931). Together, these novels portrayed French-Canadian society as static and rural, steeped in history and tradition, and devoted to its Catholic religion. It was a romantic portrayal that appealed to anti-modern sentiments at a time of industrialization, urbanization, and alienation through the mechanization of labour. Stories set in New France emphasized both the struggle for survival of the common people and the heroism of historic civic and religious leaders.[53]

There were also prominent opinion pieces and other non-fiction promoting understanding, reconciliation and accommodation, notably the works by Moore, Morley,

---

[49] Lorne Pierce, *An Outline of Canadian Literature (French and English)* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1927), pp.29. See also Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," pp.468, 471; Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, p.46.
[50] Roy, "L'Appel de la race," p.274; Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, p.197.
[51] Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, pp.17-18.
[52] In *Ibid*., p.18.
[53] See Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," pp.468, 471.

and Hawkes. While those three important authors focused on the intellectual debate and provided thoughtful critiques of British-Canadian attitudes in particular, other popular non-fiction works written specifically for public consumption endeavoured to explain the many attractions of French-Canadian culture to the Anglo-Canadian middle class. By the late 1930s, these books reflected a greater appreciation among mainstream authors for Canadian diversity, and an appetite among Anglo-Canadians for literature on French Canada.[54] Lorne Pierce explained Anglo-Canadians' new interest in French Canada:

> French speaking Canadians have urged that English Canadians should understand their interests and needs. There is a genuine wish in English speaking Canada to do that very thing. As a matter of fact, English-speaking Canadians have made pilgrimages to Quebec for pleasure or for study in an unbroken stream.... Artists have always sought out Quebec as a very haven of delight. Our writers have described the French and their Province in a library of books. Many French Canadian works have been translated into English. .... A good many subscribe to French papers in English speaking Canada.... In fact there are large numbers of English Canadians who speak and write about French Canada with genuine good will and even affection, and have been doing so for years.[55]

Frank Oliver Call, from Bishop's University, for instance, produced books for the popular *Spell* series promoting tourism to Quebec and New Brunswick in the early 1930s, entitled *The Spell of French Canada* and *The Spell of Acadia* (1932). Call collaborated with the University of Ottawa's C.M. Barbeau, an anthropologist, E.Z. Massicotte from the Montreal Archives, L.R. de Lormier from the Université de Montréal, and William Wood, among others, to complete the books. Call was enraptured by French-Canadian and Acadian history, folk culture and rural life. He was convinced that his English-speaking audience would be equally drawn to these societies. He encouraged potential visitors to make a "pilgrimage," and to imagine themselves in ancient New France as

[54] Jean-Charlemagne Bracq's *The Evolution of French Canada* (1924), for instance, first appeared in English before it was translated as *L'évolution du Canada français* (1927).
[55] Pierce, *An Outline of Canadian Literature*, p.46.

they visited such sites as Old Montreal, Verchères, the "country of Maria Chapdelaine," and to take in the winter festivals, folklore and folk songs of the St. Lawrence Valley.[56]

In the 1930s, Wilfred Bovey published several editions of *Canadien: a study of the French Canadians*, and *The French Canadians Today: A People on the March*, including a French-language edition in 1936. "What are these French Canadians?" he asked prospective readers. "Are they a people, or only a part of a people?" Bovey attempted to counter Anglo-Canadian perceptions of French-Canadian disloyalty and fascistic sympathies, explaining that Quebec was home to a diverse and vibrant political culture, education system, and social reconstruction movement. He attempted to demystify the language question and Quebec's Church/State relationship by explaining it in terms that Protestant Anglo-Canadians could understand and in the context of the French-Canadian perspective.[57]

In 1931, William Wood co-edited a four-volume work with William Henry Atherton and Edwin P. Conklin entitled *The Storied Province of Quebec: Past* and *Present*. The project was made possible by the collaboration of a long list of French-Canadian authors and political figures, including Premier Louis Alexandre Taschereau, Camille Roy, Thomas Chapais, George Garneau, and Athanase David.[58] Like other works of the time, the book embraced the heroes of French-Canadian history: Dollard-des-

---

[56] Frank Oliver Call, *The Spell of French Canada* (Boston: L.C. Page & Co., 1932), p.1.
[57] Wilfrid Bovey, *The French Canadians Today: A People on the March* (Toronto: J.M. Dent, 1938), sleeve. See also Wilfrid Bovey, *Canadien: a study of the French Canadians* (Toronto: J.M. Dent, 1933), which was reprinted at least twice.
[58] William Wood, ed., et al., *The Storied Province of Quebec: Past* and *Present*, Volume I (Toronto: Dominion Publishing Company, Ltd., 1931), Table of Contents, p.v. Several prominent Anglo-Canadians contributed, including Canon Scott and Sir Arthur Currie.

Ormeaux had provided the "Canadian Thermopylae" in 1660, Frontenac had been "Victorious" in his defiance of the New England invaders, and Montcalm was a "Hero."[59]

That the book covered Quebec's past *and* present spoke to the authors' desire that readers learn not just a nostalgic version of Quebec history, but also its more recent history and modern economic, industrial and cultural development. The section covering 1867-1927 depicted Quebec as a "growing modern province," and additional sections explained the role and structure of government, the Church, journalism, banking, medicine, intellectual life, and popular culture, among other things. The work also celebrated the organization and coexistence of Catholic and Protestant school systems. The volume was published in Ontario and included chapters on "Game and Fly Fishing," "Sports," and "Unique Quebec" for the potential tourist.[60]

The Storied Province of Quebec also celebrated the province's historical and modern bilingualism and biculturalism. The Legislative Assembly was described as "Bi-Lingual, Bi-Centric, Harmonisable," and potential visitors were told that they would be comfortable in either French or English while in the province.[61] The chapter on "Anglo-French Quebec," written by Wood himself, extolled the virtues of mutual understanding and accommodation. The authors took heart in the increasing recognition of Montreal, Quebec, and Canada's bicultural nature:

> Happily, most happily, the Anglo-French-Canadian discords of the past were greater than any of the present are; and if, as all good-willing people of both races hope, the mutual understanding of each other's idiosyncrasies should go on gaining ground then there is every reason to believe that in this bilingual city, as in the Province and Dominion, there will be a completing harmony between these two very diverse parts of the All-Canadian whole.

---

[59] *Ibid*., pp.46, 57, 66.
[60] *Ibid.*, pp.vii-xii.
[61] The book also noted that "A quick and sympathetic ear will note that the French Canadians speak a quite good French." *Ibid*., p.131.

Wood and his colleagues celebrated the differences between the two communities, but also the shared cultural and historical experiences that, hopefully, would unite them:

> However wrong it is to maximise the inborn and acquired diversities between the French and English, it is equally wrong to minimize them. We should remember the common human qualities of both, the many centuries of intercourse between – and influence on – each other's life in Europe, as well as the several generations of personal contact here in Canada, where both have varied from the same environment, and both are varying still.[62]

The authors reminded their audience that "true harmony between such diverse parts" required tolerance and understanding: "we should equally remember how differently the same objectives look from French and English points of view."[63]

E.C. Woodley's popular history piece, *Canada's Romantic Heritage* (1940), was also a clear indication of the extent to which the new narrative had become more commonplace. Woodley took inspiration from popular historical fiction like *Maria Chapdelaine*, and from the works of previous historians, like Francis Parkman, publications by the Champlain Society, Dollier de Casson's *History of Montreal*, and, notably, George Wrong's two-volume *The Rise and Fall of New France*. Woodley himself pointed out that his book had been made possible by the improved archival collections at Quebec City and Ottawa.[64]

Woodley's work was very much as its title suggested: a romantic portrayal of New France, written in a more flourishing style than the scholarly works of professional historians like Wrong and Burt. What is interesting about Woodley's popular history is its proud and unapologetic appropriation of the heritage of New France as a central part of

---

[62] *Ibid*., p.131,
[63] *Ibid*., p.131,
[64] E.C. Woodley, *Canada's Romantic Heritage. The Story of New France* (Toronto: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1940), preface.

all Canadians' heritage. For the author, this exciting story of heroes and heroines compensated for Canada's (apparently) dull post-Conquest history:

> The French had written a notable chapter in the history of the New World, containing the record of countless deeds of heroism and valour done by hardy pioneers, dauntless priests, bold adventurers and brave soldiers. .... The pages of a new chapter [after the Conquest] tell an equally great, if very different, story, less romantic and more matter-of-fact. But as we read the record of Canada's amazing development under the British Crown which is still being written, there may come to us at times the brave vision of those earlier days when the lilied flag of the Bourbons floated proudly above the heights of Quebec and over far-scattered French forts from Hudson's Bay to the Gulf of Mexico. The lilies have faded, but the fragrance of brave deeds still remains.[65]

Woodley's treatment of some of the military heroes of New France who had frustrated British aspirations in North America spoke to the extent to which the author had embraced these men as Canadian heroes. For example, Woodley dedicated two full chapters to Frontenac's brave resistance to invasion by a British fleet out of Boston that had included the forbearers of the Loyalists (who in turn would become the ancestral 'heroes' of British Canadians). The irony in this was completely lost on Woodley, and understandably so: in 1690, Frontenac, and no Bostonian, was the 'Canadian,' and so it was Frontenac's historical legacy that belonged to all Canadians as their historical inheritance, and it was his legacy that was to be celebrated. If fate had been different, and if the British expedition of 1690 had succeeded, they too would doubtless have been celebrated as the ancestral 'heroes' alongside Frontenac, much as both Montcalm and Wolfe had become celebrated 'co-heroes' in the preferred Anglo-Canadian historical narrative. Equally interesting was Woodley's treatment of Pierre le Moyne d'Iberville, whom Woodley called the "Paladin" of New France. D'Iberville received an entire chapter that praised his adventures and exploits in the name of the French Crown. In

[65] *Ibid*., pp.264-265.

Woodley's portrayal, the French hero d'Iberville was a hero for all Canadians – never mind his brutal campaign of destruction among British settlers in Newfoundland and New England.

Moreover, a slower rate of immigration in the 1920s as compared to the pre-war peak and even slower rates in the 1930s had helped temper some Anglo-Canadian apprehensions over the diversity principle (so long as the population continued to at least 'look' European).[66] Indeed, the decline of British immigration in particular meant that immigration policy toward eastern and southern Europeans would have to be relaxed out of economic necessity, especially in the '20s. Meanwhile, some native-born Canadians had grown more confident in immigrants' abilities to integrate into the larger society. "Since assimilation was occurring," explains Howard Palmer, "nativist fears were unwarranted. Indeed, immigrants would make some valuable cultural contributions to Canada during the process of assimilation."[67] The population had become increasingly multi-ethnic – by 1931, 18% was of neither British nor French extraction – and there was a growing acceptance of this reality. The coinciding decline of British-Canadian ethnic nationalism during the interwar period allowed for greater acceptance of the new demographic reality.[68] Several observers, like influential Winnipeg newspaperman John W. Dafoe and constitutional lawyer and autonomist J.S. Ewart, concluded that it was simply unrealistic to expect immigrants to have the same sense of loyalty to Britain –

---

[66] See Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, pp.iii.

[67] Howard Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts: Anglo-Canadian Views of Multiculturalism in the Twentieth Century," in Canadian Consultative Council of Multiculturalism, *Multiculturalism as State Policy* (Ottawa: Department of Canadian Heritage, 1976), p.181.

[68] Palmer refers to the "declining status of things British as Canadians moved toward a North-American-based nationalism which did not include loyalty to the British Empire as its primary article of faith." Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts," p.181.

loyalty to Canada, more so than the Empire, was necessary for national unity.[69] The same logic could be extended to French Canadians.

Still, many people remained apprehensive over the growth of Canada's Ethno-Cultural communities. Interestingly, this drove some Anglo-Canadians to identify more closely with other 'native-born' Canadians, namely French Canadians. As Arthur Lower confided in one racist outburst to a colleague during the 1930s, "'French Canadians seem a good deal more my own people than do Japs or Jews (at least many Jews).'"[70] Moreover, the results of the 1931 and 1941 censuses that showed French-Canadian gains in relation to British-Canadian numbers east of Manitoba did not result in the type of anti-French vitriol that had followed the release of earlier censuses. Clearly, something was changing, and it was reflected in the popular literature.

Simply put, the notion that pluralism and national unity were mutually exclusive had lost much of its salience among popular Anglo-Canadian authors. Moreover, advocates of pluralism "believed that recognition of the cultural contributions of non-Anglo-Saxon groups would heighten the groups' feeling that they belonged to Canada and thus strengthen Canadian unity."[71] Racism and discrimination certainly did not disappear. Indeed, support for multiculturalism in the 1930s was in part a reaction against the extremist rhetoric of fascists and racists like the KKK, whose extremism was, in turn, an expression of their anxiety over the decline of British Canada.[72] By the 1930s, then, the rhetoric of these Anglo-Saxon conformity types had become something of an

---

[69] *Ibid*., p.182.
[70] In Wright, *The Professionalization of History*, p.96.
[71] Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts," p.184.
[72] *Ibid*; James M. Pitsula, *Keeping Canada British: the Ku Klux Klan in 1920s Saskatchewan* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2013), pp.1; Robin Martin, *Shades of Right: Nativist and Fascist Politics in Canada, 1920-1940* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), pp.28.

embarrassment for moderate liberals. Prominent advocates of multiculturalism like John Murray Gibbon and Watson Kirkconnell, for instance, "were influenced by a liberalism which rejected the assumptions of Anglo-Saxon superiority." It was the distinct cultures of the country's many peoples that made Canada interesting and gave it its character. Canadians must "'save for our country every previous element of individuality that is available,'" wrote Kirkconnell. A set of shared institutions and values, Gibbon explained, would be the binding glue that kept the country's diverse peoples together.[73]

Perhaps the best example of a book that reflected the appreciation of some mainstream authors by the late 1930s for Canadian diversity was John Murray Gibbon's *Canadian Mosaic: The Making of a Northern Nation* (1938). Gibbon was a respected author and cultural enthusiast, notably with regard to folk music and poetry, and had promoted cultural tourism for the CPR and produced cultural programming for the CBC.[74] Like Arthur Hawkes, Gibbon had emigrated from Britain to Canada (in 1908) and, enamoured with its diversity, quickly fell in love with the country. From the beginning, he had been fascinated with French-Canadian culture in particular.[75] In addition to personal encounters with Francophones of various backgrounds, Gibbon had taken inspiration from intellectuals like Marc Lescarbot, author of *Nova Francia* (1928), Benjamin Sulte, whom he described as the "keenest of historians" on New France, Henri

[73] Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts," p.184.
[74] Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, pp.i-xi.
[75] "Ever since first I came to Canada thirty years ago, I have been intrigued by the variety of racial types. On the day of my first arrival, I saw a member of the Dominion Cabinet, the Hon. Jacques Bureau, on a Government tugboat at Quebec, serving ginger ale in his shirtsleeves to a party of newspaper men, and singing the French-Canadian folk-song 'En roulant ma boule roulant,' and I imagined the kind of letter that some English Colonel would write from his Club to the London *Times* if a British Cabinet Minster were to have done anything of the kind." Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, p.x

Lorin, "the sanest of French historians," and Émile Vaillancourt, "an eminent French-Canadian author" and historian.[76]

Gibbon was convinced that Canadian attitudes about diversity had changed for the better. As the country finally showed signs of coming out of the Great Depression, he believed, Canadians' attitudes against immigration had softened considerably. Gibbon supported the increasingly common belief that Canada's diversity was its strength, not its weakness: "Each racial group has brought its own worthwhile contribution of tradition and culture."[77] Nearly all Canadians had immigrant roots, a desire for a better life, and a genuine wish to contribute to the greater good. Gibbon also pointed to the gradual replacement of the status of 'British subject' with 'Canadian citizenship,' and that immigrants had contributed to this larger shift in identity.[78] At heart, Gibbon's book was an attempt to counter arguments in favour of a return to cultural homogeneity (inherent in Depression-era anti-immigration sentiments and European fascism), and to promote Canadian diversity and a *civic* Canadian nationalism grounded in a shared historical experience.[79] Each chapter of his book gave a brief history of each European racial group, their cultural traits and strengths, and their interactions with each other. Drawing from his experience organizing multicultural folk music festivals across the country, Gibbon believed that highlighting unique aspects of different cultures would help endear them to British Canadians.[80]

---

[76] *Ibid*., pp.19-20, 29, 40.
[77] *Ibid*., book jacket.
[78] He noted that 85% of foreign-born continental European immigrants had "become naturalized Canadian citizens, although no obligation to take up citizenship was made on these immigrants when they entered Canada." *Ibid*., pp.44-45.
[79] Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, p.iii.
[80] *Ibid*., p.x.

Canadian Mosaic spoke to how far attitudes appeared to have changed on the eve of the Second World War. The enduring French fact in Canada, civic Canadian nationalism, and Canadian citizenship were increasingly taken for granted. Multiculturalism was a natural outgrowth of these ideas. Immigrants and new Canadians had to be incorporated into this civic identity, and the idea of the 'Canadian mosaic' – of strength through diversity, a sum greater than its parts – was just the way to do it, according to Gibbon.[81] In other words, attitudes had opened up to the point that some Canadians were beginning to look to the advantages of an even larger, more magnanimous, and more inclusive pluralism – one that included not only British and French Canadians, but Ethno-Cultural Canadians as well.[82] There were limits, however, to this pluralism: Gibbon was virtually silent on visible minorities and Aboriginal Canadians.

Gibbon attributed the gradual change in attitudes in part to the increased day-to-day interaction between peoples. There were several contributing factors:

> ... common employment in a factory, industry, business or store, membership in a brotherhood, union or fraternal lodge, membership in a choir or musical club, amateur theatricals, membership in discussion clubs, membership in Canadian Clubs, ... playing hockey, football, baseball, ... friendships made at school or college, neighbourliness in country, village or city.[83]

Activities officially sanctioned for bringing people together in bonne entente, Gibbon continued, had also made a difference: "these remind the younger generation of New Canadians that they have a heritage ... worth preserving." He cited such activities as the multicultural festivals hosted by the CPR "at Quebec, Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, Banff,

---

[81] "[E]ach racial group has brought with it some qualities which are worthwhile contributions to Canadian culture – as for instance the national proverb of the Czechs 'Not by might but by the spirit shall ye conquer.'" *Ibid*., p.v.
[82] *Ibid*., p.vii.
[83] *Ibid*., p.415.

Vancouver, Victoria and Toronto," the initiatives of "various clubs in various places," and even "a colourful pageant of New Canadians at Lafontaine Park, Montreal, in connection with the King's Birthday in 1938," organized by the Catholic Schools Commission.[84] His activities even got positive coverage in *Le Devoir*.[85]

Gibbon's 'multiculturalism' was not incompatible with cultural dualism. Along with the British-Canadian peoples, Gibbon distinguished French Canadians as one of the founding peoples of the country.[86] The French, he explained, were the first to identify as "Canadians" – they had been the first to develop an identity that was North American and truly of this place, giving birth to the new nationality to which all denizens could now lay claim.[87] Gibbon had deep admiration for the French-Canadian "respect for tradition. He is steeped in the history of his race, a history alive with picturesque and romantic figures."[88] Like popular authors and amateur Anglo-Canadian historians of the period, Gibbon provided a decidedly romantic history of New France, complete with all the usual suspects: Cartier, Champlain, Brébeuf, Marie de l'Incarnation, Frontenac, d'Iberville, and other explorers, settlers, missionaries, and coureurs des bois.[89]

Gibbon's condensed history of French Canada did not end with the Seven Years War. The liaison between Francophone Métis and First Nations, for instance, had allowed

---

[84] *Ibid*., pp.424-425.
[85] See "Festival Écossais à Banff," *Le Devoir*, 17 septembre 1927, p.6.
[86] "Since there are nearly three million Canadians of French descent in Canada, and the French were the first to settle in Canada, there is particular interest in the contribution of France to Canadian life and in the relations of the French-Canadians to the other races that came to settle alongside." Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, p.19.
[87] "In reviewing the history of Canada during the eighteenth century, one realizes that the French-speaking fur-traders were now Canadians rather than French, and in this growth of a new nationality the *coureur de bois* played a notable part." Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, p.29.
[88] *Ibid*., p.22.
[89] Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, pp.23.

for a relatively peaceful westward expansion of the nation, unlike in the US.[90] French Canadians had defended Canada in 1775 and 1812, they had cared for the refugees of the Irish Potato Famine, helped build the CPR. Their political leaders, like Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine and George-Étienne Cartier, had partnered with moderate British Canadians to achieve self-government and autonomy.[91] Gibbon even highlighted the common cause of Anglophones and Francophones who had rebelled *against* the established authority in Upper and Lower Canada during 1837-1838. This reflected a new historiographical trend that attempted to understand the rebellions within the context of the injustices faced at the time instead of simply discounting them as fanatical fringe movements.[92] Gibbon hoped that these historical examples of cross-cultural collaboration would inspire better relations in the present. He reserved his greatest praise for Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his lifelong quest for cultural-linguistic harmony: "Today the memory of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is cherished by Canadians of British as well as French origin as that of one of the great men of Canada."[93] It was a far cry from the anti-French vitriol that Laurier had endured scarcely twenty years earlier.

Gibbon also informed readers about French-Canadian society in the present. He included images of French-Canadian art and provided readers with English translations of French-Canadian poems and songs, evoking the pan-Canadian historical presence of Francophones, the civic beauty of French-Canadian cities and towns, and the

[90] Gibbon, Canadian Mosaic, pp.30.
[91] An illustration of a typical "French-Canadian type" portrayed a cheerful looking, warmly dressed, moustachioed and pipe-smoking habitant. See *Ibid*., p.24.
[92] "A number of histories of Canada leave the impression that the Papineau Rebellion of 1837 was a rebellion of the French-Canadians against British rule, but it is now being generally recognized that, while there was a considerable French-Canadian element in the rising, this was rather a republican movement in sympathy with a similar movement for Reform in Upper Canada, the object of which was to break down the oppressive bureaucracy kown as the Family Compact. Dr. Wolfred Nelson, Papineau's lieutenant, was a prominent English-speaking doctor." Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, p.39.
[93] Gibbon, *Ibid*., p.45.

perseverance of the people.[94] Gibbon asserted that French-Canadian society boasted a strong educational and intellectual life, and he chided the British-Canadian extremists who had opposed French-language instruction outside Quebec.[95] In classical, technical, and commercial education, French Canada was at the forefront. Both in terms of education and creative production, in music, art, literature and poetry, from architecture to agriculture, French Canadians led the way, and inspired Anglo-Canadian writers, artists and architects.[96] The greatest musical gift that French-speaking Canada had given the country, Gibbon wrote, was the new unofficial national anthem, increasingly popular among Anglo-Canadians: "today 'O Canada' is sung together by French and English speaking Canadians with equal fervour. Other racial groups have followed suit, and there are versions sung today in their mother tongues by Ukrainian and German-Canadians."[97]

While the greatest discernable shift may have occurred in English-speaking Canada, the interwar period also witnessed the publication of a spate of books in French that looked beyond the borders of Quebec to promote all of Canada to French Canadians. They included such titles as *Le Canada Illustré* (1914), *Le Canada d'aujourd'hui, son Industrie* (1929), *De Québec à Vancouver: À Travers le Canada d'aujourd'hui* (1924), *Dictionnaire général de biographie, histoire, littérature, agriculture, commerce, industrie et des arts, sciences, moeurs, coutumes, institutions politiques et religieuses du Canada* (1931), *La Nation Canadienne* (1934), *L'Ouest canadien* (1931), and *Le Canada d'Hier et Aujourd'hui* (1934). Such works were further promoted by the combined efforts

[94] *Ibid*., pp.22-31.
[95] Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, p.45.
[96] *Ibid*., p.46.
[97] *Ibid*., p.40. Gibbon was not alone in praising the newer anthem over the more generic and exclusively British 'God Save the King.' See, for instance, M.E. James, "Jubilant Message of Glorious Music Comes from Bells," *Globe*, 2 July 1927, p.1. 'O Canada' was becoming so popular that even the KKK was becoming anxious that it would displace 'God Save the King.' Pitsula, *Keeping Canada British*, p.8.

of literary critics Camille Roy and Lorne Pierce. With the rise of literacy rates across the country (92% nationally by the early 1930s), these works could be accessed by a greater number of Canadians than ever before.[98] George Wrong was heartened by the change engendered in Anglo-Canadian attitudes, especially: "Writers in English-speaking Canada now find a charm and romance in the life of French Canada which stimulates imagination." He was keen to point out that "it was a man of letters in Toronto who gave to English readers that fascinating romance," *Maria Chapdelaine*, by having it translated. Wrong was optimistic that this "charm and romance" would help contribute to national unity. He hoped that French-Canadian authors would take a similar interest in English-speaking Canada and so expose their readership to the lighter side of the other solitude.[99]

Around the same time, the Quebec government became conscious of the potentially positive role that popular literature might play in Anglo-/ French-Canadian relations, and especially in attracting tourists to the province. It encouraged Anglophones who had read such novels to pay a pilgrimage to the settings of their favourite works.[100] It is clear from the writings of Anglo-Canadian travel writers that many had been motivated at least in part by these popular novels to visit Quebec.[101] In contrast to American travel writers to Quebec, Anglo-Canadian authors frequently wrote about their visits in the terms of pilgrimage. "'It was *Maria Chapdelaine* that inspired our sentimental pilgrimage this summer to the Lac St. Jean country,'" explained travel writer Carleton McNaught in

---

[98] See Lanctot, *Le Canada d'Hier et Aujourd'hui*, pp.297.
[99] Wrong, "The Two Races in Canada," p.12.
[100] "[Visit] the ruins of the seigniorial manor of the Aubert de Gaspé family. Here the author of 'Les Anciens Canadiens' wrote his stirring narrative." Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province. A Harmony of Beauty, History and Progress* (Roads Department of Québec, March 1926), Amicus no. 8652444, p.10.
[101] "English Canadians had assuredly been more exposed than Americans to novels that included descriptions of French Canadian culture or that used this culture as a backdrop." Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," pp.471-472.

1935.[102] Anglo-Canadians were reading and learning more about Quebec than ever before, and as a result had begun to take a greater interest in Francophone society.

In addition to popular literature, the teaching of English and French also may have contributed to greater cross-cultural understanding. Civil society, for example, played an important role in helping teach one or both of the country's principal languages to new Canadians. Gibbon:

> Several organizations are actively working to make the newcomers feel that they are welcome in Canada. Since English and French are the official languages in the Province of Quebec, facilities for enabling adults to learn these languages are provided.[103]

The YMCA in Montreal, for instance, historically a Protestant British-Canadian organization, taught newcomers both English and French. By 1938 its membership included people from twenty-four different nationalities and various denominations, including Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Orthodox Christians.[104]

While the overall proportion of bilingual Anglo-Canadians was undoubtedly small, there were signs that some English-speaking Canadians were anxious to learn French. "Les tendances à une langue particulière des deux parties du peuple persistent," observed Jean-Charlemagne Bracq in 1927, "mais le nombre des 'bilingues' croît en même temps que l'intelligence des deux littératures. .... On est impressionné, dans les grandes villes, par le nombre croissant des enseignes en deux langues de magasins et bureaux anglo-français."[105] In Quebec schools, it was standard practice to teach French or English as a second language to students from both cultural-linguistic communities by the

---

[102] In *Ibid*., p.471.
[103] Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, pp.414-415.
[104] *Ibid*., pp.418-419.
[105] Bracq, *L'évolution du Canada français*, pp.284-285.

mid-1920s.[106] To be sure, this emerging bilingualism was especially prominent in Quebec.[107] But it was not limited there. At Upper Canada College in Toronto (Ontario's leading boys' school) French-language instruction was improved at the behest of Headmaster William Lawson Grant, an avowed Francophile who had lived and studied in Paris.[108] In 1931, the University of Alberta began teaching French phonetics. Within a few weeks over two thousand people had enrolled, "including many businessmen." Similar courses offered in Saskatchewan around that time also met with high levels of enrolment.[109] In 1932, the University of Western Ontario, under its bonne ententiste chancellor Henry Cockshutt, established Canada's first official French Immersion programme, at Trois-Pistoles in Quebec.[110] By the early 1930s, Ottawa's two major Anglophone high schools were holding annual "oratorical contests in French and English."[111] In the mid-1930s, Ontario's Ministry of Education experimented with ways to improve the teaching of French in high schools. During the 1935-1936 school year alone there were over 65,000 Anglo-Canadian Ontario high school and collegiate students – almost the entire student body – who were registered in a French class. An

---

[106] See Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.12.

Canada and Newfoundland Education Association Secretary Charles Phillips had this to say about Quebec's growing bilingualism: "what should really surprise us is that so many people, school children included, speak English so well [in Quebec]. English receives almost one-eighth of the timetable hours in grades VI and VII of French urban schools, more than one-eighth in grades VIII and IX, and as much as one-sixth in schools with higher grades. In schools for English-speaking pupils, Protestant and Catholic, French is taught from grades III or IV upwards. With the advantage of a pre-existent bilingual environment, in most cities at least, this instruction can be reinforced with the continued practice necessary to make it lastingly effective. Actually the visitor has to avoid the temptation to regard attainments of French-speaking pupils in English as a yardstick of progress. We have to remind ourselves that our fellow-Canadians in Quebec from birth and by constitutional right think, speak, teach, and learn in French. This circumstance also is one which calls for acceptance without question." Phillips, "The Schools of Quebec," pp.61-62.

[107] Bracq, *L'évolution du Canada français*, p.284.

[108] "Dr. W.L. Grant, UCC Principal, Dies in Hospital," *Mail & Empire*, 4 February 1935.

[109] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.149.

[110] This programme is still running. See University of Western Ontario, "Who We Are" (2013), accessed 11 April 2013, http://www.uwo.ca/about/whoweare/history.html.

[111] "Glebe-Lisgar Debate on Friday," *Ottawa Evening Journal*, 30 April, 1931, p.8.

additional 413 students took French at vocational schools during the night. This was not insignificant, given that French was not an obligatory subject. Indeed, French was by far the most popular of the wide variety of optional courses from which students could choose.[112] At the same time, a growing number of Ontario teachers (over 600 between 1927 and 1936) travelled to Quebec for the summer to take French courses – paid for by the Ministry – at the Sillery Convent, McGill and Trois Rivères. Summer courses to improve teachers' written and spoken French were also offered in Ontario for those unable to travel.[113] By the end of the interwar period, the Canada and Newfoundland Education Association had begun looking into establishing more regular exchanges between English- and French-speaking teachers.[114]

Greater still was the number of French Canadians learning English. In Ontario, more French-Canadian students began to learn English after Regulation 17 was amended in 1927. This was the result of higher overall attendance and a vast improvement in the quality of education.[115] By 1936, the ability of newly trained Franco-Ontarian teachers to speak and teach English was apparently on par with that of their Anglo-Canadian peers. Students benefitted; test results demonstrated an overwhelming improvement in Franco-Ontarian children's ability to read, write and speak both French and English, as compared

---

[112] See Ontario, *Report of the Minister of Education, Ontario, 1936* (Toronto: T.E. Bowman, 1937), Robarts Library, AFG-5659, pp.190, 204, 223.

[113] See *Ibid*., pp.10-11, 21, 102.

[114] Canada and Newfoundland Education Association, "The Program for the Promotion of Canadian Unity," *Canadian Education*, Official publication of the Canada and Newfoundland Education Association, Vol.1, No. 1 (October 1945), p.36.

[115] Amédée Bénéteau, "Il y a vingt-cinq ans," *Le Droit*, 13 novembre 1950. Newspaper clipping in UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/64/1. In Ottawa the number of Franco-Ontarian students enrolled in Grade 8 in bilingual schools was 414 in 1926, and 1,221 in 1934. Province-wide, the number of Franco-Ontarian students in High School went from 600 to 2,500.

The number of properly trained teachers also rose drammatically. By 1936, the University of Ottawa Normal School (teacher's college) was enrolling an average of over two hundred students to train as teachers for the Franco-Ontarian bilingual schools See Ontario, *Report of the Minister of Education, Ontario, 1936*, pp.1, 26, 30-34.

to the pre-1927 period.[116] As they learned English, Franco-Ontarian children had a greater chance to come into contact and integrate into the larger Ontario society. In urban centres in Ontario, French-Canadian children came into increased contact with Anglo-Canadian children and learned to speak English. French-Canadian children were also exposed to English via radio.[117] For some, this may have led to assimilation, but certainly not for all, as Ontario's French-Canadian population continued to increase into the 1940s and beyond. In any event, bridging the linguistic divide would have allowed for greater cross-cultural contact.

In Quebec, too, more French Canadians were learning English. This was especially the case among the educated French-Canadian élite, who saw English as a means to succeed in business, public affairs, academia or elsewhere.[118] The élite were not alone, however. Some estimates placed the rate of bilingualism among Franco-Quebecers by the late 1920s as high as 42% – over half a million people.[119] This was a substantial proportion of the population, especially considering that bilingual French Canadians were more likely to live in cities where the Anglo-Quebecer population was concentrated. Bilingualism was in part the result of greater access to English for students and teachers alike. In some institutions, the Catholic Church offered bilingual instruction to

---

[116] Ontario, *Report of the Minister of Education, Ontario, 1936*, pp.26, 30-34.

[117] "In centres where the French-speaking pupils come in contact with English-speaking pupils, the problem of teaching conversational English is greatly simplified. When these pupils reach their senior classes, they speak English with a facility approaching that of English-speaking children. .... [I]n most of the rural schools in Eastern and Northern Ontario, practically the only English which the pupils hear outside of school is that which comes over the radio. In these schools, conversational English based on the direct method is begun in the first year.... Usually, the pupils acquire a simple everyday vocabulary very quickly and it is not unusual to find pupils of seven or eight years of age who are able to answer in English with surprising facility questions based on a story they have heard or on a picture they have studied." Learning English did not necessarily mean losing French. The report spoke at length of "the great improvement made in the standard of both the oral and written French." *Ibid*., p.32.

[118] "Les Canadiens-Français instruits, ceux des classes dirigeantes, ... en général, parle[nt] les deux langues." Camille Roy, *Pour conserver notre héritage français*, p.10.

[119] Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, p.107.

prospective teachers who could then impart that knowledge onto students of their own.[120] The Department of Public Instruction, with its Catholic and Protestant committees, oversaw over one thousand school boards across the province, each with a high degree of autonomy.[121] As such, the level of English-language instruction in French Catholic schools varied, but several offered the courses. Administrators at various levels embraced the merits of bilingualism. These so-called "pédagogues anglomanes," as their critics called them, argued that "chaque citoyen, ayant le droit de parler sa langue partout au Canada, possède aussi le droit de se faire comprendre dans la langue de tous ses concitoyens."[122]

In higher learning, many young French Canadians were anxious to open up opportunities by learning English, "la langue des affaires."[123] Commercial colleges sprung up across Quebec in which commercial subjects were taught in English. Many upper- and middle-class French-Canadian fathers insisted that their sons learn English.[124] This led to much hand-wringing on the part of nationalistes, who feared the cultural, religious and ethical dilution of their people: bilingualism was "une cause de déracinement pour notre paysannerie, il dénationalise notre peuple et le prolétarise," complained Hermas Bastien.[125] Some even saw it as "a *bonne-ententiste* conspiracy to sap French-Canadian strength."[126] English was portrayed as a forbidden fruit that the

---

[120] *Ibid*., p.107.
[121] Mathieu Pigeon, "Education in Québec, before and after the Parent reform" (Montreal: McCord Museum, 2008), accessed 4 February 2012, http://www.mccord-museum.qc.ca.
[122] Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, p.130.
[123] *Ibid*., p.107.
[124] "Les pères de famille qui ont des droits exigent, dit-on, que leurs fils apprennent l'anglais." *Ibid*., p.126.
[125] *Ibid*., p.107. "La nécessité de l'anglais dans une province française, il convient de la restreindre, grâce à l'émancipation économique des nôtres. Le principe utilitaire doit se subordonner au principe culturel." P.126. See also André Laurendeau, "Bilinguisme intégral," *L'Enseignement secondaire* 21, no. 4 (janvier 1942): 306-309.
[126] *L'Action Française* opposed the teaching of English in schools, and argued that bilingualism should be

unwitting habitant had to be protected against – once exposed to it, they would only want more: "Notre peuple, y ayant goûté, en requiert une dose plus forte."[127] For some, the increased bilingualism of French Canadians was a source of resentment. For others, it had opened up opportunities and the possibility of developing greater understanding and communicating with the English-speaking population. "J'exprime ma pensée dans [ma] langue," explained Liberal Senator Raoul Dandurand, a vocal proponent of bilingualism for both peoples. "Je parle aussi la langue de la majorité. Je crois que mon bilinguisme me donne la physionomie d'un Canadien intégral, supérieur à l'unilingue, malgré ce qu'en pense l'abbé Lionel Groulx."[128]

In addition to language and literature, film had also become an important medium for cross-cultural exposure shortly after the Great War – a product of the growth of the industry itself. After the war, the number of production companies and film directors in Europe and North America grew exponentially, and movie theatres began opening in cities and towns across the country. Home-grown Canadian cinema enjoyed early success but almost died on the vine for lack of government protection from foreign competition.[129] There was some sporadic government funding of film production through federal and provincial film agencies, beginning in 1916. Documentary shorts used for educational purposes and to promote travel and immigration received some attention, and in 1939 the federal government created the National Film Board. American films,

---

restricted to the élite. Trofimenkoff, *Action Française*, p.56.

[127] Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, p.107.

[128] Dandurand, *Le sénateur-diplomate: Mémoires, 1861-1942* (Québec: Laval, 2000), p.334. Although a nationaliste, Dandurand's having been raised in "un milieu anticlérical" had turned him off of clerico-nationalism's cultural insularity. Privately, he was a man of faith. Intellectually, he was a liberal humanist. See pp.33.

[129] Peter Morris, "Film History," *The Canadian Encyclopedia* (Historica-Dominion, 2011), accessed 1 November 2011, http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/ index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=A1ARTA0002800.

meanwhile, became immensely popular in Canada, especially among Anglo-Canadians, with the establishment of branch distribution companies in the country. A number of successful American films of the interwar were set in Canada, playing on its romantic natural surroundings and history.[130]

Several of these depicted an idyllic representation of French-Canadian life, and Hollywood soon adopted the stereotype of the "happy-go-lucky" French Canadian.[131] French-Canadian trappers, guides, farmers and habitants were popular characters throughout Hollywood's decades-long love affair with its rugged, wild, and romantic northern neighbour. Pierre Berton described Hollywood's idealized French Canadians:

> [A]lmost all had small moustaches, turned up at the ends to emphasize their incredible good nature. All had flashing, pearly teeth, which were in constant view. Happy and carefree, they capered through movie after movie, slapping friends and even enemies on the back and giving constant thanks to Le Bon Dieu for their existence. Several of them played the fiddle incessantly.[132]

The "happy-go-lucky" French Canadian was down-to-earth, at home in the forest, and "so cheerful, so humane, so fond of his fellow men that he was too good to be true."[133] In *Nomads of the North* (1920) and *The Trap* (1922), Lon Chaney, the famous "'man of a thousand faces,'" played such a character. *The Trap* opened with Chaney playing Gaspard the Good, in his "simple cabin, the compulsory tuque crowning his head, hands on hips, head thrown back, laughing uproariously at his good fortune in being alive."[134] In a similar vein, *God's Country and the Law* (1921) centred around the good-natured character 'Poléon, who "somewhow managed to drive a horse and buggy and a cow

[130] See Tippett, *Making Culture*, p.80; Morris, "Film History."
[131] Berton, *Hollywood's Canada*, p.82.
[132] *Ibid*., p.84.
[133] *Ibid*., p.82.
[134] In *Ibid*., p.84.

home and to play the fiddle at the same time."[135] Some films featured historical French-Canadian heroes, like Paul Muni's version of an expressive and flamboyant happy-go-lucky Pierre Radisson in *Hudson's Bay* (1940). Other movies with prominent French-Canadian settings or characters included *The Strength of Men* (1913), *The Snowbird* (1916), *The Primal Lure* (1916), *Jules of the Strongheart* (1918), *Where the North Begins* (1923), *Slander the Woman* (1923), *The Eternal Struggle* (1923), *Tiger Rose* (1923 and 1929), *Back to God's Country* (1927), *Men of the North* (1930), and *Pierre of the Plains* (1942).

The emergence of "talkies" (films with sound) after 1927 and the boredom generated by Depression-era under-employment significantly boosted the popularity of film as a means of diversion, exposing more Anglo-Canadians to the stereotype of the happy-go-lucky French Canadian. Films like the screen adaptation of *Maria Chapdelaine* (1934), which idealized life in rural Quebec, and *Rose Marie* (1936), inspired by the smash-hit Broadway musical of the same name set in northern Saskatchewan with a French-Canadian heroine in love with an Anglophone miner, were especially popular and influential.[136] *Rose Marie* also appeared in 1928 and 1954 versions. Like their American counterparts, many Anglo-Canadians were drawn to see such films.[137]

Interwar cinema also served to remind Anglo-Canadians that the French fact persisted throughout the country, and not just in Quebec. Indeed, more often than not, Hollywood depicted French Canadians from outside Quebec. "For years," Berton explains, "the movies populated Canada with men and women who spoke with French-Canadian accents, confessed to Roman Catholic priests, raised their eyes to Le Bon Dieu

[135] *Ibid*., p.84.
[136] Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.468.
[137] *Ibid*., pp.471-472.

and uttered expletives like 'By Gar!' The Northwoods were crammed with such people, from Dawson City to Labrador."[138] Such generalized stereotypes and condescension certainly did not provide the makings for full equality between French and English. If attitudes sometimes change by fits and starts more so than leaps and bounds, then Hollywood had at least provided a less negative portrayal than what many British Canadians had grown up with – it was a far cry from the war-time image of the aggressive ultramontaniste and Prussian sympathizing French Canadian.

Print media

While an exhaustive survey of the print media would go beyond the means of the current study, this important medium merits some consideration here. Just as English-language literature and film began projecting a more positive image of French Canada, newspapers and magazines also showed signs of change. Sympathetic papers in both languages did what they could to inform the Canadian public about bonne ententiste initiatives throughout the period. Indeed, several newspapermen had been directly involved in such activities. Owners, editors and journalists from both cultural-linguistic groups met and collaborated regularly through a variety of associations, notably the Canadian Press.[139] The agreeable press coverage the bonne entente movement received at its inception, for example, and occasionally thereafter, likely had a positive effect on public perceptions – at the very least, it kept them informed that such activities were ongoing. Indeed, the prominence of the political figures who were involved or had

[138] Berton, *Hollywood's Canada*, p.85.
[139] "French- and English-speaking members are there on equal terms and officers are elected of either language." Maheux, *Canadian Unity. What Keeps Us Apart?*, p.79.

endorsed the movement guaranteed a certain amount of favourable coverage that would have reached some of the public, either directly or through word of mouth (to say nothing of the various educational activities and propaganda disseminated by the movement).[140]

The bonne entente movement received prominent coverage in both the English- and French-language presses at its inception in 1916. John Godfrey, Lorne Mulloy, and Arthur Hawkes had ensured this with their own public relations visits to the important newspaper owners, editors and advertisers of the day. Mulloy's meeting with the influential O.S. Perrault, "the manager and director of the Imperial Tobacco Company, who had close connections with other business and financial interests,"[141] for instance, proved particularly memorable:

> I had Perrault up in my room last night until the wee small hours…. I never met a man who could punish an equal amount of scotch with as little noticeable effect. Incidently (*sic*) we became thoroughly acquainted and with his wide newspaper connection – his company spends tens of thousands annually in advertising – I expect he will be very useful.[142]

Mulloy also visited Henri Bourassa, editor of *Le Devoir*, in August 1916. Hawkes appeared to have attempted to convince Bourassa to join the Bonne Entente League a month before, but without success – Bourassa had been skeptical of an initiative whose founders were wound up in wartime recruitment.[143] Nonetheless, the old imperialist Mulloy was pleasantly surprised by his visit with this supposed adversary. "[I] must confess that they were about the most enjoyable two hours I have had on the Quebec trip. … Bourassa, courteous, frank and cordial, lighted his pipe and we began. From first to

---

[140] See, for instance, UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/257/8, Jean I. Hunter, "This bi-racial country," CBC radio broadcast transcript, n.d. (1937?).
[141] Cameron, "The Bonne Entente Movement," p.47.
[142] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol.1, Mulloy to Godfrey, August 11, 1916.
[143] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol.1, Hawkes to Godfrey, July 7, 1916. "Nothing doing with Bourass[a]," Hawkes reported.

last there was a perfect congeniality and comraderie (*sic*)." Bourassa appeared equally impressed by Mulloy: "'I can always come to a better understanding with a true Imperialist than with a fake patriot,'" he told his guest.[144]

Ultimately, Bourassa's apprehensions prevented him from taking part in the movement. Nevertheless, he tasked one of *Le Devoir*'s writers, Ernest Bilodeau, to report on the proceedings of the October 1916 and January 1917 conferences. The paper provided extensive coverage of the meetings. To be sure, its tone was standoffish. Bilodeau drew attention to the excesses and lavishness of the banquets, and reported with amusement that the French- and British-Canadian participants did not always mingle. He focussed especially on the speeches of French-Canadian nationalists like Lamarche and Dandurand.[145] The speeches of recruiters or those who talked at great length about duty to the Empire, like Ontario Premier Hearst, remained highly suspect. Still, Bilodeau was impressed by the apparent sincerity of a number of the Anglo-Canadian participants, and especially by the frank-talking Mulloy. The hospitality with which the Quebecers were greeted during their Ontario visit also left a positive impression on the once-skeptical Bilodeau: "Les Ontariens de la Bonne-Entente ont fait preuve d'une indiscutable sincérité dans leur désir de mettre fin à la désunion qui sépare les deux grandes races canadiennes, nous n'avons point de doute là-dessus. Et leur sincérité s'est manifestée en une admirable hospitalité. On ne peut que leur souhaiter la pleine réussite de leurs désires."[146] After the war, Bilodeau demonstrated an ongoing interest in the improvement of Anglo-/French-Canadian relations – in 1920 he translated William Moore's *The Clash!* so that French-

[144] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol.1, Mulloy to Godfrey, August 11, 1916.
[145] *Le Devoir*, October 10, 1916, pp.1-2.
[146] *Le Devoir*, January 15, p.2.

Canadians could read what was effectively an Anglo-Canadian apology over its wartime intransigence and a call for greater recognition of Canada's French fact.[147]

The coverage of bonne entente activities by the more mainstream *La Presse* was unabashedly optimistic. Typical was the 10 October 1916 coverage of the opening Bonne Entente League convention at Montreal:

> Il est certain ... que les deux grandes races ... ont fait un grand pas dans la voie de la conciliation et dans le règlement pacifique des questions épineuses qui les séparaient jusqu'ici. On a aboli pour la circonstance toute distinction de langue et de religion pour ne voir que des Canadiens animés des mêmes sentiments quand il s'agit de la conservation, de l'agrandissement et de l'exaltation de la patrie canadienne.[148]

At the outset, one detects a real hope that the movement would create at least a semblance of rapprochement, quell the most extreme rhetoric of animosity, and perhaps even address the issues of recruitment and minority language rights. The latter, of course, got more mention in French-language papers, the former in the English-language press.

To be sure, by the end of the war, many French-language newspapers expressed a skepticism mirroring that of disillusioned bonne ententistes themselves. One editorial from the Ottawa-based *Le Droit*, entitled "La Question du Québec," met the creation in 1918 of the Better Understanding Association with understandable criticism:

> Nous rencontrons, écoutons, lisons assez souvent des 'bonnes ententistes' de langue anglaise, apparemment animés des meilleures dispositions à notre égard.... Ils nous parlent avec de grands gestes et des sourires engageants des bonnes relations qui devraient exister entre les deux grandes provinces-soeurs, entre les deux grandes races qui habitent ce dominion; mais ils ne mettent jamais le doigt sur la place.[149]

In the wake of the disillusioning experiences of conscription and coalition government, nationaliste newspapers like Bourassa's *Le Devoir* and Lionel Groulx's *l'Action française*

[147] William Moore, *Le Choc* (1920).
[148] *La Presse*, October 10, 1916, p.1.
[149] *Le Droit*, March 16, 1918, p.1.

could scarcely have been expected to trust Mikel's attempt to revive the bonne entente movement. Only the September 1920 meeting of the BUA received any mention in *Le Devoir*.[150] Given its modus operendi, it should come as no surprise that *l'Action française* made almost no mention at all of either the old BEL or its successor organizations.[151] Instead of discussing the need to find a means for coexistence between Ontario and Quebec, the journal was more interested in protecting French Canadians against "le poison colonial anglo-saxon."[152] While even *Le Devoir* gave some coverage to the BUA's third 'Meilleure Entente' meeting, the writers of *l'Action française* were more interested in entertaining ideas of creating a separate state in which Francophones could escape once and for all "le fanatisme qui caractérise nos voisins d'Ontario."[153] The journal described later bonne entente initiatives as hypocritical and useless.[154]

To be sure, French-language print media reflected a wide variety of opinion during the interwar years, from secessionism to reconciliationism. Groulx's monthly *l'Action française*, founded in 1917 amidst the full furore of the conscription crisis, provided a voice for those who shared his skepticism of Anglo-Canada. However, due to financial mismanagement, a limited readership, and embarrassing links with France's right-wing journal of the same name (banned by the Catholic Church for its extremism), the journal ceased operations in early 1929.[155] Its fate had been sealed when, in July 1928, Groulx accepted a $2400 raise from the Université de Montréal on the condition

[150] *Le Devoir*, September 2, 1920, p.2.
[151] It is mentioned in passing in *L'action française,* Vol. 1, No. 2, February 1917, p.64.
[152] *Ibid*, p.49. Around the time of the first BUA meeting, in mid-1918, Groulx was criticizing the idea that "la Confédération canadienne était une chose nécessairement éternelle." *L'action française,* Vol. 2, No. 8, August 1918, p.347.
[153] *L'action française,* Vol. 4, No. 9, September 1920, p.405.
[154] See Rumilly, *Histoire de la province de Québec,* Vol. XXVI, pp.258-259.
[155] It would be revived in 1933 under a new name and new editorship. If not for the discontent arising from the Great Depression, one wonders if it would have been revived at all. See Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1896-1929*, pp.184-186.

that he promise "'à prêcher à [ses] étudiants la loyauté à la constitution du Canada'" and "'à ne rien dire ni rien écrire qui puisse blesser les légitimes susceptibilités de nos compatriotes anglo-canadiens.'" These conditions had been set out by Liberal Senators and well-known bonne ententistes Raoul Dandurand and Frédéric-Liguori Béique, members of the university's administrative council.[156] Concerned with repairing the Anglo-/French-Canadian relationship, Dandurand and Béique were highly conscious of the damaging effect Groulx's rhetoric could have on those efforts.

Other French-language print media reported more favourably on Anglo-/French-Canadian relations. *La Patrie*, out of Montreal, was perhaps the strongest advocate of bonne ententism. *La Presse*, also based in Montreal, was by far the province's most popular newspaper, and tended to sympathize with bonne entente initiatives without losing sight of French-Canadian interests.[157] Its publisher, Pamphile Du Tremblay, was a great admirer of Ernest Lapointe.[158] In Quebec City, *Le Soleil* was the effective organ for Taschereau's Liberals. It came out strongly against *l'Action française* and its accusations that those who did not share its brand of nationalism, like the premier, were anti-clerical.[159] Its editor during the 1920s was the secular advocate of pan-Canadian biculturalism, Jean-Charles Harvey. He argued that French-Canadians and Anglo-Canadians should be able to feel at home wherever they lived in Canada.[160] The Quebec City papers generally were sympathetic to biculturalism, thanks in no small part to the

---

[156] In *Ibid*., pp.185-186.
[157] See, for instance, "Pour l'harmonie au Canada: Nos concitoyens anglais et la langue française," *La Presse*, 4 Mars 1924, p.9. The article makes note of an article in the Montreal *Star* "pour la bonne entente," calling on Ontario to protect and promote the French language in that province.
[158] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, pp.189, 210. See also p.94.
[159] Lamonde, *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1896-1929*, p.185.
[160] Simard, "Jean-Charles Harvey: défenseur des libertés," p.79.

popularity of local Anglo-Quebecer Liberal MP Chubby Power.[161] For its part, *Le Devoir*'s editor, Henri Bourassa, had not given up on pan-Canadian biculturalism. The tone of the newspaper under Georges Pelletier, its new editor in 1932, became more subdued and less virulent than in the past.[162] By the late 1930s there were about a dozen French-language dailies, with a total combined average circulation of 415,000 per day. The more nationalistic serials were far less popular than those that proved less wrapped up in the spectre of Anglicization.[163]

Among Anglo-Canadians, meanwhile, tastes in newspapers appeared to have become more moderate during the interwar years. In 1918, for instance, *The Telegram*, the voice of working-class Orange Ontario, was arguably the province's most popular newspaper. William Moore described its editor, the highly influential John R. Robinson (editor from 1888 until his death in 1928), as one of the "outstanding figures in the Canadian clash."[164] After the war, *The Telegram* gradually declined in popularity. By 1932 it had been overtaken by the far more moderate and liberal Toronto *Star*. The *Star* extended its reach in the mid-1920s when it started its own radio station.[165] By 1939 it was the most widely read newspaper in English-speaking Canada, with a daily circulation of 219,000, compared to the *Telegram*'s 75,000.[166] The *Orange Sentinel*, another prominent Ontario newspaper before the war that could be relied upon for anti-French-Catholic vitriol, also declined in importance, and no longer had as its editor the fiery

---

[161] "[I]n Quebec City ... the press was very friendly to me." Charles G. Power, *The Memoirs of Chubby Power: A Party Politician* (Toronto: MacMillan, 1966), p.117.
[162] Pierre-Philippe Gingras, *Le Devoir*, (Montréal: Libre-Expression, 1985), pp.111-113.
[163] "Les plus répandus sont les moins bons. Ceux qui sont d'esprit français ont une faible circulation." Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, p.120.
[164] Moore, *The Clash!*, p.247.
[165] See Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.115; Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*, pp.34-35.
[166] Or 69,000 more than the *Globe and Mail*, and 144,000 more than the *Telegram*. "Circulation Growth Continues!" *Globe and Mail*, 20 February 1939, p.8.

Horatio Hocken.[167] The Toronto-based *Saturday Night* magazine, which before the war had contributed its share of such invective, changed its tone dramatically in the interwar period. Its editor, Fred Paul, became directly involved with the Unity League of Ontario.[168] By the 1930s, *Saturday Night* regularly featured articles promoting tourism to Quebec.[169]

Other English-language papers in Ontario gave positive press to bonne ententiste initiatives as well. Both the director of the Toronto *Globe* and the owner of *Canadian Magazine* had joined the ULO by 1925.[170] In Ottawa, the *Citizen* became an organ for reconciliationist discourse under its liberal editor, Charles A. Bowman, who was also a friend of Ernest Lapointe.[171] The Belleville *Intelligencer* and the *Daily Ontario* both greeted Mikel's first BUA conference in July 1918 with favourable coverage. An editorial from the *Daily Ontario*, for instance, borrowed a line from former Montreal Mayor L.A. Lavallée when it asked whether Switzerland was "less united because it tolerates and officially recognises three languages within its borders." Canada's two languages, it continued, were integral to the country's history. "The real disintegrating force in our dominion is the persistent appeal to race and creed prejudice by peanut politicians and irresponsible newspapers." The paper chided those Ontarians who "talk about forcing the English language down the throats of the people of Quebec."[172] In a similar vein, the Windsor *Border Cities Star* and the Peterborough *Evening Examiner* greeted the January 1925 BEL conference with a call to repeal Regulation 17 as a means

[167] See Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*, p.36.
[168] Cloutier, *Quinze années de lutte! 1910-1925*, p.68.
[169] Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*, pp.35; Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," pp.471.
[170] Cloutier, *Quinze années de lutte! 1910-1925*, p.68.
[171] See Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, pp.127-128; Vipond, *Listening In*, p.230; Nolan, *Foundations*, pp.65.
[172] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, newspaper clippings, *Daily Ontario*, n.d., p.12, *Intelligencer*, July 26, 1918, p.10.

to prove Ontario's sincerity. This was not insignificant, given Bishop Fallon's previous targeting of the French-Canadian community in and around Windsor.[173] French-language papers in both Ontario and Quebec took notice. "Ceux qui ont suivi de près la presse ontarienne depuis douze ans savent très bien que les opinions trouvées dans cette presse n'ont pas l'habitude de ressembler à celles que nous venons de lire," *l'Action catholique* reported with cautious optimism.[174]

In Quebec, the English-language Montreal *Star* called upon Ontarians to eliminate Regulation 17 out of a spirit of "Bonne Entente." Ontarians and Quebecers alike, the paper argued, should promote the French language against the economic pressures of the day; its demise "would be a veritable loss for the culture, traditions and history of this country."[175] The article was reprinted in *La Presse*. In western Canada, meanwhile, the *Manitoba Free-Press* reigned supreme. Run by J.W. Dafoe, "probably Canada's most influential journalist in the twentieth century,"[176] it strongly supported the Liberal Party's advocacy of Canadian autonomy from Britain, and preached greater acceptance of Canada's French fact.[177] The paper featured a regular column entitled "Quebec's Viewpoint," in which major themes from the liberal, conservative and nationaliste French-language papers were summarized and translated (without editorial comment) for

[173] John K.A. Farrell, "Michael Francis Fallon, Bishop of London, Ontario, 1909-1931: The Man and His Controversies," *Canadian Catholic Historical Association Study Sessions*, 35 (1968), pp.84.
[174] See UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/257/8, press clippings, *Le Nouvel Ontario*, February 7, 1925, and *L'action catholique*, February 26, 1925.
[175] A True Canadian (pseudonym), "French Schools in Ontario," Montreal *Star*, 3 March 1924, p.1.
[176] "He wrote literally millions of words expounding this theme and was, unquestionably, very effective in convincing both Canadian politicians and the public at large of the validity of this Liberal-Nationalist view." Cook, "A Canadian Account of the Imperial 1926 Conference," p.53.
[177] See, for instance, Grant Dexter, *Manitoba Free-Press*, 9 September 1933.

Anglophone readers. Instances in which the French-language press wrote about English-speaking Canada and the West garnered special attention.[178]

The *Canadian Forum*, popular among younger conscientious middle-class Anglo-Canadians,[179] published articles on the topic of national unity throughout the interwar period. The *Forum* was leftist in its outlook and primarily concerned with social democratic and labour issues. It advocated for Canadian autonomy and for a civic nationalism that included greater consideration for the country's French fact. Early in the 1920s, the *Forum* warned readers about the secessionist impulse that decades of ethno-centric British-Canadian imperialism had engendered. In 1924, contributor J. Addison Reid drew readers' attention to a series of articles in the *l'Action Française* that, two years earlier, had mused about the creation of a separate state composed of Quebec, eastern Ontario and the Maritimes. The *Forum* article was notable for its attempt at providing a dispassionate summary of the principal arguments behind French-Canadian secessionism: improved economic circumstances for French Canadians, safeguarding of language, religion and traditions, and protection for the Francophone minorities of central and eastern Canada against the many abuses suffered under British-Canadian majority rule. "The possibility of a Separatist movement in French Canada is one that must always be reckoned with by any far-sighted political thinker," Reid explained.[180] The arguments of secessionists must not be countered only by words, he continued, but by deeds on the part of English-speaking Canada if it was going to be prevented from becoming more popular. Anglo-Canadians might thus consider shedding some of their British identity,

[178] "Quebec's Viewpoint," *Manitoba Free Press*, 30 January 1931, p.13.
[179] Sandra Djwa, "The *Canadian Forum*: Literary Catalyst," *Studies in Canadian Literature*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1976), p.1.
[180] Reid, "Secession in Canada: Quebec," p.25.

not only for their own self-realization, but also for the sake of national unity. Reid summarized the secessionists' assertion of "the instinctive and inevitable antipathy between Ontario and Quebec":

> The people of Ontario are not Canadians; they are colonists of England and think and act not as Canadians but as colonists. In their attitude toward their large French populations they are merely persecutors and religious fanatics.[181]

Only by treating the French-Canadian minorities justly, then, could Anglo-Canadians convince French Canada at large of their good will.

Significantly, Reid argued that Anglo-Canadians must look to Henri Bourassa for inspiration, "a man whom English-speaking Canada has [erroneously] regarded as the chief of the separatist movement." Clearly, this label was undeserved: "It has remained for one of the oldest and best tried leaders of Quebec particularism to offer the most forceful opposition to this [separatist] school of thought."[182] Reid quoted from a recent speech Bourassa had given against secessionism and in favour of Canadian biculturalism:

> 'Whatever may happen, the whole of the Canadian Confederation is, none the less, at the hour, the country of all Canadians, ours as well as that of the Anglo-Canadians; it imposes on all the same duties, it commands the same love....'[183]

With died-in-the-wool secessionists, Reid conceded, "there is no hope of coming to an understanding." But with moderates like Bourassa, "it may be easier than we think to find a common ground."[184]

Just as Anglo-Canadian moderates were paying close attention to what was being said in French-Canadian intellectual circles, French-Canadian moderates followed the writings of sympathetic individuals in English-speaking Canada. Independent Liberal and

---

[181] *Ibid*.
[182] Reid, "Secession in Canada: Quebec," p.25.
[183] In *Ibid*., p.25.
[184] *Ibid*., p.26.

Bourassa-supporter Roland-Gilles Mousseau, for instance, was anxious to point out to Anglo-Canadians that the Groulx school did not represent majority opinion in Quebec. In a published letter to the *Forum*, Mousseau responded to Reid's article by stating that the secessionist movement, spearheaded by *l'Action Française*, "is not widespread, and it is likely to die a natural death as a result of public apathy."

> The rural population, the backbone of the province, is in absolute ignorance of the activities of the separatist organization. In fact, the overwhelming majority of the voters of the province have not been reached by the secessionist move. Nor is any serious partisan of the movement to be found in the circles of government, industry, commerce, or finance.

Mousseau asserted that secessionism was limited to some "persons whose connections with the University of Montreal are well known," but he contested any assertion that "no effective attempt is being made to check the attack upon the very spirit of the federative pact." He pointed out that the secessionist movement had "rouse[d] the direct and immediate opposition of Laval University in Quebec. Quebec, as a rule, sincerely professes to see white whenever Montreal sees black." Mousseau also reassured readers that even within the University of Montreal, secessionism was popular only among a small "handful of crusaders."[185] Like Reid, Mousseau also encouraged Anglo-Canadian readers of the *Forum* to look to Henri Bourassa, now "the most serious opponent of what was once his own nationalist party," for intellectual inspiration.[186]

Anxieties over the rise of corporatism and the extreme right in Quebec during the 1930s were watched closely in the left-leaning *Forum*. While anxious over possible

---

[185] "It is an open secret that the few fervent advocates of the founding of a French free state are only a handful of crusaders, not even forming the responsible element of the university. Dissenssions later broke out among the secessionists themselves." Roland-Gilles Mousseau, "Letter to the editor," *The Canadian Forum* (August 1925), in J.L. Granatstein and Peter Stevens, eds., *Forum: Canadian life and Letters, 1920-1970, Selections from* The Canadian Forum (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), p.30.

[186] He concluded by quoting the same passage from Bourassa's speech that Reid had quoted: "'Whatever may happen, the whole of the Canadian confederation is the country of all Canadians, ours as well as that of the Anglo-Canadians.'" In *Ibid*., p.30.

fascistic tendencies in the province, this did not mean a lack of sympathy for French-Canadian empowerment. F.R. Scott, writing for the *Forum* in April 1934, criticized the alleged alliance between the Taschereau government, the conservative clergy, and capital. The best means for true empowerment of the French-Canadian working class, he insisted, was not to replace "English capitalists [with] French ones" and to send "all unemployed persons ... to work on the abandoned farms." In terms that would not have been out of place in 1960s Quebec, Scott insisted that "public ownership is the easiest method by which the French-Canadian may regain control of the natural resources which English and American capitalists have stolen from him."[187] To that end, he hoped for a CCF breakthrough in Quebec, citing the attendance of 1,300 "enthusiastic" French Canadians at a recent Montreal appearance by J.S. Woodsworth. With Quebec leading the way, Canada would become "an exciting place to live in. We Anglo-Saxons are dull fellows beside the French when it comes to politics."[188] Other articles in the *Forum* that expressed concern over right-wing nationalism in mid-1930s Quebec urged Anglo-Canadians to avoid responding with sensational rhetoric of their own. Instead, they should show support for French-Canadian aspirations so as to quell the frustration upon which the nationalistes bred their support:

> Whether [nationaliste ideas] do or do not prevail, however, will depend to a large degree upon the way they are received by the rest of Canada. If they are simply met with Imperialist ballyhoo, Orange cries, Protestant bigotry, and Anglo-Saxon conceit, they will prevail. If they are met with sympathy, understanding, and reasonable concessions, they may be satisfied with something less than the break-up of the Dominion. Ideas of this sort do not spring from mere cussedness, but from a frustrated desire for self-expression.[189]

---

[187] F.R. Scott, "The Fascist Province," *Canadian Forum* (April 1934), p.294.
[188] *Ibid*.
[189] 'Quebecer,' "French Canadian Nationalism," *The Canadian Forum* (March 1936), in J.L. Granatstein and Peter Stevens, eds., *Forum: Canadian life and Letters, 1920-1970, Selections from* The Canadian Forum (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), p.143.

For the sake of national unity, then, moderate Anglo-Canadians would have to find common ground with moderate French Canadians.

Radio

By the late 1920s and early 1930s, popular and commercial radio broadcasting had begun to arrive in Canada.[190] The first scheduled radio broadcast occurred 20 May 1920 when a concert performance from Montreal was transmitted to a select audience of the Royal Society of Canada at the Chateau Laurier in Ottawa.[191] Over the next few years, small and independent radio stations began popping up across the country. These were owned and operated by a variety of interests, including universities, provincial telephone companies, provincial governments, wheat pools, newspapers, church organizations, and even Eaton's. These organizations recognized early on the cross-promotional advertising and public service potential inherent in radio communication. By 1922 alone, there were twenty-one radio stations broadcasting in Canadian cities, from Halifax to Vancouver, including three in Montreal. By 1928, ninety-three radio stations were broadcasting in Canada.[192]

The most notable foray into radio in the 1920s was that of the federal government-owned Canadian National Railway. In 1923, the CNR began using its

---

[190] Howard Fink, "English-Language Radio Drama," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, (Historica-Dominion, 2012), accessed 6 January 2013, http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/englishlanguage-radio-drama; Gérard Laurence, "French-Language Radio Drama," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, (Historica-Dominion, 2012), accessed 6 January 2013, http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/frenchlanguage-radio-drama.

[191] Vipond, *Listening In*, p.1.

[192] See *Ibid*., pp.18-27, 48-51, 196; John D. Jackson and Paul Millen, "English-language radio drama: a comparison of central and regional production units," *Canadian Journal of Communication* Vol. 15, No. 1 (1990), pp.3-5.

telegraph facilities to broadcast radio programming.[193] By 1932, the CNR held thirteen radio station licenses throughout the country,[194] from the Maritimes to the Pacific. This included the four stations of its French network. In addition to local programming, the CNR stations hosted regularly scheduled national programming several times a week.[195] Before the Great Depression, the CNR was spending nearly half a million dollars annually on radio.[196] CNR President Sir Henry Thornton and Vice-President Gerard Ruel were early proponents of radio.[197] They recognized the potential for advertising CNR routes, promoting colonization and tourism across Canada (which in turn meant selling more train tickets), entertaining passengers, and communicating with employees. Thornton also endowed CNR radio with a nationalist mission, to form a "'complete'" service that would offer similar programming from coast to coast and spread "'ideas and ideals nationally by radio.'"[198] For all intents and purposes, CNR provided Canada with its first truly 'national' broadcaster.

Indeed, the CNR network provided an infrastructural and ideological precursor to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. In 1933 its radio assets were sold to the new Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission (later the CBC), and several of its staff also transferred over.[199] Among them was Earnest Austin Weir. Originally from rural Ontario, he began as the CNR's Director of Radio in May 1929 and then worked for the CRBC/CBC as a high-ranking administrator until 1956. Weir worked in Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto. From early on he developed a reputation as a supporter of Canadian

[193] See Jackson and Millen, "English-language radio drama," pp.5.
[194] The CPR held one. Vipond, *Listening In*, pp.49-51.
[195] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.43.
[196] Vipond, *Listening In*, pp.49-51.
[197] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.115.
[198] In Jackson and Millen, "English-language radio drama," p.5.
[199] Vipond, *Listening In*, p.51.

pluralism.[200] Like many of his colleagues, he strongly believed that national radio must "serve still better the interests of all of Canada."[201] Under Thornton and Weir's direction, CNR radio emphasized Canadian content, including the hiring of Canadian musicians, composers, writers and actors, and programming that chronicled Canadian stories, including history.[202]

The CNR was not alone in promoting the nationalist potential of radio. From early on, enthusiasts pointed to the sense of "'comradeship'" that the miracle of radio engendered between those who listened in to the same voices and the same music despite the distances that separated them.[203] As Mary Vipond explains, throughout the 1920s, commentators "expect[ed] radio to play a central role in binding the country together" and to help "create a nation."[204] To that end, some hoped that national radio would bring about greater recognition of Canadian biculturalism.

There was cause for optimism. The popularization of radio helped give more exposure to French-Canadian music, which, by the 1920s, had already begun to gain listeners in English-speaking Canada. In 1916, the National Museum of Canada engaged ethnologist Marius Barbeau to record the folk songs of the habitants living along the St. Lawrence. Barbeau had previously worked for the museum to record First Nations music in British Columbia and Quebec. In addition to inspiring the works of several Anglo-Canadian artists like A.Y. Jackson, Barbeau transcribed the music into several song-books. Recorded and live radio performances by vocalists Juliette Gaultier, Charles

---

[200] Weir complained that "a settler to get into Canada has to crawl through the eye of a needle while wearing a diver's suit." D.B. Macrae to J.W. Dafoe, 29 October 1926, in Cook, "A Canadian Account of the 1926 Imperial Conference," pp.54-56.
[201] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting in Canada*, pp.xii-xiv.
[202] *Ibid*., pp.44-46.
[203] Vipond, *Listening In*, p.23.
[204] From radio to the telegraph to railway, "the celebration of the technology of communication has always been central to both the material and the mythological definition of Canada." *Ibid*., p.23.

Marchand and Jeanne Dusseau further popularized "both native Indian and French-Canadian songs throughout Canada."[205] Well-known Anglo-Canadian composer Ernest MacMillan, who heard the music, asked Barbeau if he would be interested in co-publishing a song-book. *Twenty-One Folk Songs of French Canada* came out in 1928. Its success encouraged other Anglo-Canadian composers to publish choral and symphonic arrangements of indigenous and French-Canadian music.[206]

Radio reached a significant number of Canadians. At the beginning of the 1920s, radio sales were initially limited to amateurs and enthusiasts with disposable incomes. But the radio soon became a household necessity. In 1930 alone, 225,399 radio sets were sold to Canadians, and sales remained strong well into the Depression.[207] In 1931, over 760,000 Canadians reported owning a radio. Including unreported units, there may have been as many as one million Canadians who owned radios. Ownership was highest in urban areas where there was more broadcasting. The numbers were by far the highest in Quebec and Ontario, where 148,873 and 362,303 radios, respectively, were reported.[208] Per thousand population, the ownership rate of reported radios was 106 per thousand in Ontario and 52 per thousand in Quebec. Each radio set potentially represented multiple listeners, as colleagues, neighbours, friends and family gathered together to tune in to their favourite programmes. Even railway passengers could listen in while riding on radio-equipped passenger cars.[209]

---

[205] Tippett, *Making Culture*, p.78.
[206] *Ibid*., p.78.
[207] Vipond, *Listening In*, pp.33, 35.
[208] Officially, radio set owners were required to purchase a $1 license every year, but enforcement was lax. Vipond estimates that as many as 40% of radio owners did not purchase annual licenses. The 1931 census reported that 763,446 Canadians owned radios, not including those that went unreported out of a fear of penalty for failing to purchase a license. *Ibid*., pp.34-36.
[209] The CNR began equipping its cars in 1923. *Ibid*., pp.38, 50.

The discrepancy in ownership rates between Ontario and Quebec can be attributed to a few causes. Quebec's population was slightly more rural. Quebec farmers, for instance, had the lowest ownership rate in the country. Income levels were also lower in Quebec, and families larger. The most important factor, however, was that initially far more programming was available in English. (Still, there is reason to believe that many Francophones tuned in to both English- and French-language radio.[210]) The discrepancy between English- and French-language programming was due in part to stations borrowing content from American radio, and also to the higher proportion of Anglo-Canadian ownership of radio stations. The Radio Branch of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the federal body administering radio, was not very active to begin with. It did little to encourage French-language programming until 1927. That year, however, it began "to correspond with French listeners and broadcasters in their language and to issue some of its licences and official publications in French."[211] French-language programming did exist. By 1932, Quebec City was home to three French-only radio stations. In Montreal, the most powerful broadcaster was the bilingual CKAC. Three other Montreal stations, including the CNR station, offered some French-language programming.[212] While many Quebecers were tuning in by the 1930s, then, radio's greatest potential in terms of educating Canadians about the cultural-linguistic 'other' lay with Anglo-Canadians. If either group was in greater need of such an education, it was certainly them. As one observer put it, "French Canadians, whose province is penetrated

[210] French-language newspapers regularly provided listings for radio programming in both English and French, even the nationaliste *Le Devoir*. See "Le Radio," *Le Devoir*, 17 septembre 1927, p.9.
[211] Vipond, *Listening In*, p.43.
[212] *Ibid*., pp.41-43, 49.

by English-speaking influences in commerce, on the screen, and in person, have less need for instruction about us than we have for instruction about them."[213]

Radio programmes, notably those of the CNR and CBC, gave Anglo-Canadian listeners important exposure to French-Canadian culture and opinion. For its part, the CPR only had a minor radio presence, but even its coverage included French-Canadian content – CPR President E.W. Beatty spoke out publicly in favour of Franco-Ontarian rights in October 1926.[214] In 1928, the CPR sponsored a Quebec festival that featured new musical scores inspired by traditional French-Canadian folk music. The CPR brought in Sir Hugh Allan, the principal at the London Conservatory of Music, composer Vaughan Williams, the Paris Conservatory's Paul Vidal, and associate director of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Eric Delamorter, to adjudicate the competition.[215]

The radio presence of the CNR, meanwhile, was far more significant, and gave important exposure to Canada's French fact. "The CNR broadcast in both French and English," Weir proudly recalled. "The standards set for French programs were in no way second to those for English programs, whether musical or dramatic."[216] The first CNR programming in French began in 1924, notably on the Ottawa station. Between 1924 and 1927, French-language programming also became regularly available on CNR stations broadcasting from Montreal, Quebec City, Moncton and, to a lesser degree, Winnipeg and Edmonton. Because much of this programming was musical, it remained at least partially accessible to unilingual Anglo-Canadian listeners who had tuned in to the same

[213] Phillips, "The Schools of Quebec," p.62.
[214] Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.234.
[215] Tippett, *Making Culture*, pp.131-132.
[216] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.49.

stations for English-language programming (to say nothing of those who had some understanding of French).[217]

In order to establish itself as a truly national network, the CNR's small office directing radio programming, which was initially based in Ottawa and then moved to Montreal, hired a full-time bilingual staff member, Esmé Moonie, in 1929. Moonie quickly became "a dominant force in Canadian network programming, both French and English, ... which formed the bulk of the broadcasts in both languages."[218] With her appointment, programming became "more subjective, more topical, and more entertaining."[219] The music became more varied, exposing listeners to the diverse musical backgrounds of the country's increasingly diverse population. Of the hundreds of musical programmes on French- and English-language radio could be heard Welsh vocalists, Scottish pipers, Hungarian Roma music, French-Canadian folk songs, Russian choral arrangements, Mohawk singing, and "very many other programs featuring, in the main, Canadian talent, both French and English."[220]

Over the course of the interwar period, French-Canadian content became more common in English-language programming as well. This was in part the product of the centralization initially promoted by CNR radio. "National networks inevitably meant greater centralization of program activities," Weir explained, and almost all network programmes "originated in Montreal."[221] As such, French-Canadian artists performed for both French- and English-language radio. This was done in part out of practical

---

[217] With the possible exception of the Quebec City station, these stations also played English-language programming. *Ibid*., p.49.
[218] *Ibid*., pp.46-47.
[219] *Ibid*., pp.46-47.
[220] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, pp.47-48.
[221] *Ibid*., pp.46, 49.

considerations – Montreal's deep pool of musical talent was predominantly French-Canadian. In addition to music, French-Canadian performers featured "quite often on English dramatic productions." But the presence of French-Canadian artists in English-language programming was also a product of evolving tastes on the part of producers and listeners alike. These talented artists, Weir recalled, "lent not only excellence but a certain indefinable colour and charm to more than a little network programming."[222]

One of the CNR's most notable national radio programmes was its *The Romance of Canada* series. By 1930, Weir recalled, it had become "increasingly important" that CNR radio use "something else besides the musical programs on the network" to convey its nationalist message. The idea for a series chronicling Canadian history came to Weir while he was playing tourist at an historic site in rural Quebec:

> Rambling through old Fort Chambly on the Richelieu river, one Sunday afternoon in May of 1930, ruminating on the history this setting had seen for nearly three centuries, an idea occurred to me. Why not dramatize a series based on the epic stories of the early Canadian discoverers, adventurers, and explorers?[223]

Instead of a documentary, the work would be a drama in which actors played notable figures in Canadian history. Weir coordinated with Mabel Williams of the National Parks Branch in Ottawa and with Toronto author and playwright Merrill Denison to devise a list of episodes. Denison, the chief author of the scripts, was equipped with "a wide knowledge of Canadian history, unusual understanding of early pioneer traditions, and youthful aspirations."[224] The project received swift and enthusiastic approval from Thornton, and a new radio studio was built specifically for the production in Montreal.[225]

---

[222] *Ibid*., p.49.
[223] *Ibid*., p.51.
[224] *Ibid*., p.52.
[225] Tippett, *Making Culture*, p.130.

In a September 1930 preview announcement of the series, Thornton made clear the purpose of the series:

> We hope to kindle in Canadians generally a deeper interest in the romantic early history of their country. No country has a richer background of achievement than Canada. The tales of courage, heroism, fortitude, and valour are legion. Among the records of the early explorers, colonizers, missionaries, traders, and warriors from Cape Breton to the Yukon during the past three hundred years, are to be found countless incidents which stir one's blood by their sublime heroism. Among other peoples such incidents furnish the source of national folklore and have been woven into the great sagas of the past.[226]

Drawing on both Canada's French and British past, *The Romance of Canada* would give Canadians a national mythology – a "national folklore" – all their own.

A closer look at the series' content reveals a dualist portrayal of Canadian history. Twenty-four one-hour episodes were produced and aired over two seasons, in 1931 and 1932. Working on the project, British-born director Tyrone Guthrie later recalled, gave him an appreciation for Canada's "'immensity and diversity.'"[227] The programme was in English, but fully half of its content featured French-Canadian history. This was done, as Weir explained, "without planning." It only occurred to the producers after the fact that they had focussed so much on Canada's French past when KKK extremists wrote to complain "about the number of broadcasts glorifying the heroes of New France."[228]

That so much of the series would focus on the history of Canada's French-speaking peoples was a reflection of the changing understandings of the country's heritage, especially among younger Anglo-Canadian authors and intellectuals like Denison and Weir. Interestingly, the topics, personalities and perspectives featured from

---

[226] In Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.53.
[227] In *Ibid*., p.58.
[228] *Ibid*., p.61. The Klan was virulently anti-Catholic, hence the extreme dislike of the Roman Catholic heroes of New France. James M. Pitsula, *Keeping Canada British: The Ku Klux Klan in 1920s Saskatchewan* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2013), pp.137.

Canada's French history were not limited to the usual suspects of popular history. They included: early Acadia as experienced by the wife of Governor de la Tour; Frontenac as founder of Kingston; Pierre le Moyne d'Iberville, whose achievements included the burning of several British settlements; the French defence of Acadia; the Seven Years War as experienced through the eyes of Montcalm (instead of Wolfe, interestingly) and the lesser known Drucour, who had defended Louisbourg; the explorations of Pierre Radisson, whose efforts had made the HBC's successes possible; and the Métis victory at Seven Oaks in 1816.[229]

The episodes featuring French-Canadian history were covered in the newspapers with as much enthusiasm as those episodes that featured British-Canadian history. Thus, the episode on Madame de la Tour's defence of Fort Saint Jean against her husband's rival, Charles D'Aulnay, was "one of the most stirring stories in Canadian history, ... heard by audiences in far-away British Columbia as well as in old Acadia."[230] In the episode on the battle at Grand Pré in 1747, "when England and France struggled for Canada," the *Canadian* heroes were unequivocally "the gallant ... soldiers of New France," whose attack against invading British troops out of Boston was "one of the most brilliant raids in Canadian history."[231] When it came to the episode on the Battle of the

[229] The episode titles reveal the focus of the producers. They were, in order of presentation: *The Last Voyage of Henry Hudson, Madame de la Tour*; *The Plague of Mice* (about Prince Edward Island); *The Selkirk Settlers* (two episodes); *The Battle of Seven Oaks*; *Red Snow at Grand Pré*; *Marguerite de Roberval*; *The Isle of Demons*; *Laura Secord*; *Drucour at Louisberg (sic)*; *Pierre Radisson*; *Alexander Mackenzie*; *David Thompson*; *Montcalm*; *Dollard des Ormeaux*; *Pierre le Moyne*; *Frontenac – the Founding of Kingston*; *Maisonneuve – the Founding of Montreal*; *Quebec – Samuel de Champlain*; *The Great Race of Jean Baptiste Lagamonière (sic)*; *The Last Stand of Almighty Voice*; *Valiant Hearts – Fort la Reine*; and *The Fathers of Confederation*. Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, pp.57, 59.
[230] "Mme. La Tour's Heroic Feat Dramatized on CNR Chain," Toronto *Daily Star*, 29 January 1931, p.29.
[231] "Romance of Canada," *Toronto Daily Star*, 5 March 1931, p.28.

Plains of Abraham, both "Wolfe, the victorious" and "Montcalm, the gallant" were depicted as "two of Canada's greatest heroes."[232]

Weir recalled one particularly stirring scene that borrowed directly from the French-Canadian interpretation of Canada's past. It occurred in the *Dollard des Ormeaux* episode, which closed out the first season. At the time, it was one of the most celebrated (and embellished) historical events in French-Canadian history; a glorified act that had kept Canada French and Catholic. In the final scene, the players re-enacted the 1910 commemoration that had taken place at Place des Armes in front of Montreal's Notre Dame Cathedral for the 250th anniversary of Dollard's 'heroic' death:

> [A] Battalion of Canadian Infantry was drawn up at the foot of the statue of Dollard and his sixteen companions. At the appointed hour, the doors of the great Cathedral swung open, and the waiting concourse of people was joined by the procession, led by the Archbishop, who took his place upon the dais, and a deep stillness fell upon the place. Standing at attention, the Captain unrolled a scroll. His strong voice rang out across the silence: 'Adam Dollard des Ormeaux – Commandant.' For a moment there was no sound, and then a voice from the ranks replied: 'Mort au champs d'honneur – Dead on the field of honour.' The bugles sounded and the drums rolled. As the name of each hero rang out, a voice answered: 'Tous Morts au champ d'honneur.' Thus ended the last play of the first series.[233]

The episode featuring Lagimodière – "that intrepid French Canadian who, alone in the depths of winter on snow-shoes, traversed the wilds for eighteen hundred miles to bring a message from the beleaguered settlement, now called Winnipeg" – had also resonated with Weir. Lagimodière was the grandfather "of the ill-fated and sadly misunderstood Louis Riel." Weir thought it fitting that both "Lagamonière (*sic*) and his grandson lie

---

[232] Listeners were told that the show "will take Montcalm for its hero." "Radio," *The Ottawa Evening Journal*, 7 May 1931, p.27.
[233] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.57.

beside the Cathedral of St. Boniface. His heroic exploit was a turning-point in Canadian history."[234]

Listenership for *The Romance of Canada* is difficult to establish, but it appears to have been strong among English-speakers. When it began, the series was broadcast on sixteen stations "from Halifax to Vancouver."[235] *The Romance of Canada* was heavily promoted prior to airing, both on radio and in print media, and even from the pulpit.[236] Toronto *Star* readers were advised not to miss the "stirring episodes in the lives of the early discoverers, adventurers and explorers in Canadian history."[237] The Ottawa *Journal* also told potential listeners that the series "has been giving listeners the stirring events of the colourful history of the Dominion."[238] The series originally played on Thursday evenings – prime time for radio, when "'listeners ... gather around their fireplaces.'"[239] Most episodes aired during the winter, when people were more likely to be at home and indoors.[240] And, as Weir explained, "listeners badly needed programs like these, for those days were the cheerless days of the Great Depression."[241] Radio provided an easy and inexpensive diversion.

Accolades began pouring in shortly after the series went to air on 22 January 1931. *The Ottawa Journal* gave expression to "the view of a substantial section of the press" when it urged other radio interests to emulate the CNR's nation-building efforts,

---

[234] *Ibid*., pp.59-60.
[235] "Historical Sketch," *Toronto Daily Star*, 22 January 1931, p.26.
[236] Weir referred, for instance, to "the President's announcement, [and] the reams of publicity ... put out by the company, particularly an article in *The Canadian Home Journal* that was being printed in what was then a most popular magazine." Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.54. Owing to the programme's Christian content, "A large section of the clergy throughout Canada had been advised, and expressions of appreciation were legion, with many ministers referring to the program from their pulpits on the following Sunday." P.57.
[237] "Historical Sketch," *Toronto Daily Star*, 22 January 1931, p.26.
[238] "Radio," *Ottawa Evening Journal*, 7 May 1931, p.27.
[239] Thornton in Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.53.
[240] This was outside "'the busy season,'" Thornton explained. In *Ibid*., p.53.
[241] *Ibid*., p.51.

so as to "'meet the wishes of a vast number of people.'" Whether Canadian radio was to be nationalized or not, the paper continued, it should at the very least be made "'to do what the Canadian National Railways made it do.'"[242] Private citizens also expressed praise for the series by phoning or writing to CNR radio. The first phone call of congratulations to CNR's radio team came from former Prime Minister Robert Borden. Saskatchewan's Minister of Public Works added his congratulations as well.[243]

The enthusiasm of educators for *The Romance of Canada* was striking. The English and History Associations of the Secondary Schools of Toronto, for instance, called for adaptations of the series to be "printed and made available to high schools and collegiate institutes."[244] History teachers from Daniel McIntyre High School in Winnipeg felt the series had "'undoubtedly stimulated interest in the story of Canada's past ... [among] all her citizens, young and old.'"[245] Another educator from Winnipeg, Professor C.W. Kierstead, called on the programmers to air the series earlier in the day because he and others were "'exceedingly anxious that as many children as possible might have an opportunity of learning history in this acceptable way.'"[246] For these educators, at least, the series doubtless influenced lesson plans, textbook selections, and the overall version of history taught to students.

Clubs and fraternal associations also made a point of encouraging their members to listen in. "'We feel that these [episodes] are of inestimable value and trust that they will be continued,'" wrote the Local Council of Women of Saskatoon on behalf of its

[242] In *Ibid*., p.62.
[243] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.61.
[244] *Ibid*., p.61.
[245] In *Ibid*., p.61.
[246] In *Ibid*., p.61.

forty-five member-associations.[247] One Saskatoon woman, for instance, made a point of assembling all of her children and "'the children of the neighbourhood'" every Thursday evening to gather 'round her husband's homemade "'little radio,'" and "'with map and history books, ... relive the stirring stories of the past.'" The romanticized stories of Canada and New France, in particular, opened up new "'worlds ... to these little prairie folk to whom the sound of waves and the songs of the sailors and the sea have been alien sounds.'"[248] Listening to the show became something of a public event in some cases. For the 26 February 1931 episode chronicling the Métis victory over the HBC at the Battle of Seven Oaks in 1816, one hundred and eighty descendants of the Métis and the Selkirk settlers who had supported the HBC gathered at the CNR-owned Fort Garry Hotel to tune in. The *Manitoba Free Press* reported on the event: "descendants of rival fur traders, the Metis and the Selkirk settlers were united in a common bond of pride in their gallant forefathers."[249] Despite its success, the series was not renewed the following year – Depression-era cuts to the CNR budget, and the uncertainty surrounding CNR radio with the impending decision to sell its assets to a new government body, prevented this.[250] But for some Anglo-Canadians, at least, the series had a clear impact on their understanding of Canada's history and its French heritage.

The formation of the CRBC (later CBC) in 1932 ensured further centralization and the continuation of a dualist narrative for national radio.[251] The debate over the nationalization of radio emerged as a result of the Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting (the Aird Commission), which began studying the questions of regulation

[247] In *Ibid*., p.61.
[248] In *Ibid*., p.61.
[249] *Manitoba Free Press*, 28 February 1931, p.3.
[250] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, pp.59.
[251] See Jackson and Millen, "English-language radio drama," pp.6.

and control in 1928. The Commission was headed by former Canadian Bank of Commerce President Sir John Aird, editor of the Liberal Ottawa *Citizen* newspaper Charles A. Bowman, and by Dr. Augustin Frigon, Director of Montreal's École Polytechnique and the Quebec government's director-general of technical education.[252] The cultural implications of radio moved quickly to the forefront of the debate, including concerns over the amount of American content hitting Canadian airwaves. These concerns were shared by both the Anglo- and French-Canadian intellectual élite.[253] During the summer of 1929, the Commission visited twenty-five cities across the country. They heard nearly three hundred presentations and written statements from citizens, radio broadcasters, commercial interests and labour, provincial governments, the Canadian Legion, and various other cultural and fraternal associations. When they issued their bilingual report on 11 September 1929, Aird, Bowman and Frigon concluded that Canada needed some form of not-for-profit national broadcasting system to meet the needs of a widely dispersed population – one that would be large enough to compete with foreign radio and capable of fostering Canadian values, culture and national unity.[254] Preferably, such a system would be owned by the federal government, and operated in cooperation with the provincial governments.

There was a real sense among the three commissioners that Canada had lost its chance to control the film and magazine industries, which by now were dominated by American content. If radio was going to serve national unity and the establishment of a

---

[252] Vipond, *Listening In*, p.211; Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, pp.111. Weir worked under Frigon for fourteen years: "Nationalized broadcasting never had a more devoted, staunch and loyal advocate."
[253] Vipond, *Listening In*, p.207.
[254] Vipond, *Listening In*, pp.213-217; Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, pp.107-108. Bowman was a close friend of O.D. Skelton, whose concern for national unity and Canadian autonomy was well-known. See Nolan, *Foundations*, p.51.

shared, *Canadian* identity, it was now or never. Encouragingly, by 1931 the quality of Canadian radio programming had started to improve to the point that Canadian stations could better compete with the American alternatives.[255] The CNR's *Romance of Canada* series had been but one manifestation of this improvement. Better to take hold of this success now, the commissioners argued, than risk letting it die on the vine.[256] The report was strongly supported by the Liberal minister responsible for radio, Minister of Marine and Fisheries P.J.A. Cardin, and by his Conservative successor in 1930, Alfred Duranleau.[257]

Nationalization could not be achieved until the question of jurisdiction was addressed. The lobby for federal control was carried on by a number of prominent individuals, many of whom were connected with the so-called Canadian movement. Vincent Massey, for example, used his influence with Prime Minister King to ensure the appointment to the Commission of individuals who would support the nationalist vision for radio. Graham Spry, secretary to the Association of Canadian Clubs, also lobbied, and the influential O.D. Skelton conveyed to the prime minister his support for "the creation of a strong, sound, publicly owned broadcasting system."[258]

In 1930, Spry and his close friend Alan Plaunt formed the Canadian Radio League (CRL) to maintain the pressure on the new Conservative government to follow through on the recommendations of the Aird Commission. They were two members of an emerging middle-class Ottawa intelligentsia who, Weir explained, "wanted an

[255] Vipond, *Listening In*, pp.241; Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.131.
[256] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.108.
[257] See Vipond, *Listening In*, pp.108-109.
[258] Vipond, *Listening In*, p.209.

opportunity to render signal service to Canada."[259] Indeed, the CRL included an array of members and organizers who were in their twenties or early thirties. Like so many others then ensconced in the Canadian movement, Spry and Plaunt had been influenced as students by the autonomist and biculturalist discourse being promoted by members of the academic community. These included the likes of Frank Underhill, whose outlook was decidedly North American and isolationist in foreign affairs, Hugh MacLennan, who would later pen his famous work on Anglo-/French-Canadian relations, *The Two Solitudes* (1946), George Wrong, whose appreciation for French-Canadian history was well-established, Stephen Cartwright, the editor of the influential *Canadian Forum*, and future prime minister and CRL member, Lester Pearson. As Pearson recalled later in life, his time with Plaunt and in the CRL left a lasting impression.[260] Others joined the movement in Ottawa, including Tom Moore of the Trades and Labour Congress, local lawyer Russell Smart, and Father Henri St. Denis from the Université d'Ottawa.[261] Together, they used their extensive connections through academia, the Canadian movement, and newspapers such as the Ottawa *Citizen* to further the cause. They also gained the crucial support of Prime Minister R.B. Bennet's son-in-law and closest advisor, W.D. Herridge.[262]

Like other young civic nationalists of the emerging intelligentsia, Spry and Plaunt called for a national identity that could be accessible to both Anglo- and French Canadians. Plaunt:

---

[259] "Those now engaged in broadcasting in Canada, and particularly those in the CBC, owe a debt that has never been adequately acknowledged, much less paid, to Spry and Plaunt." Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.117.
[260] See Nolan, *Foundations*, pp.34-37.
[261] Vipond, *Listening In,* p.231.
[262] *Ibid*., p.230; Nolan, *Foundations*, pp.65.

> 'Canada is a nation – young and inexperienced it is true, but nevertheless a nation. Gradually the people of French, British and other origins are beginning to think nationally, as it were; are becoming proud to look upon Canada as their patria, their native land, and to regard themselves as, first of all, Canadians.'[263]

In radio, Spry saw the opportunity to finally communicate to all Canadians a unique and shared sense of identity, despite the cultural and geographic distances separating them:

> 'I feel more strongly every day, as I go about this country, that our national problem of creating a distinct nation at once different from either Britain or the United States, based upon two races historically antagonistic – the French and the English – and split up by economically unproductive areas or natural barriers, can be enormously hastened and facilitated by the new weapon science has given us – the radio.'[264]

Among the CRL's stated objectives was the development of broadcasting as "'an effective instrument in nation building,'" and the "'fullest protection of the language and character of the Province of Quebec.'"[265] Although culturally Anglo-Canadian, both Spry and Plaunt had some French ancestry, and demonstrated a keen sensitivity to French-Canadian interests. To that end, they made a point of recruiting French-Canadian leaders into the CRL. In addition to St. Denis, active Francophone members included *Le Devoir* editor Georges Pelletier in Montreal, Marguerite Lafleur, also from Montreal, Eugène l'Heureux from Chicoutimi, Sir Georges Garneau at Quebec, and the future prime minister, Louis St. Laurent.[266]

The question over jurisdiction was finally settled in 1932, when the JCPC ruled in favour of the federal government's claim to complete authority over broadcasting.[267] The federal legal team had been led by Brooke Claxton, a Liberal Anglo-Quebecer who

---

[263] In Nolan, *Foundations*, p.29. In 1939 he urged Mackenzie King to keep Canada neutral for the sake of national unity. P.152.
[264] In Vipond, *Listening In*, p.228.
[265] Spry in *Ibid*., p.261.
[266] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.121; Vipond, *Listening In*, p.233.
[267] Beginning in 1929, Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick had backed a legal challenge to the federal government's claim over jurisdiction in radio broadcasting, and appealed it all the way to the JCPC. Vipond, *Listening In*, pp.251-252.

believed in radio's potential for fostering cross-cultural understanding, Winnipeg newspaperman J.W. Dafoe, and Louis St. Laurent.[268] Shortly after the JCPC decision came down, the federal government established the CRBC, headquartered in Ottawa, to regulate and administer broadcasting licensing, and to create content for nation-wide broadcasts.[269] The *Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act* passed in May 1932, moved by Prime Minister Bennett himself. It passed almost unanimously with the vocal support of Ernest Lapointe and J.S. Woodsworth.[270]

The CRBC began its operations by taking over the national network that had been established by the CNR, including its studios and its experienced staff centred in Montreal and Halifax.[271] Its first Chairman was Hector Charlesworth, the music and drama critic and editor of *Saturday Night* magazine, "the most important weekly, both editorially and pictorially, Canada ever had."[272] As a matter of convention, its first Vice-Chairman was a French-Canadian, Thomas Maher from Quebec City. Maher, a successful forestry engineer, was the founder and editor of the partisan Conservative Quebec City-based *Le Journal*. He had entered politics in 1930 as a federal Conservative organizer.[273]

The decision to nationalize helped foster radio programming that was ultimately more pan-Canadian, and less regional, in its presentation.[274] "The movement toward nationalization was clearly motivated by a desire to create a national culture," explain historians John Jackson and Paul Millen. Prime Minister R.B. Bennett stated as much

[268] Bercuson, *True Patriot*, pp.67-71, 79.
[269] Vipond, *Listening In*, pp.53, 195, 270.
[270] Only one backbench MP voted against the bill. Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, pp.133-135.
[271] *Ibid*., p.139-140; Tippett, *Making Culture*, pp.80-81.
[272] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.137.
[273] *Ibid*., pp.137-138.
[274] See Jackson and Millen, "English-language radio drama," pp.3-5.

when he declared in 1932 that radio must "'be the agency by which national consciousness may be fostered and sustained and national unity still further strengthened.'"[275] Moreover, the nationalization of radio would allow for further expression of the cultural federalism that had been evoked earlier by CNR radio. To be sure, some French-Canadian observers were skeptical as to how much French-language programming they could expect from a single, unified national broadcaster. *La Presse*, for instance, had at first opposed the recommendations of the Aird Commission.[276]

The CRBC's early programming, however, suggested that such fears were misplaced. Much as with CNR radio, the CRBC's transmissions contained a mix of music, drama and news programming, about four hours every evening – the "peak hours" for listening. Three of those hours were made up largely of regional programming so as to cater to regional tastes, and one hour consisted of national coast-to-coast programming. Moreover, a significant amount of the national broadcasts included French.[277] In late 1932 the CRBC hired established Montreal radio programmer Arthur Dupont to head the French-language operations. In 1933, Dupont became responsible for overseeing all programming in Quebec and the Maritimes, which were lumped together as one CRBC region, thus ensuring that "a varied schedule of French programs" would air across Eastern Canada, serving Anglo-Canadians, French Canadians and Acadians alike. That same year, CRBC Vice-Chairman Maher was tasked with overseeing all national programming. Maher ensured the national broadcasting consisted of "good productions,"

[275] In *Ibid*., p.7.
[276] Vipond, *Listening In*, p.239.
[277] See Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, pp.146-149.

and that "three and sometimes four of the seven national hours available weekly [were] filled with French-language programs."[278]

This was a significant increase in the amount of nation-wide French-language programming that had previously been available on CNR radio. It did not go unnoticed. The sudden appearance of so much French programming prompted protests from extremists in some parts of Ontario and Western Canada, in particular from the Orange Order and the KKK. As Weir explained, the perceived "problem" was not so much the French language itself, but rather its association with Roman Catholicism.[279] The Order and the Klan were doubtless still upset over the limitations that Cardin and others in government had placed on the use of radio for denouncing Catholics. Their reaction, Weir continues, was the product of a "queer mixture of prejudice, bigotry and fear."[280] Indeed, these groups feared that Canada was becoming a more progressive country, and that it was leaving behind the British-Canadian ethno-centrism that they held so dear.[281] For its part, *The Canadian Forum* poked fun at the controversy: "Let us give thanks that the Radio Commission is specializing on French programmes from Montreal. They might [otherwise] be giving us Orange programmes from Toronto."[282]

---

[278] *Ibid*., p.149. See Nolan, *Foundations*, pp.109, on the early evolution of the CRBC/CBC as a "national institution."

[279] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, pp.149-151. In 1934, with an election looming, Bennett noted that the "'Government is losing hundreds of votes through the insistence of the French Canadians on bilingualism, particularly at the moment in connection with radio.'" Instead of calling directly for a change to the CRBC's programming, Bennett tried to get his political operatives to set up private radio stations sympathetic to the Conservatives in western Canada. Nolan, *Foundations*, p.113.

[280] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.150.

[281] To that effect, the Sons of England of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan "went on record as considering it a concerted effort to make Canada a bilingual country, and insisted that the French language had no official standing outside the Province of Quebec." *Ibid*., p.150.

[282] "Editorial: Thanksgiving," *The Canadian Forum*, October 1933, in J.L. Granatstein and Peter Stevens, eds., *Forum: Canadian life and Letters, 1920-1970, Selections from* The Canadian Forum (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), p.114.

Anglo-Canadian moderates who did not oppose the high level of national French-language programming lamented the fact that it had not been more slowly introduced, so as to gradually instil "greater appreciation of French talent and the French way of life."[283] As Grant Dexter, the Ottawa correspondent for J.W. Dafoe's *Manitoba Free-Press*, explained: "Had they started with two hours of French per week, their chances of success would have been much better."[284] In effect, the CRBC's French-language content and the subsequent protest were a reminder of both the successes and the limitations of cross-cultural rapprochement during the interwar period. The winds of change may have been in the air, but British-Canadian ethno-centrism still had its supporters.[285]

Despite the mixed response to the amount of French-language programming, the CRBC/CBC continued to project a message of cultural-linguistic pluralism. Maher resisted pressures to drastically alter the ratio of French-English programming. Instead, the CRBC claimed that "it was not that too many French programs were being broadcast but too few English," and resolved to increase English-language programming without reducing French-language programming.[286] Popular drama series aired by the CRBC/CBC during the 1930s built on the success of *The Romance of Canada*, reflecting Canada's diversity. The Toronto studio produced the nationally aired and highly popular *Forgotten Footsteps*, another piece that focussed on the past. Rupert Caplan's popular Montreal-produced religious series, *And it Came to Pass*, also aired nationally. Caplan, a Jew, carefully established a narrative that both Catholics and Protestants could identify

---

[283] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.151.
[284] See Grant in *Manitoba Free*-Press, 9 September 1933, p.10. Weir provided a similar explanation: "Later, as understanding grew and prejudice lessened, such broadcasts might have been judiciously increased without arousing any serious agitation." Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.151.
[285] "The trouble was the French language was associated with Roman Catholicism." Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.150.
[286] *Ibid*., p.152.

with.[287] Orchestras from both Montreal and Toronto featured regularly on the programming. Some national radio programs made deliberate attempts at fostering mutual understanding. Listeners to one CBC program were told that

> Responsibility for better understanding falls alike on French-Canadians and English-Canadians. But for our part, we must overcome our anglo-Centrism, learn to appreciate the heritage of the French-Canadian, build in the rest of Canada a broader understanding of French difficulties and problems. Then, in a milieu of joint activity about the things which concern us, a true 'bon-entente' (sic), not an illusory one, may be reached.[288]

English- and French-language radio services were available from coast-to-coast, albeit limited at times. The Canadian Medical Association used radio to deliver medical talks and public service announcements in both English and French.[289] In addition to the national programming, regional programming for the CRBC/CBC outside Quebec also included some French-language content. As early as 1934, the CRBC was broadcasting a bilingual musical programme in Western Canada featuring a group of Anglo- and French-Canadian musicians from Edmonton, "Violons et Violoncelles." Quebec's French-language press took notice.[290] By this time, the CRBC's programming had also begun to include English and French broadcasts of the stock market. Dramatic programming and informative talks in both English and French also received renewed emphasis at the main studios in Toronto and Montreal, and improved in both quality and quantity. Coverage of special events took place on nationwide broadcasts, including a national radio pageant for

---

[287] See LAC, Graham Spry fonds, MG30-D297, reel M-7470, Austin Weir, "Forgotten Footsteps"; Tippett, *Making Culture*, pp.80.

[288] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/257/8, Jean I. Hunter, "This bi-racial country," CBC radio broadcast transcript, n.d. (1937?), p.1. See also Pierce, *A Canadian People*, p.12; and *Le Devoir*, 5 June 1934, p.1.

[289] As Dr. Gerin-Lajoie explained, "It is impossible to value a matter such as this." LAC, CMAF, MG28-I343, AGM minutes (M-7486), 17-18 June General Council, 1940, p.208.

[290] "Chez nos frères de l'Alberta," *Le Devoir*, 5 June 1934, p.1.

George V's Jubilee in 1935 that featured, among other things, "a champion farmer of Quebec; an Ontario prospector; [and] a pioneer lumberman of British Columbia."[291]

In 1936 the CRBC became the CBC, with expanded funding and programming. When it was created, the CBC owned seven stations outright, including four English and three French.[292] Producing original dramas became a priority, and by 1938 the CBC had created a separate drama department that produced 350 plays over the next four years.[293] Like the CRBC, the CBC would be headed by an Anglo-Canadian and a French Canadian: Chairman Leonard W. Brockington, a "scholar and orator" and legal counsel for the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, and Vice-Chairman René Morin, from Montreal, who had graduated from McGill as a "notary and man of financial standing."[294] Morin had been general manager of the General Trust of Canada, subsidiary of the Banque Canadienne Nationale. He succeeded Brockington as Chairman in late 1939.[295] The initial CBC board of governors included an assortment of other Canadian nationalists, Anglophones and Francophones, including Plaunt, who had intervened to ensure the presence of members who "'really understood the dual language question'" and who would be sensitive to "'the strength of [foreign policy] isolationist sentiment in French Canada at the present time.'"[296] Even Anglo-Quebecers appointed to board, Plaunt continued, should be "'agreeable to the French-speaking members of the Board.'"[297]

In the late 1930s, CBC Chairman Brockington and General Manager Major Gladstone Murray commissioned cultural enthusiast John Murray Gibbon to provide

---

[291] Weir, The Struggle for National Broadcasting, p.197.
[292] It made immediate plans to buy out dozens more and so create a truly national radio network for national, regional and local broadcasting. Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.226.
[293] Nolan, *Foundations*, p.148-149.
[294] Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.207.
[295] Nolan, *Foundations*, p.167.
[296] In *Ibid*., p.131; Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.207.
[297] In Nolan, *Foundations*, p.158.

radio programming for the transcontinental network that would better expose different Canadians to each others' cultures. Early in 1938, Gibbon presented ten musical programmes highlighting the folk music of different groups of Canadians. The first episode highlighted French-Canadian music. Gibbon provided English-language translations and recordings of the songs so that his Anglo-Canadian audience could understand their meaning. Through cultural descriptions and music, Gibbon hoped to "convey a message and an opportunity of mutual understanding to a large audience of listeners scattered from Coast to Coast over the nine Provinces of Canada." The program was a hit, having large numbers of listeners, many who wrote Gibbon to express how much they had enjoyed learning about the country's diverse musical heritage. The program was so successful that the translations were released and sold as sheet music in a collection entitled *Northland Songs* (1938). It also spawned a book – Gibbon's *Canadian Mosaic* (1938).[298] Radio also gave voice to French-Canadian moderates like Jean-Charles Harvey, who went on to become a radio news commentator, and the Abbé Arthur Maheux, whose famous lecture series aimed at reconciling cross-cultural differences, *Pourquoi sommes-nous divisés?*, aired as French-language programming. These were but the beginnings of a long history of cross-cultural promotion from Canada's national broadcaster.

During the interwar period, the Anglo-Canadian public encountered a more positive image (albeit at times stereotypical) of Quebec and of French-Canadian society through civic anniversaries, popular literature, print media, radio, and film. Some were even inspired to learn French. For many, however, this was not enough – they wanted to experience Quebec, the heart of French Canada, firsthand. "First, Go there! Do it! Then

[298] Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, pp.x-xi.

Write it!" declared Francis Parkman, to which his biographer, David Hackett Fischer, added: "and Inspire others to do the same!"[299] A surprising number of Anglo-Canadians, and Ontarians in particular, would do just that.

[299] David Hackett Fischer, *Champlain's Dream* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2008), p.9.

Chapter IX: TOURISM AND LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL DUALISM IN QUEBEC

In the 1920s and '30s, private and public interests in Quebec made a concerted effort to attract American and Anglo-Canadian tourists. The reasons were above all economic. Tourism to Quebec had already begun to develop before the war. "Many of our citizens go down there in the summer," Toronto Mayor Tommy Church told his Quebec guests at a Bonne Entente League meeting in January 1917. Such visits served to improve perceptions of Canada's French-Canadian province – visitors returned with "a warm feeling towards [French Canadians] generally and towards the people of the province of Quebec."[1] If tourism had begun to develop before the war, it was the affluence of the 1920s that made it possible for even more upper- and middle-class Anglo-Canadians to take longer, farther-flung vacations and to spend more money while on vacation. In the 1930s, as in other times of economic recession, tourism stood out as a means for economic diversification through the service sector and, more to the point, a means to supplement the province's diminished income.[2] New modes of transportation also made large-scale tourism possible, not only by train and boat, but by bus and increasingly by personal passenger car. The latter had been made more affordable by innovations in mass production, and more feasible thanks to post-war road construction.[3] In addition to instructing potential visitors on how to best reach Quebec destinations like Montreal by

[1] LAC, GP, MG30-C11, Vol.2, BEL meeting, January 8-10, 1917, Tommy Church, p.3.
[2] In Atlantic Canada, too, people turned to tourism to alleviate a depressed economy. McKay, *Quest of the Folk*, p.xv.
[3] Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.465.

train, bus, and car, by the late 1930s promotional material even provided advice on how to reach the city by plane.[4]

Renewed curiosity in French-speaking Canada motivated thousands of middle-class Anglo-Canadians to visit Quebec. Indeed, many went in response to advertisements from the Quebec government and private companies that portrayed a visit to Quebec as an historical pilgrimage to the cradle of Canadian civilization. Historian Nicole Neatby explains:

> In Quebec, one encountered 'four centuries of Canadian history,' the 'beginning of a new continent, a new nation, a new Dominion.' …. English Canadians' interest for Quebec in terms of its historical connection to the birth of Canada was also taken into account in statements that the people of Quebec were 'descendants of some of *our* earliest settlers.' Some of the ads invited readers to 'know more of *our* corner of the Dominion,' suggesting that the Quebec government intended the advertisements to have a special appeal to English Canadians.[5]

The assertion that Anglo-Canadians, too, could take some ownership over Canada's French heritage was clear. Anglo-Canadian travel writers recounted their experiences accordingly. By the late 1930s, they had developed a more nuanced perception of French-Canadian society as not only steeped in history, but also at the leading edge of modernity in some cases.[6]

The 1950s are often associated with road and highway construction and the proliferation of the automobile among the middling classes, but the interwar period marked a real beginning for increased access to the automobile. "'By the 1920s,'" Stephen Davies explains, "'it was no longer simply a rich man's toy." Indeed, while

---

[4] See, for instance, Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.29.
[5] Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," pp.491-492. Emphasis added.
[6] "The awareness that they were visiting part of their own country coloured all their reactions and produced a slightly different set of attitudes to those of their fellow American travel writers. .... [F]or many English Canadian travel writers, Quebec was ... the homeland of the ancestors of all Canadians. .... Their reactions also suggest that this national pride [in Quebec's modern industry], combined with prior access to a wider range of cultural products about Quebec, allowed them to project a less folkloric image of the province." Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," pp.471, 485-486.

income levels rose, automobile prices dropped dramatically – from an average of $906 in 1921 to $695 in 1926 – as a result of mass production and "new financing plans" for consumers. Significantly, Ontario, the source of most Canadian tourists to Quebec, had more passenger vehicles than any other province. By 1914, travel by automobile in Ontario had already begun to eclipse horse-drawn traffic. The number of cars in the province in the post-war increased from 31,724 in 1914 to 490,906 by 1930 – or one motor vehicle for every seven people. Globally, only the US had more automobiles registered *per capita*.[7]

Automobiles brought people from greater distances into closer contact with each other as they took advantage of the new 'freedom' cars offered. It became popular for people to see how far they could travel as they explored this new freedom, visiting more distant destinations, including rural areas where the open space, quaint countryside and 'simpler' lifestyle contrasted with the restrictive environment, oppressive modernity and crushing industrialization of urban spaces. This theme was perpetuated by automobile advertising, which promised freedom and emphasized this "reorientation of spatial norms" with the increasing proximity of rural and previously 'far-flung' spaces.[8] Such values would naturally be associated with the rural Quebec spaces now being visited by Ontario's tourist 'explorers.'

The Quebec government invested heavily in building new highways and improving old ones, including routes connecting it to the rest of Canada via Ontario and New Brunswick. From 1912 to 1925, the Quebec government spent $75M on this "Good Roads" program. "These roads," it explained, "link together all the centres of the

[7] Stephen Davies, "'Reckless Walking Must Be Discouraged': The Automobile Revolution and the Shaping of Modern Urban Canada to 1930," *Urban History Review* 18, 2 (October 1989): 123-138.
[8] *Ibid*., p.130.

Province and provide numerous connections between the latter, the neighbouring Provinces and the United States."[9] While many of the more rural roads were closed in the winter, the major highways remained open, and services such as gas stations, restaurants, motels and campgrounds began popping up along these routes. Summer was the prime tourism season. By 1925, three major highways connected Quebec to Ontario, with two more under construction, and two other routes connected to New Brunswick. Tourism material promoted Route 27, the Montreal-Toronto highway that skirted the St. Lawrence, as an "extremely picturesque route and the main entering highway for tourists from Ontario."[10] Route 35, the Charlemagne-St. Eustache route, provided "direct communication between Ottawa and Québec."[11] Route 31, the Rimouski-Matapédia highway, was part of Quebec's contribution to "the proposed Trans-Canada Highway and is the direct route to Québec for tourists from Campbellton, Moncton and Halifax, and for tourists from Prince Edward Island."[12] From 1923-1930, the Quebec government spent another $20M on highways, the "largest single budgetary item," making up nearly 25 per cent of annual expenses by the province. As a result, the amount of good quality roads and highways "nearly tripled to 12,464 miles."[13]

Several motivations lay behind the Quebec government's improved roads initiative, including increased freight (truck) traffic, municipalities' inability to improve local roads themselves, dramatically increased provincial funding (thanks to a boost in Liquor Commission profits) that made the initiative possible, and, most importantly,

---

[9] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.37. "The roads are open to motorists immediately after the spring thaw, generally in April [through to December]." P.40.
[10] *Ibid*., p.59
[11] *Ibid*., p.61.
[12] *Ibid*., p.60.
[13] Bernard Vigod, *Quebec Before Duplessis: the Political Career of Louis-Alexandre Taschereau* (Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1986), p.126.

"providing access to resource-rich districts of Quebec."[14] But tourism was also a major driving force.[15] By 1930, three quarters of tourists to Quebec were coming by car, growing from 15,000 in 1915 to 650,000 in 1930. This number did not include countless short trips made by Ontarians and New Brunswickers who lived closer to the provincial boundary. With the increased number of tourists, related revenues increased exponentially, from a mere $34,000 in 1915 to $61,200,000 in 1929.[16] The advent of improved and paved highways also opened up bus travel. By the mid-1920s, Gray Line buses connected cities like Ottawa, Toronto, Vancouver, Victoria, and even Banff to Montreal and Quebec City.[17]

Tourists also continued to travel to Quebec by more traditional means, including by boat and, more importantly, by rail. Windsor, London, Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa, Niagara Falls, and Saint John, connecting through the CNR and CPR, could all make Montreal or Quebec City within a day. Hotels in each of these cities had special contacts prepared to make arrangements for anyone wishing to make such a trip.[18] With the new popularity of the automobile, the CPR and CNR mounted aggressive tourism campaigns to encourage customers to keep taking the train. The railway companies' promotions appealed directly to potential visitors' curiosities about the different cultures of Canada's peoples. In 1928, for instance, CPR Chairman and President Sir Edward Beatty commissioned cultural commentator John Murray Gibbon to organize "a series of

[14] Vigod, *Quebec Before Duplessis*, p.126.
[15] "Good roads are the best advertisement for the Province." Province de Québec, *Roads Department 1925 Report* (Québec: The Printer to His Majesty the King, 1925), LAC, Amicus no. 28581627, p.29.
[16] Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," pp.466-467.
[17] See Province of Quebec Tourist Association, "How to Visit Montreal," map insert.
[18] *Ibid*.

folksong, folkdance and handicraft festivals" from Quebec to British Columbia highlighting various cultural communities, including Francophones.[19]

With the automobile, then, the country had become smaller, people from different regions less isolated from each other, and Quebec much closer and accessible to other Canadians. Travel to the French-Canadian province – having been logistically and financially unfathomable for so many Canadians in the past – was suddenly affordable and feasible for middle-class Anglo-Canadians who might otherwise never have met a Francophone in their lives. New roads and highways opened up previously remote regions of the province. "Among the new districts opened to tourist traffic," the government was pleased to report in 1928, "may be mentioned Chicoutimi and Lake St. John, the Laurentians north of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa, and finally the Gaspé Peninsula" – some of the most scenic regions of the province.[20] Tourism to Quebec was made possible by technology, but it was also made possible by the fact that the audience was becoming more open to the idea of visiting the heart of French Canada.

The growth in tourism can also be attributed to the provincial government's post-war promotional efforts. The campaign was directed for the most part by the Tourism Bureau of the Quebec Department of Roads and Mines. In addition, municipal associations like the Montreal Historical Guides Association, the Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, as well as the City of Montreal itself also promoted visitation with tourist maps and brochures. Initially, the importance of the automobile to tourism had remained hypothetical in the eyes of government.[21] But by 1925, however, tourism

[19] Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, p.x.
[20] Province de Québec, *Roads Department 1928 Report* (Québec: The Printer to His Majesty the King, 1928), LAC, Amicus no. 28581627, p.47.
[21] "Quant au tourisme étranger, il n'est pas encore né." Province de Québec, *Rapport du Ministère de la*

promotion was a high priority as the proliferation of the personal automobile created new economic potential. "The Province of Quebec now enjoys unprecedented publicity," read one government report. "Tourist traffic is becoming one of our main sources of revenue."[22] Convinced that tourism was "inseparable from roads," the Quebec government distributed highway maps and road guides along with the usual tourism brochures and guidebooks, and embarked on its improved highways programme to make it easier for motorists to visit.[23]

Car tourism was so successful that by the late 1920s the Quebec government considered its income potential to be almost limitless. "Our tourist resources are inexhaustible. They are indestructible. The yearly income from this capital can increase almost indefinitely," gushed the provincial government's 1928 annual report.[24] The government was evidently proud of the amenities – natural, historical, cultural and commercial – that it had to offer the visitor, especially its unique character:

> The Province of Quebec offers to the tourist attractions unparalleled in any other Province or State in North America. It is characterized by history, traditions, a language and population quite distinct from the rest of America. This can be the basis of a most flourishing tourist industry. Besides its picturesqueness, the Province of Quebec can boast of fisheries, hunting, summer resorts, sports, large cities, industrial areas, a little Switzerland north of the Ottawa and the St. Lawrence…. [T]he Province is only awakening to the value of this industry and to a realization of its limitless resources. Systematic advertising has only just begun. .... Much remains to be done to make tourist traffic a success.[25]

In other words, exposing more individuals to Quebec, including Canadians from outside the province, made simple economic sense. The Quebec government estimated that tourism between 1919 and 1929 had generated some $245M for the economy. Tourism-

---

Voirie, 1923 (Québec: Imprimateur de sa Majesté le Roi, 1923), LAC, Amicus no. 28581627, p.8.
[22] Province de Québec, *Roads Department 1925 Report*, p.29.
[23] *Ibid*., p.29.
[24] Province de Québec, *Roads Department 1928 Report*, p.47.
[25] *Ibid*., p.45.

related economic activity had grown from $2M in 1919, to $16M in 1924, to over $60M in 1929.[26]

The tourism campaign was above all about making money, but it also aimed to educate visitors about the province – to promote its place as the historical heartland of Canada, and also as Canada's centre of modernity and material progress. "The object of our tourist policy," explained one government report, "[is] to foster among possible tourists a wish to know [Quebec], and especially to make them remain in the Province as long as possible."[27] Improving roads, for instance, was one way of helping tourists reach Quebec's natural and historical heritage sites, but it also helped project a modern self-image: "To attract the tourist, it is not enough to tell him that we have fine landscapes and many historical spots. We must also show him how to get there."[28]

As historian Nicole Neatby has explained, the tourism promotional campaign was aimed primarily at Americans from New England and New York – the largest, wealthiest, and therefore most lucrative nearby market for potential tourists. By 1929, Quebec was attracting "39% of the American tourist market."[29] Some publications were careful to cater to American needs, advising them, for instance, of speed limits, customs regulations, and restrictions on bringing "Pistols and Revolvers" across the border.[30] But the tourism promotional material also targeted Anglo-Canadians as a valuable 'bonus' market for promotional materials that were going to be produced in English anyways.[31]

---

[26] Province de Québec, *Department of Highways 1929 Report* (Québec: The Printer to His Majesty the King, 1929), LAC, Amicus no. 28581627, p.109.
[27] Province de Québec, *Roads Department 1928 Report*, p.47.
[28] Province de Québec, *Roads Department 1925 Report*, p.31.
[29] Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.466.
[30] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* p.20. See also Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, pp.29-30.
[31] See Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.491.

Countless brochures, pamphlets, and newspaper, radio and magazine ads appeared in both the United States and throughout Canada. These were published by provincial and municipal governments and by several business and tourism associations. In 1928 alone, the Provincial Tourist Bureau distributed 1,500,000 "pamphlets, road maps, bulletins, post-cards, etc.," including 300,000 postcards promoting the Gaspé Peninsula.[32] That year the Bureau sponsored a travelling exhibit promoting Quebec at the Ottawa Annual Exhibition and began subsidizing a course in tourism at the Université de Montréal. The government partnered with other distributors of promotional material, such as municipalities, "Auto Clubs and … Civic Authorities, who thus have the benefit of our mailing lists."[33] It also collaborated with the Ontario government to promote inter-provincial tourism.[34]

Many advertising campaigns were designed in part or specifically with Anglo-Canadians in mind. The Tourist Bureau of Quebec's most extensive work, a book entitled *The French-Canadian Province: A Harmony of Beauty, History and Progress* (1925), was, according to its authors, "intended for tourists from the Sister-Provinces and the United States contemplating a visit to French Canada."[35] The Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau's *Montréal: The Paris of the New World* (1937), gave a nod to the recent coronation of George VI by incorporating a seal entitled "Coronation Year, 1937" on its cover, which was sure to please British-Canadian readers.[36] Other brochures provided travel information – including rail and bus connections as well as mileage by

[32] Province de Québec, *Roads Department 1928 Report*, p.49.
[33] *Ibid*., p.49, see also p.51.
[34] This included cooperation on highway maps for tourists in the mid-1920s. Maude-Émmanuelle Lambert, "La promotion du tourisme automobile et l'élargissement du territoire touristique: vers l'effacement des frontières, 1920-1967." Presentation to the CHA (Victoria, BC), 3 June 2013.
[35] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.5.
[36] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, front cover.

car for reaching Quebec – for both American and Canadian cities, like Ottawa, Toronto, Windsor, London, Hamilton, Niagara Falls, Saint John, and even Vancouver, Victoria, and Banff.[37] In its most comprehensive tourist information piece, the Tourist Bureau of Quebec included several pages listing routes to and from starting points in both Canada and the US. Travelling distances were provided for over forty Canadian cities and towns outside Quebec (most of them in Ontario), and from as far afield as Halifax, Sudbury, Sault-Ste. Marie, and Windsor. The Bureau promised "Good roads everywhere."[38]

Several themes emerged in the promotional material. These themes are important to understand because they indicate what visitors and readers might have learned from the promotional material and from their visits They also reveal something about the self-image that the province wanted to project – how some Quebecers perceived their place in North America and, more specifically, Confederation.

History as attraction

By its very nature, tourism emphasizes history and difference. Tourists want to see something different than what they experience at home – they want to be transported outside their environment in a way that is non-threatening. In the Quebec tourism promotional campaign, history emerged as one of the most predominant themes. Countless ads, brochures, pamphlets, books, booklets and postcards celebrated French-Canadian history and its larger contribution to the making of Canada.

[37] See map insert in Province of Quebec Tourist Association, "How to Visit Montreal."
[38] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, pp.44, 78.

Visitors and prospective tourists were told that the province, and Quebec City and Montreal in particular, were "the heart of French-Canada,"[39] the historical centre of all Canada, and the "cradle of Canadian civilization."[40] Promotional material reminded potential visitors that Canada had not begun with the British Conquest of 1759, but with the arrivals of Jacques Cartier and Samuel de Champlain and the establishment of New France. Thus, the Montreal Historical Guides Association published its "How to Visit Montreal – Old France in North America, the Playground of the North" (1920) with a cover featuring a colourful picture of Jacques Cartier at Cap Rouge, with soldiers and the royal flag of France at his back, and an Amerindian and a bald friar, cross in hand, standing at his feet, looking out at a ship on the water – presumably the famous *Grande Hermine*. The cover also included a ghastly poem:

> Even before the Pilgrim Fathers gathered.
> On these wild shores unknown as yet unnamed.
> Old France had raised her Royal Standard bearing
> The Golden Lillies and with pride had claimed
> The Mountains – Valleys – Timberlands and Mines.
> All Nature's wealth within its Border Lines.[41]

For all of its clumsiness, the poem highlighted a number of themes that tourism promoters tried to evoke: the attraction of the province's untamed natural spaces, ideal for hunting, fishing, and other backcountry vacationing; the attraction of the province's as-yet-unexploited economic potential, notably in resource extraction; and, of course, the attraction of its romantic history – the first line is noteworthy for boasting that Cartier's arrival had preceded that of British America's "Pilgrim Fathers."

---

[39] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, p.28.
[40] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* p.2.
[41] Montreal Historical Guides Association. "How to Visit Montreal," cover.

Like the Montreal Historical Guides Association, the Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau was especially proud of the role that its city had played in opening up the interior and providing a presence for the 'white man' to establish 'civilization':

> Thus did the romantic story of Montreal begin, a lonely fort in the forests hundreds of miles from any other colonist's settlement. Indians constantly threatened the first inhabitants of Ville-Marie. The white man's conquest of the St. Lawrence valley was a bitter struggle….[42]

Provincial government publications also glorified the habitants' struggle in New France and in particular around Montreal (Ville Marie) against "the warlike Iroquois."[43] When depicted at all, tourism publications callously misrepresented Quebec's Aboriginal culture. One brochure contained an image of Kahnawake Mohawks wearing Plains Indian attire in front of a grotesque imitation of a Pacific-Coast-style totem pole, with the caption: "Under the leadership of Chief Poking Fire, seen here with his squaw and son, the Indians at Caughnawaga Reservation live peacefully today where their ancestors camped."[44]

Potential visitors were told that history permeated Quebec society – it was easily accessible and could be found in just about every corner of the province. "The shades of Cartier, Champlain, Frontenac, Talon, de Laval, Montcalm still haunt both town and countryside," promised one booklet.[45] Guidebooks regularly provided 'historical routes' that motorists could follow, detailing each historical site along the way.[46] In other

---

[42] Montreal's founder, Maisonneuve, was featured in a large photograph of the monument. Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.4. A later version of the brochure also featured a picture of an "Indian village." Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, p.4.

[43] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* p.4.

[44] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, p.10. To be sure, some Aboriginal people would have participated out of their own economic pragmatism.

[45] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* p.1.

[46] The Quebec government's provincial visitors' guide, for instance, gave multiple routes that traversed the province with step-by-step information on historic sites. Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian*

publications, Anglophones visiting Montreal were encouraged to go and see such French historical sites as the "Sault aux Recollets – 'The Travellers' Stone Cross at the foot of Rapid du Crochet, where Jacques Cartier is supposed to have landed and where Mass was first celebrated in 1615," the Grey Nunnery, the "Site of Lachine Massacre," the nearby "Old Forts" at Chambly and Ile Sainte-Hélène, or "The Chateau de Ramezay (sic) – Built in 1705 by Claude Ramesay, Governor of Montreal," which had been "occupied by Montgomery in 1775, during American Invasion" and "served as residence for [British] Governors."[47] The authors reminded readers that the Americans had failed to gain "French-Canadian adherence to their cause."[48]

The province's historical architecture and monuments were regularly promoted as attractions in their own right. For prospective North American tourists, visiting Quebec was an inexpensive way to get a feel for the Old World without having to pay for a cruise ship to Europe. Publications boasted of old churches, ancient fortifications, and even the old swept-roof farmhouses of the countryside in an effort that must have appealed to Anglo-Canadians who had grown bored of their own province's staid and utilitarian Protestant British architecture.[49] Quebec's two major urban centres featured prominently when it came to historical architecture and monuments. Quebec City was "the city of remembrance. Proudly rising on its rock, it lives in the memory of the past, raises monuments to the glories of Old France and extends a cordial welcome to tourists."[50] It

---

Province, pp.6-12.
[47] Montreal Historical Guides Association, "How to Visit Montreal." See also Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* p.4.
[48] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, pp.17-19.
[49] See, for instance, Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, pp.8. In *The Clash!*, William Moore also spoke of his admiration for French-Canadian architecture, especially homes, in contrast to the drab, utilitarian and altogether boring British-Canadian architecture common to Ontario.
[50] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.6.

was "the ancient capital and cradle of Canadian civilization."[51] Montreal, meanwhile, was home to the architectural history of both peoples, French and British: "Old Montréal, in the heart of the modern city, still retains its historic buildings. Here we find St. Paul Street, oldest in the city; Place d'Armes, where Maisonneuve defeated the Iroquois in 1644; the Seminary of St. Sulpice dating from 1680; Château de Ramezay built in 1705; the McTavish House of 1780, and many others."[52]

The Tourism Bureau of Quebec was quick to recognize its province's historic appeal as its greatest asset.[53] Specifically, it promoted Quebec as the heartland of *Canadian* historical heritage. "The Province of Québec claims the honour of being the oldest in the Dominion," the Bureau told prospective visitors. Now a proud part of Canada, "Under the French Régime, it was called New France. After being ceded to England, it was successively called Province of Canada, Lower Canada and finally, since Confederation, Province of Québec. It is the 'Historic' Province overflowing with reminiscences of a glorious past."[54] The Bureau encouraged Anglophones to turn their visit into an "historic pilgrimage":

> Here, on the banks of the little river St. Charles, the first Frenchmen took up their winter quarters. Further up, in those plains now called the Battlefields Park, Montcalm fought and died. Close-by, at Ste. Foy, a valiant little French army won a last victory.[55]

Interestingly, several publications assumed a level of knowledge and sentimental connection to the history on the part of the reader. The point here is that Canada's French history was portrayed as an asset, both commercially for tourism purposes (painting

---

[51] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* p.2.
[52] *Ibid*., p.1.
[53] In Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*. The book's first chapter was entitled "The Historic Province," pp.6-12.
[54] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.6.
[55] *Ibid*., p.6.

Quebec as an exotic place) but also culturally; there was a certain pride in the 'ancientness' of the place and its history. Anglo-Canadians, too, could see themselves as inheritors of that history – of Cartier and Champlain's legacy to build 'civilization' and exploit the riches of the new world.

Language and culture as tourist attractions

Much like the province's history, Quebec's French language and French-Canadian culture were promoted as something that could *appeal* to Anglo-Canadian visitors, instead of acting as a deterrent to visiting.[56] The tourism promoters were confident that Anglo-Canadian visitors would be delighted by the cultural differences, from language to cuisine. Moreover, they promoted these differences as a part of the larger *Canadian* culture.[57] In Montreal, promised one tourism brochure, "food and drink have an added zest when accompanied by the lilting tones of French voices."[58] The culinary cultural duality of the city was equally celebrated: "hotels, restaurants and cafés provide a characteristic English-French atmosphere.... [Y]ou can sample French cooking or satisfy the most ravenous appetite on dishes as British as roast beef and Yorkshire pudding."[59]

Over time, the promotional tourism material placed a greater emphasis on the French language as an attraction unto itself – French made Quebec unique and,

---

[56] "More allusions to the French language and more references to the special French cuisine available in Quebec also pointed to the veneer of sophistication that Quebec's image was gradually acquiring." Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.492.
[57] Visitors were told that in Quebec they would "enjoy Canadian dishes." Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.10.
[58] Province of Quebec Tourist Association, "Presented to the Visitor With Compliments of the Province of Quebec Tourist Association," (Quebec, 1925), LAC, Amicus no. 8613350, no page.
[59] *Ibid*.

paradoxically, both quaint and sophisticated. The language was said to create a romantic atmosphere for the visitor, something akin to a 'Paris North':

> There are some things about Montreal, its charm and atmosphere, that cannot be rendered pictorially. French is the mother tongue of a large part of the population. Visitors hear French spoken everywhere, in shops, restaurants, night clubs, and this gives life in Montreal a very Parisian touch.[60]

While evoking France, the promotional material was careful to point out that Quebec culture was unique. "Québec is a French province, but not like modern France. Her people have built up a distinctive culture, colourful in its old-world traditions, rich in its historic background."[61] By the end of the interwar period, promotional material encouraged Anglophone visitors to come to Quebec to try out their French-language skills without having to face the humiliating consequences of failure: "There's a cheery, pleasant feeling everywhere; everybody [in Montreal] speaks English – unless you prefer to give your French a little airing."[62] Such bilingualism, the promoters pledged, naturally created a congenial setting: "You will find too, that Montréal not only writes its signs in both languages but thinks in both as well. Stop a person on the street to ask a direction and you will get a pleasant: 'Oui, M'sieu. Just three blocks to the right! Bon jour (*sic*)!'"[63] Such promotional tactics reassured Anglophones with poor French-language to not feel intimidated about visiting Quebec, and asserted that French-English relations had greatly improved.

Indeed, tourists were repeatedly promised that friendliness was intrinsic to French-Canadian culture. Government publications told prospective visitors that they

---

[60] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.6.
[61] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"*, p.1.
[62] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, p.22.
One Anglo-Canadian referred to having "broke through into the easier relations of human frailty" when French Canadians' forgiving attitude made him feel more at ease with his poor French. See Phillips, "The Schools of Quebec," p.64.
[63] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, p.28.

would "enjoy French-Canadian hospitality."[64] The provincial capital, Quebec City, was said to "extend a cordial welcome to tourists."[65] Tourists would not be treated so coldly as they might expect to be treated in cities like London, Paris or New York. This friendliness only added to the experience: everywhere in the province, "The courtesy of the people gives a new zest to travel."[66] At least one Anglo-Canadian visitor was hopeful that French-Canadian friendliness would rub off on his own people:

> I think that we other Canadians should go to Quebec to receive an education in manners and kindness, if our friends there can implant the necessary attitudes and qualities to make outward manifestations natural and spontaneous, as are their own. There is hope that they might succeed with us, for their own English-speaking colleagues ... are so noteworthy for similar qualities that some credit at least must be given to French-Canadian environment.[67]

The theme of friendliness extended to the Quebec government's hope that other Canadians would recognize Quebec as an integral part of their own country – they wanted Anglo-Canadians to "feel at home in Old Québec."[68] The Tourism Bureau of Quebec referred to the "Old Province" as often as it did to "Old France."[69]

Quaintness

Along with history, language and culture, quaintness emerged as an important theme in Quebec's interwar tourism campaign. Brochures often contained images and illustrations of "quaint," "picturesque" and "typically French-Canadian" villages, complete with pictures of parish churches and religious shrines.[70] French-Canadian

---

[64] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.5.
[65] *Ibid*., p.6.
[66] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* p.1.
[67] Phillips, "The Schools of Quebec," p.63.
[68] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.5.
[69] *Ibid*., pp.6-7.
[70] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* pp.2; Montreal Tourist and Convention

habitants were promoted as a tourist attraction in their own right. "The French nobleman lives on in the courteous peasant who offers you a glass of water and invites you to his table."[71] Quebec was culturally uncorrupted; it housed "the spirit of a people who not only have a deep affection for the 'good old days' but have kept touch with them to a degree unknown elsewhere in the New World."[72] Moreover, a quaint French-Canadian Quebec was a non-threatening Quebec. The theme of quaintness detracted from the ethno-centric nationalism and labour unrest then prevalent in some quarters of the province.[73]

By promoting quaintness, Quebec boosters offered an escape from other places that had 'lost' that character. Potential visitors could travel back in time to a place of historical romance, untarnished by modernity. Promotional campaigns played on Anglophones' growing disillusionment with modernity's problems – industrialization, urbanization and rural depopulation, loss of tradition, alienation with contemporary culture – and harkened back to an older, 'better' time:

> While other lands may lose their individuality – while cities may become so modernized and streamlined that the casual visitor scarcely notices any difference in them except size and location – the Province of Québec still retains its old-world charm.[74]

Moreover, the rapid industrialization and urbanization of much of Canadian (and especially Ontarian) society in the early twentieth century – and the equally rapid and troubling retreat of traditional culture – allowed Anglo- and French Canadians alike to view the persistence of old modes of living with nostalgia instead of embarrassment.

Bureau, *Cosmopolitan Montreal* (Montreal, 1927), LAC, Amicus no. 2638855.
[71] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.8.
[72] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.20.
[73] Organized labour was becoming much more active in Quebec in the 1930s. Fernand Harvey, *Le mouvement ouvrier au Québec* (Montréal: Boréal Express, 1980), p.288.
[74] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* p.1.

Even at the end of the interwar period, the Quebec tourism material asserted that French-Canadian society had retained its ancient Norman character, especially in rural areas. Here, old manners and customs and a warmth "which has long since vanished from other countries" lived on.[75] One booklet promised that even in the late 1930s, "the outdoor bake-oven, hand loom and spinning wheel are still in everyday use" in rural areas, where "old farm houses, windmills and ox-teams lend a picturesque touch to the rustic scenery."[76] These "'Canadiens'" continued to speak an uncorrupted "seventeenth century French," and had "vivacious and charming personalities."[77]

Even the people of Montreal had allegedly retained this quaintness despite life in the 'big city.' The habitants of Montreal were said to have held on to a folkloric culture that visitors could experience while bartering at the Bonsecours Market, for instance, which was "well worth a visit."[78] To be sure, Canadian 'quaintness' could most easily be experienced in the Quebec countryside:

> The whole population of the Old Province lives on the past. Nor is the tourist slow to realize it when travelling through the countryside. Everything conjures up by-gone days: manners, customs, language, quaint dwellings, narrow fields, antiquated windmills, old churches. Each district bears its characteristic features. …. [This is] the typical Canadian homeland, stretching from Québec to Cap Tourmente…. Here lives a population which has most faithfully kept the traditions, language, customs and dress of the past.[79]

---

[75] *Ibid*., p.1. See also Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," pp.490-491.
[76] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* p.2.
[77] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.17.
[78] Montreal Historical Guides Association, "How to Visit Montreal." See also Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*: "[At] Bon-Secours Habitant Market Place… seventeenth century French is spoken (also English), and if you decide to make a bargain at one of the interesting stalls you will be thrilled by the vivacious and charming personalities of the 'Canadiens.' The column seen in the background is a monument to one of England's greatest sailors, Lord Nelson." P.17.
[79] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.6.

The day-to-day life of the 'habitant' was said to have scarcely changed.[80] Surely this was not true, especially in the towns and villages that had manufacturing and related services. But that was beside the point. The literature emphasized what the authors hoped would attract tourists and ignored the realities of a changing French-Canadian society, especially in urban areas.[81]

From the provincial government's perspective, reinforcing stereotypes of rural French-Canadian 'quaintness' was particularly important because of the relative impact that tourism dollars could have in these regions, which had become economically depressed by the 1920s.[82] It was in this vein that the Tourism Bureau of Quebec released its book-length *The Gaspé Peninsula: History, Legends, Resources, Attractions* (1930). Its purpose was "to make it possible for the Tourist (*sic*) to more fully enjoy what is today acknowledged as one of the best holiday outings" in "this Magic Land of Canada."[83] Its depictions of the Gaspé were decidedly romantic. The region was portrayed as frozen in time, with a rugged, natural landscape, picturesque traditional fishing villages dotting the coastline, and small farms where the "sickle and reaping hook are still in use."[84] It was a romantic, windswept, seaborne land, full of mystical legends.[85] The book contained illustrations of "many picturesque sites, typically French-Canadian villages and settlements." According to promoters, the entire countryside was "redolent

---

[80] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.20.
[81] As for the Gaspé: "There's no bread delivery in Gaspé, and so Madam bakes her own and finds the old-fashioned outdoor oven quite suitable to her needs." Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* p.12.
[82] See McKay, *Quest of the Folk*, p.159.
[83] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The Gaspé Peninsula. History, Legends, Resources, Attractions* (Québec: Department of Highways and Mines, April 1930), LAC, Amicus no. 2717922, p.7.
[84] *Ibid*., p.227.
[85] "The old fishermen … have their stories and folklore, their tales of apparitions and legends handed down from father to son and told in the long winter evenings by the flickering light of the open grate." *Ibid*., p.191.

with the atmosphere of antiquity, tempered with just enough of modern civilization to make for combined comfort and pleasure."[86] Visitors to the Gaspé could thusly experience 'real' French-Canadian culture and landscapes without having to visit an outdoor biffy in the middle of the night.

Depicting the Gaspé in more familiar terms to Anglo-Canadians was central to the promotional strategy. The book likened the region's charm to that of Ireland, except that it was bereft of the corrupting influences of time and overpopulation. It also tied Gaspésie's history into more popular Canadian historical themes, citing Île Verte, where "Jacques Cartier, the discoverer of Canada," stopped along his way, and the birthplace of "Raymond-Marie Rouleau, the third cardinal in Canada." The book also pointed out that the region had first been settled by a Scotsman who had served under Wolfe.[87] The Gaspé was "Quebec's Wonderland" and "Canada's Vacation Land," home to "the country homes of wealthy residents of Montreal and other large Canadian cities."[88] The region was well connected to the rest of Canada by sea, car and especially by rail. The book boasted that Gaspésie's population was "considerably increased during the summer by those who gather there for the vacation season from all parts of the Province of Quebec and from other parts of Canada."[89]

Asserting 'Canadianness' and Anglophone/Francophone peaceful coexistence

[86] *Ibid*., p.31. Other publications promoting the entire province went out of their way to feature the Gaspé. See, for instance, Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* pp.12.
[87] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The Gaspé Peninsula*, p.36.
[88] *Ibid*., pp.31-32, 248.
[89] The popular beach community of Cacouna, for instance, was directly connected by the CNR line. *Ibid*., p.34. The book lists travelling distances to Gaspé by road, rail and sea from Canadian and US starting points, pp.249.

The Quebec tourism literature promoted the province as a place that was decidedly Canadian. Montreal was "The Metropolis of Canada," the Laurentian Mountains were "the playground of Eastern Canada," Quebec City was "the ancient capital of Canadian civilization," the Eastern Townships were "so strangely reminiscent of the English lakelands," and the Gaspé was the "Site of the white man's discovery of Canada."[90] For potential Anglo-Canadian tourists, then, Quebec could hold the double allure of being both familiar and exotic – a part of their country, yet distinct. In many respects, the 'Canadianness' promoted in the tourism literature was that of a liberal, tolerant Canadian nationalism – Quebec and Canada's pluralistic culture were championed throughout in the advertising material.

Anglo-/French-Canadian coexistence and cooperation were celebrated as key features of Quebec society.[91] The provincial population was "85.5% Catholic; 80% French," but that left room for sizeable Protestant British-Canadian minorities.[92] The Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau demonstrated a certain pride in its city's cultural duality. "More than two-thirds of the inhabitants of Montreal speak French as their native tongue," it told prospective tourists. "They and their English-speaking fellow-citizens have a well-deserved reputation as dispensers of a warm and charming hospitality."[93] Montreal's mayor, Camilien Houde, had as much to say in his bilingual address in the tourism brochures: "Here you will find two great races living in peace and

[90] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* pp.1-2.
[91] Nicole Neatby maintains that this theme only really began in 1940, with the Second World War and the reopening of the conscription debate: "In the ads of the 1930s no mention had been made of an English Canadian presence in the province." Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.492. While the theme of bonne entente did take on a new urgency with the advent of the war, the tourism material examined here demonstrates that the themes of cultural dualism and bonne entente were also present in much of the tourist literature of the 1920s and '30s.
[92] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.31.
[93] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.2.

harmony; two great races that maintain the cultures of their forbears, their languages and their religions."[94] There was also occasional passing reference to the city's growing Ethno-Cultural communities: Montreal was "a city where an amalgam of British and French stocks with an alloy of other races has produced a population unique in its distinctiveness and an atmosphere not to be duplicated elsewhere in the New World."[95]

The promotional tourism material did much to attempt to soften British-Canadian perceptions of French-Canadian Catholicism. It gave an unabashed, unapologetic nod to the province's religious character:

> The society of old Québec is deeply religious. Historical studies, social endeavours, political discussions are all influenced by catholic thought. True to tradition, Québec seeks to carry on the work of those Catholic heroes who were its discoverers, its founders, its settlers and its martyrs. Such is the Historic Province, faithful to the religion and language of its forefathers.[96]

Government publications, especially, attempted to communicate the historical context behind Catholicism's central place in the community to the Protestant Anglophone masses. French Canadians' religion, the publications explained, had helped them preserve their past, their language, their culture, and their social cohesion:

> Everywhere the Canadian parish preserves its ancient aspect. …. It is dear to the people of Québec, for it safeguarded their religion and their language. When the storm of 1760 swept away the French Régime together with the 'fleurdelisé' standard of the Kings of France, the catholic parish proved the one rallying-place for Frenchmen under British rule.[97]

Throughout, churches were mentioned as points of architectural interest. Indeed, Quebec's Catholic character was itself promoted as a point of interest. Moreover, it was promoted as part of *Canadian*, and not just French-Canadian, heritage.

---

[94] In Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, pp.1.
[95] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Cosmopolitan Montreal*, p.14.
[96] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.8.
[97] *Ibid*., p.7.

The churches of both major cultural-linguistic groups occupied a prominent place in the tourism literature. Images of famous churches and cathedrals covered the pages of countless brochures, from Ste Anne de Beaupré (an important place of pilgrimage for thousands of North American Catholics in search of healing and spiritual inspiration) to the Ursuline Convent in Trois Rivières.[98] Montreal was home to countless impressive French Catholic churches and shrines that outsiders, including Protestants, were encouraged to visit. These included places like Montreal's "Notre Dame Church – Built in 1824-29 by Architect James O'Donnell," with its rich "paintings and wood sculptures," ten church tower bells including the 24,780-pound "Gros Bourdon," and a "seating capacity [of] 10 to 12 thousand." Curious Protestants might also enjoy a visit to "St. Joseph's Oratory – A famous shrine erected in honour of St. Joseph, where wonderful happenings have taken place. [It] is growing in popularity daily. Started by a humble Brother .... on the side of Mount Royal, [St. Joseph's is] now a superb Basilica, which will cost millions of dollars when completed."[99] Such structures would have been impressive to some Protestants, who were accustomed to far more sparse, aesthetically understated places of worship. Montreal's abundance of churches, basilicas and cathedrals was an obvious point of pride: "Here stands the second largest French-speaking city in the world, the 'City of spires in the green' with more churches and chapels open to worship than Rome itself."[100] The Anglicans, meanwhile, also had their Christ Church Cathedral in Montreal, built in 1859-1867. "According to laws of architecture," the brochures boasted, it was the "most perfect church on [the] American

[98] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* p.7.
[99] Montreal Historical Guides Association, "How to Visit Montreal." See also the several images of Catholic churches and cathedrals in Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*.
[100] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, p.3.

Continent."[101] Another Montreal brochure featured large images of St. Andrew's and St. Paul's Presbyterian Churches, among the "newest, ... largest and finest, of Montreal's many splendid Protestant edifices, ... buttressed by more than a century and a half of ecclesiastical history."[102] Elsewhere in the province, Protestants could visit the Anglican Church in Trois Rivières that "formerly belonged to the Récollets who built it in 1720. It has been an Anglican Church since 1795." At Bertier they could make a pilgrimage to "the first Protestant chapel built in this country (1766)," which "is still existent. It belonged to the Cuthbert Seigneurs."[103]

The theme of cultural pluralism was employed to make the province seem more appealing, welcoming and familiar to potential Anglophone visitors. But one also senses a real intent on the part of tourism promoters to educate Anglophones on the merits of cross-cultural contact and accommodation. "Plus vous venez en contact avec lui [le Canadien français]," Premier Taschereau told a group of Ontarians, "plus vous l'observez à l'oeuvre, et mieux vous appréciez le précieux actif qu'il constitue dans notre patrimoine national."[104] Taschereau himself played the role of tourism promoter while speaking to the Ontario public:

> [J]e vous invite à venir voir de vos yeux le berceau de la colonisation et de l'agriculture au Canada, tout en face du fier rocher de Québec, sur la merveilleuse côte de Beauport.... C'est là ... que vous pourrez vous reporter au temps où la forêt primitive fut entammée par la hache vaillante des colons venus du Perche et de la Beauce, et où les plus éclatantes pages de notre histoire furent écrites par de nobles guerriers. Arrêtez-vous à parcourir cette historique région, et prolongez un peu votre séjour dans notre capitale. Vous me direz ensuite si nous n'avons pas quelques raisons de soutenir que notre population des villes et des campagnes

[101] Never mind that its spire had only just been "removed for safety owing to sinking of [the] foundation"! Montreal Historical Guides Association, "How to Visit Montreal."
[102] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.12.
[103] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.11.
[104] Louis-Alexandre Taschereau, *L'habitant de Québec: Noblesse Canadienne-Française. Conférences prononcés à Toronto devant l'Empire Club et le Women's Canadian Club, le 27 avril 1922* (s.n., 1922), p.25.

> constitue un des éléments qui symbolisent le mieux le caractère de la nation canadienne.[105]

For its part, the government's Tourist Bureau of Quebec paid homage to the Quebec British-Canadian community's history by emphasizing the example of the diverse Eastern Townships, where the spirit of 'bonne entente' and peaceful coexistence predominated:

> In this picturesque region are the finest farms and the greatest wealth. Descendants of the United Empire Loyalists, of English and Scotch immigrants and of French pioneers live in perfect harmony, each retaining their characteristic methods of construction and farming. Bilingualism can thus exist in a country without injury to the various races and without compromising their prosperity.[106]

The last statement was clearly intended to encourage Anglo-Canadians from outside Quebec to adopt a similar attitude of tolerance and magnanimity toward the official language minorities of their respective provinces. The same document included a picture of James Wolfe's monument on the Plains of Abraham alongside a photo of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, thus paying homage to both French and British military victories.[107] Such imagery served two purposes. First, it acknowledged Quebec's British history, for which many Anglo-Canadian tourists might have initially sought to visit the province. Second, it projected an alternative message that visitors might take away: the Conquest of 1759 was not so much a victory of one people over another as it was a joining into partnership of two peoples in one country.

Still, the tourism literature projected a measure of pride in the province's British culture and history. A large brochure published by the Province of Quebec Tourist Association for Montreal featured a history of "Montreal in New France" alongside a history of "British Montreal" before Confederation. Loyalty to the Empire during the

---

[105] *Ibid*., pp.40-41.
[106] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, pp.7-8.
[107] *Ibid*., p.9.

American invasions of 1775 and 1812 was highlighted, along with the "British settlers and British capital [that] continued to flow in and increased the prosperity of the city."[108] One Montreal publication invited visitors to visit Nelson's column in Bonsecours Market, "a monument to one of England's greatest sailors."[109] Montreal publications honoured the city's more recent military contributions. One contained a large image of an impressive gathering at the Dominion Square war memorial, entitled, "November 11th, any year since 1918." The same brochure also contained a large image from one of Montreal's famed English-language units, "The Pipe Band of the Black Watch (Royal Highland Regiment) of Canada," second only to the Mounties in its handsomeness, "a very colourful spectacle which never fails to arouse the enthusiasm of visitors."[110] The city was portrayed as being at the heart of the vast British imperial network, notably when it came to shopping: in Montreal, consumers would find "Canadian-made specialties as well as articles from all parts of the British Empire."[111] Quebec was made more familiar to Anglo-Canadians, too, with depictions of curlers sporting the typical Scottish tam. "Curling is a right royal pastime of the winter season," declared one Montreal publication.[112]

This careful acknowledgement of Quebec's British heritage did not diminish the province's French character, nor the crucial principle of pluralism that the material attempted to project. For the Quebec Liberal government, the "ABSOLUTE FREEDOM OF FAITH AND LANGUAGE (*sic*)" enjoyed in the province was a hallmark of its modernity and progressive outlook. The linguistic and religious pluralism inherent in the

---

[108] Province of Quebec Tourist Association, "How to Visit Montreal," p.v.
[109] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.17.
[110] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, pp.14-15.
[111] *Ibid*., p.22.
[112] *Ibid*., p.19.

provincial education system, it asserted to prospective visitors, begot understanding and harmony between peoples:

> Religious instruction is not compulsory for pupils of an opposite faith in any school [in Quebec]. This freedom extends to the matter of language. In French Catholic schools, French is the teaching language, with English as a second language. In English Catholic schools, English is the teaching language, with French as a second language. The same rule is followed in English and French Protestant schools.[113]

Both linguistic communities and both religious groups (Catholic and Protestant), exercised a significant level of autonomy over their respective educational systems while at the same time operating in a highly cooperative administrative structure, and no child was forced to have religious instruction.[114] In addition, children and students from both linguistic communities learned the other's language. Tourists were also informed that Quebec brought together the very best in French- and English-language higher learning: "Two of the best known institutions for higher education on this continent, the Montreal and McGill Universities, are located in Montreal, besides theological colleges in connection with the Roman Catholic, United, Presbyterian, and Anglican Churches."[115] McGill, with its "at least 8 faculties,"[116] featured prominently in a number of tourist promotional material as "Montreal's world-famous seat of learning."[117] Visitors to Montreal also learned that even the main public library observed the bicultural principle: "Built entirely of Canadian marble," it was "the largest dual language (French and

[113] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.12.
[114] *Ibid*., pp.11-15.
[115] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.7.
[116] Montreal Historical Guides Association, "How to Visit Montreal."
[117] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.13.

English) library in the world and is recognized as the finest single unit library in Canada."[118]

Upon first consideration, it might seem peculiar that tourist promotional material would contain information on a country's educational system. But this was an important point for Quebec officials, given previous insinuations that the Quebec education system was underfunded, failing to enrol students, failing to encourage literacy, lacking in innovation, and simply backward. One of the government's more comprehensive pieces of tourist literature went on at length about the structure of the education system, even providing the numbers of schools, colleges, and universities in the province, along with their various specializations.[119] Moreover, such information was likely written for an Anglo-Canadian audience, as Americans tourists would have had little interest in the subject except, perhaps, out of investment considerations. What is important here is that Quebec officials apparently cared about how Anglophones – including Anglo-Canadians – perceived their province, whether or not they ultimately visited. Their intent was to dispel some of the misconceptions Anglo-Canadians from outside Quebec held about the province – of an allegedly coercive educational system that thrust Catholicism upon innocent Protestant children. To that end, the government was unapologetic about the religious nature of its education system:

> For outsiders, whether from other provinces or the United States, the most striking feature in the Québec System is that all our schools are 'religious' in their control and distinctively Catholic or Protestant. This aspect of Québec education is appreciated by all unprejudiced observers. The emphasis placed upon moral and religious instruction both in Protestant and Catholic schools undoubtedly influences the manners, morals and character of the people. Much of that general

[118] Montreal Historical Guides Association, "How to Visit Montreal."
[119] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, pp.11-15.

> respect for law and custom, and the rights of [the] other, which marks the Province, can be attributed to such instruction in the schools.[120]

Here the Quebec government seemed to ask: 'we respect the official language minority in our province, so why can't you respect yours?' It was a none-too subtle hint at how the other provinces might accommodate the expanding French-Canadian and Acadian minorities in their education systems. In this way, tourism was not only a means of making dollars, but also of educating other Canadians and gaining respect for French Canada.

The 'modern' Canadian province

Quebec's tourism promoters went to great lengths to assert that their province was a leading, modern part of Canada.[121] In an age when national identity and national pride were so often defined by a country's "bigness" – when industry and progress were one in the same – this message would have appealed to Anglo-Canadians especially.[122] Canadians from across the country could share in the pride of the province's accomplishments. In this way, the tourism propaganda encouraged all Canadians to see French Canada as a part of their Canada too: "everyone feels at home when reaching this side of the border," the Tourist Bureau of Quebec promised.[123] Moreover, the 'modern' image of a Quebec that was just as advanced as any other province served to debunk the myth that French Canadians were backward and opposed to modern (*i.e.* material)

---

[120] *Ibid*., p.12.
[121] Neatby notes this was especially the case in the 1930s and '40s. See Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.492. The material examined here suggests that it was also prevalent in the 1920s.
[122] "'Our prevailing passion is for bigness, for rapidity of growth, for a sudden and sensational development,'" lamented Stephen Leacock in 1911. In Carl Berger, "The Other Mr. Leacock," *Canadian Literature*, 55 (Winter 1973), p.25.
[123] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.41.

progress. The message could also appeal to potential investors: Quebec had a modern infrastructure and a competent and educated workforce that was also traditional in outlook (*i.e.* not socialistic and prone to unionization).[124]

The assertion of modernity might seem paradoxical, given the efforts to play up the province's folksy character and history. But for Quebec promoters, there was no contradiction – the preservation of heritage and the embrace of modernity were parallel pursuits. Modern industry and modern amenities could exist side-by-side with a population steeped in history and tradition. Montreal was promoted as a city both "Ancient and Modern."[125] After venturing into La Malbaie and "com[ing] in contact with charming inhabitants," the potential tourist could travel on to "Murray Bay, [where] he once more falls in with modern civilization – splendid hotels and a fashionable beach."[126] The idealized Quebec that tourists read about had apparently achieved a perfect balance between tradition and modernity. The title of the Quebec government's flagship promotional book, *The French-Canadian Province: A Harmony of Beauty, History and Progress* (1926), said it all.

As with education, championing the province's economy – in business, agriculture, industry, and finance – was central to fostering an image of modernity. While on the one hand drawing attention to the 'picturesque' and 'ancient' rural heartland of the province, the government's promotional material also asserted that Quebec's agricultural sector used the best of modern techniques and technology, raising yields of various grains, dairy and produce. Far from depicting the 'habitant' as only a relic of the past,

---

[124] *Ibid*., p.29.
[125] See Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montreal: Ancient and Modern. Cosmopolitan Montreal* (Montreal, 1931), LAC, Amicus no. 10016233.
[126] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.10.

government propaganda depicted the rural Quebecer as decidedly modern. With an eye to potential investors, the government advised that the habitant "is averse to social legislation that would interfere with his personal liberties…. he is not a ready listener to the labour agitator or socialistic propagandist. Strong, willing and resourceful, he makes a valuable employee in the mills."[127]

Some promotional material, especially those produced by the government, included all variety of descriptions of factories, pulp and paper mills, mines, and other projects, complete with photographs of cityscapes with smokestacks, industrial-use dams, open-pit mines, and polluted waterways – sure symbols of progress.[128] Government tourist propaganda touted "The forests of Québec" as "one of the richest forest sources in the world," easily brought to mill and market by a vast network of rivers. Quebec forestry in 1924, it proudly told tourists, amounted to "one half of the total production in the Dominion." Even more, "The hydraulic capacity of the Québec water powers" could be "harnessed for industrial purposes of every description." As for mining, "The Province of Québec is a vast store-house of unknown mineral wealth." The province was, after all, "the largest of the Dominion," with an economy of equally vast potential.[129] Quebec industry had put the province and the country on the national and world maps, respectively.

Quebec, visitors were told, was an ideal place for investment. It was in good financial standing: fiscally conservative, prudent, and stable, it boasted the country's second-lowest per capita debt, and a strong banking system headquartered in Montreal.[130]

---

[127] *Ibid*., p.29.
[128] *Ibid*., pp.11, 20, 22; Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* pp.8.
[129] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, pp.8, 16, 18-19, 31-32.
[130] See Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, chapters entitled "Economic Facts on

The population was growing, from 1.65M in 1901 to 2.7M in 1924, fully "26.87 [per cent] of the Dominion," and second only to Ontario.[131] Economically, government documents proudly pointed out, Quebec punched above its weight: the "total value of trade [in 1924-1925 was]: $577,651,643, or 30.7% of the Dominion."[132] Quebec was home to major cities that had long been and continued to be at the cutting edge of progress. Quebec City was a centre of educational innovation, having established the first agricultural school in Canada, and Trois Rivières had "developed into a manufacturing centre."[133]

Montreal, especially, was proudly portrayed as *the* business, commercial and industrial centre of Canada. "Montreal is the commercial metropolis of Canada," boasted one promoter.[134] It was "Canada's Business Capital," boasted another, occupying *the* "predominant role in Canadian financial, commercial, industrial and transportation spheres."[135] Mayor J.-Adhémar Raynault pointed out in 1937 that his city was "[t]he only city in Canada with a population of over a million, it is the industrial, commercial and financial centre of the Dominion. …. [Y]ou will not regret your visit to the Metropolis of Canada."[136] Montreal was Canada's largest seaport, and the "second largest seaport of North America," Canada's largest French-speaking city, and the "second French city of the world."[137] It was a city of global importance, home to "industries, railways, and commercial enterprises which do business throughout the British Empire and America,

---

Québec" and "The Financial Standing of Québec." There is a slough of statistics on the strength of Quebec's economy, financial and banking stability. Quebec was "a Province that lives within its means," with surpluses since 1898. P.34.

[131] *Ibid*., p.31.
[132] *Ibid*., p.32.
[133] *Ibid*., p.11.
[134] *Ibid*., p.33.
[135] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.6.
[136] *Ibid*., p.2.
[137] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* p.1.

and have made Canada the fourth largest exporting nation on earth."[138] All Canadians, the material seemed to suggest, should take pride in Montreal's successes. Canada's metropolis, prospective visitors were told, was home to modern civic buildings, libraries, courthouses, universities, hospitals, clerical and business establishments, office towers, and parks. All of these things contributed to an air of sophistication. One publication demonstrated so much pride in the city's civic buildings that it even listed the number of beds in every hospital.[139]

When it came to Quebec roadways, the medium was the message: the quality and availability of roads was a means to travel the province, but they were also a symbol of the province's infrastructural advancement and modern sophistication. The Tourist Bureau of Quebec's comprehensive *The French-Canadian Province* (1926), for instance, was intended to help with trip planning, and featured no less than six chapters related to road travel. The publication went on at length about its "Good Roads" program – understandable considering the amount of money the province was spending on roads and highways. Quebec proved a leader in Canadian highway regulation, and was proud of the example it had set for the other provinces. Given the prevalence of the two languages in the province, Quebec had also led the way in abandoning "the obsolete system of worded danger signs" for roads, devising instead "a complete system of symbols…. All Canadian Provinces have followed the example of Québec in adopting symbolic signs."[140]

The advertising material encouraged motorists to travel to the Quebec countryside, and not just the cities. In the countryside, especially, the advertisements

---

[138] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.7.
[139] Montreal Historical Guides Association, "How to Visit Montreal." See also Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, pp.6-7.
[140] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.41.

promised, visitors could experience the charm of the traditional habitants, and experience Quebec's 'Old World' culture. Here, the apparent paradox of simultaneously promoting the modern, sophisticated 'new,' and the folksy 'old,' was apparent. Quebecers wanted to be portrayed as modern, but at the same time knew that playing on old 'positive' stereotypes would help bring in more dollars. In this way, the advertising material both reinforced these stereotypes and projected a new, somewhat more complex image of French-Canadian society. Tourists were thus encouraged to travel Quebec's "historic highways."[141]

Leisure

In addition to travelling to Quebec to experience its unique history, language, and culture, Anglo-Canadians were increasingly visiting the province to pursue leisure activities. Camping, hunting and fishing in rural Quebec became more popular as new roads and even planes opened up previously remote hunting and fishing grounds. The Quebec government encouraged hunting and fishing tourism through the leasing of some six hundred concessions on Crown Land to private individuals, entrepreneurs and clubs "on the proviso that the territory so leased is adequately protected."[142] The legislation had the double effect of protecting game and habitat, and of helping potential outfitters promote their services. These activities were also facilitated by a provincial Department of Colonization, Mines and Fisheries programme that arranged for the hiring of local

[141] *Ibid*., p.10.
[142] W.H. Petry, "Big Game and Fly Fishing," in Wood, William, ed. et al., *The Storied Province of Quebec: Past* and *Present*, Volume II (Toronto: Dominion Publishing Company, Ltd., 1931), p.1031.

guides for visiting sportsmen.[143] For many Anglo-Canadians and Americans, these guides provided their first exposure to friendly, 'everyday' French Canadians. "When we go fishing today, or hunting, in Quebec or Northern Ontario," wrote John Murray Gibbon, "we find in our French-Canadian guides a reminiscence of this roving race, the forerunners of the *voyageurs* of latter days."[144] The rich hunting and fishing grounds of Quebec were even more accessible for many Anglo-Ontarians than were the northern reaches of their own province, especially in light of the fact that much of the Laurentian hunting and fishing could be done in relative proximity to the transportation hub of Montreal. The province became popular for the hunting of bear, moose, deer, and waterfowl, and for the fishing of salmon, trout, bass, and sturgeon. English-language advertisements promoted Quebec as "this Switzerland of North America [with] literally thousands of rivers and lakes that for some years to come cannot even be mapped," home to inexhaustible game and fish.[145]

For city slickers, Montreal was recognized as *the* major centre of Canadian leisure. In the 1920s, it developed a racy reputation, a 'little Chicago' home to gambling, alcohol, and, for those inclined, prostitution and drugs. (These specific amenities were certainly not referred to in the tourism literature, but the general party atmosphere was indeed advertised.) This environment attracted jazz musicians and musical theatre performers from all over North America.[146] For individuals bored with the more staid atmosphere of Protestant Canada and regions of the US that had fought hard to keep out

---

[143] See Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, pp.71, 74. See also Province of Quebec Tourist Association, "How to Visit Montreal," p.iii.
[144] Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, p.26.
[145] Province of Quebec Tourist Association, "How to Visit Montreal," p.iii.
[146] Marc Charpentier, "Broadway North: Musical Theatre in Montreal in the 1920s," PhD dissertation (Montreal: McGill University Department of History, 1999).

dancing, alcohol, drugs and gambling, 'Paris North' beckoned. Visitors in search of fun could also relax in the finest of accommodations. The Mount Royal Hotel, for example, was advertised as the "Largest hotel in British Empire," with 1100 rooms.[147] Montreal also boasted the Windsor Hotel, the Ritz Carlton, the Berkeley, Hotel Ford, Hotel de la Salle, and the Queen's Hotel, among other luxurious and 'sophisticated' establishments.[148] All of these advantages made the city an ideal location for conferences:

> Montreal, in this magnificent setting, is the ideal convention city. Large, luxurious hotels afford the perfect 'Home, away from home,' as well as every scope for meetings. And there's something contagious about Montreal's gay life – an atmosphere of good fellowship and camaraderie – intangibles – but vital factors in the success of any convention.[149]

Indeed, many national fraternal, business, professional and other associations held annual meetings in Canada's biggest city.

Entertainment was apparently easy to find throughout Quebec. Montreal was promoted as a sports hub. By 1928 it boasted sixteen golf courses, four different racetracks, and a brand new baseball stadium.[150] Golf had exploded in popularity in the province. Before the war there had been only eight courses in the entire province. By 1931, there were over sixty, including private clubs and highly popular public courses scattered throughout Quebec.[151] Tourist material for the province included images of packed baseball, hockey and horse track stadiums, golfing, hiking, swimming, horseback riding, hunting, fishing, curling and winter carnivals or "fêtes de nuit." It also promoted other winter sports throughout Quebec like snowshoeing, sleighing, tobogganing, figure

---

[147] Montreal Historical Guides Association, "How to Visit Montreal."
[148] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.30.
[149] *Ibid*., p.3.
[150] See Montreal Historical Guides Association, "How to Visit Montreal"; Province of Quebec Tourist Association, "How to Visit Montreal," p.iv.
[151] Conklin, "Sports," p.1029.

skating, and skiing, "Canada's favourite winter sport."[152] In the Laurentians, especially, with its newly developed ski resort at Mont Tremblant, "every form of outdoor sport may be enjoyed in [a] gloriously picturesque [setting]."[153] Brochures displayed stunning scenes of the province's geography, from Montreal to the Laurentians, from Quebec City to the Gaspé.[154] Montreal was also home to diversions of more 'sophisticated' attractions, including music, plays, art galleries, cultural events, cafés, shopping, nightclubs, modern hotels, restaurants and other fine dining. It was in this vein that promoters referred to Montreal as "The Paris of the New World."[155] If the promotional literature both reflected and informed how people saw Quebec, by the 1930s, at least, the image of French-Canadian society as one-dimensional, backward, and unsophisticated, was beginning to erode.

The tourism promotional campaign: A success?

In its opening pages, the Tourist Bureau of Quebec's *The French-Canadian Province* (1926) summed up the central themes of Quebec tourism promotion. Quebec was the heart of Canadian and North American history, a traditional and culturally unique society, a modern leisure and commercial destination, and a destination that, thanks to technological advances, was closer than ever before to potential visitors:

---

[152] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, pp.15, 26-27. See also Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec"*; Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*; Province of Quebec Tourist Association, "How to Visit Montreal," p.16: "Ice Hockey at the Forum is at its best. Here, in its birthplace, there is an added zest to the game which seems always lacking elsewhere."

[153] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, Visit "La Province de Québec," p.5. See also Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, p.16.

[154] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *Visit "La Province de Québec,"* pp.5.

[155] Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.6.

> This booklet is ... a suggestion to prospective visitors. Québec, the oldest Province in Canada, has retained its French character. It has a charm of its own, and a lure found nowhere else in North America. It has beautiful panoramas, countless historic spots and splendid opportunities for sportsmen. Furthermore, its economic progress has made it a thoroughly up to date Province; and good roads have brought it within easy reach.[156]

If the tourism promotional campaign encouraged potential visitors to discover and experience all of these different aspects of Quebec, two questions remain. First, was it successful in attracting visitors, and Anglo-Canadians from outside Quebec in particular? Second, how far did these visitors experience or embrace the many versions of French-Canadian society being conveyed by the promotional material?

If the numbers provide any indication, the advertising campaign was highly successful in encouraging Anglo-Canadians to visit Quebec. Car traffic provides a useful means of measurement. In 1923 the Quebec government performed its first traffic census. Over a seven-day period that included the Labour Day weekend, the census tracked the origin of automobiles on twenty-nine different principal highways and calculated the average number of cars per day on each route. Altogether, some 6,700 Canadian cars from outside Quebec were counted over the week-long period, providing for an average of 33 per route per day, or 6% of total traffic.[157]

The numbers calculated in another census only two years later were impressive. This time, the census was conducted along fifty-five routes over the first week of August 1925. It counted a grand total of 23,500 Canadian cars from outside Quebec, making for an average of 61 cars per route per day, or 11% of total traffic.[158] While the absolute number of Canadian visitors travelling to Quebec by car had ballooned, the proportion of

---

[156] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.5.
[157] Province de Québec, *Rapport du Ministère de la Voirie, 1923*, pp.88.
[158] Province de Québec, *Roads Department 1925 Report*, pp.139.

visitors on the road had nearly doubled. The proportion of cars on the highways that were from Quebec and the US was 67% and 22%, respectively. In other words, by 1925, a third of car traffic in Quebec was from out of province, and Anglo-Canadians represented as much as a third of that traffic (to say nothing of Anglo–Quebecers touring within the province).[159] In terms of actual numbers of people, the Quebec government estimated that of "tourist traffic in 1925: over 1,000,000 persons entered Québec in 300,000 automobiles."[160] If one third of that traffic was made up of Canadians from outside Quebec, then in 1925 alone some 300,000 Anglo-Canadians in 100,000 different cars visited 'La Belle Province.' This becomes all the more impressive when contrasting the populations of the US (approximately 116M) and of Canada excluding Quebec (approximately 7M).[161] While the Anglo-Canadian population was only one twelfth the size of the US population in 1925, Anglo-Canadians were providing half as many tourists by car in absolute terms, and six times as many tourists proportionately.

The frequent focus of tourism campaigns on the United States was the product of absolute numbers. Roughly twice as many Americans visited Quebec as did Canadians from outside Quebec – targeting the former made commercial sense. But a far higher proportion of Canadians from outside Quebec were visiting the province by the mid-1920s, suggesting that the impact of the campaign was stronger in English-speaking Canada than it was in the US. The point here is that, by the mid-1920s, Anglo-Canadians from outside Quebec appear to have begun taking a greater interest in the 'French-Canadian' province. To this we must add consideration for the countless Anglo-

[159] *Ibid*., pp.139.
[160] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, pp.32, 43.
[161] United States Bureau of the Census, *Historical National Population Estimates* (Population Estimates Program, 2000), accessed 10 June 2012, http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/nation/popclockest.txt; Leacy, *Historical Statistics of Canada*, Table A125-163.

Quebecers who must have vacationed by automobile to the various French-speaking regions of their home province. By 1925, there were 97,418 cars registered in Quebec, a sizeable portion of which were doubtless owned by Anglophones, who tended to be more affluent.[162]

Moreover, the huge rise in the number of cars travelling the Quebec highways cannot be explained by increased availability of personal vehicles alone. Anglo-Canadians, and Ontarians especially, had taken a much greater interest in learning about and experiencing French Canada. The data for Quebec's 1929 automobile census suggest as much. Conducted over the first week of August and covering forty-five highways, the census counted an average of 115 Canadian cars from outside Quebec per day per highway, adding up to a total of over 36,000 for all the highways for the week. The proportion of Canadian traffic from outside Quebec remained steady at 11%, while American traffic had declined somewhat to 20%, and Quebec traffic increased to 69% as more Quebecers acquired cars.[163] By then, the government could approximate the number of Canadian cars from outside Quebec entering the province each year at 250,000, and counting[164] – over twice the 1925 estimate.[165] Cars were not the only means of travelling from other parts of Canada to Quebec. CNR routes connecting Ontario and Quebec, for instance, increased in traffic. Even at the outset of the Great Depression this trend continued. From May 1930 to October 1931, some 255,308 passengers travelled on the

[162] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, p.32.
[163] Among the most frequented routes by Canadians from outside Quebec were: Montreal-Quebec (161/day, being over 50% more than in 1925), Montreal-Ottawa via Hull (439/day), Hull-Aylmer (1881/day), Montreal-Rivière Beaudette (706/day), Hull-Wakefield (739/day), Vaudreuil-Pointe Fortune (536/day). Province de Québec, *Department of Highways 1929 Report*, pp.287, 294-297.
[164] Province de Québec, *Roads Department 1928 Report*, p.49.
[165] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, pp.32, 43.

CNR's Toronto-Montreal route, at an average of 465 passengers per day.[166] This occurred despite the fact that the CNR had begun to reduce its passenger service in other areas on account of the Depression.[167] Moreover, passenger volume on the Toronto-Montreal trains increased by 40% during the peak summer vacation months and into Labour Day.[168] If the tourism campaign was successful in attracting a greater number of Anglo-Canadians from outside Quebec, then, did the message projected by the campaign reflect the experiences of visitors?

If the experiences of Anglo-Canadian travel writers provided any indication, the growing number of Anglo-Canadian tourists to Quebec came away with a positive impression of French-speaking Canada.[169] As Nicole Neatby has shown, Anglo-Canadian travel writers demonstrated a more nuanced view of Quebec than Americans. To be sure, some still harboured a condescending perception informed by nostalgia and an anti-modernist slant. Several Anglo-Canadian travel writers admired Franco-Quebecers for upholding their traditional lifestyle in the face of the perceived evils and excesses of modernity, industrialization, and urbanization. But unlike Americans, the Anglo-Canadian travel writers exhibited a view of Quebec as far more familiar and less alien, while at the same time special and unique. This was in part the product of Anglo-

[166] From May 1930 to October 1931 (18 months), there were 255,308 passengers on the two daily trains between Montreal and Toronto. LAC, Canadian National Railways fonds (CNR), RG30, accession 1981-82/004 GAD, volume 20, file 4400-20-2, "Data prepared in connection with royal commission on transportation – 1931," item 1, pp.6.
[167] LAC, CNR, RG30, acc. 1981-82/004 GAD, vol. 20, file 4400-20-2, item 13 (1931).
[168] LAC, CNR, RG30, acc. 1981-82/004 GAD, vol. 20, file 4400-20-2, item 1, pp.6.
[169] As Neatby explains, "These travellers were professional tourists who recorded their impressions for the reading public in the popular press and in the more specialized magazines and so helped shape the expectations and reactions of the travelling public. Their writings … offer the historian an opportunity to come closer to understanding what may have gone through the minds of the more silent masses of tourists heading for Quebec." Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.466.

Canadian exposure to a popular literature that had shed light on French-Canadian culture and history.[170]

Anglo-Canadian travel writers recognized Quebec as the most distinct part of their country. They remarked on the province's rural character and cultural traditions, and most notably on its linguistic distinction. They were especially appreciative of Quebec's bilingualism. Neatby: "travel writers made it clear to the reader that tourists would be warmly welcomed in Quebec, in their own mother tongue and by a people who were compatriots regardless of the language difference,"[171] not unlike the message in the tourism promotional material.[172] Travel writer William Macmillan, for instance, who visited Quebec in 1933, expressed a mix of envy and admiration for this bilingualism: "'In nine cases out of ten [the French Canadian] does what [the Anglo-Canadian] frequently cannot do – speak both languages.'"[173] The reference to "both" languages, as opposed to "two" languages, is instructive.

An increase in tourism to Acadia had also apparently served to expose some Anglo-Canadians to Canada's French fact. "'I just happened to be spending some time in the Maritime Provinces on a holiday, where the French language is well understood,'" remarked C.H. Cahan, in 1936. "'I think there is more complete sympathy between the Maritime Provinces and Quebec than between any other parts of Canada.'"[174] With the success of Quebec's tourism campaign, some Maritimers were anxious to cash in on their own provinces' French heritage. Dominion Atlantic Railways official F.G.J. Comeau told

---

[170] *Ibid*., pp.471-472.
[171] *Ibid*., pp.486-487.
[172] Tourist Bureau of Quebec, *The French-Canadian Province*, pp.7-9, 12; Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *Montréal: The Paris of the New World*, p.2; Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau, *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal*, pp.1.
[173] In Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," pp.486-487.
[174] In Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting*, p.151.

the Commercial Club in Halifax that "[t]he historic values of the Province offer an attraction, [especially] Longfellow's famous poem popularizing Grand Pré and immortalizing Évangeline."[175] Other Nova Scotians called for provincial and federal funds to restore the old French fortress of Louisbourg, "to give the visitor an adequate idea of the strength and extent of the works."[176] In Ontario, meanwhile, plans were underway to reconstruct Sainte-Marie Among the Hurons, the famous mission of Brébeuf and the Jesuits.[177] For their part, craft sellers from across Canada took inspiration from Quebec's handicrafts promoter Oscar Bériau, who visited the other provinces and foresaw the day when the "'various races composing our great Dominion'" would together create a "'truly Canadian popular art.'"[178]

Anglo-Canadian travel writers were conscious of their role in changing the perceptions of their compatriots about French Canada for the better. To that end, they tried to dispel harmful myths about Quebec. They described Franco-Quebecers as loyal Canadians who harboured no serious animosity toward the rest of Canada. Catholic oppression of the Protestant minority, they reported, was simply untrue, and the relations between English- and French-speaking Quebecers were largely harmonious. Anglo-Quebecers, a linguistic minority, travel writers noted, were well treated.[179] The implicit message here was that British Canadians, especially from outside Quebec, were the ones in need of a changing of attitude and greater consideration for the 'other,' and not the reverse.

---

[175] "Hope to See Tourist Trade Increase Here," *Halifax Herald*, 6 March 1931, p.16.
[176] Judge Walter Crowe in "To Restore Louisburg?" *Halifax Herald*, 6 March 1931, p.3.
[177] A nearby martyrs' shrine had opened in 1926. C.E. Heidenreich, "Ste Marie Among the Hurons," *The Canadian Encyclopedia* (Historica-Dominion, 2012), accessed 24 July 2013, http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/ste-marie-among-the-hurons.
[178] In McKay, *Quest of the Folk*, p.159.
[179] Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.486.

The travel writers reminded readers that Quebec, too, was a part of their country, and that they should take pride in its uniqueness and in its accomplishments. The travel writers embraced the Quebec government's message that Quebec was the heart of Canadian civilization, and the historical heartland of *all* Canadians.[180] They encouraged other Anglophones to visit what they believed to be the historical sites of their own, shared history. In this way, appropriating French-Canadian history allowed Anglo-Canadians to better identify with their compatriots, and to better understand the desire to preserve Quebec's unique culture, language, history, traditions, and religion. Early bonne ententistes writing at the height of the Conscription Crisis in 1917, like Moore, Morley and Hawkes, doubtless would have been pleased to see the popularization of this discourse only a decade later. Anglo-Canadian tourists were invited to adopt Quebec and its past into their own history and sense of place.[181] If the Anglo-Canadian travel writers provide any indication, then many tourists did just that.

In addition to celebrating Quebec's past, Anglo-Canadian travel writers also exhibited pride in its present and future. Whereas "Americans emphasiz[ed] the exotic, folklorish *habitant* way of life," Neatby explains, "English Canadians add[ed] to this unique aspect of the province a proud recognition of its other multiple accomplishments – including its modern industrial progress."[182] For Anglo-Canadians, at least, the Quebec advertisers' message of 'progress' was getting through. The Anglo-Canadian travel writers certainly appreciated the escape from the more crushing effects of modernity that certain parts of the province offered. But they also saw Quebec's modernity as a source

[180] *Ibid*., p.471.
[181] *Ibid*., pp.491-492.
[182] *Ibid*., p.494.

of national pride.[183] By the 1930s, then, Anglo-Canadians – especially the growing number who had a chance to visit Quebec – had begun to adopt a more nuanced view of French-Canadian society. This was an important change from the pre-WWI attitudes of some visitors to Quebec who had explicitly and deliberately condescended to French Canada.[184]

What is important here is that, thanks to increased tourism, by 1940 a large number of Anglo-Canadians (and Ontarians especially) had the opportunity to visit and learn about the heart of French-speaking Canada. Many also realized that Quebec, especially urban and small town Quebec, was modernizing at a rapid rate and that they could find all the amenities they experienced at home. This level of exposure lay in stark contrast to the relative insularity and ignorance of the pre-war period. Even those who did not make their way to Quebec could very well have been exposed to the experiences of others. Then as now, travel and vacationing were something of a status symbol. Friends and family would have boasted about their voyages to friends, family, and colleagues. Indeed, tourism publications and guidebooks encouraged visitors to record their experiences in detail, and to pass their stories on to others.[185] Travel writers reached a wide audience, publishing "in the daily press, popular and more specialized magazines, and numerous guide books."[186] Tourism material also reached thousands, with the proliferation of books, booklets, brochures, pamphlets, radio spots, magazine ads, and newspaper ads taken out by government, commercial agencies, and tourism bureaus. In

---

[183] *Ibid*., pp.485-486.
[184] R.G. Moyles and Doug Owram, *Imperial Dreams and Colonial Realities: British Views of Canada, 1880-1914* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), pp.89.
[185] The last half of *The French-Canadian Province* (1926) consisted of blank pages for the traveller to chronicle their experiences.
[186] Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.467.

1925 alone, 21,000 copies of the Quebec government's bi-monthly tourism bulletin, "one of our most effective means of publicity both in the United States and in the neighbouring Provinces," were distributed to Ontarians.[187]

Moreover, the representations of Quebec that visitors and readers were exposed to were far more positive than those of the pre-war or wartime newspaper representations. Promotional material was necessarily positive and "focussed on attributes of the province that these constituencies of tourists enjoyed."[188] Travel writers typically "emphasized positive experiences or impressions. They wrote for an audience of potential tourists; by force of circumstance, they thus wrote about what they liked or found interesting about Quebec." They contained little of "what these authors did not like about Quebec or what they found objectionable."[189] Government ads were overwhelmingly positive, as one would expect. These advertisements were important in both shaping and reflecting the views of the potential American and Anglo-Canadian tourists that they targeted. As Neatby has pointed out, the campaign depicted both how the promoters wanted visitors to perceive the province, and what they thought potential visitors wanted to see in the province. In other words, it reflected the views of both author and audience.[190] What was significant about this self-promotion was that it went beyond the traditional emphasis on the outdoors, hunting and fishing (although those remained important), to include a celebration of the French fact in Canada.

---

[187] "Highway maps are distributed broadcast throughout Canada and the United States. Tourist guides are issued in all sizes and descriptions. .... All automobile clubs and tourist associations in North America are on our mailing list. Radios, newspapers and magazines then complete the diffusion." Province de Québec, *Roads Department 1925 Report*, p.31.
[188] Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.467.
[189] *Ibid*., p.467.
[190] The Quebec government's advertising "reflected particular assumptions about what these tourists wanted or what they should want." *Ibid*., p.466.

Chapter X: YOUTH AND THE PROCESS OF CROSS-CULTURAL RAPPROCHEMENT

In addition to the intellectual élite, civil society, government, popular culture and tourism, Canadian youth increasingly gave expression to cultural dualism. Over the course of the interwar period, more Anglo-Canadian and French-Canadian youth gained exposure to each other's cultures. This change would have long-term implications. Young people of the interwar period would go on to become the teachers, academics, civil servants, politicians, business people, journalists, writers, opinion-makers and community leaders of the post-WWII era. It was they who would shape the many policies and initiatives that contributed to greater recognition for bilingualism under the governments of Louis St. Laurent, Lester B. Pearson and Pierre Elliott Trudeau. If either group was in need of developing a greater appreciation for biculturalism, it was Anglo-Canadians. To that effect, Anglo-Canadian youths' exposure to French Canada was particularly important. Some Anglo-Canadian youth vacationed with their families in Quebec. At school, Anglo-Canadian students read from new history texts that placed greater emphasis on the country's French past. Young people from both cultural-linguistic groups mingled informally in national clubs that brought together youth from every province. And, much like their parents, who had formed professional associations during the interwar period, French- and Anglo-Canadian students came together in common cause to lobby for their own shared interests.

Several formal initiatives also promoted positive interaction between young adults. In 1923, Quebec and Ontario agreed to an interprovincial exchange of teachers.[1]

[1] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/98/19, newspaper clipping, Boutet, "M. Ferguson promet une

By the late 1920s, the Ontario Department of Education was sending interested high school teachers to Quebec during the summer months to take immersive oral French courses. It was apparently a popular programme.[2] In France, Anglo- and French-Canadian exchange students were housed together in the Maison des Étudiants in Paris and developed positive relationships in a French-language setting.[3] At the University of Toronto, over a third of the students who graduated from the new public health studies program came from Quebec's French-language universities. This fact was not lost on the university's president, H.J. Cody. The presence of "graduates of French-Canadian universities," he reported with satisfaction, "has had many results of substantial importance and value from both a national and a public health standpoint."[4]

Annual university debating tournaments also brought French- and English-speaking students together from across Canada. These debates were "of special interest to many people throughout the Dominion."[5] Indeed, beginning in 1934, the debates were broadcast nation-wide on live radio by the new CRBC through the initiative of its French-Canadian vice-president, Thomas Maher. That year's final was between teams from the University of Manitoba and the Université Laval, and hosted at the University of Toronto. The debate was conducted "partly in English and partly in French." The Laval team came away the winners. "These debates," explained one organizer, "contributed much to a better understanding between English-speaking and French-speaking citizens

---

enquête – La fin du débat sur la motion Bélanger," *Le Devoir*, 7 April 1925.
[2] Over six hundred Ontario teachers took part between 1927 and 1936. See Ontario, *Report of the Minister of Education, Ontario, 1936*, pp.21, 102.
[3] Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, p.45.
[4] Cody, *President's Report for the Year Ending 30th June 1934*, p.37.
[5] W.J. Dunlop, "Report of the Director of University Extension and Publicity," in Cody, *President's Report for the Year Ending 30th June 1934*, p.90.

of Canada and to a sense of unity among the undergraduates of all the Universities that were able to participate."[6]

Letter exchanges between English- and French-speaking students from different parts of the country were also set up on the initiative of individual teachers and schools. The national association of educators, the Canada and Newfoundland Education Association (CNEA), proposed more formalized and widespread initiatives of this nature. While the CNEA hoped that more could be done, by the end of the interwar period it could look back with some satisfaction at what had been achieved:

> [P]romising beginnings have been made in activities designed to promote mutual understand and wider use of both languages on the part of both English and French-speaking Canadians, such as summer schools, exchange of students and correspondence between French and English-speaking students in the secondary schools of Canada.[7]

McGill and the Université de Montréal, for instance, had set up regular student exchanges by the late 1930s in the hopes that these young people would better get to know each other's cultural perspective. It was covered on national radio by the CBC, which described it in bonne ententiste terms. Apparently, prejudices and stereotypes on both sides had been difficult to overcome at first; the French-Canadian students had assumed that the Anglo-Canadian students would all be godless communists, while the latter had assumed the former would be fascist sympathizers. But time and a means for positive interaction did their part: "And yet the students emerged with a sense of unity which had not existed before," the CBC reporter remarked. One French-Canadian student involved in the program explained his experience in similar terms: "'I came away realizing for the

---

[6] *Ibid*.
[7] CNEA, "The Program for the Promotion of Canadian Unity," p.36.

first time that we were all concerned about some of the basic problems of today; peace, social security, justice. And that is a very important thing.'"[8]

Youth clubs and associations

Much like the growth of professional, fraternal, business and other associations that occurred during the interwar period, Canadian society experienced a proliferation of young people's clubs and associations. Indeed, some of these were sponsored by the plethora of adult associations that had sprung up after the war. In the mid-1930s, for instance, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce (CCC) sponsored the creation of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Canada (JCCC), along with the establishment of several local 'Jaycees,' as they were known. The CCC worked closely with its junior organization, even hosting the JCCC headquarters alongside its own at the Montreal Board of Trade building. The Jaycees aimed "to provide leadership training and other self-development activities to young men, ... to help improve their community and the nation, ... and to promote fellowship among young businessmen."[9] The Jaycees exposed young men to a variety of ideas, and not only about business. The Montreal Junior Board of trade, for instance, hosted a provocative lecture by the CCF's F.R. Scott. Canada, he told his young audience, must not allow itself to be dragged into another European war simply because of its political connections. Most people, he argued, recognized this: "'If you took a straight vote in Canada as to whether we should participate in a war just

[8] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/257/8, Jean Hunter, "This bi-racial country," p.1.
[9] LAC, CCC fonds, MG28-III62, volume 16, file "History, n.d.," *The Canadian Chamber of Commerce. Its History, Policy, Departments and Operations, and You!* (Montreal: CCC, 1949), chapter 10, "Junior Chamber of Commerce," p.17. Additional Jaycee activities included "Community Beautification, Tourist Promotion, Conservation of US Dollars, Youth Development, Citizenship, Public Health," national oratorical contests, and the Jaycees' official organ, *Action* Magazine, published out of Winnipeg. P.17.

because Great Britain was involved, I believe the great majority of the people would say no.'"[10] Within fifteen years, the JCCC counted some 225 member-Jaycees with over 20,000 members between them, including an untold number of French Canadians.[11] Even before the Second World War, many business-minded young Francophones were anxious to join and take advantage of the opportunities afforded by involvement in the JCCC, and applied to set up their own local Jaycees.[12] After the war, the JCCC reached an agreement with La Fédération des Chambres de Commerce des Jeunes de la Province du Québec to collaborate more closely.[13]

For its part, the Montreal Board of Trade helped sponsor and direct the Quebec government's Montreal Technical School, which taught the trades to both French- and Anglo-Canadian students. The school's Board of Directors was made up of members from a variety of associations, both Anglophone and Francophone. The institution offered evening courses "for workmen and apprentices at work in one or other of the various manufacturing and building trades," and day courses "for the benefit of young men … to become skilled mechanics, capable foremen or shop superintendents." The day courses were divided into two groups, English-language and French-language for the classroom element, but students could choose which section to attend, providing an opportunity to mingle. In the workshops, English- and French-language students were brought together to work alongside each other. In its first five years, the number of students doubled to

[10] Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, p.177.
[11] LAC, CCC fonds, MG28-III62, volume 16, file "History, n.d.," *The Canadian Chamber of Commerce. Its History, Policy, Departments and Operations, and You!*, p.17.
[12] See LAC, Junior Chamber of Commerce of Canada (JCCC) fonds, MG28-I489, volume 29, files 7, 12, 17, 19, 27, 31, and 47, applications for membership from French-Canadian communities.
[13] See LAC, JCCC fonds, MG28-I489, volume 28, file 1, memorandum of agreement between the JCCC and La Fédération des Chambres de Commerce des Jeunes de la Province du Québec, 1949.

well over five hundred, half of whom were Francophones.[14] In this instance, then, the industrialization of the Quebec economy had brought Montreal's youth together in the workplace.

Rural Canada also experienced the expansion of interactive associations for youth in the form of the Canadian 4-H Clubs. The clubs had begun to spring up in Canada in 1913, and became more active in the post-war "as agricultural associations aimed at enriching rural life and improving agricultural production" through "skill-development projects" and competitions. The clubs were organized by groups of parents and volunteers. Through 4-H, rural youths engaged in activities "designed to provide them with a knowledge of home economics, community service, leadership and citizenship." Club activities included a broad range of "athletics, crafts, debating, public speaking, exchange visits, tours, camping, projects in farm management and safety, financial management, mechanics, and conservation."[15] By 1930, the 4-H Clubs decided to create a national council located in Ottawa and made up of volunteers from member-associations, corporate sponsors, and the provincial and federal governments to coordinate activities between the various clubs from across the country. The Council would include at least one representative from each of the provincial departments of agriculture, one from the federal department, and three representatives from "commercial organizations contributing to yearly trips and prizes."[16] The Council would "foster, promote and develop Boys' and Girls' Agricultural Club Work in Canada; ... co-ordinate all Club

[14] "These courses are preparatory to the following callings: pattern-maker, wood-worker, machinist-fitter, lathe-hand, electrician, moulder, blacksmith, draughtsman, and in general, to all positions connected with the metal, wood, electrical or automobile industries." LAC, Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, Council Annual Reports, 1912-1926, 1916 Annual Report (Montreal, 1917), p.40.
[15] See LAC, Canadian 4-H Council fonds, MG28-I427, archival description.
[16] LAC, Canadian 4-H Council fonds, MG28-I427, volume 1, "Report of Special Committee on the Development of a National Boys' and Girls' Agricultural Club Policy," 1931, p.1.

Work in Canada; [and] arrange for trips, prizes, scholarships and programmes at national contests."[17] Club members could be anywhere from 10 to 20 years old, and competition contestants could be from 16 to 21 years old. From the beginning, the Council included Anglophone and Francophone representation.[18] The 4-H clubs were not insignificant: by 1938, some 35,000 rural youth from across Canada were involved.[19]

French Canadians from both in and outside Quebec proved keen on participating in the 4-H Clubs' national programs. From early on, the 4-H Council realized that it would have to be able to correspond with member-associations in both English and French if it hoped to attract participants from across the country, and approved funds to "purchase a typewriter, with French accents."[20] Around the same time, J.H. Lavoie, the official delegate for Quebec, was elected to the Executive Committee.[21] The first national competition, held in Toronto in November 1931, was made up of twenty boys' and twenty girls' teams. It included a strong contingent of teams from across Quebec, who had a chance to mingle with teams from the Maritimes during a stopover in Montreal on their way to the Ontario capital.[22] All forty teams, "together with their coaches, the members of the Council, and other interested persons," took in the "Royal Winter Fair" at the Toronto Coliseum. There, the awards were presented before the crowd, with "a number of prominent officials of large industrial and commercial organizations" looking

---

[17] *Ibid*.
[18] *Ibid*., p.6.
[19] LAC, Canadian 4-H Council fonds, MG28-I427, volume 1, "Canadian Council on Boys' and Girls' Club Work," W.J. Elliott Presidential Address to the AGM, November 1938, pp.112.
[20] LAC, Canadian 4-H Council fonds, MG28-I427, vol. 1, "Canadian Council on Boys' and Girls' Work, Minutes of Meeting of Executive Committee," 18-19 May, 1931, p.1.
[21] See LAC, Canadian 4-H Council fonds, MG28-I427, volume 1, "The Canadian Council on Boys' and Girls' Work, First Annual Meeting," 18 November 1931, Toronto, p.4; and, same volume, "Canadian Council on Boys' and Girls' Club Work," Board of Directors Meeting, Toronto, November 1934, p.47.
[22] LAC, Canadian 4-H Council fonds, MG28-I427, volume 1, "The Canadian Council on Boys' and Girls' Work, Minutes of Meeting of Executive Committee," Ottawa, 21 October 1931, pp.4.

on. A French-Canadian team from Quebec, "the St. Georges de Beauce Boys' Cattle Breeding Club team," won the prize for the best cattle, while teams from other provinces took the prizes for the grain, potato and swine categories.[23] By the mid-1930s, fourteen different French-Canadian clubs from Quebec, Ontario and the West had competed nationally. Anglo-Canadian teams from Ontario westward tended to excel in the grain and oats competitions, while the Franco-Quebecers dominated in the potato categories.[24] In the grand scheme of things, such 'events' may seem trifling. But to the boys and girls involved, competing for and winning recognition as the first, second or third-best young potato or grain farmer in all of Canada would have been accompanied by excitement and pride, and, perhaps, may have generated a more tangible attachment to the country as a whole.[25]

The Canadian youth movement

One of the most noteworthy formal initiatives for bringing youth together was the Canadian Youth Congress (CYC), which held meetings from 1935 into the 1940s, when activities were interrupted by the war.[26] It brought together hundreds of leading young Canadians from across the country, and included strong representation from Quebec. More than anything, the Congresses reflected the uninhibited curiosity on the part of English- and French-speaking youth toward each other, the new currents of Canadian

[23] LAC, Canadian 4-H Council fonds, MG28-I427, volume 1, "The Canadian Council on Boys' and Girls' Work National Club Contests, 1931," p.1.
[24] LAC, Canadian 4-H Council fonds, MG28-I427, vol. 1, "National Club Contests, 1935."
[25] As much might be said of the 'grown-ups.' See "Les canadiens français à l'honneur à la foire d'hiver," *Le Droit*, 24 novembre 1926, p.9.
[26] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 6, files 109-122, "Notes and Clippings = *Canada: Land of Two Nations*" [1967], unpublished manuscript by Frank and Libbie Park, p.330.

identity and nationalism that had emerged during the interwar period, and the limits imposed on youth by some of their more intellectually conservative seniors.

The CYC began as a loose coalition of left-leaning youth movements from the Toronto area. The idea for a youth conference came from a study group of young church and YMCA members, "[y]oung people probing the causes of the depression, seeking ways to end poverty and the threat to democratic institutions from governments of the Iron Hell type."[27] The first meeting, held in Toronto in May 1935, brought together 389 delegates representing 201 different youth organizations. Employment, education, and war were the primary focus of discussions. Delegates passed resolutions calling for increased support for employment and the unemployed, relief, education, conditions of youth, slums, and for international peace. Among those in attendance were the young left-wing activists, Frank and Libbie Park, who kept a detailed file on the proceedings.[28]

Out of this meeting came an impetus to mount an annual, national congress. It quickly attracted the attention of youth groups from across Canada, including "youth from the churches, schools, the 'Y.'s,' political parties, racial groups, the farms, the factories, the professions, unemployed, peace groups, cultural and athletic societies, – English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians."[29] Organizers promoted the Congress "as open to all young people through their respective organizations, 'regardless of race, sex, creed, origin, colour, belief, opinion or affiliation' and delegates had been chosen on that basis."[30] The May 1936 Congress, held in Ottawa, was a success, "attended by 456

---

[27] *Ibid*., p.327.
[28] See LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Research Material," from 1935 Toronto YMCA Youth Congress, p.0.
[29] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Declaration of rights of Canadian youth / Déclaration des droits de la jeunesse canadienne," At Ottawa, May 1936 (Toronto: Canadian Youth Congress Continuations Committee, 1936), p.2.
[30] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 6, files 109-122, "Notes and Clippings = *Canada: Land of Two*

delegates from 329 organizations estimated to represent 343,000 young people."[31] Delegates adopted a "Declaration of the Rights of Canadian Youth" and a corresponding "Canadian Youth Act" to be put to MPs, and sent a group of 32 young people to the World Youth Meeting in Geneva. Notably, they also decided to set up an executive and move their temporary office from Toronto to a permanent office in Montreal. Receiving feedback from and communicating results to youth organizations was a priority.[32]

The CYC called on governments to address a slew of challenges faced by young people. These included farm and labour issues such as collective bargaining, unemployment, low wages and child workers, and social issues such as access to education, housing and better living conditions. The CYC also came out against discrimination: "it is the obligation of the whole people through the government to provide alternative and adequate means to decent living without discrimination because of age, colour, politics or religion."[33] It advocated pluralism and the legal entrenchment of free speech, the right to organize, and other civil rights and liberties.[34]

Such were the issues that brought Anglo- and, increasingly, French-Canadian youth together to lobby out of a common interest. The solutions they offered were progressive for the time; they included unemployment insurance, health laws, a demand for more cultural, recreational and sports facilities, the right to form unions, minimum wage enforcement, educational grants and vocational training, assistance for young

---

Nations," p.328.
[31] *Ibid*., p.327.
[32] *Ibid*., p.327. See also LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Canadian Youth Act, Submitted to all YOUTH Organizations in Canada for Discussion and Amendment. Accepted in principle by the Canadian Youth Congress," Ottawa, May 23-25, 1936.
[33] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Declaration of rights of Canadian youth / Déclaration des droits de la jeunesse canadienne," p.6.
[34] "We stand for justice, democracy, and liberty. We want equality of opportunity and right for all people in our country, regardless of race, creed, colour and political opinion. We will countenance no breach of those rights established by the tradition of our people." *Ibid*., p.8.

farmers, affordable housing, the abolishment of child labour, and even a guarantee for old age security.[35] With the call on governments to establish the social-welfare state, the initial leftist influence in the movement was clear: "If private initiative cannot give all young people work, we want the people through its government to do it," read the Declaration of the Rights of Canadian Youth. "We want such a distribution of wealth and opportunity as will satisfy the needs of the whole people."[36] Cross-cultural collaboration among youth, then, was not the preserve of one end of the political spectrum. If Canadian youth were coming together on the centre-right, with the Junior Chambers of Commerce, then they were also coming together on the left.

The CYC's 1936 Declaration was decidedly pacifist, and autonomist. The document called for youth "to play a constructive role in our national life and to have our Dominion stand in the forefront of international peace and progress."[37] The CYC was especially concerned over the potentially destructive impact another war would have on their generation, which would be expected to fight it. Asserting a non-interventionist, autonomist stance, the CYC favoured peaceful diplomacy over violent intervention, and went so far as to call for referendums on any future war in which Canada might be expected to participate.[38] These pacifist positions would doubtless have appealed to many French-Canadian youth.

Promoting cross-cultural collaboration, including recognition of Canada's French fact, was important from the start. The "Déclaration des droits de la jeunesse canadienne"

---

[35] *Ibid*., pp.5-6. The list goes on to include "the development of our national life." See also LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Canadian Youth Act." The proposed act reiterates the same demands, for all youth "without regard to sex, race, origin, colour, creed or political belief or affiliation."
[36] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Declaration of rights of Canadian youth," p.6.
[37] *Ibid*., p.2.
[38] "[T]he imminence of destructive war threatens the existence of another generation of our best youth, while youth itself desire only peace in which to work out their own destiny and to serve the common good." *Ibid*., p.5, see also p.7.

was written out in full English and French text, and endorsed by an overwhelming majority "of Canadian youth on a non-partisan, non-sectarian and non-credal basis."[39] The Declaration recognized the central place of "English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians," and emphasized the need for cross-cultural understanding "in order to achieve a common program of thorough action, borne out of common needs of all youth."[40] Forty years before Pierre Trudeau's French Immersion and Katimavik initiatives, the CYC delegates were calling for increased interaction between the two principal cultural-linguistic groups, and, significantly, for an education system that placed greater emphasis on bilingualism and biculturalism:

> We want knowledge. We want to know about ourselves. …. We want a friendly intermingling of the French and English-speaking youth of Canada and a mutual understanding of language and culture in our schools and in our social relationships. …. We want our educational systems based on those purposes.[41]

Before leaving the 1936 Congress, delegates made a point of celebrating the "spirit of unity" that they had "so magnificently achieved at Ottawa."[42]

The CYC of May 1937, held in Montreal, was a watershed moment for the organization. Some 735 delegates from 492 different organizations representing 500,000 members from across Canada attended. The backgrounds and political views represented, from left to right, were even more diverse, from fringe movements like the Young Communists to more mainstream organizations like the Young Liberals. Among these were 51 union representatives counting a membership of 100,000, and 125 youth from church and other religious groups, as well as "delegates from student peace organizations,

---

[39] *Ibid*., p.2.
[40] *Ibid*., p.2.
[41] *Ibid*., p.7.
[42] *Ibid*., p.2.

political movements, from YMCAs and YWCAs and so on."[43] But "[t]he most important fact," Frank and Libbie Park recalled, "was that 234 delegates came from Quebec, mainly French Canadians from organizations under Church influence."[44] Just like their parents' many fraternal societies, clubs, and professional associations, the Anglo-Canadian youths of the interwar saw French-Canadian participation as something of a validation – a legitimation of their organizations' claims to being truly 'national' in scope. The 1937 CYC in Montreal, one observer declared, was "'the first really sincere attempt since Confederation to bring about between Quebec and the rest of Canada a mutually satisfactory agreement for facing, not ignoring, problems.'"[45]

The Francophone delegates attended the 1937 Congress with more than a little reluctance. They had apparently been pressured not to attend by Duplessis's Union Nationale "and the conservative-minded Church leaders with whom he was associated [who] were horrified at the idea of French Canadian youth discussing and debating at a conference that included communists."[46] As a pre-condition for attending, the French-Canadian youths demanded that the congress title be bilingual, that representation be organized along ethnic, as well associational lines, and that French Canadians be guaranteed "30% representation on all committees." To waylay their own fears of anti-French and anti-Catholic sentiments, they demanded that the CYC acknowledge the "freedom of creeds," and "that the Congress declare itself for justice for all." To appease the clergy's suspicion that the congress was overly socialistic, even communist, they also demanded "that the Congress aims be internal and world peace, that the Congress

[43] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 6, files 109-122, "Notes and Clippings = *Canada: Land of Two Nations,*" p.327.
[44] *Ibid*., p.328.
[45] *Ibid*., p.328.
[46] *Ibid*., p.328.

proceed according to the principles of democracy, and affirm a belief in God, the right of individuals to private property, the necessity for internal peace and cooperation between classes, and the sanctity of the human personality, and finally that it condemn subversive doctrines."[47] That the young French-Canadian delegates had sought to partake in the CYC in spite of the several limitations imposed by their clerico-nationaliste elders suggests a sincere desire to engage with other, English-speaking youth of the country.

In the context of the times, the French-Canadian demands were a tall order, especially given the fact that the Congress already included a broad spectrum of political and religious views, including those of "non-believers."[48] But the Anglo-Canadian organizers, anxious to have meaningful French-Canadian participation, accepted all of the conditions. "The Duplessis-inspired attempt to divide the young people had been temporarily frustrated," wrote the Parks with satisfaction, "and believers and non-believers sat down together to discuss common problems."[49] A new, more progressive English-speaking Canada was already developing before the Second World War, and Canada's new left, including the CCF, was both a product of and a driver for more relaxed attitudes toward Francophone Canadians.

The array of issues on which the young Anglo- and French-Canadian delegates were able to find common cause and establish a shared position was impressive. Delegates passed motions calling for social justice and "internal peace" in Canada, and "a Crusade for Peace" in light of mounting tensions in Europe and East Asia. The CYC's position on international conflict, however, remained decidedly non-interventionist. The Congress denounced "'the imperialism of certain powers,'" and went so far as to cable

[47] *Ibid*., pp.328-329.
[48] *Ibid*., p.329.
[49] *Ibid*., p.329.

the Canadian delegation to the British Imperial Conference then in session "urging that Canada retain complete independence of action in the field of foreign policy."[50] Over the course of the interwar, conscientious young Canadians had been energized by the development of Canadian autonomy and the self-assurance that it engendered. Whether English- or French-speaking, many looked to statesmen like Ernest Lapointe for inspiration. As Lapointe's biographer explained, "it was on the young that Lapointe made the greatest impression. At universities and law schools across the country, students debated the justice minister's proposal [for] ... patriation of the constitution."[51] Lapointe's speeches to the Cercle Universitaire in Montreal and to the Quebec young lawyers' association on Canada's constitutional status was published in a number of law journals and as a pamphlet by *Le Devoir*.[52]

Further to having embraced the principle of full Canadian independence, the Congress also adopted an official position opposing conscription. The French-Canadian delegates must have been pleased by the Anglo-Canadians' willingness to compromise on issues like imperialism and conscription that had been so contentious in the past. For their part, the French Canadians proved willing to accommodate the leftist Anglo-Canadians, as the Congress "called for federal legislation to establish the right of workers to collective bargaining through the unions of their choice."[53]

The CYC had its detractors, most of them 'grown-ups.' One CCF paper criticized the organizers as "'all fence-sitters'" who had compromised too much on their originally leftist pretentions. A few "Protestant extremists," meanwhile, denounced the Congress

---

[50] *Ibid*., p.329.
[51] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.141.
[52] *Ibid*., p.141.
[53] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 6, files 109-122, "Notes and Clippings = *Canada: Land of Two Nations,*" p.329.

for its "'abject surrender to the Roman Catholic Church.'"[54] Ironically, Church officials in Quebec decided in early 1938 that the Congress had catered too much to leftist and Protestant positions, and attempted to ban Catholic youth organizations from taking part in further youth congresses.[55] Whatever the setbacks, meetings like those of the CYC must have had a positive long-term impact on at least some participants.

The youth of Canada could not be fully deterred from their desire to reach out to each other. Shortly after the close of the 1937 Congress, the Parks reported, "Provincial Youth Councils grew up, provincial conferences were held, and the youth of Canada began to develop a consistent attitude to the menace of fascism and the threat to peace, and on measures to deal with Canada's economic problems."[56] Among the new associated youth councils popping up was the Montreal Youth Council, predominantly Anglophone but incorporating Francophones as well. Among other things, the MYC hosted bilingual peace rallies and a bilingual Model Youth Legislature at which the theme of world peace took centre stage.[57] Members also protested against the infringement of civil liberties, including the padlocking of a Jewish Cultural Community Centre and of the French-language, communist-affiliated newspaper, *Le Combat*.[58] The MYC stressed pluralism and inclusiveness: "YOU are wanted whatever your race, your religious or political opinions," participants were told.[59] Its aim was to encourage positive interaction, a "spirit of friendship and cooperation" among youth, and to promote cross-cultural unity: "To strive for a better understanding among all Canadian young people of

[54] *Ibid*., p.329.
[55] *Ibid*., p.329.
[56] *Ibid*., p.329.
[57] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, pamphlet, "Model Youth Legislature by the Montreal Youth Council at the Montreal High School, May 6, 7, 8, 1938," p.4.
[58] See LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, files 133 and 134, on the Padlock Act.
[59] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Model Youth Legislature by the Montreal Youth Council at the Montreal High School, May 6, 7, 8, 1938," p.2.

different beliefs and persuasions, and to eliminate ugly national and racial prejudices so inimicable (*sic*) to unity and goodwill."[60] Participation within the council was broad-based, including "representatives from all the major youth organizations in the City."[61] The MYC and its pacifist stance received the endorsements of a number of locally and nationally prominent individuals, including Chief Justice Greenshields, Wilfred Bovey, who had a deep interest in French-Canadian culture,[62] the famed Drs. Norman Bethune and A. Grant Fleming, constitutional scholar Eugene Forsey, Quebec MLA Edgar Rochette, Prime Minister King, and several reverends, rabbis, and priests.[63] The misgivings of some of the French-Catholic clergy could not prevent the endorsement of Father Henri St. Denis, who was of course a strong supporter of cross-cultural exchanges for youth and a colleague of Arthur Lower.[64]

The CYC left a lasting, positive impression on many youth who had participated. One Anglo-Canadian participant and "future CCF Member of Parliament" described the 1937 meeting "as having given 'greater promise of a united Canada than any other event since Confederation.'"[65] At the 1938 Congress, in Toronto, another 564 representatives of 469 organizations, "including representatives of seven church denominations, five political parties and many language groups," attended. The Quebec clergy's ban kept many French Canadians away, but some still attended: 83 delegates from Quebec

---

[60] *Ibid*., p.5.
[61] *Ibid*., p.5.
[62] See Wilfrid Bovey's *Canadien* (1933) and *The French Canadian Today* (1938).
[63] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "A Model Youth Legislature presented by the Montreal Youth Council at the Montreal High School, May 6, 7, 8, 1938," p.7.
[64] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, Canadian Student Assembly and L'Association des Étudiants Canadiens (CSA-AÉC), "Correspondence From Resource Leaders of the Third National Conference of Canadian University Students at Macdonald College Regarding the Charges of Dean Charles A. Krug of Mount Allison University," (1940), Arthur Lower to Grant H. Lathe, 28 January 1940.
[65] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 6, files 109-122, "Notes and Clippings = *Canada: Land of Two Nations,*" p.329.

attended, including 26 French Canadians, "mostly from trade unions and radical groups."[66]

The youth congresses coincided with another important initiative that brought together young Anglo- and French-Canadian students: the National Conference of Canadian University Students (NCCUS), beginning in the later 1930s. It was hosted by the Canadian Student Assembly / L'Association des Étudiants Canadiens (CSA/AÉC), whose National Secretariat, headed by Dr. Grant H. Lathe, was based in Montreal. With a National Executive that included "a fair proportion of ... French-Canadian Roman Catholics,"[67] the CSA/AÉC prided itself on its pluralism, and was recognized as "a thoroughly representative forum" that allowed a voice for "minority groups" and "reform groups."[68] The third NCCUS annual meeting, held at McGill's Macdonald College in January 1940, was notable for the level of French- and Anglo-Canadian collaboration that it produced. In addition to students, the NCCUS in Montreal also brought together professors and educational figures from across the country. Among the participants were some thirty-five Francophone students, and, as participants were proud to point out, "at least two French-Canadian Roman Catholic leaders."[69]

Around this time the NCCUS was attacked by Mount Allison University Dean Charles A. Krug for being overly leftist, latently communist, and anti-British. A series of prominent Canadians who had attended as observers, such as academics and public

---

[66] *Ibid*., p.330.
[67] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, CSA-AÉC, "Correspondence From Resource Leaders of the Third National Conference of Canadian University Students at Macdonald College Regarding the Charges of Dean Charles A. Krug of Mount Allison University" (1940), W.H.D. Vernon to Grant H. Lathe, 31 January 1940.
[68] *Ibid*., John E. Robbins, Director of Educational Section, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, to Lathe, 29 January 1940. See also *Ibid*., Vernon to Lathe, 31 January 1940: Vernon called it "one of the most democratic of student organizations."
[69] *Ibid*., Vernon to Lathe, 31 January 1940.

servants, rallied to the NCCUS's defence, including Director of Education Section at the Dominion Bureau of Statistics John E. Robbins, Brandon College Philosophy Professor W.H.D. Vernon, University of Manitoba Professor of Economics and historian Arthur Lower, and established youth exchange advocate Father St. Denis. As to the "charge of Communist control," Vernon remarked, anyone familiar with the level of French-Canadian participation "will hardly take it seriously."[70] Lower and St. Denis had as much to say. "I wonder how long Father Saint Denis would have stayed in the Conference, he a priest of the Catholic church, if he had detected the odour of Communism," Lower asked Lathe. Lower urged the CSA/AÉC to "stand up and fight; fight hard but fair. And don't run away and complain if you are beaten. That is what I said to the general Conference [and] Father Saint Denis backed me up."[71]

Lower was deeply inspired by the sentiment of Anglo-/French-Canadian collaboration evinced by Canada's youth at the NCCUS. These 'leaders of tomorrow,' he told Lathe in words of encouragement, were living out his own cultural dualist dream:

> In respect to the Conference in general, … I believe it was a most successful body. What impressed itself on me most was the fine relationship between English and French students: when English students speak in French and French students in English in discussion of their common Canadian affairs, HISTORY IS BEING MADE. I sincerely believe that your conference did make history: it was perhaps unparalleled in Canadian annals. No better guarantee for our common Canadian future could be given than the spirit which characterized your Conference as respects French and English: it far transcended in importance any particular issue that was discussed. I hope there will be many more of them.[72]

For Lower, as with the CSA/AÉC, this process was inextricably linked to the creation of a new, Canadian national feeling that had taken root during the interwar years:

---

[70] *Ibid*., Vernon to Lathe, 31 January 1940.
[71] *Ibid*., Lower to Lathe, 28 January 1940.
[72] *Ibid*., Lower to Lathe, 28 January 1940. Lower's emphasis.

> Many things have happened in Canada of late years and much serious thought has been given to the difficulties of our Canadian position. In particular there has been a rapid increase in the depth of Canadian national feeling. It was quite evident that most of the students attending the Conference were deeply sincere in the degree of their Canadianism: to them, devotion to their common country (I speak to both French and English) exceeding any other political loyalty. I must confess I could not find that sentiment reprehensible. After all it was enjoined on us by the present Governor-General [Tweedsmuir], who has told us that a Canadian's first loyalties are to Canada.
> But there [a]re some who ha[ve] obviously not encountered very much of this new way of thought…. Their sentiments [a]re frankly still colonial: they ha[ve] not discovered that Canada is a nation and must act as a nation, not as a colony with no will of its own.[73]

What was important in the NCCUS was not so much the particular political ideas being discussed, but rather the forging of cross-cultural relationships and a common sentiment that would continue on after the conference had concluded: "the important thing is frank and free discussion of national issues," Lower continued. "Conclusions will come later; those that emerge in the minds of individuals as they go on with their studies are the important ones."[74]

The NCCUS must have had a positive impact, as a few months after the January 1940 meeting, more French Canadians returned to the CYC. It helped that the annual CYC meeting (in July 1940) was being held in Montreal. Proceedings were largely bilingual,[75] and out of 280 delegates and 198 organizations there were 77 French-Canadian delegates representing 47 different organizations.[76] This sizeable group, it seems, could not be deterred by conservative members of the clergy. Moreover, in addition to a genuine desire to work more closely with their Anglo-Canadian counterparts

---

[73] *Ibid*., Arthur Lower to Lathe, 28 January 1940.
[74] *Ibid*., Arthur Lower to Lathe, 28 January 1940.
[75] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Camilien Houde Appuit le Congrès," *Le Congressiste*, 30 juillet 1940, pp.1, 4. The paper proclaimed that it had been "Publié dans l'intérêt de la jeunesse canadienne-française."
[76] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Democracy, Civil Liberties, Economic Conditions. The Opinions and Program of Canadian Young People as Expressed, Reported and Adopted by the Fifth Canadian Youth Congress, Montreal, July 1940," participation chart, p.17.

on broader issues, they doubtless recognized that a national organization such as the CYC provided a larger platform to lobby on issues that were of particular concern for French-Canadian youth.[77] The Francophone and Anglophone minorities were well represented in the CYC. Anglo-Quebecers, from Montreal in particular, played an important role, notably through the Montreal Youth Council. The CYC's National Secretary, Ken Woodsworth, for instance, was a Montreal Anglophone. Its National President and Co-Chair, Laurier Regnier, was a Franco-Manitoban from Saint-Boniface. Regnier also represented the Manitoba Junior Liberal Association and some twenty-six CYC-affiliated French-Canadian organizations from his province.[78] French-language minority rights received special attention throughout the CYC's existence.

Like those before it, the 1940 meeting brought together an impressive cross-section of Canadian youth. Nearly every province was represented (Quebec had far and away the strongest numerical representation), and there were delegates representing churches and Christian groups (especially United), Anglophone and Francophone youth, Ethno-Cultural minorities (including Jewish, Black, Hungarian, Ukrainian, and Finnish Canadians), unions, junior boards of trade, YMCAs and YWCAs, sport groups, the fine arts, rural and agricultural associations, the unemployed, various student organizations and youth councils, communities, and youth wings of political parties (including the

[77] Such as "high incidence of illness ... particularly in the Province of Quebec where lack of public health provisions and undernourishment make it a very serious problem. .... Delegates repeatedly emphasized that educational facilities in Canada have been notably inferior in necessary equipment, teachers, salaries, scholarships, etc. The special position of French Canadians has been characterized by poorer conditions in almost every respect, and particularly with regard to the lack of compulsory education. Many delegates attributed this to Quebec's poorer economic condition." Participants issued a call for "compulsory education in Quebec, and the need to extend the school leaving age in Quebec and the maintenance of it in other provinces." *Ibid*., pp.14-15.

[78] The CYC's third chairman was Dave Bowman, also a representative of the Saskatoon Junior Board of Trade. LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7 file 128A, "Déclarations de Monsieur K. Woodsworth, Secrétaire National de Congrès des Jeunesses Canadiennes, et de Monsieur Laurier Regnier, Président National," *Le Congressiste*, 30 July 1940, p.4.

Communists, CCF, Liberals, and Conservatives), and other groups.[79] The CYC was immensely proud of this diversity, which made it "Canada's only truly national youth movement."[80] Diversity and difference were sources of strength, not weakness, the Congress declared:

> Freedom and a mutual tolerance, respect for differences of religion, and opinion – the spirit of democracy – have been the guiding principles of our Congress life. .... Canada is composed of many racial groups all of whom have made valuable contributions to Canadian life.[81]

The CYC opposed the internment of alleged 'enemy aliens,' condemned "Racial prejudice which is prevalent throughout Canada," and protested "against numerous instances of suppression of national cultural organizations."[82] Canada was a nation of minorities, it insisted. Moreover, minority rights must be protected in order to "keep this nation of many minorities united and free, as a nation in which all races will be on equal ground."[83] On balance, the discourse reflected the extent to which many young people had embraced the more pluralistic Canadian identity articulated by the likes of Moore, Morley, Hawkes, Roy, Harvey, Maheux, Gibbon, and countless other moderate liberal intellectuals of the interwar period.

The July 1940 CYC positions were developed through the distribution of questionnaires to the delegates. In addition to the usual concern over "conditions of youth," the Canadian war effort and the preservation of "civil liberties" were the central

---

[79] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7 file 128A, "Democracy, Civil Liberties, Economic Conditions," participation chart, p.17.

[80] It was "a federation of youth organizations. .... Delegates came from every part of Canada to the Congress. They were factory workers, students, farmers, stenographers, teachers, lawyers, doctors, unemployed, miners, lumbermen, and others. They represented churches, Y's, trade unions, French-Canadians, political organizations and practically every other kind of youth interest. Who can say that these young people do not represent the youth of Canada?" *Ibid*., p.1.

[81] *Ibid*., pp.1, 7.

[82] Notably those "national groups [that] form an important section of some of the strongest trade unions in Canada." *Ibid*., pp.6, 7.

[83] *Ibid*., p.2. The CYC was also very progressive on gender equality. See *Ibid*., pp.6.

themes of the meeting. The Congress was disillusioned by the fact that Canada was at war, yet again, after the failure of several peace initiatives. The CYC's attitude toward conscription remained decidedly cold (despite the fact that Hitler's armies had only just conquered France and the Low Countries, and were now looking menacingly across the English Channel). Some even questioned Canada's involvement in the war altogether:

> Now what do we find? Threat of conscription. Coercion of unemployed workers and farmers. Trampling of civil rights. ....
> Thousands of young people have spoken against conscription through the Youth Congress questionnaire. Against or for conscription, it is our duty to speak up. Canada's war aims must be analyzed; we should know the causes of war and the terms of peace. We should know about Canada's war effort. ....
> Youth want jobs, not conscription.[84]

The CYC leadership was acutely aware of what conscription had cost the country during the Great War, both materially and in terms of national unity, and how little it had accomplished: "How would conscription affect personal liberties and democratic procedure," they asked delegates. "What were the results of conscription in the last war in Canada?"[85] At the very least, the delegates concluded, conscription must be put to a referendum before being imposed.[86] The CYC came out against the War Measures Act and the Defence of Canada Regulations on the grounds that they would "deny our traditional rights of free speech, free assembly, organization and trade union action, free press, radio and pulpit." Together they were a threat to "'traditional British justice'" and "'true democracy,'" and a threat to civil liberties that had been "taken away in dictator countries."[87] For this stance, the CYC office and those of the affiliated Montreal and

---

[84] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "5th Canadian Youth Congress, July 5-6-7. Conscription and War Aims. Civil Liberties. Conditions of Youth" (Montreal, 1940), p.2.
[85] *Ibid*., p.3.
[86] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Democracy, Civil Liberties, Economic Conditions," p.5.
[87] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "5th Canadian Youth Congress, July 5-6-7. Conscription and War Aims," pp.2-4.

Toronto youth councils were raided by the police, and at least one Conservative MP called for the suppression of the CYC.[88]

The CYC was careful to present its Francophone and Anglophone membership as being united in their anti-conscription stance. "A vast majority, both French and English, spoke emphatically against conscription for overseas service," announced the Congress.[89] Moreover, both groups were unified in their consternation over ongoing mobilization efforts. They reminded "the present Government" that it had been "elected on an anti-conscription program."[90] The CYC's unity was a far cry from the divisions that had permeated Canadian society over conscription in 1917-1918.

Preserving and forwarding the hard-fought restoration of French- and Anglo-Canadian unity was a central theme of the 1940 CYC gathering. Delegates from across the country took for fact what only a generation earlier had been the subject of acrimonious debate by passing a resolution recognizing that Francophones had been given a raw deal:

> We believe that French-Canadians in Quebec and other parts of Canada have not had equal rights in the past with English-speaking sections of Canada in matters of language, religion and economic livelihood, and we believe that equality of French-Canadians with other sections of the people must be an essential part of Canadian democracy.[91]

Delegates demonstrated broad support for the CYC's position, approving the following statement at the general assembly: "'At a time when Canada is at war, we wish to reaffirm our allegiance to the democratic traditions of our country and to the British Commonwealth of nations, freedom of speech, press and assembly, the right of trade unions to organize, universal education and the rights of minorities.'" The group of delegates for the Young Liberals added that it "pledge[d] its confidence in the Mackenzie King Government in its prosecution of the war." LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Democracy, Civil Liberties, Economic Conditions," pp.1, 4.

[88] The MP for Parkdale, Ontario, Herbert Alexander Bruce. LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Democracy, Civil Liberties, Economic Conditions," pp.7.

[89] *Ibid*., p.13.

[90] Some, likely the Young Liberals, "felt that it was not opportune to criticize the Government in this respect since in their opinion it had recently received a mandate from the people and had promised that it would not introduce conscription for overseas service." *Ibid*., pp.4-5.

[91] *Ibid*., p.3.

This statement was significant, not only in that it came as the country was debating conscription anew, but also in that it was the product of two decades of cross-cultural rapprochement – the product of the inculcation of a new set of values and a new, pluralistic identity for Canadians and for Anglo-Canadians in particular.

True to its desire to continue the process of cross-cultural rapprochement, the CYC passed a series of resolutions for the promotion of bicultural equality and French-language rights. In this it had the support of both youth constituencies:

> The vast majority of French and English delegates were in agreement that the French Canadians must stand on equal footing with the English-speaking Canadians and all must bend their efforts to secure full and equal participation of each in our national life. The fact that this has not yet been achieved has been a barrier to both ethnic groups, and at this Congress it has served as an object for both to discuss, with a resulting determination to overcome existing obstacles.[92]

Twenty years before the Quiet Revolution, these Anglo-Canadian youth were recognizing not just French-Canadian language and cultural rights, but also acknowledging their unequal economic position. And not just in Quebec: the precarious economic and cultural position of Francophone minority communities also garnered special attention.[93] Delegates advocated forcefully for a greater recognition of French-language rights throughout Canada, calling for the "extension of bilingualism" and "the democratic rights of language minorities to be educated in their own language."[94]

The CYC's Anglo-Canadian leadership took great pride in their organization's recognition of Canada's bilingual and bicultural nature. "Notre Congrès a toujours reconnu l'existence de la nation canadienne-française," declared CYC Secretary Ken

---

[92] *Ibid*., p.9.
[93] The "rise in cost of living, a trend most observable in mine regions of Northern Ontario and in farm areas .... has been most keenly felt by the French Canadian people because of their already depressed economic condition." *Ibid*., p.12.
[94] *Ibid*., p.16.

Woodsworth. "Il a toujours pris position nettement sur les droits de cette nation, et a maintenu fermement qu'elle devait être sur pied d'égalité avec les autres races au Canada."[95] Woodsworth linked the challenges of French Canadians with the Canadian working class in general. Their difficulties were severe, he told members, and had to be addressed:

> L'inégalité des Canadiens français, l'oppression de la nation canadienne-française, se fait sentir tout d'abord par la position inférieure des gens du Québec dans l'économie du Canada. Et cet état des choses frappe tout d'abord les masses canadiennes-françaises, et surtout la classe ouvrière de la province de Québec.[96]

Woodsworth believed that the Congress's heavy focus on Francophone issues, framed in such a way so that others could relate to them (by linking them to labour, farm, and economic issues), had a marked effect on all delegates from across the country: "c'est ça que chaque délégué a apporté avec lui en partant, et c'est ça qui portera chacun de ces délégués à s'appliquer énergiquement à la solution du problème national des Canadiens français, problème qui est une partie intégrale du plus grand problème auquel toutes les masses Canadiennes font face."[97]

The French-Canadian participants of the 1940 CYC came away pleased with what they and their Anglo-Canadian colleagues had accomplished. They were proud of the congress's vast regional representation, and that so many youths from across the nation had chosen to assemble in their province.[98] The CYC's Secretariat canadien-français published a newsletter describing the proceedings of the "Magnifique Congrès de la

---

[95] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Déclarations de Monsieur K. Woodsworth et de Monsieur Laurier Regnier," *Le Congressiste*, 30 juillet 1940, p.4.
[96] *Ibid*.
[97] *Ibid*.
[98] "'Les délégués sont venus de Halifax à Vancouver." LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "De Halifax à Vancouver," *Le Congressiste*, 30 juillet 1940, p.3.

Jeunesse" for its member-organizations.[99] It called the meeting "un évènement d'importance historique pour l'avancement de la nation Canadienne-française envers sa pleine liberté, envers son plein développement dans le bien-être de ses masses."[100] Moreover, the French-Canadian participants had been noticeably moved by the CYC's Anglo-Canadian delegates' commitment to French-Canadian equality:

> Pour une des premières fois dans notre histoire, des Canadiens anglais ont pu apprécier les problèmes nationaux des Canadiens français, ont pu réaliser l'importance de ces problèmes pour tout le reste du Canada, et ainsi ont pu se decider d'apporter leur aide à la solution de ces problèmes.[101]

Even more, the positive interaction begot by the CYC's activities had led to the mutual realization of shared interests of youth from across the country:

> Les délégués du Québec, en outre, ont bien vu qu'ils avaient des alliés dans toutes les parties du Canada. Savoir que des jeunes de Halifax à Vancouver luttaient pour les mêmes choses, c'était réaliser qu'il n'était plus question pour les Canadiens français de lutter contre les Canadiens anglais, mais plutôt pour les deux de s'unir pour lutter contre ceux qui ont intérêt à nous séparer. Divisés, nous sommes faibles, et ne pouvons accomplir que très peu. Unis, nous sommes forts, et pouvons vaincre tous les obstacles. ….
> Ce sera pour nous le moyen de faire du Canada un pays de bonheur, un pays où nous n'aurons pas à lutter pour le droit de travailler à un salaire raisonnable, pour les droits de la nation et pour nos libertés, mais où ces choses nous seront garanties et où nous pourrons en jouir.[102]

The Francophone delegates had been especially pleased by the common stance against conscription, and the proposal that any imposition of conscription must at the very least be the subject of a plebiscite.

---

[99] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Magnifique Congrès de la Jeunesse," *Le Congressiste*, 30 juillet 1940, p.1.
[100] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Le Congrès Demande l'Égalité Pour les Canadiens-Français," *Le Congressiste*, 30 juillet 1940, pp.1, 3.
[101] *Ibid*., pp.1, 3. See also, in *Ibid*., "En dépit d'une opposition acharnée, le 5e Congrès du CJC réussit à Montréal," pp.1, 3.
[102] "[L]a vaste majorité des jeunes Canadiens représentés luttait pour les memes choses: du travail, une meilleure education, la démocratie, une vie plus heureuse. Les sans-travail de Vancouver étaient aussi opposés au Plan Bouchard que les Canadiens français de Québec." LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Le Congrès Demande l'Égalité Pour les Canadiens-Français," *Le Congressiste*, 30 juillet 1940, pp.1, 3.

The CYC's stance on conscription ensured a great deal of positive and negative recognition from 'grown-up' circles. Some of the large Montreal newspapers came out against the Congress. Montreal Mayor Camilien Houde, on the other hand, defended the Congress for its "'esprit de tolérance, d'appaisement, et de bonne entente.'" Houde was especially pleased by the CYC's goal of achieving "'une meilleure entente non seulement entre les races, mais entre les classes sociales,'" and by its "'bilinguisme [qui] vous portera plus loin que certaines personnes voudraient que vous alliez.'"[103]

The Francophone youth, desirous of the respect of their Anglophone colleagues, went to lengths to assert that they were committed to defeating fascism and any external threats to Canadian democracy, and a few even expressed anxiety that the CYC's position in support of the war effort was not strong enough.[104] They also reaffirmed their commitment to Canada's traditions of democracy and the civil liberties of the British Commonwealth.[105] These French-Canadian youth, undeterred by the clerico-nationaliste élite, chose to engage with their fellow Canadians, and in so doing discovered a shared set of values, interests and concerns. Together, they came away with a positive outlook for the country's future. Having lost its initial raison d'être in suing for world peace, the CYC petered out during the war.[106] But at the very least, it left a lasting impression on those who had participated.

---

[103] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Camilien Houde Appuit le Congrès," *Le Congressiste*, 30 juillet 1940, pp.1, 4.

[104] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "En dépit d'une opposition acharnée, le 5e Congrès du CJC réussit à Montréal," *Le Congressiste*, 30 juillet 1940, pp.1, 3.

[105] See LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Ce que la jeunesse a demandé en congrès," *Le Congressiste*, 30 juillet 1940, pp.1-2, and "En dépit d'une opposition acharnée, le 5e Congrès du CJC réussit à Montréal," pp.1, 3.

[106] It fractured in late 1940 along ideological (and not cultural-linguistic) lines over the question of the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact. See Ruth Latta, *They Tried: the Story of the Canadian Youth Congress* (Ottawa: R. Latta, 2006); and Paul Axelrod, "The Student Movement of the 1930s," in Paul Axelrod and John G. Reid, eds., *Youth, University and Canadian Society* (Kingston and Montreal, 1989), pp. 238.

Towards a new Canadian history in the classroom

The progressive attitudes of the Canadian youth movement were in part a reflection of the new history being taught in English-language schools by the 1930s. As early as 1927, Prime Minister King himself had called for a greater emphasis on teaching history in the classroom.[107] Academics were equally aware of the nation-building potential inherent in historical instruction, especially in terms of its potential to build cross-cultural understanding. Among the most prominent of these educators was Lorne Pierce, the editor of the influential Ryerson Press, which reached thousands of Anglo-Canadian students through its publication of history texts for elementary, high school and university courses.

Pierce hoped to use history to emphasize Canada's dual nationality and to build what he liked to call "a covered bridge" between the two cultural-linguistic communities.[108] National unity, he explained, must be achieved through a better appreciation of Canadians' own culture and history:

> How, then, are we to acquire a greater cohesiveness? It cannot be through the influence of foreign capital any more than through the supremacy of foreign magazines. It must be through the intensive study of our history, its romantic events and inspiring personalities, as well as an increasing devotion to our national literature. Here, for better or for worse, speaks the soul of Canada; here is the highway, broad and beautiful, which shall cross every divide, and create the only enduring *entente cordiale*.[109]

---

[107] "Let us hope that the interest created by the present anniversary [of Confederation] will give us a greater pride in our country's past, and mark a a place of new beginnings in the importance to be attached to Canadian history in our universities and schools. Let it be a study not from some prejudiced partisan or favoured point of view, but a simple record of the truth." King in "Canada's Story of Achievement," *Globe*, 2 July 1927, p.3.
[108] Pierce, *A Canadian People*, p.vii.
[109] Pierce, *An Outline of Canadian Literature,* p.237.

Canadians must pay "equal attention to both French and English" cultural and intellectual contributions in order to achieve "a degree of national self-consciousness," he explained.[110] Pierce was especially proud of French-Canadian literary achievements, which, in his view, lent an air of sophistication to Canadian culture as a whole.

Like Moore, Morley and Hawkes before him, Pierce was a strong advocate of the advantages of Canadian pluralism and civic patriotism. He highlighted the contributions of Canada's Aboriginal, French, British, and (white) Ethno-Cultural communities.[111] Despite their differences, he argued, the Anglo- and French-Canadian outlooks, especially, shared a certain cosmopolitanism, a love for liberty, and "nonconformity and free thought."[112] To be sure, British-Canadian bigotry had done much harm to national unity in the past: "Let no one imagine that our English-speaking population can make smug faces at the French. The stupidity of the English in Canada is historic, almost cosmic."[113] But looking back on the interwar years, Pierce was optimistic that Anglo-Canadian attitudes toward French Canada had changed for the better – the politically charged bigotry of the past was now the exception, not the rule.[114]

This change in attitude, Pierce explained, had been made possible by the evolution of a more self-confident Canadian historiography during the interwar period.

---

[110] *Ibid.*, p.238.

[111] "Canada traces its cultural ancestry back to the *chansons* of Normandy.... To this may be added the many centuries of Indian traditions which will sooner or later affect more appreciably our literature and art. Moreover ... we must be prepared for an ever-increasing multitude of new Canadians, each bringing his own intellectual and social inheritance. By every token we surely have the elements out of which may evolve a great people and a splendid tradition. .... Separate units entered Confederation as they were prepared for it, and the spirit of patriotism and national self-consciousness grew with each succeeding addition." *Ibid.*, p.236-237.

[112] *Ibid.*, pp.240-241.

[113] Pierce, *A Canadian People*, p.63.

[114] "The blustering vote-snatcher who rants about imperialistic wars, ... he can be roared down. The guileless fellow who cackles about the quaintness of Quebec, who lisps that *les habitants* are virtuous and simple and unlearned in the intricacies of democracy or world affairs, this lad can be pushed aside. These men have sung to the one tune so long that it has ceased either to instruct or entertain." *Ibid.*, pp.46-47.

This historiography had, in turn, made its way into the textbooks that were now in the hands of countless Anglo-Canadian students:

> It is within comparatively recent years that historians of Canada have had the courage to be Canadian. The colonial point of view has largely disappeared, and with it the nostalgia for other days and other ways which plagued our arts and letters for a century. As our historians became more definitely Canadian, more certain of their own position, they ceased to patronize racial and religious groups within our borders, and they are at last beginning to put a stop to the apology, approximation and compromise, which had hitherto characterized their approach to our relationship with the United States.[115]

In this spirit, the task of the school textbook author was to promulgate a romantic Canadian narrative, inspired by the great stories of both the "French Régime and the British Régime." The next generation of Canadians would be "proud, strong, alive and united," Pierce continued, "if the story of their country is ... presented to them in such a way as to suggest that they should be."[116]

One of the earliest textbooks that promoted a more dualist narrative to Anglo-Canadian young people was William Lawson Grant's *The Ontario High School History of Canada* (1914). Grant had studied French in Paris. While there, he also conducted archival research on New France. A history professor at Queen's, in 1917 he became Headmaster at Ontario's most influential preparatory school, Upper Canada College, serving there until his death in 1935. A veteran who had entered the Great War as an imperialist (his father, George Monro Grant had advocated Imperial Federation), Grant emerged a firm supporter of Canadian autonomy within the Empire.[117] Several of his pupils and colleagues would go on to lead Canada's civil service in the ensuing decades,

---

[115] *Ibid.*, pp.18-19.
[116] *Ibid*, pp.19-20.
[117] He imparted this new outlook on his students at UCC from the very beginning. Michael Ignatieff, *True Patriot Love: Four Generations in Search of Canada* (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2009), p.103; Obituary, *Mail and Empire*, 4 February 1935; "William Lawson Grant," *Mémoires* (Royal Society of Canada, 1935), v-viii.

Vincent Massey and O.D. Skelton among them.[118] Grant was an educational authority in his own right, and was often consulted by education officials in Ontario and elsewhere in Canada. *The Ontario High School History of Canada* was used extensively in high schools throughout the province and across Canada, going through some ten editions during the 1920s and '30s. In addition to chronicling Canada's French and British heritage and its North American frontier experience, it emphasized the role played by 'heroic' individuals of that past that students could aspire to emulate, from Samuel de Champlain to the Canadian soldiers at Vimy Ridge.[119] Indeed, it placed so much emphasis on Canada's French heritage that in 1920 it was criticized by the radical Orange lobby in British Columbia for being pro-French, pro-Catholic, anti-Protestant and anti-British. Elsewhere in Canada, however, the book continued to do well. "'I believe that the general public, as well as the teaching profession, is friendly to your book,'" wrote the University of British Columbia's Mack Eastman to Grant. "'Only the wild Orangemen, the Fenian Raid Veterans and some other antiques who will soon die off, refuse to disarm.'"[120]

In addition to Grant and Pierce, several other textbook authors encouraged Anglo-Canadian youths to appropriate Canada's French history as their own. These included George Wrong, Chester Martin, A.L. Burt, W.S. Wallace, and Inspector-General of Protestant Schools in Quebec, J.C. Sutherland.[121] Texts that incorporated the French

---

[118] See Ignatieff, *True Patriot Love*, pp.75.
[119] *Ibid*., pp.75-76, 105-106.
[120] In Wright, *The Professionalization of History*, p.84.
[121] See Wright, *The Professionalization of History*, pp.79-80; also Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," pp.472-473; Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, p.14. Among the more important texts noted by Wright, Neatby and Berger are: Isaac Gammell, *History of Canada* (Toronto: W.J. Gage & Co., 1927), which was the textbook assigned to Montreal high schools, and approved in British Columbia; W. Stewart Wallace, *A First Book of Canadian History* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1928; reprinted 1929, 1931), which was the Ministry of Education's official history text for Ontario public schools from 1928 to 1951; George Wrong, Chester

element as part of the larger Canadian story were thusly titled *History of Canada*, *A First Book of Canadian History*, *The Story of Canada*, or *The Story of Our People*. The books reached a wide audience, several of them being sanctioned as official readers by provincial governments and education boards from across the country.[122] Pierce's books alone sold by the tens of thousands annually.[123]

Moreover, the emphasis on pre-Conquest New France allowed Anglo-Canadian students to claim for Canada and themselves a more 'ancient' history – something more comparable to their European confreres. The widely used Ryerson readers of 1930-onward thusly focussed on the exploits of French explorers, early military heroes, and missionaries. The series also placed great emphasis on the important role of Catholicism in New France, which itself remained an important element of contemporary French-Canadian society.[124] For some Protestant Anglo-Canadian youths, this would have been their first exposure to a positive portrayal of Catholicism. A change to a history textbook "qui ne commencerait pas seulement à la domination anglaise, mais qui contiendrait aussi la domination française" would certainly have been welcomed by Franco-Ontarians.[125] Moreover, the new narrative covering the New France era was highly positive, and

---

Martin, and Walter N. Sprague, *The Story of Canada*, illustrated by C.W. Jeffreys (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1929); D.C. Harvey, *Sir George Étienne Cartier* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1930), edited by Lorne Pierce; Gilbert Paterson, *The Story of Our People*, illustrated by C.W. Jeffreys and Edith MacLaren, (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1933); J.C. Sutherland, *The Romance of Quebec* (Toronto: W.J. Gage & Co., 1937); E.C. Woodley, *The Province of Quebec through Four Centuries* (Toronto: W.J. Gage & Co., 1947).

As an Anglo-Quebecer, Sutherland appreciated the magnanimity shown his people by the Francophone majority. See Moore, *The Clash!*, p.314. See also A.A. Heriot, "School Inspectors of the Early Days of Manitoba," *MHS Transactions*, Series 3 (1947-1948), accessed 7 June 2011, http://www.mhs.mb.ca/docs/ transactions/3/schoolinspectors.shtml.

[122] See Wright, *The Professionalization of History*, pp.79-80; Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," pp.472.

[123] Campbell, "From romantic history to communications theory," pp.94-95.

[124] Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.472.

[125] "Manuel d'histoire," *Le Droit*, 24 novembre 1926, p.3.

provided Anglo-Canadian children with French-Canadian 'heroes' and role models that they could look up to.[126] They, too, were the inheritors of this romantic history.

To be sure, the school history texts of the late 1920s and the 1930s, while exposing more children to Canada's French past, tended to give "relatively little attention to Quebec and to French Canadians after the Conquest."[127] Indeed, as José Igartua has amply demonstrated, it was not until after the Second World War that English-language history texts truly began to give greater attention to contemporary French-Canadian society.[128] Still, the texts of the latter interwar period laid the groundwork for a narrative that gave more weight to both cultural-linguistic communities. W.S. Wallace's *A First Book in Canadian History* (1928), for instance, the official text for Ontario middle schools well into the 1950s, provided the basis for Aileen Garland's *Canada: Then and Now* (1954), which replaced Wallace's work in the classroom and was very sympathetic to the post-Conquest French-Canadian perspective.[129] Leading Anglo- and French-Canadian educators who advocated a more dualist narrative also identified George W. Brown's *Building the Canadian Nation* (1942) as, in their words, evidence of "the trend to a more constructive approach in the presentation of our national development."[130] His book quickly became the major history text for high schools in Ontario and Manitoba, and was also used in Alberta. The narrative Brown constructed was very much a product of his intellectual formation during the interwar years as a history professor at the University of Toronto. Brown explained that unity between the two cultures was born

---

[126] These heroes of the past were depicted as a means for providing "social guidance." Ontario, *Report of the Minister of Education, Ontario, 1936*, p.48.
[127] Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.472.
[128] See Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution*, pp.63.
[129] Garland encouraged students to empathize with the Lower Canada rebels of 1837-1838 and the Red River Métis, 1869-1870. Igartua, *Other Quiet Revolution*, pp.69-71.
[130] Maheux, "Report of the Committee for the Study of Canadian History Textbooks," *Canadian Education*, vol. 1, no. 1 (October 1945), p.5.

"'not merely of convenience but of necessity.... At every crisis the intuition that this was so has prevailed, and no central fact in Canadian history has been more commonly overlooked.'"[131] Students reading his text were told that politicians like Lord Durham were "'wrong in thinking that the French could be deprived of their language and laws after ... centuries of settlement along the St. Lawrence.'"[132] Brown believed sincerely that a pluralistic Canada should act as an example for cross-cultural cooperation in an ever-diversifying world.

The interwar textbooks did not leave out post-Conquest French Canada altogether. Ryerson Press, for instance, published a reader in 1930 "devoted to Sir George-Étienne Cartier."[133] Overall, contemporary French-Canadian society was depicted in the textbooks as traditional, even pre-modern, and valuing a rural life grounded in the past. It was a somewhat patronizing and stereotypical depiction, but one that suggested a certain merit in the 'down-to-earth' values of French-speaking Canadians.[134] It bears pointing out that the emphasis on New France and on the traditionalism of contemporary Québécois society was common in French-language Quebec school history texts as well – this was how French-Canadian educators wanted French-Canadian society to conceptualize itself. They offered up "the *habitant* way of life ... as a model,"[135] and, interestingly, in the face of rapid modernization, urbanization, and industrialization, Anglo-Canada became increasingly interested in and sympathetic to that model. For all its faults, the portrayal of French-Canadian society was generally

[131] In Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution*, p.73.
[132] In *Ibid*., p.77.
[133] Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.472.
[134] See *Ibid*., pp.473-474.
[135] *Ibid*., p.475.

positive, and it taught Anglo-Canadian children that their French-speaking neighbours were a distinct people. As Neatby explains,

> children were encouraged to view French Quebecers as distinct in terms of culture, lifestyle, and also temperament if not sophistication. Students were told that, when entering Quebec, the visitor would have the impression of discovering 'another world' for the province 'in character … is unique.' …. [T]he *habitants* with their Old World traditions had survived.[136]

Thanks to the habitants' historical resiliency, students learned, they were not going to assimilate and disappear anytime soon.

In addition to learning about distinct characteristics of French Canada, children also learned about points of commonality between Canada's two major cultural-linguistic groups. Authors were anxious to dispel harmful myths about French-Canadian society and to have Anglo-Canadian children associate Quebec as part of their country too. J.C. Sutherland, for instance, explained that his textbook was "'intended to show that the province of Quebec, however much it has retained of the character and customs of Old France, is nevertheless a loyal and essential part of our great Dominion.'"[137] As an Anglo-Quebecer, Sutherland had played the role of intermediary between French-speaking Quebec society and English-speaking Canadian society before.[138] Ryerson Press's text on George-Étienne Cartier also elaborated on the theme of a shared political nationality; children were told that French-Canadian society was "'monarchical by religion, by habit and by the remembrance of past history.'"[139] The assertion of monarchism, however erroneous it may have been, at least identified for Anglophone children a common, secular sentiment with their Francophone counterparts. For

---

[136] *Ibid*., p.474.
[137] In *Ibid*. p.474.
[138] Heriot, "School Inspectors of the Early Days of Manitoba"; Moore, *The Clash!*, p.314.
[139] In Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.472.

generations, Anglo-Canadians had been told that there were fundamental, irreconcilable differences between the two cultures – French Canadians were Catholic and not to be trusted. Now, they were depicted as compatriots, with their own set of flaws, sure, but sharing values similar to those of Anglo-Canadians.

By the end of the interwar period, educators from across Canada and from both cultural-linguistic groups had come together to call for the teaching of a more unified history of the country. At the urging of the Quebec Liberal government of Adélard Godbout and his Minister of Education Charles Bilodeau, in 1941 the Canada and Newfoundland Education Association (CNEA) established a Committee for the Study of Canadian History Textbooks "in order to bring about a better understanding between the two main groups of the Canadian nation."[140] Bilodeau's modus operandi was clear:

> L'enseignement de l'histoire est trop important pour qu'on ne prenne tous les moyens de l'améliorer. Les jeunes Canadiens ont droit de connaître l'histoire véridique et complète de leur pays. Evidemment, Canadiens anglais et Canadiens français ne réagiront jamais de façon identique au récit du passé, mais il est possible d'expliquer aux uns les attitudes des autres et de développer ainsi la sympathie et la compréhension. L'histoire peut encore faire valoir la richesse culturelle du Canada, héritier des deux plus hautes civilisations contemporaines, montrer l'apport de chaque race à la grandeur du pays, donner à tous une même conception de la patrie, fortifier l'esprit canadien. C'est ainsi que l'enseignement de l'histoire se prêtera davantage à des fins désirables et deviendra une force réelle pour la nation. La grande oeuvre de l'unité nationale doit commençer dès l'école.[141]

The CNEA was not without influence. Its board of directors was composed of ministers of education and university administrators from across the country, and its

---

[140] Maheux, "Report of Committee for the Study of Canadian History Textbooks," p.4.

Bilodeau was supported by other influential members of the Godbout Cabinet, including T.D. Bouchard. Bouchard, a critic of nationaliste historical interpretations, also believed that history should be used to instill cross-cultural unity amoung youth. See T.D. Bouchard, *L'Enseignement de l'histoire: discours prononcé au Sénat le 21 juin 1944* (Saint-Hyacinthe, Québec, L'Imprimerie Yamaska, 1944), University of Ottawa Archives Pamphlets, 01-CRC 1944-6.

[141] Charles Bilodeau, "Suite au Rapport du Comité des Manuels D'Histoire du Canada," *Canadian Education*, Vol.1, No.4 (Summer 1946), pp.196-197.

recommendations reached "thousands of teachers, parents, and other interested persons."[142] The committee was composed of three Anglo-Canadians and three French Canadians: E.L. Daniher from the Ontario College of Education in Toronto, R.M. Saunders from the University of Toronto, A.R.M. Lower from United College in Winnipeg, Jean-Jacques Lefebvre of the Société Historique de Montréal, Charles Bilodeau, and the Abbé Arthur Maheux from Laval, who would chair the committee.[143]

The report recommended to the several provincial departments of education, and to educators and textbook writers alike, that Canadian pupils be taught a history that would "emphasize the common heritage of the Canadian people."[144] Pointing out historical examples of cross-cultural collaboration was key: "Authors and teachers should emphasize the things which all Canadians have in common, and the steps which have led to the building of the Canadian nation, especially the means by which difficulties and controversies have been resolved."[145] This would "enlarge the vision, interests, and comprehension of the young Canadian citizen."[146] The Committee devised a grade-by-grade list of history lessons that the provinces could follow. In addition to an ample

---

[142] Maheux, "Report of the Committee for the Study of Canadian History Textbooks," p.35. The CNEA was formed in the early 1920s. In 1945 its president was Fletcher Peacock, and its vice-president was B.O. Filteau, Quebec's Deputy Minister of Education. Its board of directors included Anglo- and French-Canadian educational leaders, among them Msgr. Aimé Labrie, the Vice-Rector of Laval. See p.1. The CNEA was headquartered in Toronto. See p.38.

[143] *Ibid*., p.4. It is telling that the very first issue of the CNEA's journal, which published articles in French and in English, opened with this report, followed by an article entitled "The Program for the Promotion of Canadian Unity," pp.36-38.

[144] Maheux, "Report of the Committee for the Study of Canadian History Textbooks," p.2.

[145] The report continued: "It is desireable not to avoid controversial matters, particularly when dealing with questions or events involving the relations between English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians, but such matters should be treated in a constructive manner. Needless to say, truth should always be respected." Maheux, "Report of the Committee for the Study of Canadian History Textbooks," p.10.

Interestingly, in order to identify those things that average Canadians held in common, the committee recommended less emphasis on "religious differences," as well as "wars, political events, and similar affairs," and more emphasis on social, cultural, intellectual and economic history. Conflicts occurring within Canada should also be set within a global context as a means of pointing out that they were not endemic to the Anglophone/Francophone relationship but rather the product, at least in part, of outside forces. P.11.

[146] *Ibid*., p.2.

serving of pre-Confederation French- and British-Canadian history, the curriculum devoted significant attention to examples of cross-cultural partnership, including Loyalist and French-Canadian advocacy of representative government in 1791, fellow rebel leaders Papineau and Mackenzie, responsible government advocates Baldwin, Lafontaine and Howe, and co-Fathers of Confederation Macdonald and Cartier. It also included more recent history, like the prime ministership of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, "the great reconciler," Canada's involvement in the Great War along with "Canadian dissensions" at home, and the development of Canadian independence from Britain after the war. Canada's "separate declaration of war" in 1939, for example, was a highlight of both cross-cultural compromise and the "attainment of nationhood."[147] The committee members were careful to distinguish between "the 'pathological' nationalisms of Europe and the sober desire for self-realization and ability to act collectively which the term connotes in Canada."[148] Throughout, one detects a sincere attempt to engender among Anglo-Canadian children a desire to accommodate the French-speaking minority. For mature students in Grade 12, the committee recommended a broader discussion of more sensitive questions, including bilingualism and Catholic/Protestant relations, "stressing tolerance," and "the principle of majority rule and its limits."[149]

Above all, the proposed curriculum must depict "Canadian civilization as the projection of two European civilizations, French and English," and "the relationships of the two national groups as the dominant theme in Canadian history."[150] The Committee was "pleased to note" the progress over the preceding decade, but suggested that more

[147] *Ibid*., pp.16-18.
[148] *Ibid*., p.19.
[149] *Ibid*., pp.29-30.
[150] The proposed curriculum also attempted to draw attention to "immigration and the diversification of the Canadian racial stock." Predictably, Aboriginal history was given minimal treatment. *Ibid*., pp.18-19.

could be done to teach students across the country a history that gave equal weight to its French and British heritage.[151] To that end, the committee recommend "a wider use by pupils of books on Canadian history," including "the textbooks authorized in other provinces, translating them for this purpose where necessary."[152] The report was generally well received by the provincial departments of education, notably Quebec and Ontario, and incremental changes to textbooks and to curriculum followed. Saskatchewan, for instance, reported teaching more about "How the people of Quebec live today; homes, the church, community, education, arts and crafts, music, language and literature, bilingualism. Emphasis [is] on the richness of this heritage in which all Canadians may share."[153]

There is reason to believe that young Canadians absorbed a good degree of the historical narrative being promoted by Pierce, Maheux and others by the 1930s. To be sure, the school textbooks of the interwar reflected an image that society hoped to construct for itself and reproduce into the future. But in an age without television and computers, these texts had a significant influence on young people.[154] In addition to textbooks, the new Canadian history benefitted from new teaching techniques. The new "story method" that the Ontario Ministry of Education had adopted by the mid-1930s, for instance, which emphasized individual actors and events and made greater use of slides and images, proved more successful in capturing children's attention.[155] The Ministry

---

[151] *Ibid*., p.5.
[152] *Ibid*., p.2.
[153] Charles Bilodeau, "Implementing the Report of the Committee for the Study of Canadian History Textbooks," *Canadian Education*, vol.1, no.4 (Summer 1946), p.201.
[154] "Attitudes of adults are created during their youth, and undoubtedly textbooks are instrumental in the formation of attitudes." Maheux, "Report of the Committee for the Study of Canadian History Textbooks," p.8. See also Neatby, "Meeting of Minds," p.469.
[155] "Methods in the teaching of history and geography have been greatly improved. The story method of teaching history has largely replaced the text-book method which was in vogue a few years ago in most of

reported that "teachers throughout the Province now present History, not as a chronological list of events to be carried in the memory, but as lives of noteworthy people to be studied for social guidance."[156] These new techniques had an impact on the teaching of Canadian History, which was taught as its own separate course in Ontario high schools by the 1930s. Approximately fifteen thousand students took this course every year.[157] Apparently, the story method had helped French- and Anglo-Canadian children develop similar understandings of historical events and characters. "During a recent inspection tour," wrote one administrator, "it was interesting to find the boys of Mr. Slatterie's [Anglo-Ontarian] class in Sarnia arriving at the same conclusion as did the girls of Mrs. Muller's [Franco-Ontarian] class in North Bay concerning relative degree of perseverance displayed by Jacques Cartier and Champlain. An understanding of the influence exerted by personal character in history would seem to be as important to growing boys and girls as a knowledge of dates and events."[158] In other words, the heroes of Canadian history, including the heroes of French Canada, stood as role models for both Anglo- and French-Canadian children to follow.

The young Canadians of the CYC also demonstrated a similar interpretation of history in their "Declaration of rights of Canadian youth / Déclaration des droits de la jeunesse canadienne" (1936). The Declaration took inspiration from the 1791 *Constitution Act* that they had learned about in school, and in particular the French-Canadian struggle to achieve at least a modest form of self-government:

---

the schools. A better presentation of the subject matter and a more general use of concrete material have created in the pupils a much greater interest." Ontario, *Report of the Minister of Education, Ontario, 1936*, p.32.

[156] *Ibid*., p.48.

[157] As opposed to the more general "Modern World History," "British History" or "Ancient History" courses. During the 1935-1936 school year, for instance, 16,089 students were registered in the Canadian History course. *Ibid*., pp.190, 204.

[158] *Ibid*., p.48.

> In 1791, after thirty years of absolute and at times tyrannical regime Canada took the first steps towards self-government. The British subjects of French origin fought with undaunted courage to obtain for Canada a representative and responsible government. Their heroic struggle obtained for all Canadians liberties that have been guaranteed by treaties and finally by a Constitution that rendered possible the free and pacific evolution of a French race in Canada.[159]

It bears pointing out that, at the time of in the Declaration's issue, the CYC was still based in Toronto and its membership was still overwhelmingly Anglo-Canadian. The failure to acknowledge the role of the British Loyalists who lobbied for representative government, and the description of British colonial governance as having been "at times tyrannical," painted a dramatically different picture from the version of history that earlier generations of British Canadians had learned in the classroom. Moreover, the terms that the CYC applied spoke to a clear decline in British-Canadian ethnic nationalism. The CYC also took great pride in the Anglophone/Francophone partnerships that had achieved responsible self-government and parliamentary democracy in 1849 and 1867. As the self-described "representative French and English speaking youth of Canada, gathered together from all sections, all creeds, classes and circumstances," they were "following the example of our forebears."[160] In addition to taking inspiration from Lafontaine and Baldwin, and Macdonald and Cartier, the CYC also encouraged its membership "to defend the liberties which our forefathers fought for, together, under the leadership of William Lyon Mackenzie and Louis Joseph Papineau."[161]

For these youth, then, their contemporary pluralism was inspired not only by the contemporary need for Anglophone/Francophone rapprochement, but also by inspiring Canadian examples of historical cross-cultural collaboration. Moreover, these children

---

[159] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Declaration of rights of Canadian youth", p.3.
[160] *Ibid*., p.3.
[161] LAC, CYC fonds, MG31-K9, volume 7, file 128A, "Statement on the Plebiscite by the National Committee, Canadian Youth Congress," 1942, p.2.

and young adults of the 1920s and ‘30s school rooms would be the adults and policy makers of the 1960s – an era that would give rise to even greater substantive recognition of Canadian bilingualism and biculturalism. But before that could happen, a more concrete cross-cultural accommodation would have to occur at the highest levels of élite accommodation, in federal and provincial politics.

Chapter XI: THE LIBERAL PARTIES OF CANADA – BUILDING NATIONAL UNITY VIA ÉLITE ACCOMMODATION

Cultural federalism has historically been promoted through the process of élite accommodation. In order for it to be successful, it must occur at the highest levels of political power – by the political representatives of the cultural-linguistic societies themselves.[1] As Lijphart reminds us, the most "crucial factor is the quality of leadership."[2] Canada's long history of British- and French-Canadian élite accommodation had been effectively abandoned by Prime Minister Robert Borden. Borden's alliance during the 1911 election with his old roommate, Henri Bourassa, had been merely tactical, as a means of defeating the Laurier Liberals whom Bourassa had blamed for failing to promote Canadian autonomy. Bourassa's nationalistes failed to establish the hoped for balance of power in parliament, however, and Borden's subsequent style of governance bore none of the hallmarks of cross-cultural accommodation – in terms of cabinet appointments, language policy, and foreign policy.[3]

The process of élite accommodation between Anglophones and Francophones had been nearly destroyed by the formation of Borden's "Union" government in 1917. By luring pro-conscription British-Canadian Liberals from amongst Laurier's ranks, the Union Government had divided Canada along cultural-linguistic lines more severely than at any other point in its history. In 1920, Borden was succeeded by one of his most imperialistic disciples, Arthur Meighen, who had infamously declared that he would sacrifice Canada if it meant saving the Empire. The French-language press would never

[1] Presthus, *Élite Accommodation in Canadian Politics*, p.x.
[2] Lijphart, *Politics of Accommodation*, p.211.
[3] See Craig Brown, "Sir Robert Borden," p.206.

forgive this, going so far as to label Meighen as the Canadian "anti-Christ."[4] The prospects of English/French political cooperation appeared dim indeed.

This final chapter focuses on the restoration of political élite accommodation between Anglo- and French Canadians and the actions of the Canadian, Quebec and, to a lesser extent, Ontario Liberal parties during the interwar years. There were noteworthy changes among the other parties as well. Premiers from the progressive and farmer parties demonstrated a willingness to compromise. The new Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), formed in 1933, also embraced the new credo. While its influence among French Canadians was limited, the CCF's approach to national unity reflected an important change within its growing Anglo-Canadian constituency and on the political left in general, whose influence was felt in the youth movement, for instance. The Conservative parties remained the last refuge of die-hard British-Canadian imperio-nationalists. But even in that camp important signs of change emerged by the late 1920s and into the 1930s, including at the federal and provincial levels in Ontario. The more progressive and pragmatic conservatives recognized the necessity of adapting to the new political climate – it was either that, or face the prospect of being shut out of government in the long-term.

It was through the Canadian Liberal parties, however, that the gospel of cross-cultural collaboration truly began to emerge at the highest political levels. Federally, it was the Liberal Party of William Lyon Mackenzie King and Ernest Lapointe that began to formulate and disseminate a liberal, North-American Canadian nationalism, one that tended to be inclusive rather than exclusive. Mackenzie King rejected the ethno-centric

[4] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.90.

imperialism of the past, much as Lapointe opposed ethno-centric clerico-nationalism.[5] As such, the federal Liberals established themselves as the party of national unity during the interwar period.

Cabinet and the Senate played important roles as vehicles for intra-state federalism, bringing the debates surrounding both territorial and cultural federalism into the centre of power in Ottawa. Prime Minister King was always careful to ensure strong Francophone representation in Cabinet, and even the Conservatives attempted to improve on their track record after the war. As for the Senate, it had historically guaranteed a level of regional and minority representation, providing Quebec, for instance, with a number of Senators equal to Ontario despite its smaller population. The appointed upper chamber also provided a means to ensure provincial minorities representation where the elected lower chamber could not.[6] Through these institutions, strong advocates of minority rights like Raoul Dandurand, C.P. Beaubien and Thomas Chapais, and representatives of the provincial minorities themselves like Chubby Power, Peter Veniot and Napoléon Belcourt, could have their voices heard.

---

[5] "As a good Catholic and a federalist, Lapointe deeply resented the way the abbé [Groulx] linked French-Canadian nationalism to religion. He thought it 'monstrous' (as he told Henri Bourassa, meeting him by chance on the train) that Groulx used the French Canadians' strong faith to compromise their patriotism. Bourassa, estranged from his former disciple since the 1920s, agreed that Groulx's speeches and articles were 'grotesque declamations.'" Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.233.

[6] David E. Smith described the Senate as "part of the protective armament awarded French-speaking Canadians ... in exchange for acceptance of the federal union. .... The fixed term for senators and the limited power to enlarge the chamber fortified the French-speaking minority against majoritarian surges that in a system like Britain's could lead to swamping of the upper chamber." Jean-Charles Bonenfant, a journalist during the interwar years, described the Senate as providing the best means to ensure French-Canadian representation, "'non seulement dans le Québec, mais aussi dans toutes les autres provinces.'" In David E. Smith, *The Canadian Senate in Bicameral Perspective* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003), p.97.

As *Le Droit* explained, the Senate was often "le théâtre d'un débat où les droits des minorités catholiques et françaises de l'Ouest ou de l'Ontario étaient lévées," where sympathetic senators could speak out "en faveur de la justice et de l'opprimé, quelque soit le party au pouvoir, quelque soit l'oppresseur." *Le Droit*, 7 janvier 1924.

On the provincial scene, meanwhile, the leadership of the Ontario Liberal Party came out in favour of the restoration of French-language education rights. Louis-Alexandre Taschereau's Liberal government in Quebec, meanwhile, reached out to the Protestant British minority, especially in Montreal (and even to the Jewish Community of Montreal). Taschereau's relationship with Ontario Conservative Premier Howard Ferguson was especially important. The Quebec premier opened up his Ontario counterpart to the practice of cross-cultural collaboration, not only on cultural matters, but on economic and political questions as well. Taschereau helped persuade Ferguson that the suppression of French-language minority rights was not in the best interests of Ontario, nor of Canada as a whole.

The rapprochement of the French- and Anglo-Canadian communities began as a revival of the bonne entente movement among their respective civil societies, especially in Quebec and Ontario. Over the course of the interwar period, their influence was felt among the public and among more prominent political actors on the provincial and national stages. It was the combined pressure of these civil society élites and of the changing public opinion that ultimately pushed governments to act. Indeed, party intellectuals working behind the scenes, like Napoléon Belcourt, the Franco-Ontarian Liberal senator, Frank Scott, a CCF'er, poet and McGill law professor, William Moore and Arthur Hawkes, Liberal Party organizers, and O.D. Skelton, Prime Minister King's closest civil servant advisor, were instrumental in promoting the movement for rapprochement in party politics. The links between intellectual bonne ententistes and the political class were drawing ever closer. Moreover, with advances in travel and communications, the world of intellectuals and politicos grew smaller – throughout the

interwar period it became easier for them to establish contact with each other and exchange ideas.[7]

French Canada and the Liberal Party of William Lyon Mackenzie King and Ernest Lapointe

"The difficult, indeed imponderable, challenge for Canadian federalism," David E. Smith explains, "occurs when the two perspectives [of cultural and territorial federalism] collide."[8] The interwar ministries of William Lyon Mackenzie King (1921-1926, 1926-1930, 1935-1948) more or less managed to accommodate both cultural and territorial federalism. Before the Second World War, King was inclined to leave the provinces to their own devices when it came to areas of provincial jurisdiction. When it came to accommodating Canada's cultural duality, King relied on persuasion, informal arrangements and executive federalism, taking care to include a number of individuals in his Cabinet and bureaucracy who were sympathetic to Francophone interests. Among others, these included the likes of O.D. Skelton, undersecretary of state for External Affairs, Jack Pickersgill, King's personal secretary, Brooke Claxton, an Anglo-Quebecer and a later addition to Cabinet, and, most notably, Ernest Lapointe, King's Quebec lieutenant and 'point man' on external relations.[9] Moreover, with a political power base that depended heavily on support from Quebec, King's first and last obsession was to preserve national unity and keep his party in power at all costs – objectives that were, in

[7] See Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, p.100.
[8] Smith, *Federalism and the Constitution of Canada*, p.161.
[9] Pickersgill referred to Lapointe as "'something of a [personal] hero.'" In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.268.

his mind, inseparable. Quebec Francophones could have confidence in a federal government that would, more or less, reflect their interests and point of view.

If the Great War and its political consequences had taught Liberals anything, it was that their party had to be the party of national unity. The conscription crisis had left the party deeply divided, Union Government had reduced it to a Quebec-centred opposition rump, and Laurier's death in January 1919 had left it leaderless. A new chief had to be selected, and a new policy direction had to be established. On 5 August 1919, 1,200 delegates from across the country gathered in Ottawa to decide the long-term future of the Liberal Party of Canada.[10] An emphasis on national unity and social justice issues could provide the previously divided membership with a common cause. Moreover, by making national unity a priority they could expose the antiquated ideas of imperialists and counter the nationaliste threat posed to their political base in Quebec. In a similar vein, a focus on social justice issues would allow the party to appeal to potential supporters of the new Progressive, farmer and labour parties. King's reputation as a conciliator and a humanist lent strength to his candidacy.[11]

With the party's base firmly established in Quebec, the anti-imperialists could set the agenda. Liberal Unionists, meanwhile, who had returned to the party after leaving Borden's coalition, were initially viewed with suspicion. The Quebec delegates at the convention tabled a motion stipulating that any move toward closer imperial ties must require the consent of both Parliament and the general population via referendum. They were outdone, however, by an even more unequivocal motion tabled by the Ontario delegates, who "vigorously opposed" any centralization of imperial control whatsoever.

---

[10] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.129.
[11] Not least for his *Industry and Humanity* (Toronto, 1919). See R. MacGregor Dawson, *William Lyon Mackenzie King: A Political Biography, 1874-1923* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958), pp.286.

At the insistence of leadership hopeful Mackenzie King, the party adopted proposals to shift the country's focus from foreign entanglements to social and economic reconstruction, including a call for an eight-hour work day, unemployment insurance, and old age pensions.[12]

For the first time in the history of Canadian federal politics, the party leader was to be chosen by locally elected delegates, and not by caucus members alone. King's candidacy was strong from the beginning. He had been among the few Anglo-Canadian Liberals who had stuck with Laurier and opposed conscription (to the detriment of his own political popularity), running and losing in 1917 in North York, Ontario.[13] This act had given King instant credibility in French Canada.[14] He admired what he called "Quebec's toleration in matters of race & religion."[15] King's ability to speak French was limited. Although he delivered the odd prepared speech in French, he "regret[ted] not having studied it" further.[16] This did not prevent a sincere appreciation for French-Canadian culture: "I find a refinement and charm of manner & sympathy about the French Canadian that our English-speaking Canadians lack," he wrote in early 1919.[17] King hoped to spend part of the summer in France to "live with a French family & practise French.... That is if the Govt. doesn't open a seat [for me]."[18] His French immersion plans never came to pass. Events kept King close to home. In April, a safe Liberal seat opened up in PEI, which King won in October. Meanwhile, the Liberal leadership race was well under way.

---

[12] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.129.
[13] King was privately very critical of those British-Canadian Liberals who had failed to stay loyal to Laurier. See WLMK Diaries, entries for 18-22 February, 1919.
[14] Morton, *A Military History of Canada*, pp.155-156.
[15] WLMK Diaries, 19 February, 1919.
[16] "I wish I could understand & speak French & cannot too much." WLMK Diaries, 28 March 1919.
[17] WLMK Diaries, 28 March 1919.
[18] WLMK Diaries, 28 March 1919.

King's candidacy received the early support of prominent Francophone MPs Rodolphe Lemieux and Jacques Bureau, who worked to ensure that the French-Canadian delegates and caucus, including potential leadership rival Lomer Gouin, were behind him.[19] Bureau was a key party organizer, considered the local party "boss" in Trois-Rivières, and mentor to Ernest Lapointe.[20] Other Anglo-Canadian Liberals who had opposed conscription also favoured King, including former Minister of Justice Allan Aylesworth and former Secretary of State Charles Murphy (an Irish-Catholic), both of whom had publicly denounced those who had "betrayed" Laurier. Still, from early on during the leadership race, King was seen as "le candidat du Québec."[21] As an Anglo-Ontarian with a professional background in conciliation, King was seen by Lemieux and the French-Canadian caucus as the best possible leader to reunite the Liberal Party and, eventually, its two cultural-linguistic communities. With the support of the Quebec caucus and others who had stayed loyal to the party in 1917 (including farmer and labour interests), King narrowly defeated seventy-one year-old imperialist and former Finance Minister W.S. Fielding.[22]

In the 1921 election, Canadians chose a government that placed a higher priority on national unity and on reconciling Anglophone and Francophone differences. During the campaign in Quebec, intellectuals and the liberal press called upon the electorate to "crush" Meighen. Bourassa even encouraged voters to support Liberal candidates where solid independent candidates were lacking. King's victory suggested that in English-speaking Canada, too, there was some appetite for cross-cultural compromise. The

[19] See WLMK Diaries, entries for 18-22 February 1919; Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.128.
[20] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.159.
[21] See *Ibid*., pp.128, 130, 135.
[22] Dawson, *William Lyon Mackenzie King*, pp.286.

Liberal Leader stumped alongside Ernest Lapointe for much of the campaign. Both in and outside Quebec, King and Lapointe called for the restoration of national unity. Meighen's unapologetic defence of conscription, meanwhile, failed to resonate with voters.[23] On election day, 6 December 1921, the Liberals won 117 seats, along with 4 independent liberal and labour MPs. King's party swept Quebec, Nova Scotia and PEI, and won at least one seat in every province except Alberta. The Progressives won 64 seats, and Meighen was left with a rump of 37 Ontario and 13 other Conservative MPs.[24]

As prime minister, King tended toward executive federalism and governing by Cabinet consensus. This was especially important given that his early governments operated without a clear majority, consisting of a coalition of regional interests mostly from the west and Quebec. Liberal Party unity was far from secure in 1921 – the caucus included former members of Borden's 'Unity' government and emotions from the divisive Great War years were still raw. As such, King afforded his ministers a significant amount of autonomy to manage regional political affairs. The most important of these regional 'lieutenants' was Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Marine and Fisheries (1921-1924) and Minister of Justice (1924-1941). King's partnership with Lapointe took some inspiration from the legacy of Robert Baldwin and Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine. King was especially proud that his own Toronto riding had elected the French-Canadian Lafontaine in 1841 – he deemed it an historic victory for cross-cultural collaboration.[25] By 1924, King had made Lapointe his desk-mate in Parliament. This "solid and unique political

[23] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.175; Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, pp.150, 263.
[24] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.152. The popular vote was 1,297,000 for the Liberals, 972,000 for the Conservatives and 769,000 for the Progressives.
[25] WLMK Diaries, 20 February 1919.

partnership" would last until Lapointe's untimely death, in 1941. There was no one else, King recalled, "with whom I could discuss the problems that are most of all before us."[26]

From early on, King placed a high priority on accommodating cultural federalism via his cabinet. His ministries included strong representation from French Canada and Quebec. In 1920, Meighen's cabinet included only one Francophone, Senator Pierre-Édouard Blondin, out of twenty-one ministers.[27] King's 1921 ministry, by contrast, which he created in consultation with Ernest Lapointe, included six Francophones out of nineteen cabinet members: Lapointe (Marine and Fisheries), former Quebec premier Lomer Gouin (Justice), Senator and vocal French-language rights advocate Raoul Dandurand (Government Leader in the Senate), Jacques Bureau (Customs and Excise), Senator Henri Sévérin Béland (Solders' Civil Re-establishment), and Lucien Turcotte Pacaud (Under Secretary of State for External Affairs).[28] In addition, Anglo-Quebec MP J.A. Robb held the Trade and Commerce portfolio and Rodolphe Lemieux became Speaker of the House of Commons. (Banking interests in Montreal had insisted on greater Anglo-Quebecer representation, but King refused.)[29] King's stated objective with his first cabinet was to emphasize "'A united Canada'" that brought together labour, business, farm, and professional interests from across the country.[30] To that effect, it included an equal balance of Protestants and Catholics, a minister from almost every province, and an equal number of Quebecers and Ontarians. King also attempted to

---

[26] Upon Lapointe's death, King was overcome with a "complete loneliness." WLMK Diaries, 26 November 1941.

[27] Privy Council Office, "Guide to Canadian Ministries Since Confederation – Eleventh Ministry," accessed 10 October 2011, http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/mgm/ dtail.asp?lang=eng&mstyid=11&mbtpid=1.

To his credit, even Meighen recognized the need for more French-Canadian ministers, promissing as much to a Sherbrooke audience during the 1921 campaign. Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.146.

[28] Privy Council Office, "Guide to Canadian Ministries Since Confederation – Twelfth Ministry," accessed 10 October 2011, http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/mgm/ dtail.asp?lang=eng&mstyid=12&mbtpid=1

[29] Dawson, *William Lyon Mackenzie King*, p.373; Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.159.

[30] In Dawson, *William Lyon Mackenzie King*, p.360.

reconcile the wartime split in the Liberal Party by including four ministers who had supported conscription, including Fielding, whom he appointed to Finance.[31] Over the years, the King Cabinets would be invigorated by a new generation of Liberals who would provide greater recognition of Canada's cultural-linguistic duality. These included Anglo-Canadian moderates and Francophones from in and outside Quebec.[32]

While Franco-Quebecers had begun to restore their influence in Ottawa, political representation of Francophones from outside Quebec showed signs of improvement over the interwar period, albeit modestly. At the provincial level, Acadians had already achieved the appointment of the first Acadian premier, Aubin-Edmond Arsenault, a Conservative, who served as Premier of Prince Edward Island from 1917 to 1919.[33] In 1923, Peter Veniot became Premier and leader of the provincial Liberals of New Brunswick, serving for two years.[34] Franco-Ontarians asserted a modicum of political influence at the provincial level with the election in 1923 of ACFÉO organizer Aurélien Bélanger as a Liberal MPP for eastern Ontario. The provincial Liberal leader W.E.N. Sinclair became a strong supporter of Franco-Ontarian rights.[35] At the federal level, it

---

[31] See *Ibid*., p.372; Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.135.

[32] A few names are worth mentioning here: Lapointe, the Quebec City Irish-Catholic Chubby Power, Customs Minister Georges Boivin, Acadian New Brunswick Premier Peter Veniot, the nationaliste and anti-imperialist Solicitor-General Lucien Cannon, Andrew McMaster and Vincent Massey from Ontario, Richelieu party organizer and Minister of Public Works P.J.A. Cardin, Fernand Rinfret, former Saskatchewan Premier James Gardiner, New Brunswick Acadian J.-E. Michaud, Canadian Bar Association President and future Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent, Alphonse Fournier, Ernest Bertrand, Montreal Anglo-Canadian autonomist Brooke Claxton, and the Franco-Ontarian Paul Martin. The party's French-Canadian wing had been invigorated by an energetic young generation of Liberals who had entered politics in 1917, determined that Quebec's voice would be heard at the federal level. King was initially successful at integrating more nationalist MPs into its party, like Cannon, and Maxime Raymond. Older bonne ententists like Raoul Dandurand, the Government Leader in the Senate, were also a mainstay in the King Cabinets over the years. See Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, pp.56, 249-250; Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, pp.135, 255, 264; Bercuson, *True Patriot*, pp.74, 82.

[33] Prince Edward Island, "Premiers Gallery – Aubin-Edmond Arsenault," accessed 2 February 2013, www.gov.pe.ca/premiersgallery/arsenault.php3.

[34] Della M.M. Stanley, "Peter John Veniot," *Canadian Encyclopedia* (Historica-Dominica, 2012), accessed 19 February 2013, http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/ articles/peter-john-veniot.

[35] CRCCF, "La Commission Scott-Merchant-Côté" (Université d'Ottawa, 2004), accessed 10 October

remained difficult for the Francophone minorities to get their own representatives elected to parliament during the interwar years. They rarely formed a majority in any given riding and were short on men with the necessary financial backing, business standing or professional connections to secure a party nomination to run. There important exceptions, however, such as prominent New Brunswick Liberal MP J.-G. Robichaud, a vocal advocate for Acadian interests and the only Liberal elected in New Brunswick in 1925.[36]

Executive federalism and the appointments process, however, provided a means for governments to establish representation for the Francophone minorities at the federal level. Ernest Lapointe, who always had the ear of his prime minister, was instrumental in helping bring about appointments for Francophones from outside Quebec.[37] Beginning in 1922, King and Lapointe established a new tradition of ensuring Acadian representation at the federal level through Senate appointments – from now on, at least three Acadian senators from New Brunswick would sit in the Red Chamber at any given time.[38] In Ontario, Liberal Senator Napoléon Belcourt had long been a vociferous advocate for the interests of the French Canadians from his province. Until 1928, however, he had remained the lone French Canadian among Ontario's twenty-six senators. That year, when King was preparing to fill three Senate appointments for the province, Lapointe and the other French-speaking members of Cabinet insisted that at least one of the new Senators be a Franco-Ontarian – otherwise, they would boycott future campaigning engagements in Ontario. King relented and appointed Lapointe's recommendation,

---

2012, http://www.crccf.uottawa.ca/passeport/IV/IVA1b/ IVA1b09.html.
[36] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, pp.203-204.
[37] "Lapointe's advocacy on behalf of his people did not stop at the Quebec border." Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.143.
[38] Naomi Griffiths, "Acadians," in Paul Robert Magocsi, ed., *Encyclopedia of Canada's Peoples* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), p.131.

prominent Windsor-area physician Dr. Gustave Lacasse, giving the historic French-Canadian community of south-western Ontario some long sought-after representation. The Franco-Ontarians received another important boost when, in 1936, Lapointe successfully pressured King into appointing Ernest Chevrier to the Ontario Court of Appeal, something French Canadians from both Ontario and Quebec had been "pressing for years."[39] With one of their own on the province's highest court of appeal, Franco-Ontarians stood a much better chance at defeating legal challenges to their language and education rights.

It was also during the interwar years that the Francophone minorities secured their first federal cabinet appointments. Interestingly, the first Cabinet to include a Francophone from outside Quebec was that of the short-lived Meighen ministry of 1926. With an election looming, and conscious of his party's desperate need to improve its image with French Canadians both in and outside Quebec, Meighen appointed Franco-Ontarian Raymond Morand to his Cabinet. Not to be outdone, upon his re-election, King established an Acadian "seat" in Cabinet when he appointed Peter Veniot as Postmaster General. It was on Veniot's initiative that Canada adopted bilingual postage – an important symbolic victory for the Francophone minorities. When Veniot retired in 1935, King appointed J.-E. Michaud, another New Brunswick Acadian, to replace him. Michaud became Minister of Fisheries – an important portfolio for Maritimers.[40] Franco-Ontarian representation in Cabinet was restored with the appointment of Paul Martin (Sr.) as Secretary of State in 1945. Martin had been a rising star in the foreign affairs portfolio

[39] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.221, see also pp.143-144.
[40] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.262.

since the late 1930s.[41] He had been a clerico-nationaliste in his youth, but a college education during the interwar years at the University of Toronto exposed him to moderate Anglo-Canadian thought and reconciliationism.[42]

With King and Lapointe in Ottawa, Quebecers could once again begin to feel represented in a federal government that addressed their views and concerns. This was made possible by federal policies and programs favourable to Quebec – the heart of the government's political base. As a former premier, federal Justice Minister Lomer Gouin helped secure patronage appointments for the Anglo- and Franco-Quebecer establishment, which helped smooth relations.[43] The 1924 federal budget, tabled by the Anglo-Quebecer Finance Minister J.A. Robb, was a boon for French-Canadian families, as it included a $300 to $500 per child income tax exemption.[44] The following year Lapointe secured some $25M in federal works funds and other subsidies for Quebec, including the construction of an arsenal and improvements to Quebec City's harbour. King, despite his misgivings, approved the funds, resolving that "'Quebec is an all-important part of Canada and always will be.'"[45] As the head of the federal Liberals in Quebec by 1924, it was Lapointe's job to coordinate with the government of Liberal Premier Louis-Alexandre Taschereau. The two men maintained a positive working relationship. Taschereau admired Lapointe for his secularism and for standing up for the Francophone minorities. Relations between Ottawa and Quebec remained cordial for

[41] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, pp.249-250.
[42] Donaghy, "A Catholic Journey: Paul Martin, Politics & Faith."
[43] See Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, pp.56, 63.
[44] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.165.
[45] In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.143.

most of the interwar. Indeed, the federal and provincial parties supported each other's election campaigns to great effect.[46]

With some exceptions, King's ministry was careful to avoid jurisdictional conflict with the Quebec government, and to maintain the delicate balance between cultural and territorial federalism. In 1926, when the federal government adopted an old-age pension scheme in which it would cover 75% of the costs, Taschereau initially refused to participate on the grounds that it was an infringement on provincial jurisdiction. He was also motivated by fiscal conservatism and a need to placate the Catholic Church – care for the elderly was the responsibility of children, families and charity, not the state. King did not force the issue when Quebec opted out, and the province joined the program in 1936.[47] The federal Liberals also opted not to act unilaterally on Senate reform, constitutional patriation, and on replacing the JCPC with the Supreme Court of Canada as the country's final court of appeal. While Lapointe strongly supported these measures, the Quebec government opposed them out of a fear that they would diminish its influence and threaten its jurisdiction, possibly leading to infringements on French-Catholic rights.[48]

King's government benefited from the ongoing, unofficial support of independent MP Henri Bourassa. To be sure, he did not shy away from criticizing the Liberals from time to time. But his overall endorsement lent the government major credibility among those soft nationalistes who still held out some hope of French- and Anglo-Canadian

[46] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, pp.189, 210. See also p.94.
[47] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, pp.214-215, 230.
[48] The Anglo-Canadians in Cabinet also accommodated Quebec in 1937 by acceding to Lapointe's insistence that the infamous 'Padlock Law' not be disallowed. While Anglo-Canadian opinion opposed the Padlock Law's infringement on civil liberties, Lapointe feared the political fallout of its disallowance would favour the clerico-nationalistes. Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, pp.138-141; Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.291.

rapprochement. During the fall 1925 election, for instance, Bourassa's *Le Devoir* all but endorsed the King campaign and denounced Esioff-Léon Patenaude, who headed the Conservative campaign in Quebec. Officially, Patenaude declared that he and his candidates were running under the old Liberal-Conservative banner of the Cartier-Macdonald and Lafontaine-Baldwin ministries, and that they were independent of Arthur Meighen, still reviled in Quebec.[49] *Le Devoir*, however, warned its readers that Patenaude's purpose was to create "un parti québécois qui serait tout à fait hostile à l'unité nationale."[50]

It was the prominence of Ernest Lapointe, in particular, that helped restore French Canadians' trust in the federal government. King was the undisputed leader of the Liberal government, but Lapointe's national profile increasingly took on that of a co-prime minister, especially after the October 1925 election. King had lost his seat, and the Liberals' hold on power was precarious. For four months, until King could win a by-election, Lapointe acted as head of government in Parliament, forging a close relationship with the Progressives to allow the Liberals to maintain the confidence of the House. Thereafter, whenever King had to leave the country he would appoint Lapointe as Acting Prime Minister.[51] After the 1930 election, it was widely speculated in the press that Lapointe might even pursue the party leadership for himself. Indeed, more than one Anglo-Canadian MP owed his seat to Lapointe's personal popularity.[52] Lapointe's loyalty to King, however, was unshakeable.

---

[49] Roger Graham, *Arthur Meighen: A Biography*, Vol. 2 (Toronto: Clarke, 1965), pp.228.
[50] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.187.
[51] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.190.
[52] Lapointe's campaigning in Western Canada during 1930 was said to have "saved" those Liberal candidates who held their seats. WLMK Diaries, 18 August 1930.

King never missed an opportunity to remind French-Canadian voters of the powerful role that their representatives played in his Cabinet, especially Lapointe. In 1930, King and Lapointe campaigned together, beginning with a stop in Quebec City on 19 June. There, King told the crowd that they should refer to his government as the "King-Lapointe ministry." He invoked the historical partnerships of Baldwin and Lafontaine, and Macdonald and Cartier. "'Ernest Lapointe has been a leader in the full meaning of the word,'" he told the crowd. "'We are inspired by Laurier and we count on continuing to apply to the administration of the affairs of this country the principles of the great chieftain.'"[53] King's sentiments were apparently sincere. "'I have, as you know,'" he confided to a colleague after the election loss, "'always endeavoured to have it appear and have [Lapointe] feel that there was no monopoly of leadership so far as I myself was concerned, but that the two of us working together as one was an evidence in itself of the unity which Liberalism seeks to create and which has found a place in the hearts of so many of its adherents.'"[54] He referred to himself and to the "chivalrous" Lapointe as the "Fr. & Eng. Liberal leaders [who] stood together for action."[55]

The prominence of a moderate liberal like Lapointe generated optimism among Anglo-Canadians that French Canada was open to rapprochement. While undoubtedly Quebec's chief representative in Ottawa, Lapointe developed a profile and popularity across the country. "'[Y]ou hold such a wonderful place in the opinion of English-speaking Canadians as well as amongst your own people,'" Senator Cairine Wilson told Lapointe in 1934.'"[56] Even some conservative Anglo-Canadians came to admire him. In

[53] In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.175.
[54] In *Ibid*., pp.178-179.
[55] WLMK Diaries, 24 May 1932.
[56] In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.193.

1935, when the Liberals returned to power, the Ottawa *Journal* proclaimed that there was "'no truer nor more loyal Captain, no finer Canadian'" than Ernest Lapointe; having such a powerful representative in Cabinet of the French-Canadian minority was a "'vindication of our democracy.'"[57] As a proud French Canadian who was willing to make compromises and to work with Anglo-Canadian leaders, Lapointe's example inspired a hope that Confederation and the democratic, cross-cultural experiment just might succeed.

The increasingly familiar Lapointe also served to make French Canada less 'alien.' He was a frequent fixture of Liberal campaigns both in and outside of Quebec.[58] In 1923, Lapointe embarked upon a speaking tour of the four western provinces. He was a smash hit: "'I receive requests for meetings every day,'" he reported to King.[59] As a rural Quebec MP, Lapointe was not in the pocket of the Central-Canadian manufacturing interests; his opposition to protectionism and the funds he secured to develop the port of Vancouver played well in the West. In addition to seeing a common economic interest between the West and Quebec, Lapointe sincerely believed that national unity required a rapprochement between regions as well as cultures. Still, sectionalism must be subordinate to the overriding national interest. Lapointe's speech at the opening of the 1924 parliamentary session made this abundantly clear. He denounced the politics of division, "des tactiques ... des cris de désunion poussés par les conservateurs," pitting one section of the country against another:

---

[57] In *Ibid*., pp.200-201.

Lapointe "could easily have succeeded Sir Wilfrid Laurier as Prime Minister had he so desired." "Lapointe," *Globe and Mail*, 20 February 1939, p.15.

[58] See Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.60.

[59] In *Ibid*., p.65.

> Chacun est fier de la partie du pays qu'il habite et qui lui est chère. Pourtant, si le Canada doit devenir un grand pays, les Provinces maritimes, l'Ouest et le Centre doivent subordonner leurs intérêts au devoir national qui incombe à tous les Canadiens de fonder une nation unie et indivisible.... Nous consacrons tous nos efforts à l'accomplissement de cette tâche. Je nourris le désir ardent qu'il y ait toujours en ce pays un grand parti qui se tienne sur la brèche pour empêcher la désunion et le démembrement du Canada.... S'il nous faut, pour y parvenir, faire des concessions mutuelles, louvoyer, je crois et j'affirme que c'est pour nous un devoir national de suivre cette ligne de conduite.[60]

Lapointe's speech was widely celebrated in the English- and French-language presses, including typically conservative-leaning papers. The conservative Montreal *Star*, for instance, dubbed it "A Brilliant Oration."[61] It was precisely this stance, and Lapointe's reputation as a left-leaning Liberal who was not in the pocket of big business, that allowed him to forge an alliance with the western Progressives after the 1925 election.[62]

Lapointe was a force for rapprochement throughout the interwar period. Looking back on his career, the Toronto *Star* lauded Lapointe for promoting "harmony, tolerance and moderation." The "combined leadership" of King and Lapointe, it continued, "follows the pattern of Canadian government at its best: Baldwin-Lafontaine, Macdonald-Cartier."[63] Indeed, it was on this basis alone, stated King, that Canada must be governed during "periods of struggle and transition":

> In looking back over the history of Canada, it will be observed that in all the great periods of struggle and transition there has been a combined leadership which has effected the unity of purpose and achievement between the French and the English, the Catholic and Protestant peoples of our country.[64]

---

[60] Puissance du Canada, *Débats Chambre des Communes, Vol. I de la troisième session – quatorzième* législature, Vol. CLX (Ottawa: F.A. Acland, Imprimeur du Roi, 1924), Ernest Lapointe, 14 March 1924, p.321.
[61] See "Lapointe," Montreal *Star*, 15 March 1924, p.1. See also *La Presse*, *Le Devoir*, *Toronto Daily Star*, *Globe*, 15 March 1924.
[62] Indeed, the Progressives and some Liberals pressured Lapointe to overthrow King. John MacFarlane, "Ernest Lapointe," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, Vol. XVII (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2011), accessed 26 June 2013, http:// www.biographi.ca/en/bio/lapointe_ernest_17E.html.
[63] "Lapointe," Toronto Daily Star, 20 February 1939, p.1.
[64] In "Lapointe Stays in Political Life," *Globe and Mail*, 20 February 1939, p.15.

Lapointe was clearly proud of his place in the cross-cultural partnership that was the King-Lapointe Ministry: "'We have defended the same causes,'" he told King at a Toronto banquet in February 1927. "'We have displayed with feelings of pride and affection the great banner of Liberalism.'"[65] Lapointe was fêted at a banquet at the Château Frontenac in Quebec City on 18 February 1939, organized by Chubby Power, P.J.A. Cardin and King himself in celebration of Lapointe's thirty-five years in Parliament. It was attended by over fifteen hundred of the "who's who" of the federal and provincial Liberal Parties.[66]

Moderate forces converge: the political lobby to restore French-language education rights in Ontario, 1918-1925

The new political climate established in the post-war would ultimately allow for one of the most important achievements in cross-cultural accommodation: the amendment of Regulation 17 in 1927 and the restoration of French-language education rights in Ontario. This was achieved in large part by the collaboration of old and new bonne ententiste liberals from both Ontario and Quebec. Their success reflected the movement's growing influence at the highest levels of political power in both Ontario and Canada. The ideas of old bonne ententistes like Moore, Morley and Hawkes, among others, who had preached cross-cultural accommodation at the height of British-Canadian wartime xenophobia, had finally gained traction.

Prominent among the next generation of bonne ententistes was the Liberal Franco-Ontarian Senator Napoléon Belcourt. A successful lawyer and University of

[65] In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.130.
[66] "Lapointe Stays in Political Life," *Globe and Mail*, 20 February 1939, p.15.

Ottawa faculty member, Belcourt served as ACFÉO President from its founding in 1910 to 1912, and again from 1919 to 1932.[67] Considered by many as the leader of French-speaking Ontario, Belcourt campaigned tirelessly through to the Regulation's amendment in 1927. He produced and distributed educational materials, wrote newspaper articles, corresponded with leading political figures, and gave speeches to both friendly and hostile audiences. For his efforts, Belcourt received the "Grand Prix d'Action française" from Lionel Groulx in 1924.[68]

While Belcourt was being lionized by the more militant nationalistes in Quebec, he remained a pragmatist who understood the need to engage with Anglo-Canadians, and not just oppose them.[69] Beginning in 1921 he directed the ACFÉO's attentions toward convincing "la majorité protestante de la province de la justice de nos revendications." For years the federal government had failed to intervene on the schools question, and Belcourt knew that only by appealing to public opinion and, moreover, reaching those in power at the provincial level where jurisdiction over education was held, could he effect change. Even before the 1920s, Belcourt had appealed to British-Canadian sensibilities by pointing out that French Canadians wanted to be key contributors to Canadian society, and that they even wanted to learn English so that they could reap all of the opportunity afforded by Confederation. Retaining their language and culture, he told Anglo-Ontarians, would not inhibit French Canadians' ability to learn English. Belcourt invoked an historical right to the French language in terms that he hoped Anglo-Ontarians could accept:

---

[67] Morgan, *The Canadian Men and Women of the Time*, p.84.
[68] See Dutil, "Against Isolationism," pp.96.
[69] See Richer, "L'apôtre infatigable," p.89; Morgan, *The Canadian Men and Women of the Time*, p.84.

> 'All Canadians of French origin, with no exception, desire and intend that all their children shall acquire at least a working knowledge of the language of the majority. But we are equally determined that they shall also learn, and preserve, the language of our forefathers, because that beautiful language was the only one spoken, besides the Indian dialects, on the greater part of this northern hemisphere for a century and a half, and in it was written the history, unparalleled for single-mindedness, heroic endeavour and brilliant achievement, of French civilization and Christian evangelization on this continent. .... [W]e know that we should, and would, deserve and receive the contempt of our right-thinking and enlightened co-citizens if we abandoned our mother tongue.'[70]

Belcourt and ACFÉO Secretary J. Edmond Cloutier wined, dined and chatted up any Anglo-Canadian who would listen, even in their own homes.[71] From early on, their message found a sympathetic ear among moderate Anglo-Canadian intellectuals. Popular authors William Moore and Percival Morley, for instance, would cite Belcourt at length in their own work, repeating his invocations of history, inalienable rights, and self-respect. To alter public opinion, and, more to the point, the opinion of the Ontario government, Belcourt's strategy was to ally with sympathetic and influential Protestant Anglo-Ontarians from the political and academic spheres.[72]

By mid-1918, the list of prominent Protestant *and* Catholic Anglo-Canadians who had spoken out publicly against Regulation 17 had already been growing. As Robert Choquette has explained, Anglo-Protestants in Ontario were more quick to accept the principle of French-language education in Catholic Schools because they knew they would not be competing for resources, and could act without fear of contradicting superiors within their respective ecclesiastical hierarchies.[73] Politically, those Anglo-Protestants and Anglo-Catholics who did favour French-language minority rights in

---

[70] In Morley, *Bridging the Chasm*, pp.62-63.
[71] Terrien, *Quinze années de lutte*, pp.27, 32.
[72] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/21/6, "Rapport des activités du comité exécutif, 12 et 13 avril, 1923."
[73] Choquette, *Language and Religion*, pp.222, 256; see also Simon Jolivet, *Le vert et le bleu*, pp.122-123.

Ontario tended to be liberals. By the end of the war the growing number of Anglo-Ontarian critics of Regulation 17 included the likes of William Moore, Percival Morley, University of Toronto Professor C.B. Sissons, former Liberal Premier of Ontario George W. Ross (1899-1905), former Laurier Cabinet minister Richard W. Scott (an Irish-Catholic), Irish Catholic teacher and journalist Thomas O'Hagan, Antigonish *Casket* editor Robert F. Phalen, Irish-Catholic Ottawa-based lawyer J.K. Foran, Ottawa Separate School Board trustees F.A. Armstrong and Dr. Anthony Freeland (Catholics both), former Laurier Under-Secretary of State Joseph Pope, the MP for Pictou E.M. Macdonald, and Presbyterian minister M.C.W. Gordon. There was also support from outside Ontario: A.M. Savary, MP for Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia, Professors J.A. Dale and C.E. Fryer from McGill, Montreal Alderman John Boyd, the Winnipeg chapter of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, a number of newspapers from across Canada, and even Sir Arthur Conan Doyle.[74]

The early lobbying by conscientious Anglo-Canadians against the suppression of Franco-Ontarian rights had taken on several forms, ranging from a moderate to a more radical discourse. From 1913 to 1917, Foran, Armstrong, O'Hagan and Phalen organized meetings and conferences on the Ontario schools question with French-Canadian leaders in both Ontario and Quebec. These gatherings secured the support of the influential St. Patrick's Society of Montreal. The meetings, explains Simon Jolivet, "représent[ai]ent un pas certain vers une entente entre élites catholiques."[75] Freeland and Armstrong compared the treatment of Franco-Ontarians to Britain's historic mistreatment of Ireland.

[74] Terrien, *Quinze années de lutte*, p.6; Choquette, *Language and Religion*, pp.215-222.
[75] Jolivet, *Le vert et le bleu*, pp.122-123.

Armstrong felt compelled by "'race, religion and justice.'"[76] to speak out in sensational terms:

> [I]t is our duty to help you and many of us will not retreat and will not lower our guns even if 500,000 Orangemen march against us. .... It is your duty as Catholic trustees, to see that you are granted justice; that when your children ask for French bread that they not be given an anglo-saxon stone and that when they ask for a Catholic fish that they not be served an Orange serpent.[77]

O'Hagan took a less inflammatory tone, insisting that "'the simplest elementary justice was being denied the French-Canadian minority in ... Ontario.'" Richard W. Scott, who had authored the 1863 Separate Schools Act, asserted to Ontarians that "'French is one of the official languages of Canada,'" and called for an appeal to the courts.[78] In mid-1918, former Ontario Premier Ross lambasted the hypocritical Regulation 17 in a letter to the Toronto *Globe*:

> It is said that Ontario is an English-speaking Province, and therefore French should not be taught in our schools. By similar reasoning it might be said that Quebec is a French-speaking Province, English should not be taught in the schools of Quebec. This is a painfully narrow view to take of the object of education. Education is a means to an end, and should be adapted to the needs of the whole people.[79]

To this, Ross added the simple pedagogical reasoning behind teaching children in their own language. He also referred to the status of French at the federal level as having bearing on its status at the provincial level in Ontario:

> Parliamentary practice sanctions the use of both languages where French and English meet on a common basis. Racial instincts add to this sanction. Every sound principle of pedagogy confirms its desirability where both languages are of more than local utility. Let not the old adage be forgotten: 'One man may bring a horse to water, but ten men cannot make it drink.'[80]

---

[76] In Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.217.
[77] In *Ibid*., p.217.
[78] In *Ibid*., p.216. See also Terrien, *Quinze années de lutte*, p.6
[79] In Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.215.
[80] In Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.215.

By the end of the Great War, then, Ontario moderate liberals in favour of French-language minority rights had a base upon which they could begin to build a credible lobby.

The result in 1921 of Belcourt's outreach to Anglo-Ontarian moderates was the formation of the Unity League of Ontario (ULO) – its chief goal: the repeal of Regulation 17. With the help of William Moore and C.B. Sissons, Belcourt successfully reached out to the intellectual community of Ontario and, specifically, Toronto. The executive included John Milton Godfrey (President), Former Inspector General of Ontario Schools and Grand Master of the Orange Lodges Dr. James L. Hughes, O.D. Skelton (Vice-President), Sissons (Secretary), and John Squair (Treasurer). Among some of the other members were Brigadier General John A. Gunn, Canadian Manufacturers Association (CMA) President Allen Ballantyne, former CMA President and Bonne Entente League member S.R. Parsons, Better Understanding Association founder W.C. Mikel, teacher and secretary of the United Farmers of Ontario Office of Education M.H. Staples, the author Percival Morley, *Saturday Night* editor Fred Paul, *Globe* director F.A. Rutter, *Canadian Magazine* owner F.H. Best, *CHR* editor W.S. Wallace, and history professor Hume Wrong, son of George Wrong. Moore, Sissons, Wrong, Hughes and Godfrey were the ULO's most active executives.[81] By 1923, the League counted some 150 members, all of them Anglophones. It was made up of university deans and professors (including at least seven from the University of Toronto), lawyers, doctors, journalists, businessmen,

[81] See Cloutier, *Quinze années de lutte! 1910*-1925, pp.66-68; Terrien, *Quinze années de lutte*, p.28; UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/21/5, "Rapport du comite exécutif, 9 mai 1922," pp.4-6; UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/21/6, "Rapport des activités du comité exécutif, 12 et 13 avril, 1923," pp.35-36.

and, l'ACFÉO enthusiastically reported, "des représentants de toutes les sectes religieuses et de tous les partis politiques, progressistes, libéraux et conservateurs."[82]

According to the ACFÉO executive, these individuals had a positive influence, both among newspapers and the general public, as well as within the provincial cabinet:

> Au moyen de leur influence, de leurs écrits mis au service de notre cause, ces hommes ont crée dans l'Ontario en faveur du français, un mouvement qui se grossit de jour en jour. Depuis deux ans, quelques uns d'entre eux font littéralement le siège de l'opinion publique anglaise de la province pour lui montrer sous un vrai jour notre cause scolaire et s'efforcent d'obtenir du gouvernement des modifications opportunes.[83]

The ULO operated in constant collaboration with the ACFÉO: "ces amis de notre cause," read a 1923 ACFÉO internal report, "sont en relations constantes avec nos représentants à Ottawa et ils ne prennent aucune initiative nouvelle sans l'avoir discutée avec [n]otre comité Executif."[84] Together, the ACFÉO and ULO mounted their "siege" on the popular opinion of Ontario. They made dozens of presentations, wrote countless editorials, and distributed tens of thousands of brochures to educators, politicians, and the general public.[85] The Franco-Ontarian clergy were impressed. Northern Ontario Vicar Joseph Hallé remarked that "'[t]he Protestants of the Unity League are effecting a magnificent work of union through justice.'"[86] That the ACFÉO was now optimistic about Ontario attitudes, after so many years of bitter fighting with provincial authorities, spoke to the extent to which the Anglo-Canadian outlook had begun to change and the ideas of moderates like Moore, Morley and Hawkes had begun to take root.

---

[82] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/21/6, "Rapport des activités du comité exécutif, 12 et 13 avril, 1923."
[83] *Ibid*, pp.35-36.
[84] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/21/6, "Rapport des activités du comité exécutif, 12 et 13 avril, 1923," pp.35-36. See also UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/21/5, "Rapport du comite exécutif, 9 mai 1922," pp.4-6.
[85] Cloutier, *Quinze années de lutte! 1910-1925*, pp.67-68.
[86] In Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.231.

In many respects, the ULO picked up where the Bonne Entente League and the Better Understanding Association had left off in 1921, to become a direct, well-organized political lobby with a very specific goal. Significantly, the ULO included a number of individuals who had been in the BEL and BUA. While some of the less sincere bonne ententistes had long ago abandoned the movement, clearly, these men had not – the successes and failures of the earlier bonne entente initiatives had proved a formative experience. One of Belcourt's chief allies in the lobby to remove Regulation 17 was the BEL founder himself, John Godfrey. Historian Brian Cameron has alleged that "[c]learly, 'Bonne Entente' had contributed nothing to Godfrey's understanding."[87] But a closer look at Godfrey's involvement with the ULO after the war reveals otherwise. Godfrey had become a ULO member early on, in 1922. "Those of us who were connected with the original Bonne Entente," he wrote in 1924, "have come to the conclusion that permanent good will cannot be established unless something is done to remedy the grievance, which the French feel they now have on account of Regulation 17."[88] Recognizing that the problem lay with attitudes in Ontario, Godfrey had joined the ULO "to educate public opinion, and at the same time prevent the question becoming a political issue.... [I]f the fires of racial prejudice were ever re-lit it would be hopeless to effect a fair settlement."[89] Godfrey was all too aware that the domestic crises of the Great War had nearly destroyed the country. The ULO provided him with an opportunity to make up for past mistakes.

The ULO argued that equal rights for Franco-Ontarians provided the best means to bring about peace and national unity. Moreover, it was a question of both legal principle and constitutional justice – the infringement of French-language educational

[87] Cameron, "The Bonne Entente Movement," p.53.
[88] LAC, Meighen papers, MG26-I, Vol.100, Godfrey to Meighen, 12 January 1924.
[89] LAC, Meighen papers, MG26-I, Vol.100, Godfrey to Meighen, 25 January 1924.

rights was a violation of the spirit of the *BNA Act*. Ontario's French population, the ULO maintained, should be treated on the same basis as Quebec's English population. Upholding bilingualism, they argued, was in Canada's greatest interest – the French language provided a mark of distinction from the United States. Without it, the country risked becoming a pale shadow of the US, and ultimate disintegration would surely follow. To that end, the league argued that French should even be reinforced in Western Canada, where they believed Americanization to be rampant. For instance, French-Canadians in search of land and work should be encouraged to move West.[90] Together with the ACFÉO, the ULO argued that Franco-Ontarian children should be allowed to attend publicly funded bilingual Catholic schools, wherein they would learn and be taught in both French and English.[91]

The ULO and ACFÉO also collaborated closely to challenge the long-held assumption that instruction in Franco-Ontarian schools was poor, and that bilingual schools would necessarily be inefficient. The ACFÉO invited Staples, Sisson, Hughes and former British Minister of Public Instruction Herbert Fisher, with their backgrounds in pedagogy, to inspect Ottawa's bilingual schools, along with Aurélien Bélanger, the director of the schools. All four issued very favourable reports. As former Inspector General of Ontario Schools, Hughes was considered the most authoritative of the visitors. Privately, he was greatly influenced by the congenial Bélanger, whom he felt had the strongest grasp of the pedagogical issues at play.[92] Hughes's independent report, issued in 1924, maintained that the vast majority of children could read, write, speak and understand English at a high level. All that the schools lacked was adequate funding.

[90] See Choquette, *Language and Religion*, pp.230-231.
[91] Terrien Esdras, *Quinze années de lutte*, p.27.
[92] *Ibid*., p.31.

Preventing a teacher from using the students' first language to provide instruction, Hughes argued, was pedagogically unsound. Hughes also found that Franco-Ontarians were anxious that their children learn English in order to give them the greatest opportunity in life. Much to the satisfaction of the ACFÉO, the ULO published the inspectors' reports under the title, *A Principle of Education Vindicated*.[93]

While the ACFÉO and ULO were hard at work attempting to repeal Regulation 17, the old BEL had returned to life. Senator Belcourt himself took part in the organization's ongoing activities. In 1923 and 1925, respectively, the BEL organized large-scale banquets in Toronto, and then in Montreal and Quebec City, akin to those of 1916 and 1917. According to *La Patrie*, the Montreal banquet alone included some five hundred participants. It brought together such influential figures as Vincent Massey (a future Governor General of Canada and proponent of bilingualism), Montreal and Toronto Mayors Charles Duquette and Thomas Foster, and Quebec and Ontario premiers Alexandre Taschereau and Howard Ferguson.[94] In addition to their potential to foster better relations, the banquets were also promoted as commercial events. This prompted *l'Action catholique* to declare them a "fiasco."[95] The events nonetheless helped expose Regulation 17 defenders, like the staunchly conservative Ferguson, to arguments in favour of French-language rights. Indeed, *l'Action catholique*'s editors could not have known that, behind the scenes, Ferguson and Taschereau were discussing the very topic of French schools in Ontario.[96] Meanwhile, Ontario Lieutenant-Governor Henry

[93] Cloutier, *Quinze années de lutte! 1910-1925*, pp.69-71; James L. Hughes et al., *A Principle of Education Vindicated: Reports on the Teaching of English in English-French Schools of Ottawa and Certain Rural Localities in Ontario* (Toronto: Unity League of Ontario, 1924).
[94] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/257/8, press clipping, *La Patrie*, 31 January 1925.
[95] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/257/8, press clipping, *L'action catholique*, 26 February 1925.
[96] See UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/98/19, press clipping, Boutet, "M. Ferguson promet une enquête – La fin du débat sur la motion Bélanger," *Le Devoir*, 7 April 1925.

Cockshutt used the occasion to publicly declare his support for French-language rights and the need for reconciliation between Anglo- and French Canadians.[97] His highly publicized comments reflected the unofficial position of the previous United Farmers of Ontario government of Ernest Drury, which had ruled the province from 1919 to 1923.[98]

Indeed, the UFO's surprise win in 1919 had helped establish a more conciliatory atmosphere. UFO Education Minister R.H. Grant and MPP A.D. Tisdelle became points of contact for the Franco-Ontarian clergy. Tisdelle represented Tilbury in south-western Ontario, with its sizeable French-Canadian population, and was sympathetic to the cause of French-language education. Both he and Grant encouraged the Franco-Ontarians to lobby Rome so that the inflammatory Bishop Fallon could be made to, in their words, "'shut up.'"[99] This, they believed, would make a solution to the crisis more politically feasible. For his part, Drury became the first Ontario Premier since Regulation 17's introduction to publicly call for a more moderate policy.[100] Negotiations between the UFO and ACFÉO for a more formal solution began in 1921-1922. Led by Bishops Joseph Hallé and Béliveau, the Franco-Ontarians pressed for the outright abolition of the regulation. Such a measure remained politically difficult for Drury. Still, by 1923 his government had begun to develop a reputation for being 'soft' on enforcing the regulation.[101] Unfortunately, discussions between the UFO and ACFÉO were slowed

---

[97] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/257/8, press clipping, *L'action catholique*, 6 February 1925.
[98] Cockshutt had been appointed Lieutenant-Governor in 1921 by then-Premier Drury. Four years earlier Cockshutt had run as an independent against Borden's wartime coalition. His Lieutenant-Governorship lasted until 1927. In October 1929 he became Chancellor of the University of Western Ontario, helping establish Canada's first official French Immersion programme three years later. Office of the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, "Henry Cockshutt," accessed 14 September 2011, http://www.lt.gov.on.ca/en/History/Bio_Cockshutt.asp?nav=7&sub=2; University of Western Ontario, "Who We Are" (2013).
[99] In Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.222.
[100] See Cloutier, *Quinze années de lutte! 1910-1925*, pp.67-68.
[101] Terrien, *Quinze années de lutte*, p.24, 31.

down by the deaths of leading French-Canadian Ontario bishops Latulipe and Gauthier, and by an early summer election in 1923.[102]

In July 1923 the Conservatives were back in power in Ontario under Premier and Minister of Education Howard Ferguson. For bonne ententistes, this would have been seen as a setback. Ferguson was a small-town Orangeman who had called for unilingual English-language instruction across the province even before Regulation 17. After its implementation, and while serving as acting Minister of Education "during the bitterest phase of the controversy, he had not only led the defence of Regulation XVII but also launched a malicious counteroffensive against Laurier and other French Canadians." Prospects for Ontario-Quebec accord on cultural matters appeared equally grim in light of Ferguson's victory – he was personally "less popular in Quebec than Arthur Meighen, if that were possible."[103]

Undeterred, the bonne ententistes identified alternative channels for lobbying. The ULO's president, John Godfrey, set about lobbying Federal Conservative Opposition Leader Arthur Meighen, who was a close friend of Ferguson. Meighen was also lobbied by other bonne ententistes, such as Senators C.P. Beaubien and Belcourt himself. "[I]t is certain that the French regard the Regulation as an insult to their nationality," Godfrey wrote Meighen in 1924. "The regulation has become a national obsession and they believe the test of good faith is the removal of this grievance." Now was the time, he argued, to remove the hated law: "given the necessary facilities the French Canadians in Ontario are entirely willing that their children should learn English. That being the case, why should they not be given the fullest opportunity to perfect themselves in their own

[102] Choquette, *Language and Religion*., pp.234-237.
[103] Vigod, *Quebec Before Duplessis*, p.124.

language?"[104] Godfrey attached a copy of Belcourt's *The Status of the French Language in Canada* in his communiqué to Meighen, along with an invitation to the Bonne Entente League's "3rd Historical Lecture" at the Château Laurier – hosted by none other than Arthur Hawkes.[105] Hawkes had been busy working on Prime Minister Mackenzie King, meeting with him in November 1925. King came to believe that Hawkes was a man with "some very true ideas."[106]

The federal Liberals had maintained close ties with the bonne entente movement. King had himself formally endorsed the Better Understanding Association before becoming prime minister.[107] Unofficially, the Bonne Entente League of President Eugénie Lorans became closely affiliated with the federal Liberals after the war. Lorans went so far as to privately suggest to King that the association's public outreach and educational activities could be used as a channel for Liberal Party propaganda during election time.[108] (Nevertheless, she was prudent enough to maintain cordial relations with Meighen.[109]) In the context of the League's longstanding objectives of fostering national unity and advocating for the avoidance of contentious issues that might serve to drive a wedge between Anglo-Canadians and French Canadians, Lorans's alliance with the Liberals made sense. The last Conservative government had implemented conscription, and in opposition the party had demanded a stronger commitment from Canada for imperial military adventures. Lorans recognized that King, hyper-conscious of the

[104] "I am writing this because, I know, you have great influence with the Honourable Howard Ferguson, in whose hands rests the settlement of this much vexed question." LAC, MP, MG26-I, Vol.100, Godfrey to Meighen, 12 January 1924.
[105] LAC, MP, MG26-I, Vol.100, Godfrey to Meighen, n.d., 25 January 1924.
[106] WLMK Diaries, 20 November 1925.
[107] LAC, CFAP, MG28-I3, various dates, pp.37-43.
[108] LAC, William Lyon Mackenzie King papers, MG26-J1, Vol.176, Lorans to King, 19 December 1930.
[109] LAC, MP, MG26-I, Vol.178, Lorans to Meighen, 1 February 1933.

national unity question and with an important political base in Quebec, held out the best promise for Anglophone/Francophone political accommodation.

Shortly after his November 1925 meeting with Hawkes, King resolved to work with the Ontario provincial Liberal Opposition to press for the abolition or, at the very least, amendment, of Regulation 17. On 30 December 1925, King reported that he had "held an important meeting in my office to discuss Ontario politics and policies and their relation to federal" politics and policies with Ontario provincial Liberal Leader W.E.N. Sinclair.[110] Like King, Sinclair had been among the "Laurier Liberals" who had stuck with the old chief during the 1917 federal election and ran on an anti-conscription platform – Like King, he had lost in his bid to win a seat in the House of Commons.[111] Moreover, the provincial Liberals were already sympathetic to Franco-Ontarian interests, given the party's more pluralistic outlook, and the fact that French Canadians formed an important part of the Liberal electoral base. During the June 1923 provincial election, the ULO and ACFÉO had persuaded Aurélien Bélanger, a bonne ententiste since the BUA days, to run for the Liberals and be their man in the legislature. The Liberals formed the Official Opposition, and Bélanger won his seat in Russell, in eastern Ontario.[112] Eloquent, perfectly bilingual and equipped with an intimate knowledge of the pedagogical benefits of a bilingual education, Bélanger would prove a valuable spokesperson.[113]

---

[110] WLMK Diaries, 30 December 1925.
[111] Parliamentary of Canada, "William Edmund Newton Sinclair," accessed 10 October 2012, www.parl.gc.ca.
[112] See CRCCF, "La Commission Scott-Merchant-Côté."
[113] Even the Conservatives were impressed by Bélanger's "classical English" after Bélanger's first speech to the legislature. "Where did you learn the language?" asked an MPP. "Why, at a bilingual school in my French village and at the University of Ottawa," he replied. In Terrien, *Quinze années de lutte*, p.32.

The 30 December 1925 meeting of top federal and provincial Liberals was important, given that elections were imminent at both levels. Moreover, it revealed the level of coordination that existed between the two parties on the language question. In addition to the two Liberal leaders, party organizers, and London MP John Campbell Elliott (from whose riding the notorious Bishop Fallon hailed), the meeting included a number of well-known bonne ententistes: Senator Belcourt, Rodolphe Lemieux, John Godfrey, and William Moore, whom King referred to affectionately as "Billy." The group decided that party organization would be run by a committee headed by Moore, with the "Prov'l. & Fed'l. organizat'n to be essentially one, to be ready for whichever campaign came first."[114] Two key policy areas were identified as requiring close coordination by both parties: prohibition and "the teaching of Fr. Language in schools." Moore forcefully argued that Regulation 17 was a nuisance, and all were agreed that the "Liberal party should stand for its abolition." They recognized, however, the potential political liability that this posed: "It was agreed we might lose the Irish Catholics who have not been as much with us in the recent campaign as they should have been," remarked King. But by supporting prohibition, King and his colleagues were confident that they would eat into Progressive Party support and ensure for themselves the "support of the Liberal press (*Star*, *Globe*, etc.) & the United Church." Ever the political tactician, King surmised that "Fr.-Canadian constituencies tho' against prohibition wd (*sic*) stand firm on this ground [restoration of French-language rights] & that rural English speaking constituencies wd hold for prohibition. The two were to go together to be put forward as

[114] WLMK Diaries, 30 December 1925.

the policy of the party when Sinclair speaks on the address." King was satisfied by the result of the meeting: "It was the best 3 hour conference I have ever had."[115]

By now, those who opposed cross-cultural understanding had identified the Liberal Party as an obstacle to their goals. In subsequent correspondence, Bishop Fallon complained bitterly to King that he was not doing enough to safeguard Irish-Catholic interests in the conflict, despite their historic loyalty to the Liberal Party, and for favouring French Canadians instead when it came to making important political appointments.[116] King was no fan of Fallon, and looked instead to O.D. Skelton and Ernest Lapointe for counsel on the issue – both advisors were sympathetic to the Franco-Ontarian cause.[117] When Fallon died in 1931, King broke protocol and skipped the funeral, sending Irish-Catholic Liberal MP Peter Heenan instead. Even this gesture, King wrote unsympathetically, was "a Christian act considering everything."[118] In the prime minister's eyes, the Bishop's attack on national unity was the most unpardonable sin of all.

With the federal and provincial Liberals now publicly supporting the restoration of French-language education rights in Ontario, modest progress was also being made with the Conservatives. Meighen was very much concerned the issue could permanently divide the country along party lines. The Union Party had rapidly dissolved without the war issue to hold it together. Without at least a modicum of political support in Quebec, the Conservative rump could never form a government, as was made plain after the 1921

[115] *Ibid*.
[116] See Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.257.
[117] See WLMK Diaries, 27 December 1927.
[118] WLMK Diaries, 26 February 1931.

and 1925 elections.[119] Meighen concluded that the party's imperialistic image must change to better reflect the values of the country. Indeed, Meighen had become so worried over his personal lack of appeal with Francophones that he had even begun learning French.[120] In subsequent speeches, his tone became increasingly sympathetic to the plight of the Franco-Ontarians, and he began acknowledging the need for greater Canadian autonomy within the Empire. The reaction among hard-core British-Canadian imperialists was understandably tepid, but Meighen's position gained the support of former Prime Minister Borden and future Conservative leader R.J. Manion.[121]

To his credit and to the satisfaction of French-Canadian Conservatives, Meighen did not relent. During the 1926 election, Esioff-Léon Patenaude and his candidates ran officially under the Conservative banner, citing Meighen's speeches as having settled the differences between the party's French- and British-Canadian factions. Meighen also made attempts at improving French-Canadian representation within the party's inner-circle. His interim ministry after the 1926 dissolution included four French Canadians, among them the first ever Franco-Ontarian federal cabinet minister, Raymond Morand. In a further gesture to French Canada, Meighen excluded J.W. Edwards from his cabinet – Edwards was a staunch Orangist and Regulation 17 advocate who had served in Meighen's Cabinet in 1921.[122]

In the meantime, Meighen had been privately encouraging Ferguson to reach a favourable resolution on the question of French-language education rights in Ontario. In

---

[119] See, for instance, LAC, MP, MG26-I, Vol.100, Meighen to Godfrey, 24 January 24.
[120] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.90.
[121] *Ibid*., p.197; Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.53; WLMK Diaries, 3 November 1927.
[122] Esioff Patenaude was appointed Minister of Justice, Eugène Paquet became Minister of Veterans Affairs, André Fauteux was made Solicitor-General, and Dr. Raymond Morand, from Windsor, became a minister without portfolio. Argenteuil MP George Perley, another Quebecer, was named Secretary of State. Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.211.

January 1924, Meighen met with Louis Côté, a Conservative Franco-Ontarian lawyer from Ottawa who had devised a compromise proposal that emphasized "'the equity and pedagogical advantages of a real bilingual education.'"[123] Côté's proposal allowed for the maintenance of Regulation 17's compulsory teaching of English and strict government inspection to ensure the effectiveness of that teaching. But it also would allow for the use of French as a means of instruction beyond the first two years of education (a limit set by the original regulation). Moreover, Côté's proposal called for more resources in order to train competent, bilingual teachers for the schools. The Franco-Ontarian lawyer made a persuasive case. He was described by one contemporary as "un parfait bilingue, esprit perspicace et ouvert, habile à plaider une cause et sachant s'attirer l'amitié et le respect de ses confrères de langue anglaise."[124] After securing Meighen's friendship and support for his proposal, Côté forwarded it directly to Ferguson in January 1924.[125]

Meanwhile, Godfrey had also begun writing to Ferguson directly. Together with Belcourt, he devised a plan to appeal to Ferguson's personal interest in pedagogy by insisting that unilingual Franco-Ontarian children could hardly learn any English if their language of instruction was not French.[126] "'I do not believe there was ever a time more propitious for a real compromise,'" wrote Godfrey to Ferguson in his official capacity as President of the ULO, in April 1924. "'After a long intimacy with the matter I have come to the conviction that the French are not only willing but anxious to learn the English language. This is substantiated by the report of Dr. Hughes.'" Godfrey reminded the premier of the national implications of his decision: "'It is a great thing to be Prime

[123] Côté in Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.243.
[124] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/64/1, newspaper clipping, Amédée Bénéteau, "Il y a vingt-cinq ans," *Le Droit*, 13 novembre 1950.
[125] Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.243.
[126] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/97/10, Godfrey to Belcourt, 22 November 1923.

Minister of Ontario, but it will be a much greater accomplishment to have made this contribution to National Unity.'"[127] In his letters to the premier, Godfrey pointed out the relative restraint shown by the Franco-Ontarian leadership, especially Belcourt. He also believed that public opinion in the province had begun to swing in favour of "'a reasonable settlement,'" as witnessed in the more moderate tone of the provincial press.[128]

Moreover, the public opposition to the status quo on the part of the provincial Liberals and UFO had left the provincial Conservatives isolated. Even the former Conservative Minister of Education, H.J. Cody (1918-1919), had come out publicly in favour of Franco-Ontarian rights, in August 1924.[129] Pressure from both the English- and French-speaking Catholic hierarchy in Ontario, who had mostly reconciled by 1924-1925, also served to make an unamended Regulation 17 untenable. In December 1924, Belcourt followed up Godfrey's efforts by extending an offer to Ferguson to meet and forge a compromise. "'[W]hy not try,'" he asked the premier. "'[Y]our gesture would be the most timely, eloquent and fruitful ever made in the cause of Canadian national unity.'"[130] It was Ferguson's relationship with another high profile French-Canadian Liberal, Quebec Premier Louis-Alexandre Taschereau, that would help convince Ontario's Conservative Premier to make such a gesture.

The Quebec Liberal Government of Louis-Alexandre Taschereau weighs in

[127] In Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.243.
[128] In *Ibid*., p.244.
[129] *Ibid*., p.234.
[130] In *Ibid*., p.244.

The moderate attitude and policies of Quebec Liberal Premier Louis-Alexandre Taschereau (1920-1936) were central to making Anglo-/French-Canadian rapprochement possible. Taschereau had long been a political moderate when it came to relations between the country's (and his province's) two dominant cultural-linguistic groups. For him, much as with Prime Minister King, politics was the art of the possible, and only this credo could serve to uphold cultural federalism in the long run. Extremism of any kind was a threat to the fragile coexistence that had been precariously maintained since the Union of the Canadas eighty years earlier. Moreover, Taschereau recognized that Ontario could be a valuable ally in the assertion of provincial power. To that end, he persuaded Ontario Conservative Premier and Regulation 17 architect Howard Ferguson to make common cause, notably in relation to hydro-electricity. While naturally in favour of increased provincial powers, Taschereau nonetheless held a view of the country as bicultural in nature, including a biculturalism that transcended provincial boundaries. As such, he was sympathetic to his province's English-speaking minority, and advocated on behalf of the rights of Francophone minorities outside his province, notably with his measured opposition to Regulation 17. Remarkably, Taschereau would use his political and economic alliance with the sister-province to help persuade Premier Ferguson to restore French-language minority rights in Ontario.

Like other French-Canadian leaders of the time, Taschereau had been frustrated by Ontario's discrimination against its French-speaking minority. In 1915 he joined the chorus of Quebec politicians in supporting Anglo-Quebec MPP W.S. Bullock's motion condemning Regulation 17.[131] He suspected that Ontario politicians who supported Regulation 17 were motivated more by political expediency than by personal conviction:

[131] See Montreal *Witness*, 23 May 1916, pp.1.

"'Ontario leaders give me the impression that this is a question they would like to settle," he remarked, "'but that they fear certain corners of their province where the modern British spirit, so broad, generous and tolerant, has not yet penetrated. Perhaps they fear certain groups too much.'"[132] Taschereau knew that once the political clout of these "'certain groups'" had diminished, change would be possible.

Long before he became premier in 1920, Taschereau was an established moderate and advocate of cross-cultural accommodation. An admirer of George-Étienne Cartier from a young age, Taschereau rejected the xenophobia, cultural isolationism and obsession with agrarianism that he believed persisted among some clerico-nationalistes.[133] As a young man he identified instead with the Victorian liberalism of Wilfrid Laurier and Lomer Gouin.[134] His beloved uncle, Charles Fitzpatrick, had set an early example of cross-cultural collaboration. An Anglo-Quebecer, Fitzpatrick had married into the family in 1879, and six years later helped prepare the legal defence of Louis Riel.[135] Taschereau joined Fitzpatrick's law practice in 1889. They were joined by Simon-Napoléon Parent, a self-made legal professional and bureaucrat who was also highly influential on Taschereau's social formation. Parent saw close economic ties between the province and Anglophone capital as crucial to French Canada's long-term success.[136]

Taschereau was convinced that extremism from both French and British Canada contributed to a vicious cycle of escalation. This was harmful not only to national unity,

---

[132] In CRCCF, "Louis-Alexandre Taschereau," *Le Règlement XVII* (2012), accessed 10 July 2013, http://www.crccf.uottawa.ca/reglement17/page/louis-alexandre-taschereau.
[133] Vigod, *Quebec Before Duplessis*, p.160.
[134] See Fernande Roy, *Progrès, harmonie, liberté*, pp.243-248.
[135] "Charles Fitzpatrick," Assemblée Nationale du Québec (2009), accessed 20 July 2013, http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/fitzpatrick-charles-3165/biographie.html.
[136] Vigod, *Quebec Before Duplessis*, pp.11.

but also to his own party's hold on power, as it strengthened the position of the clerico-nationalistes. Taschereau also recognized that inflaming British-Canadian animosity would do nothing to restore French-language rights outside Quebec. Instead of accusing Ontarians of "Prussianism," he argued, French Canadians should reach out to the moderate Anglo-Canadians and bonne ententistes who had come out against Regulation 17 early on.[137] Drawing on his own positive experiences with Anglo-Quebecers, he asked an April 1917 gathering of Montreal Liberals: "'why can't we have mutual understanding with the majority in our sister province, when we French Canadians get along so well with our English-Canadian compatriots of Quebec?'"[138]

Nor was Taschereau afraid to reach out to British Ontarians with more conservative and imperialist inclinations. In April 1922, Taschereau delivered an address to the Empire Club and Women's Canadian Club in Toronto, in which he discussed "la noblesse canadienne-française." Taschereau told his audience that, "durant tout le cours de [ma] vie publique," he had been "l'avocat de la bonne entente et de la bonne volonté, de la tolérance et du respect mutuel entre tous les Canadiens."[139] It was this spirit of tolerance for cultural-linguistic difference, he explained, that made Canada possible:

> L'immensité imposante de notre pays, nos hautes montagnes, nos grands lacs et nos puissantes rivières, tout nous rappelle que l'union canadienne ne saurait exister sans les rapports étroits et cordiaux entre les diverses provinces et les différentes races, et que c'est pour nous un devoir de nous mieux connaître et de nous rapprocher. ....
> [A]u Canada, les deux nationalités, différentes quant à la langue, aux traditions et aux coutumes ethniques, mais réunies dans leurs aspirations et leur loyalisme, sont essentielles à la vie canadienne. L'union des deux plus grandes nations du

[137] Vigod, *Quebec Before Duplessis*, p.59.
[138] In *Ibid*., p.62.
[139] The lectures were given in English, providing "une leçon de bilinguisme qui s'est ajoutée délicatement aux arguments de l'orateur." Louis-Alexandre Taschereau, *L'habitant de Québec: Noblesse Canadienne-Française*, p.11.

> monde dans un commun effort, sur une base généreuse et large de respect mutuel et d'entente sympathique, ne peut engendrer une nation faible et dégénérée.[140]

The Quebec premier enlightened his audience as to French Canadians' attachment to their language and culture, and to their "sol natal." Playing to the sympathies of his audience, Taschereau argued that French Canada provided the best guarantee against the country's cultural absorption into the United States.[141] At length, he asserted a shared history – in the exploration, settlement, defence and governing of Canada – and countered popular misconceptions about Quebec. Taschereau insisted that Quebec valued secularism, provided statistics of its contribution to the Canadian economy, and boasted of its classical colleges, "nos institutions de haute culture," where "on enseignait le français et l'anglais ... longtemps avant que Toronto ne devint une ville."[142] He reminded the Ontarians of the "plus grand respect mutuel, [le] plus vif sentiment d'entr'aide, de bonne entente et de réelle amitié entre hommes de races et de croyances différentes ... dans le Québec," and implored them to act in the same spirit toward the Franco-Ontarian minority:[143]

> L'habitant est un aussi bon Canadien qu'aucun de nous. Il constitue un apport précieux pour notre pays. Le Canada est sa patrie. Il admire votre province, votre richesse, votre esprit d'entreprise. C'est pour vous un ami. Soyez de ses amis. Donnez-lui en retour le fairplay britannique. Pardessus la ligne imaginaire qui sépare nos deux provinces, tendez-lui une main amie qu'il sera heureux de saisir. Car il sait que les institutions britanniques comportent l'exercice de la liberté, l'harmonie des races et le respect des minorités.[144]

---

[140] *Ibid*., pp.11, 24.
[141] *Ibid*., preface, p.12.
[142] "Nous savons que nous pouvons conserver notre nationalité, jouer un rôle dans ce Dominion et contribuer au développement du Canada." *Ibid*., pp.22-23.
[143] *Ibid*., p.17.
[144] *Ibid*., p.25.

The premier's high-profile speech was given broad coverage and was well received in both the English- and French-language press.[145] Taschereau's message in favour of cultural-linguistic dualism did not go unnoticed: "perhaps the public men of Ontario could, with time, reciprocate by speaking French as well as Mr. Taschereau speaks English," remarked the *Globe*.[146] Indeed, Taschereau was encouraged enough by the success of this event that he returned to Toronto exactly two years later to deliver an address to the Ontario Educational Association on the necessity of bilingualism.[147] Since becoming premier, he had advocated for greater access to English-language teaching in Quebec's schools.[148]

Taschereau's comfort with the diversity in his own province was exemplified by his handling of the Jewish schools question. The *BNA Act* of 1867 provided for denominational schools in Quebec – Catholic and Protestant – each with their own separate school boards, which came together in the province's Council of Public Instruction. The large number of Jews who moved to Montreal at the turn-of-the-century tended to send their children to Protestant schools, in part to learn English, but also because the schools tended to be more secular.[149] By 1922, forty per cent of students for which the Montreal Protestant Board was responsible were Jewish, leading to funding shortages (funding being based on the number of Protestants in a district). In 1930,

---

[145] "Friendship between English and French Canadians will be much more achievable once Quebec is better understood in its history and its intellectual culture." Ottawa *Citizen*, 2 May 1922. "Jamais aucun Canadien-français n'avait jusqu'à ce jour parlé dans la grande province anglaise avec autant de courage, de fierté et de franchise." *Bulletin* (Montréal), 30 April 1922. See also Sherbrooke *Tribune*, 29 April 1922; Trois-Rivières *Nouvelliste*, 1 March 1922; *Le Soleil*, 29 April 1922; *La Presse*, 28 April 1922; Halifax *Chronicle*, 2 May 1922; *Le Canada*, 28 April 1922; Montreal *Gazette*, 29 April 1922; *Saturday Night*, 20 May 1922; Hamilton *Spectator*, 3 May 1922; Brockville *Recorder-Times*, 2 May 1922; London *Canada*, 13 May 1922; Montreal *Journal of Commerce*, 5 May 1922; *La Patrie*, 28 April 1922; *L'Action Catholique*, 27 April 1922; *La Voix du Sol*, 4 May 1922; In Taschereau, *L'habitant de Québec*, pp.42-62.
[146] *Globe*, 28 April 1922.
[147] Antonin Dupont, *Taschereau* (Montréal: Guérin, 1997), p.xix.
[148] *Ibid*., pp.231.
[149] Vigod, *Quebec Before Duplessis*, p.157.

Taschereau backed a proposal by Protestant and Jewish moderates to create a separate Jewish School Commission of Montreal, officially under the purview of the Protestant Superintendant. The Catholic hierarchy protested, and a rash of anti-Semitic accusations from nationaliste circles ensued, including from Abbé Lionel Groulx and the fascist leader Adrien Arcand.[150] The proposal had to be withdrawn to avoid a further backlash. Still, Taschereau was quick to denounce the bigotry of the likes of Groulx and Arcand, and the government resolved to further supplement the Protestant schools and to allow Jewish and Protestant leaders to reach as best a compromise as they could within the pre-existing system.[151]

Conscious of the fact that the suppression of French-language rights outside Quebec continued to play into the hands of the Liberals' ideological opponents in his own province, Taschereau had continued lobbying against Regulation 17 after the war. At the 1923 Bonne Entente conference with Ferguson in Toronto, he publicly denounced the "'fanaticisme'" on both sides of the debate.[152] Privately, he gave ongoing encouragement to Napoléon Belcourt to carry on the fight.[153] As Premier, Taschereau knew that the utmost tact would have to be observed so as to minimize the appearance of Quebec's 'interfering' in an internal matter of Ontario. Taschereau's political opponent, Quebec Conservative Leader Arthur Sauvé, also applied pressure to Ferguson, if less tactfully. In November 1924 he publicly refused to attend a national Conservative Party convention being held in Toronto, out of protest against Regulation 17. Like Meighen, Sauvé

[150] *Ibid*., p.159.
[151] Dupont, *Taschereau*, pp.253-273.
[152] In *Le Soleil*, 19 March 1923, p.2.
[153] Vigod, *Quebec Before Duplessis*, p.273.

increasingly resented the damage that Ontario conservatives had done to the Conservative brand elsewhere, especially in Quebec.[154]

The back channels of Liberal Party organization, meanwhile, provided one means of strengthening the anti-Regulation 17 lobby. Unlike the Conservatives, coordination between the Canadian, Ontario and Quebec Liberal Parties was strong, especially on cultural questions and during election campaigns. Philippe Paradis, from Quebec City, was the chief Liberal organizer in Quebec during the 1920s, and an old friend of Lapointe. He acted as a go-between for the two parties.[155] In addition to Paradis and Lapointe, other important politicians maintained close links between the two parties, including Lucien Cannon (who acted as King's personal representative to Taschereau), Senator Sévérin Béland, P.J.A. Cardin and Chubby Power. King and Taschereau regularly conferred with each other on matters of mutual political interest.[156] Even before either man had assumed the leadership of their respective parties, King had been impressed with Taschereau, calling him "a very charming & fine type of man."[157] Outside of elections, close ties were maintained through formal and informal meetings, social gatherings and banquets held by the several local Liberal Clubs throughout Quebec, and the frequent face-to-face meetings between party leaders.[158] During election time, at both levels, the overall strategy, riding organization, fundraising, speech-making

---

[154] In his refusal to attend, published in *Le Droit*, Sauvé implored Ferguson to observe "'les droits constitutionnels et naturels reconnus par Cartier et Macdonald.' .... Il n'y a pas d'autres moyens pour le parti conservateur d'unir Ontario et Québec. M. Meighen parle juste quand il dit "qu'il espère que ceux qui portent l'étandard du conservatisme dans la province où leur party domine, se souviendront des problèmes et des difficultés des conservateurs dans les autres provinces."'" In Terrien, *Quinze années de lutte*, p.37.
[155] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.52.
[156] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, pp.189, 230.
[157] WLMK Diaries, 28 March 1919.
[158] King wrote, for instance, of being warmy received at a Liberal Club banquet in Quebec City, at which Taschereau, Lapointe, Parent and Chubby Power spoke. King was worried about having to make his address in English, but his speech was nonetheless commended by both Taschereau and Lapointe and very warlmy received by the audience. WLMK Diaries, 15 January 1925. See also WLMK Diaries, 23 and 24 September 1925.

and campaign events were closely coordinated. When Parliament dissolved on 2 July 1926, for instance, King's first step was to immediately arrange a joint meeting with key provincial and federal Liberal organizers from across Canada, including William Moore and Newton Rowell for Ontario, and Party heavyweights Jimmy Gardiner (Premier of Saskatchewan) and Taschereau.[159] Given this level of coordination, it was crucial to maintain a consistent message, especially in Quebec where culturally sensitive matters were closely covered in the press.

King and Taschereau did not agree on all things. Jurisdiction over natural resources, for instance, would prove a point of contention. But both men needed each other, and not simply because their parties shared the same name. As an Anglo-Canadian, King was an outsider in Quebec, and his French-language skills were weak. He needed prominent local French-Canadian politicians to speak for him and lend legitimacy to his brand in the province, where his party depended heavily for support. Taschereau regularly gave speeches and accompanied King on the federal campaign trail. King referred to the premier as "a fine chairman."[160] For his part, Taschereau made great use of King's high-profile Quebec ministers to get out the vote during provincial elections. Lapointe, for instance, was arguably the most popular Quebec representative at either level of government, and by the early 1930s his profile rivalled that of King himself.[161] Moreover, King and Lapointe could promise Quebecers what Taschereau could not – an independent foreign policy to keep Canada out of international imbroglios, including those of the British imperial variety. More importantly, both King and Taschereau recognized that having culturally sensitive governments in both Ottawa and Quebec City

[159] Cannon and Paradis were also in attendance. WLMK Diaries, 2 July 1926.
[160] WLMK Diaries, 23 September 1925.
[161] See Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.190.

helped mitigate the development of animosities that would play into the hands of their imperialist and clerico-nationaliste adversaries. To that end, the parties had a mutual interest in seeing French-language education rights restored in Ontario.

Quebec/Ontario relations immediately after the war had been less than optimal. But few things bring people together like a shared economic interest. In 1922, an Ontario report confirmed the feasibility of a St. Lawrence Seaway and hydro-electricity development along the Ontario-Quebec-New York border. Since the project would require an international agreement with the US, however, the King government asserted a claim to potential revenues in spite of the provinces' constitutional jurisdiction over natural resources. Moreover, both Ontario and Quebec feared that the electricity would be sold off to the US to the detriment of Canadian manufacturing interests. Taschereau wrote to Ferguson after the 1925 Bonne Entente meeting in Quebec City: "'We have too many interests in common not to become closely united in community of ideas and unity of action.'"[162] Ferguson agreed. In early 1926 he called a secret meeting at which Taschereau consented to having Quebec companies supply Ontario manufacturers with more electricity on the condition that the two provinces combine forces to mount a "joint legal challenge to federal claims."[163] This ranged from challenging Ottawa's claims over hydroelectric and natural resource control, to the federal government's attempts at amending the constitution, to new national social programs such as the Old Age Pension scheme. The old provincial rights alliance of Quebec and Ontario, harkening back to the days of Honoré Mercier and Oliver Mowat, had been reborn.[164]

---

[162] In Vigod, *Ibid*., p.125. See also Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, pp.137.
[163] Vigod, *Quebec Before Duplessis*, pp.125-126.
[164] Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*, pp.30-31.

Despite their different political and cultural affiliations, the two premiers quickly developed a positive rapport that allowed them to broach the language issue.[165] Indeed, it was apparently on Ferguson's initiative at the Quebec City Bonne Entente meeting of 1925 that the premier consulted privately with Taschereau and other "French-Canadian leaders" on the Ontario schools question. He appreciated Taschereau's grasp of the sensitivity of the question in Ontario as well as Quebec – Ferguson could not simply abolish the Regulation outright, "d'un coup de plume" without warning, lest he enrage his political base. Still, Taschereau urged the Ontario premier to reach some sort of compromise.[166] The following year, Ferguson was looking again to Taschereau for advice on another sensitive issue dividing Protestants and Catholics: prohibition. He resolved to adopt the Quebec model, whereby an Ontario Liquor Commission would control the sale of liquor, thus satisfying temperance advocates whilst securing a lucrative source of revenue for provincial coffers.[167]

By now, Taschereau had become confident enough in his working relationship with Ferguson that he could leverage Quebec electricity for Franco-Ontarian minority rights. Quebec public opinion, Taschereau privately informed the Ontario premier, would never consent to any interprovincial power arrangement without some kind of resolution to the schools question: change the law, or lose the power.[168] Having established an alliance based on the principles of territorial federalism, Taschereau had forced Ferguson to finally confront the challenges of cultural federalism.

---

[165] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.137.
[166] See UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/98/19, newspaper clipping, Boutet, "M. Ferguson promet une enquête – La fin du débat sur la motion Bélanger," *Le Devoir*, 7 April 1925.
[167] See Dupont, *Taschereau*, p.60.
[168] Vigod, *Quebec Before Duplessis*, pp.124-125; Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.137.

Toward an ultimate compromise: the amendment of Regulation 17, 1925-1927

While Ferguson continued to be lobbied behind the scenes, the Premier of Ontario also faced increasing pressure in the provincial legislature. In early 1925, Liberal MPP Aurélien Bélanger mounted a tireless campaign in the chamber, making several speeches and sponsoring a motion in favour of restoring and properly funding bilingual schools for French-Canadian children in Ontario. Bélanger argued at length about the pedagogical advantages of teaching in a child's maternal language, and called for adequate resources and institutional support to train proper, bilingual teachers through the establishment of a bilingual Normal School.[169] He argued that the restoration of bilingual schools was a matter of simple justice, and that bilingualism was a benefit to society as a whole – even Anglo-Canadian children would benefit from learning more French, he insisted. The Bélanger motion received the support of several MPPs, including Liberal Leader Sinclair, the Franco-Ontarian Liberal caucus, and Anglo-Canadian Conservative and Liberal MPPs from ridings with sizeable French-Canadian populations.[170] The Quebec French-language press took notice, which further compounded the pressure Ferguson faced from Taschereau.

The Bélanger motion forced Ferguson back on his heels. He rejected Bélanger's assertion that Ontario was a bilingual and bicultural society: Ontario remained an "English province." Still, Ferguson admitted that he could not ignore the important place of French in the province, especially in its education system. He expressly denied the

[169] "Comment former de vrais citoyens, sans le concours de la langue maternelle? C'est d'ailleurs la conclusion unanime de tous les grands pédagogues qui ont étudié la question." UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/98/19, newspaper clipping, Boutet, "M. Ferguson promet une enquête – La fin du débat sur la motion Bélanger," *Le Devoir*, 7 April 1925.
[170] *Ibid*.

insinuation that his government's long-term objective was to abolish the French language from Ontario altogether. Moreover, the pedagogical argument in favour of teaching French-Canadian children in their first language had begun to weigh heavily on the premier. Ferguson confessed to the chamber that Bélanger had provided the most clear and complete discussion on the subject that he had yet heard, and that the Regulation would have to be revisited.[171] As a compromise, Ferguson promised to commission an inquiry into the schools question, and to seriously consider its recommendations in consultation with Bélanger. He had been thinking about creating such a commission for several months. Public life, Ferguson told the chamber, had brought him into constant contact with French Canadians, whose loyalty and devotion could not be doubted. Moreover, the damage that Ontario's language policy had done to national unity had also begun to weigh heavily on Ferguson's mind. "I would like to say to all French Canadians in Quebec and Ontario," he told the chamber in his concluding remarks, "that this government sincerely wishes to restore better understanding and to adopt the best [pedagogical] methods."[172] With the promise of a commission secured, at 12:30am on 7 April, after some five hours of uninterrupted discussion and debate, Bélanger withdrew his motion in a gesture of good faith.

Unable to fully enforce Regulation 17 due to its impracticality and the resistance from Franco-Ontarians, and facing the combined pressure of Taschereau, provincial and federal politicians, the ACFÉO, the ULO, Catholic clergy, the Ontario intellectual élite and a changing public mood, Ferguson had finally been forced to act. Created in October 1925, the commission of inquiry into the quality and feasibility of bilingual schools

[171] Premier Ferguson praised Bélanger for his tact in approaching such a sensitive "religious" and "race" question, over which inflammatory comments had been made by "extremists" from both sides. See *Ibid*.
[172] In *Ibid*.

worked from November of that year until June 1927. It was headed by the province's chief schools inspector Dr. F.W. Merchant, Perth judge J.H. Scott, and Louis Côté. Merchant was considered an authority on the matter, given that it was his 1912 report on bilingual schools that the Conservatives had relied upon to create the Regulation. (In 1912, Merchant had recommended better training for teachers and a more flexible approach to introducing students to English – not the repression of the French language.) Côté, the requisite Franco-Ontarian on the commission, was already well known for the compromise that he had previously proposed to both Meighen and Ferguson. As a prominent Orangeman, Judge Scott could not be accused of a pro-French bias, although his Franco-Ontarian colleagues came to appreciate his conciliatory attitude. In addition to the three commissioners, the inquiry was served by two secretaries: one Anglo-Canadian, William John Karr, and one French Canadian, Amédée Bénéteau.[173]

It was around this time that the bilingual schools question had cropped up again in the prairie provinces. According to the 1905 terms that Laurier had engineered for Saskatchewan and Alberta's entry into Confederation, the federal government retained control over Crown lands, and a portion of Crown land sales in these provinces had been earmarked to fund separate schools. In practice, this had the effect of funding the schools of the Francophone minorities in those provinces. In 1926, as a compromise to Progressives, the King government agreed to transfer control over Crown lands to the provincial governments, as was already the case in the senior provinces. This transfer, however, would have the unintended effect of eliminating the guarantee of funding for bilingual schools. In a private meeting with King and Lapointe in May 1926, Alberta's

[173] See CRCCF, "La Commission Scott-Merchant-Côté"; UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/64/1, newspaper clipping, Amédée Bénéteau, "Il y a vingt-cinq ans," *Le Droit*, 13 novembre 1950. Bénéteau referred to Karr as an "homme consciencieux."

progressive premier John Edward Brownlee expressed his willingness to support bilingual schools, but he could not risk doing so publicly as a provincial election loomed. King's Cabinet was divided over what to do next, but Lapointe succeeded in convincing his colleagues that the Francophone minorities must not be abandoned. In June, Lapointe announced that the government would ask the Supreme Court to decide on the constitutionality of the change to school funding that the transfer of jurisdiction over Crown lands entailed. While the western press and the Orange lobby vocally lamented the delay that this would cause for the transfer, nationaliste circles in Quebec praised the move, including Henri Bourassa, who had been a vocal critic of the government's initial failure to safeguard French-language minority rights in the west. The federal government's legal team ultimately won the decision, which brought the prairie provinces to the negotiating table. In July 1928 the impasse was broken when King and Lapointe struck a tentative deal with Manitoba's progressive premier John Bracken to guarantee ongoing funding for bilingual schools through Crown land sale revenues.[174] King's ally in Saskatchewan, Liberal Premier Jimmy Gardiner, also agreed to the compromise. Gardiner was a strong advocate of Canadian pluralism and defender of French-Catholics in western Canada.[175] By March 1930, agreements had been signed with all three prairie

[174] Bracken, a progressive, had already expressed openness to bilingual separate schools, but wanted to avoid stirring up controversy. King managed to divert public attention by opening up the prospect of federal compensation for previous Crown land sales via a royal commission. Frances Russel, *Canadian Crucible*, p.187; Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, pp.100-102, 141-142, 159-160.

[175] Gardiner "maintained that tolerance and respect for minority rights were at the core of the British political tradition." Pitsula, *Keeping Canada British*, p.1.

He was an especially fierce critic of the anti-Catholic KKK, which had made inroads into western Canada. He paid politically when he lost the provincial election to the Conservatives (a patronage scandal didn't help). In any event, Gardiner won the 1934 election, and left provincial politics a year later to sit alongside Lapointe in Cabinet. The federal Liberals, meanwhile, also lost some votes in western Canada owing to the bilingual question. But the Bennet government did not reverse the legislation, and in 1935 the Liberals returned to office with strong representation in the west. Pitsula, *Keeping Canada British*, pp.40; Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.190.

provinces. In the end, the education rights of the French-speaking minority, such as they were, had been salvaged and the country was not torn asunder.

Meanwhile, in Ontario, the Merchant-Scott-Côté Commission soldiered on. Over the course of their work the commissioners and secretaries visited dozens of Franco-Ontarian schools from south-western, northern and eastern Ontario, and tested some thirty thousand students on their abilities in French, English, and various other subjects.[176] The ACFÉO put its faith in the sincerity of the commission, and advised all schools to cooperate fully. The Franco-Ontarian leadership was confident that, given the support of such Anglo-Canadian "pédagogues comme le Dr. James L. Hughes, l'honorable Fisher [(Liberal MPP for Ottawa)], M. C.-B. Sissons, M. Staples et quelques autres, les enquêteurs trouveront que l'on donne, dans ces écoles, l'enseignement des deux langues officielles du Canada tout en faisant primer le développement intellectuel, la formation morale et la langue maternelle des enfants."[177] By now, the ACFÉO had made clear its full acceptance of the principle of bilingual (as opposed to French-unilingual) education for French-Canadian children in Ontario, and articulated how this was to be achieved in its *Programme d'enseignement bilingue*, published in 1925 and distributed to every Franco-Ontarian school commission. The *Programme*'s front page was graced with a quote from William Moore: "The French Canadian Culture is not only an obligation upon this Country rising out of the past; it is an asset, an essential asset of the future."[178]

---

[176] CRCCF, "La Commission Scott-Merchant-Côté"; UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/64/1, newspaper clipping, Amédée Bénéteau, "Il y a vingt-cinq ans," *Le Droit*, 13 novembre 1950.
[177] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/88/6, Belcourt, Circulaire no.4 (G), Ottawa, 30 October 1825, p.1.
[178] The program was modelled on those of other bilingual states, including South Africa, Belgium, and Wales. Association canadienne-française d'éducation d'Ontario, *Programme d'enseignement bilingue*, (Ottawa, 1925), cover page. Université d'Ottawa, CRCCF, Collection générale, BRO-1925-16.

The Merchant-Scott-Côté Commission issued its report to the public on 22 September 1927. The situation in most schools was deplorable: students performed poorly in both English and French. The poor level of education, however, was not due to a lack of English instruction, but to the ban on teaching in French beyond Grade 2, inadequate resources, and inadequate teacher training in both languages.[179] The commissioners made two key recommendations. First, an official, properly supported system of bilingual schools for Franco-Ontarians overseen by one English director (Karr), one French director (Bénéteau) and the Ontario chief of school inspections, wherein French and English could both be used as languages of instruction. Second, approval of the Normal School (teacher's college) at the University of Ottawa to train proper bilingual teachers.[180] By now, Ferguson himself had come to believe that Regulation 17 was unfair, impractical, a political liability, and "'a rigid uniform rule.'"[181] The report was adopted in full by the provincial legislature on the day of its issue, thus amending Regulation 17 "to the point where it became completely acceptable to Franco-Ontarians."[182] The quality of education for Franco-Ontarian children, and their ability to work and live in both French and English, would improve exponentially over next few years. By the 1930s, the Ministry of Education had embraced both the results and benefits of bilingual schools, and the public had moved on.[183]

---

[179] UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/64/1, newspaper clipping, Amédée Bénéteau, "Il y a vingt-cinq ans," *Le Droit*, 13 novembre 1950.
[180] CRCCF, "La Commission Scott-Merchant-Côté"; Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.246; CRCCF, "Le Règlement XVII."
[181] Ferguson to Charles Gordon, 8 December 1927, in Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.246.
[182] The amendment came into effect 1 November 1927. Regulation XVII was formally removed from the books in 1944. Choquette, *Language and Religion*, pp.245-246.
[183] See UO, CRCCF, Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/64/1, newspaper clipping, Amédée Bénéteau, "Il y a vingt-cinq ans," *Le Droit*, 13 novembre 1950; Ontario, *Report of the Minister of Education, Ontario, 1936* (Toronto: T.E. Bowman, 1937) Robarts Library, AFG-5659: "[T]he progress accomplished during the past few years is a source of great satisfaction. ... [We] have all worked conscientiously towards the great

The measures were widely celebrated in both Ontario and Quebec. The Toronto *Star* announced that the leaders of the ACFÉO had "risked everything for a principle," and won.[184] The *Hamilton Herald* asserted that the amendments were a fair and just compromise:

> Mr. Ferguson has achieved a marked political triumph. He has succeeded in removing a cause of offence to the French-speaking population of Ontario and a source of resentment to Quebec people, generally, and has apparently done so without offence to those who feel that a fair English education is the birthright of every child in this Province.[185]

Senator D.O. Lespérance, president of the bonne-ententiste newspaper *La Patrie*, Senator C.P. Beaubien, who had been a long-serving ally of the ACFÉO, and former schools inspector James Hughes were among those who sent Ferguson their personal congratulations. Some of the highest praise came from Taschereau, who wrote to Ferguson immediately to "'congratulate you on the very honest endeavour you have made to settle the school question in your Province.'"[186] Ferguson had personally sent a copy of the Report to Taschereau.[187] Two weeks later, he hosted the Quebec premier at the fall convocation of the University of Toronto, and held a luncheon in Taschereau's honour.[188] At the Dominion-Provincial conference in Ottawa that November, Ferguson met Taschereau's 'bonjour' with "glad-handing and backslapping."[189]

---

objective of having the French-speaking pupils of this Province acquire an education which, while meeting the wishes of their parents, will enable them to work and live in harmony and friendship with their English-speaking compatriots. It is confidently expected that the general public will continue to give these schools its sympathetic co-operation so that the arduous efforts of those who are concerned with the education of the children may continue to be fruitful." p.34.

[184] "Samuel Genest," *Toronto Star Weekly*, 8 October 1927, p.1.

[185] "Regulation Goes," *Hamilton Herald*, 22 September 1927, p.4.

[186] In Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.246.

[187] *Ibid*., p.246

[188] It was attended by some seventy-five political 'who's who,' including Prime Minister King. See WLMK Diaries, 7 October 1927.

[189] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.137.

Even the skeptics of bonne entente had to admit that the removal of the most onerous elements of Regulation 17 had been the result of cross-cultural collaboration, and of such organizations as the Unity League of Ontario.[190] ULO President Godfrey, satisfied that his ten-year mission to improve relations between Anglo- and French Canadians was finally coming to its completion, also wrote to congratulate the premier: "'You have done a fine big thing which will ensure for you in history an outstanding position among the public men of Canada.'"[191] In June 1928, Godfrey, Hughes, Samuel Genest, T.P. Foran and Côté were honoured by the Université d'Ottawa for their efforts with honorary Doctorates of Law.[192]

The new political climate in English-speaking Canada

By the mid-1930s, the new political climate in English-speaking Canada had revealed that most people had moved on from or were simply ambivalent toward the language question. With the Great Depression in full swing, economic relief was of much greater interest to voters than were cultural issues. Moreover, it was no longer enough to play on anti-Catholic and anti-French sentiments in order to win elections. During the 1934 Ontario provincial election, the Toronto *Telegram* and its Conservative Orangist clientele made an attempt to whip up the schools and religious questions. The *Telegram* accused Liberal Leader Mitch Hepburn and his party of having "'sold out'" to Catholic interests. Hepburn, a Protestant, unapologetically replied that, yes, he believed Catholics

[190] See, for instance, Bastien, *Le bilinguisme au Canada*, p.50: "De 1919 à 1922, la minorité [en Ontario] négocie. D'abord avec the gouvernement Drury. Par l'intermédiaire merveilleux de la *Unity League*, organisme admirable mis sur pied par le sénateur Belcourt, elle négocie avec l'élite ontarienne. Et voici que l'opinion s'éclaire peu à peu. La cause minoritaire gagne des amis en milieux anglais. Les animosités s'apaisent et les bonnes volontés surgissent. Hommes publics et hommes d'Église y contribuent."
[191] Godfrey to Ferguson, 27 September 1927, in Choquette, *Language and Religion*, p.246.
[192] Terrien, *Quinze années de lutte*, p.45.

to be trustworthy people. After that, the religious and language questions all but disappeared from the campaign.[193] Ontarians, it turned out, were more interested in the economic crisis than they were in the old cultural animosities. The provincial Liberals swept the province and formed a government for the first time since 1902. In later provincial elections, Hepburn would enlist the services of Ernest Lapointe to ensure that French Canadians got elected in Franco-Ontarian ridings.[194]

In October of the following year, the federal Liberals were also re-elected in a landslide, capturing 171 seats to R.B. Bennett's 39 Conservative seats, Social Credit's 17 seats and 7 for the CCF. In Ontario, previously the heart of support for the federal Conservatives, the Liberals had achieved a telling victory, winning 56 seats to the Conservatives' 25. The party had strong representation across the country, including, of course, in Quebec. Lapointe's position as second-in-command after 1935 was uncontested. He was the first MP King called upon for advice in forming a new Cabinet. Lapointe resumed his role as Minister of Justice and his leading role in External Affairs, with King as Minister for that portfolio.[195]

Humiliated, the federal Conservatives decided that they still needed to do more to broaden their appeal beyond their traditional British-Canadian base. In July 1938, the party selected R.J. Manion as its new leader. Manion had developed a reputation as an

---

[193] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.244.

As much might be said about the 19 June 1934 election in Saskatchewan, which saw the provincial Liberals of King's ally Jimmy Gardiner throw out the Conservative government of James Anderson. The provincial Conservatives had played on anti-Catholic and anti-French sentiment to win enough seats in 1929 to establish a thin plurality in the chamber (the Liberals still out-polled them 46% to 36%). The 1934 election results were telling: the Saskatchewan Liberals won 50 seats, the Progressives 5, and the Conservatives were completely shut out. As David E. Smith explains, "Gardiner accepted, in the language of modern-day Canada, the country's bicultural origins and multicultural society. He disavowed throughout the 1929 campaign, and for the rest of his days, the monocultural ideal his opponents upheld." David E. Smith, "James G. Gardiner," in Gordon L. Barnhart, ed., *Saskatchewan Premiers of the Twentieth Century* (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 2004), pp.99-100.

[194] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.329.

[195] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, pp.261.

advocate of Canadian autonomy. An Irish Catholic from northern Ontario who had married a Franco-Ontarian, he was also known for being more sensitive to French-Canadian opinion. Manion won the leadership campaign with the combined support of the progressives within the party and the party's Quebec wing.[196]

The social democratic left had also demonstrated a keen awareness of the importance of constructing a more positive Anglophone/Francophone relationship. This was not insignificant, given the movement's increasing popularity among Anglo-Canadians, and with the establishment in 1933 of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation in particular. Its leader, J.S. Woodsworth, a former Methodist minister, had long demonstrated sympathy for French-speaking Canadians, if less so for the Catholic Church and organized religion in general. As a pacifist, his advocacy of Canadian independence and foreign affairs isolationism were appreciated by many French Canadians (during the Great War he had even spoken out against the brazen use of the pulpit for recruiting purposes). Woodsworth became close colleagues and good friends with his parliamentary desk mate, Henri Bourassa, and received the accolades of even the most ardent of nationalistes. "'Sa grande voix, souvent accusatrice,'" wrote *l'Action Nationale*'s René Doussin in a retrospective after Woodsworth's re-election in 1940, "'se fera encore entendre aux Communes de nombreuses vérités.'" André Laurendeau was equally admiring: Woodsworth, he recalled, opposed war "'avec un courage et une vision que personne après lui ne paraît avoir retrouvés.'"[197] For even these nationalistes, there

[196] *Ibid*., p.295.
[197] In Gordon O. Rothney, Review of K.W. McNaught, "J.S. Woodsworth and a Political Party for Labour, 1896 to 1921," *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. 30, No. 2, June 1949: 123-143, in *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1949: 281-283. See also Kenneth McNaught, *A Prophet in Politics: A Biography of J.S. Woodsworth,* 2nd edition (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001).

was at least one Anglo-Canadian politician with whom they knew they could make common cause.

Francis Reginald Scott, a prominent intellectual and a respected professor at McGill University, became the CCF's staunchest Anglo-Canadian defender of French Canada during the 1930s. Scott was one of those Anglo-Quebecers who, caught between British-Canadian imperialism and French-Canadian nationalism, had a vested interest in changing the political climate. A third-generation British Canadian from Quebec City, Scott was "brought up to be thoroughly British and English-speaking."[198] His father, the Canon Frederick George Scott, was an Anglican priest and author who had served dutifully in the Great War. The younger Scott was educated at Bishops and then Oxford on a Rhodes scholarship. Despite living in the heart of French America, he was somewhat insulated from French-Canadian society until after the Great War – typical of many Anglo-Quebecers at the time.[199]

Still, he developed a certain appreciation for French Canada from an early age. The Quebec Tercentenary celebrations of 1908, for instance, in which the young Frank portrayed a French soldier in a re-enactment, had deeply impressed him with the importance of English/French harmony.[200] A summer highlight for the Scotts was to camp and fish on the shores of the St. Lawrence, and to take a paddlewheel to one of the "fashionable resorts."[201] The young Frank Scott came to excel in his spoken and written French. Like many other Anglo-Quebecers of his generation, Scott was particularly

---

[198] Michael Oliver, "F.R. Scott: Quebecer," in Sandra Djwa and R. St. J. Macdonald, eds., *On F.R. Scott: Essays on His Contributions to Law, Literature, and Politics* (Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1983), p.165; see also Djwa, *The Politics of the Imagination*, pp.34.
[199] Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, pp.25.
[200] *Ibid*., pp.31-32. As a young boy Scott's father had taken him to place a penny in the wet concrete base of the new Wolfe and Montcalm monument. This remained a cherished memory throughout Scott's life. Oliver, p.165.
[201] Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, p.32.

marked by the events of the 1918 Conscription Crisis, having witnessed the rioting firsthand. He resolved that such a division in Canadian society could never be allowed to happen again. After the war, Scott moved to Montreal and integrated into its Anglo-Canadian community, and he also gained some exposure to the French-Canadian intellectual community. Scott became a Canadian nationalist, North American in outlook, and a strong internationalist. Like many others of the time, he had become disenchanted with the racialism, imperial and European imbroglios, and lack of say in foreign policy that had come to characterize, in his mind, Canada's relationship with Britain.[202]

Scott's sense of distance from Britain stemmed in part from the simple fact that roughly half of the country was not ethnically British. As such, Canadian nationalism would have to be a *civic* nationalism, based on an ideal and sense of place rather than any attachment to race, language or religion:

> If an idea is to be found great enough to evoke a common loyalty amongst all races in Canada and to overcome their differences sufficiently to make stable political union possible, it can only be found in the idea of Canada, the nation. The building of an orderly and just society ... while maintaining a fair balance between the claims of racial and religious minorities – that is a task … that can hardly be achieved, however, except at the expense of the old imperialist foreign policy.[203]

Here was a man who had been born into British-Canadian society, studied in Britain and at Oxford, and who, as late as 1924, believed that Canada retained at least some imperial obligations, and was now calling for an end to ethno-centric British-Canadian nationalism. Scott's transformation spoke to a more general change that was underway.[204]

---

[202] Oliver, pp.165, 168; Djwa, *The Politics of the Imagination*, pp.36, 39.
[203] F.R. Scott, "A Policy of Neutrality for Canada," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.17, No. 2 (January 1939), pp.407-408.
[204] As late as 1924 he still believed that Canada had some imperial obligations, however ambiguous, Moreover, he was also yearning for the establishment of "'a distinct nationality.'" In Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, p.70.

The Great Depression pushed Scott into active politics. By 1931 he had connected with other prominent social democrats and liberals of the day.[205] Over the winter of 1931-1932, Scott helped form the League for Social Reconstruction (LSR) in Montreal and Toronto. Its aim was to discuss social issues and educate the public.[206] The LSR was made up of progressive-minded academics, journalists, ministers, teachers, social workers, and university students, including such members as Woodsworth, Eugene Forsey, Graham Spry, David Lewis, and Escott Reid. They believed that "in Canada only the central government was able to ... protect minority rights adequately."[207] A number of LSR members, including Scott, would go on to found the CCF.

Scott was not anti-Catholic. But as a social democrat, he attacked the corporatist, conservative Catholic element in Quebec for using Jews and Anglo-Canadians as a scapegoat for society's ills. Not only did this inhibit the development of the secular social-welfare state in Quebec, he argued, but the implications for national unity were serious.[208] Scott sought out French-Canadian allies among the intellectual classes who were not beholden to clerico-corporatist dominance. He went to lengths to ensure that CCF policies accommodated Francophone interests, even if its French-speaking membership was relatively limited. He ensured, for instance, that respect for the French language would be part of its platform.[209] At the CCF's founding meeting in Regina in July 1933, Scott declared that the new party would respect minority rights. He also stated

---

[205] See Guy Laforest, *Trudeau and the End of a Canadian Dream* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1995), p.66; Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, pp.108-109, 120.
[206] Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, pp.131, 137-138.
[207] Michel Horn, *The League for Social Reconstruction: Intellectual Origins of the Democratic Left in Canada, 1930-1942,* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), p.vii.
[208] See F.R. Scott (pseud. S.), "Embryo Fascism in Quebec," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.16, No.3 (April 1938), pp.454-466; F.R. Scott, "The Fascist Province"; F.R. Scott, "The Cardinal Speaks," *Canadian Forum* (January 1939), pp.294-295; Oliver, p.166.
[209] He co-wrote the *Regina Manifesto* (1933). Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, p.140.

that the party would encourage Anglo-Canadians to learn French, and encourage bilingualism in other areas. "'There is no reason why we might not come out with a bilingual currency,'" he told the packed hall. His comments were warmly received.[210]

The context in which Scott delivered his speech was significant, and a sign of changing times. The CCF became an important political force in Anglo-Canada. Moreover, Scott's audience in Regina had been overwhelmingly Anglophone and western Canadian. The French-language press took notice.[211] Scott was soon made president of the Quebec wing of the CCF. The Church's denunciations of the party as "*communisant*," however, inhibited more religious French Canadians from becoming closely involved. But Scott's involvement in the Quebec CCF still created a point of contact with like-minded Francophone social-democrats like future Quebec CCF President Guy-Merill Desaulniers and social reformer Thérèse Casgrain.[212] The political climate of 1938 was indeed vastly different from that of 1918. As far as the language issue was concerned, most Canadians had, for now, simply moved on.

Cross-cultural accommodation in practice: Liberal foreign policy and national unity

By the 1930s, efforts were being made across the Anglo-Canadian political spectrum to better accommodate Francophone opinion. The federal Liberals, however, remained the main political vehicle for cross-cultural accommodation. One of the most important factors that helped restore French Canadians' confidence in the federal

[210] Woodsworth, M.J. Coldwell and Robert Gardiner, MP, also spoke to the audience. Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, p.144.
[211] *Ibid*.
[212] Oliver, "F.R. Scott: Quebecer," pp.166. See also Laforest, *Trudeau and the End of a Canadian Dream*, pp.64.

government was the Liberals' approach to foreign policy. When he became prime minister in 1921, King insisted on reserving the Ministry of External Affairs for himself. King knew that navigating the troubled waters of Canadian foreign policy required the utmost tact in order to avoid potentially divisive issues. His undisputed second (and frequent lead) in External Affairs, however, was Ernest Lapointe.[213] The divisions wrought by the Great War and the conscription crisis in particular had convinced both King and Lapointe of the need for a foreign policy that would not pander needlessly to British interests and drag Canada into another foreign war. Canada would have to go its own way. To be sure, King and even Lapointe remained supporters of Canada's membership in the Commonwealth, and they knew that the Empire remained very important to many British Canadians. Given the party's political base in Quebec, however, the Liberals' foreign policy had to remain sensitive to French-Canadian aspirations as well.

The development of a more autonomist Canadian foreign policy during the interwar years has been discussed at length in the historiography, of which the present section makes significant use. What is important here is that this foreign policy be situated within the broader context of the cross-cultural rapprochement that was occurring at other levels of society and in other policy areas at the same time. The Liberal Party was not always the party of national unity.[214] What efforts Sir Wilfrid Laurier had

[213] The most complete work on this point is John MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence on Canadian Foreign Policy* (1999). MacFarlane goes so far as to assert that, in foreign affairs, "Lapointe's voice was clearly dominant over King's." P.9.

[214] At the time of Confederation it was the Liberal-Conservative Party of Macdonald and Cartier. The Liberals of Alexander Mackenzie, Oliver Mowat, Honoré Mercier, and W.S. Fielding had been the strongest advocates of provincial autonomy. It must be remembered, for instance, that in the 1890s the Conservatives of Charles Tupper had proposed remedial legislation that would have better protected the Franco-Manitoban minority than Laurier's proposal, which privileged provincial autonomy over minority rights. See Frances Russell, *The Canadian Crucible*, pp.179-183.

made to that effect had been all but destroyed by the acrimony of the Great War. After the war, and as part of its own rebuilding process, the Liberal political movement responded to what was happening on the ground – changes among the intellectual élite, the business community, professionals, civil society, and the middle class. Liberals and other moderates pressured their political leaders to become more open to and acceptable of the Francophone fact in Canada. This included adopting a foreign policy that better reflected the proclivities of both cultural-linguistic groups.[215]

Moreover, like French Canadians, many Anglo-Canadians were actually pleased by the country's increased international recognition after the Great War. They welcomed Canada's assertion of autonomy – it became a shared source of liberal civic nationalism. Future Liberal Prime Minister Lester Pearson, who joined External Affairs as a young bureaucrat in 1927, summed up King and Lapointe's approach to foreign policy in the interwar years:

> Most important, every position taken by Canada on moving into the world as an independent state had to be related, Mr. King was convinced, to its effect on Canadian national unity, ever his passionate and over-riding concern. He was certain that British traditions, British loyalties, British connections were still deeply and strongly felt by a majority of the Canadian people. But he was aware also of a growing Canadian nationalism centred in, but not restricted to, Quebec; a nationalism dreading involvement in another war; suspicious of British and European policies; sensing that if the price of association with Empire or Commonwealth was to be yet another holocaust across the Atlantic, such a price was far too high to pay. In brief, he believed that any decisions bringing into open conflict two irreconcilable policies, the national against the imperial, would be damaging, even fatal, to Canadian unity.[216]

---

[215] As John MacFarlane has explained, "Both King and Lapointe were more followers than leaders of public opinion" when it came to foreign affairs. MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence on Canadian Foreign Policy*, p.4. While MacFarlane has emphasized "francophone Quebec's influence on Canadian foreign policy," the autonomist position of the interwar period was also the product of moderate Anglo-Canadian public opinion.

[216] In short, King's "abiding preoccupation with Canadian unity was behind every move – or, more accurately, every refusal to move." Pearson, *Memoirs*, p.70. Pearson worked closely with King, Lapointe, O.D. Skelton, and Escott Reid, among others.

More than anything, the party's foreign policy reflected the importance the Liberals had placed on maintaining national unity and encouraging Anglo- and French-Canadian rapprochement. Liberal foreign policy would be driven by moderate French- and Anglo-Canadian autonomists, and informed by compromise on both sides. This was especially apparent in the King government's reticence toward the principle of collective security being promoted by Britain.[217] Despite the presence of a loud minority of British Canadians who continued to oppose any lessening of the imperial connection, and despite a resurgence of French-Canadian ethnic nationalism in the mid-1930s, the Liberals managed to craft an independent foreign policy that more or less accommodated both cultural-linguistic groups. In 1919 the country had just come out of a war, deeply divided. By 1939, it was preparing to enter another war, relatively, and surprisingly, united.

The Liberals wasted little time in charting a new path for the country's international relations. In December 1921, mere days after coming to power, King rejected British Prime Minister David Lloyd George's call for imperial uniformity in foreign affairs. The following September, King refused to send Canadian troops to support Britain during the Chanak Crisis in Turkey, much to the embarrassment of the British Foreign Office.[218] It was the first time that Canada had rejected a direct call from London for military assistance since Confederation.

After having won a seat at the Treaty of Versailles negotiations and in the League of Nations, Canada's international status was ambiguous. In 1922, King sent Ernest Lapointe and W.S. Fielding to the League of Nations conference in Geneva. Fielding, the most prominent of the old Union Government Liberals, told the conference that he was

[217] See Zara Stein, *The Lights That Failed: European International History, 1919-1933* (Oxford, 2005), pp.349.
[218] See Pearson, *Memoirs*, p.65; Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, pp.271.

completely satisfied with Canada's subservience to Britain in foreign affairs. Lapointe, on the other hand, intended to assert Canada's full and separate membership in the League. He did so by leading the call for a an extremely limited interpretation of the League's Article X collective security clause. Lapointe sincerely believed that disarmament, and not military commitments, provided the best means to ensure peace. "'Great policies must be thought out rather than fought out,'" he proclaimed. His approach reflected opinion back home – Canadians were tired of war.[219]

French Canadians could be reassured in the knowledge that much of Canada's foreign policy was being set by one of their own, Ernest Lapointe. The Conservative opposition and older Liberals like Fielding objected to undue assertions of Canadian independence, but younger Liberals like Lapointe and Andrew McMaster pushed for an even greater assertion of Canadian autonomy. Indeed, the Liberals' growing reputation as the party of Canadian independence would attract a coterie of new and energetic MPs, especially from Quebec.[220] King's sympathies were clearly with the new wave. By 1923, Fielding's influence within Cabinet had declined significantly – like most of the other old Union Liberals, he was "heard but not headed" by King when it came to international affairs.[221] Moreover, many Anglo-Canadians were pleased with the role being played by

---

[219] The suppression of Article X and Lapointe's role in it were well received in much of the English-language press, and especially in the French-language papers. Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, pp.50, 59. See also C.P. Stacey, *Canada and the Age of Conflict, Vol. 2, 1921-1948: the Mackenzie King Era* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), pp.56.

[220] "The best men had been absorbed by the federal Liberal Party," remarked Chubby Power, "which had within its ranks men who had been trained in the battles against the Bourassa nationalists from 1910 on; others had gained considerable parliamentary experience in the debates held during the Bennett régime. As a result it could fairly be said that the cream of the Liberal campaigners was concentrated in Ottawa." By 1939, the attractiveness of the federal Liberals for young energetic Quebec pan-Canadians had left the provincial party somewhat weak. Power, *Memoirs*, p.127.

[221] Carman Miller, "William Stevens Fielding," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, Vol. XV (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2000), accessed 20 February 2013, www.biographi.ca. See also Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, pp.268; Ernest Lapointe, *La situation internationale du Canada* (Montreal, 1928), pp.12.

Lapointe. As the frequent head of Canadian delegations abroad, Lapointe's very name had become associated with Canada's new international status.[222]

In addition to Lapointe, one of the most important figures in establishing the new Canadian foreign policy of the interwar period was O.D. Skelton, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs from 1925 to 1941. Skelton had been born in 1878 into a conservative Presbyterian family in Orangeville, Ontario. His academic career, however, introduced him to a more liberal Canadian identity that went beyond the constraints of Anglo-Saxon conservatism and the British Empire. In 1908 he succeeded Adam Shortt as Professor of Political and Economic Science at Queen's. Skelton developed a great affinity for then-prime minister Wilfrid Laurier, completing his *Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier* in 1921. Skelton portrayed Laurier as a moderate in impossible times, unfairly treated by critics, and a victim of the cynicism of those who had divided the country along cultural-linguistic lines for their own political interests. To that end, Skelton supported Laurier's opposition to conscription, seeing the policy as having been designed to whip up British-Canadian sentiment and win Borden's re-election more so than help win the war. (It was around this time that Skelton joined the bonne entente movement.) Skelton strongly opposed to Chamberlainian imperialism for being centralizing, anti-democratic, and a huge stumbling block to national unity.[223] "'No

[222] By 1923 Lapointe had become popular with the influential *Maclean's* columnist J.K. Munro for asserting Canadian autonomy abroad. See Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.62.

[223] Laurier's deft handling of the Boer War and his opposition to writing a blank cheque for the Royal Navy had been especially praiseworthy in Skelton's estimation. See O.D. Skelton, *Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Vol. II, 1896-1919* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1965 [1921]), pp.35, 123. Norman Hillmer described Skelton's tenure in External Affairs as a "three-decade-long crusade for independence from Britain." Norman Hillmer, "National Independence and the National Interest," p.11.

one,'" King recalled, "'could have been more strongly for everything being done for Canada, as against Britain, than Skelton.'"[224]

In Skelton's view, asserting Canadian independence in foreign policy was central to the development of Canadian self-government and the protection of the national interest, which included national unity. Specifically, it was key to making Anglophone/Francophone rapprochement possible. For Skelton, explains his biographer, "Canadian unity was the keystone of the Liberal governing canon. He saw national parties as a glue to unite regions that were still not quite a country, and the Liberal Party as the best glue of all, in large measure because it embraced Quebec and Canada's francophone population as an essential part of the Canadian texture."[225] To that end, Skelton advocated for greater acceptance of biculturalism.[226] As an active member of the ULO he had been part of the campaign to amend Regulation 17. He promoted his outlook both in the university classroom and as a public servant.

It was for this set of views that Mackenzie King endeavoured to bring Skelton into government. In 1922 Skelton gave a series of addresses on Canadian foreign policy to the Canadian Clubs in Toronto and Ottawa. Speaking to the country's newfound *de facto* autonomy and of the need for Canada to safeguard its own interests, Skelton "rejected the idea that it was possible to formulate a common imperial policy."[227] The

---

[224] In Hillmer "O. D. Skelton: Innovating for Independence," p.70.
[225] *Ibid*., p.64.
[226] "Skelton regarded French-English harmony, and the social cohesion that was meant to flow from it, as a fundamental national interest. Following from his argument that domestic interests and international interests were intertwined, and reinforced by his belief that the French fact was an indispensable part of the Canadian story, his sermons on the importance of national unity were a staple of his speeches and writings on foreign policy." He considered both Britain and France to be "'our Mother Countries.'" Hillmer, "National Independence and the National Interest," pp.17-18, 22.
[227] Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, p.51.

prime minister happened to be in attendance.[228] That the two would cross paths through an institute like the Canadian Club spoke both to the importance of such bodies and of the intellectual élites' access to the political classes during the interwar period.

Impressed by Skelton's approach to foreign policy, King asked him to join the Canadian delegation to the 1923 Imperial Conference in London. Skelton accepted the assignment enthusiastically. In 1925, his role was made official with his appointment as Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs. Soon, he would refer to Lapointe and King as "'my chiefs.'"[229] Skelton was little known to the public, but behind the scenes, as personal advisor to the prime minister, he was arguably the most influential bureaucrat in Ottawa, consistently encouraging King and Lapointe to strive for greater independence from Britain. Skelton saw in Lapointe, especially, an ally who could help "keep King on track" whenever the prime minister's British sentimentalism crept up.[230]

After the Imperial Conference of 1923, British officials would regard Skelton as an "'extreme autonomist,'" a "'hack ... who is nervously jealous of what he suspects as English "superiority."'" For his part, Skelton was quite pleased to be "'as popular with the Imperialists here as a skunk at a tea party.'"[231] At Skelton's urging, King had joined the South African and Irish prime ministers in refusing British Prime Minister Lloyd George's call for a single imperial policy in foreign affairs. King was also emboldened by

---

[228] King and his ministers had been fretting over the question of what protocol to apply in sending a condolence letter to the Vatican upon the death of Pope Benedict XV – should it be sent from Canada directly, or through the Colonial Office in London? King identified the moment that had helped make up his mind: "Oddly enough it was after an address by Skelton of Queen's on Foreign policy, an excellent address – pointing out that foreign policy was an extension of domestic policy & that as we had gained control of the one so we must gain control of the other.... Skelton's address would make an excellent foundation for Canadian policy on External Affairs, and Skelton himself would make an excellent man for that department. .... He certainly has the knowledge & the right point of view. The department as at present constituted is a Tory hive." WLMK Diaries, 21 January 1922.

[229] In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.121.

[230] This would be the case, for instance, during the crucial Balfour Conference of 1926. MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence*, p.57.

[231] In Hillmer, "O.D. Skelton: Innovating for Independence," p.62.

the presence of the forceful Canadian autonomist and *Manitoba Free-Press* editor, John W. Dafoe, who he had invited along to ensure favourable press coverage. "'Canada,'" the prime minister declared, "'claimed [the] right of self-government in external affairs.'"[232] King rejected attempts to formalize the principle of mutual security with the Dominions. He insisted that the Canadian Parliament alone could commit Canada to war, and announced that treaties signed by Britain would no longer have any bearing on Canada without its signature. British officials met these statements with "'astonishment.'"[233] The 1923 conference, recalled Dafoe, "'was the decisive moment.'"[234] Dafoe reassured King's inner circle that the position would be "'strongly supported'" by popular opinion in Canada, except by "'the Imperialists, who were against King anyway.'"[235]

Throughout all this, prominent French-Canadian officials played a highly visible role. For his first new hire within the External Affairs bureaucracy, Skelton insisted on an officer with "'a good knowledge of both English and French.'"[236] Université de Montréal law professor Jean Désy got the job. He was followed not long after by Paul-Émile Renaud and Georges Vanier, a future Governor General. By 1930, nearly a third of Skelton's officers were francophones. In addition to Skelton, King had brought federal Justice Minister and former Quebec Premier Lomer Gouin to the 1923 Imperial Conference. Gouin remained in Europe to act as Canada's chief representative at the League of Nations Assembly that year, where he upheld Lapointe's 1922 position on Article X to great effect, securing the support of every single member-nation except

---

[232] John W. Dafoe diary, 14 October 1923, in Ramsay Cook, "J.W. Dafoe at the Imperial Conference, 1923," *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. XLI, no. 1 (March 1960), p.26.
[233] King threatened to withdraw from Imperial Conferences altogether. This came as "'something of a bombshell.'" John W. Dafoe diary, 7 November 1923, in *Ibid*, p.38.
[234] *Ibid*, p.21.
[235] *Ibid*., p.37.
[236] Hillmer, "National Independence and the National Interest," p.15.

Persia.[237] Gouin was succeeded in his position by another prominent French Canadian, Liberal Senator Raoul Dandurand, Canada's representative to the League from 1924 to 1930. Dandurand even sat as President of the League Assembly (1925-1926) – a particular point of pride for French-Canadian observers.[238] (French-Canadian moderates Thomas Chapais and Édouard Montpetit would also represent Canada in the Assembly, in 1930 and 1935, respectively.[239]) Dandurand made clear Canada's aversion to foreign security commitments when he declared at Geneva that, in Canada, "'Nous habitons dans une maison à l'épreuve du feu, loin des matériaux inflammables.'"[240] He pointed out to British officials that "'le Canada [est] sur un pied d'égalité dans la Société des Nations avec toutes les autres nations membres de cette Société.'"[241] Canada's representatives, and not those of the Empire, would speak for the country. Indeed, King's inner circle considered participation in the League as an important counterweight to the imperial connection.[242] In the meantime, Lapointe had also been busy asserting Canadian autonomy abroad, leading trade discussions with Italy, Spain and France. Quebecers were especially proud to see one of their own negotiating directly with the old 'mère patrie.' Lapointe set a precedent by concluding Canada's first international treaty without British involvement, a fisheries treaty with the US, in 1923.[243]

With the question of international treaty-making effectively settled, one highly symbolic issue remained unresolved: the ambiguous role of the Governor General. Was

---

[237] Stacey, *Canada and the Age of Conflict*, pp.66; Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.65.
[238] Lanctot, *Le Canada*, pp.8-9.
[239] Université de Montréal, "Exposition virtuelle: Édouard Montpetit."
[240] In Paquin, "Raoul Dandurand: porte-parole de la conscience universelle," p.42.
[241] In *Ibid*., p.46.
[242] King told J.W. Dafoe that Canada "could do more to further future peace of [the] world through [the] League than by forumulating vigorous policies on international issues in Downing Street." John W. Dafoe diary, 14 October 1923, in Cook, "J.W. Dafoe at the Imperial Conference," p.27.
[243] See MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence*, pp.51-54; Stacey, *Canada and the Age of Conflict*, pp.49.

he to continue as a representative of the British government, advising the Canadian prime minister, or would he solely be a representative of the *Crown* in Canada, acting on the advice of the prime minister?[244] "'His Majesty's Government in Canada,'" O.D. Skelton wrote, "'is not a branch of His Majesty's Government in Great Britain.'"[245] Still, the Governor General remained a tangible symbol of Canada's connection with Britain – any perceived change to the office would provide a litmus test for Anglo-Canadian attitudes.

The issue came to a head in late June 1926. During the federal election of October 1925, the Liberals had failed to win a plurality of seats (only 100 to the Conservatives' 115), but Governor General Byng reluctantly acquiesced to King's request to carry on governing with the unofficial support of the Progressives, who held the balance of power with 22 seats.[246] By mid-1926, the Progressives had begun to waiver over a series of government corruption scandals. King, preferring to face electors on his own terms than to face the humiliation of losing on a confidence motion in the House of Commons, asked Byng to dissolve Parliament. The Governor General refused, insisting that Arthur Meighen's Conservatives had the right to attempt to govern first. Constitutionally, Byng was correct.[247] Politically, however, he had made a serious miscalculation.

King was convinced that the Governor General's refusal to act on the advice of the Prime Minister constituted an affront to Canadian self-government. On this he had the support of Lapointe and Cabinet. King was also operating on the constitutional advice of the long-time advocate of Canadian independence, J.S. Ewart. King went so far as to warn Byng that the Governor General's actions would have grave implications for

---

[244] See Cook, "J.W. Dafoe at the Imperial Conference, 1923," p.28.
[245] In Hillmer, "National Independence and the National Interest," p.21.
[246] H. Blair Neatby, *William Lyon Mackenzie King, Vol. II*, pp.78.
[247] Eugene Forsey, *The Royal Power of Dissolution of Parliament in the British Commonwealth* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp.249-250.

Canada's ongoing attachment to the Empire. Canadians at large, he insisted, would interpret Byng's actions as British meddling in Canadian affairs:

> I then said that were His Excellency to take the course of refusing dissolution when advised to grant it by myself as Prime Minister .... it would mean that Canada was not a self-governing country but was reduced to the status of a Crown Colony, where the representative of the Crown, in the person of an English gentleman, regarded it as within his power to settle differences between political parties and to exercise the royal prerogative apart from the advice of his First Minister.[248]

King's diaries suggest that he sincerely believed that he was protecting Canadians' right to self-government; that he had the only legitimate claim to the office of Prime Minister, having been approved in parliament, and that Byng's refusal of his counsel was inherently undemocratic. A British Lord, and not the people of Canada, he argued, would be choosing the next government. King told his caucus that "as Liberals we would have to make a stand for our rights and constitutional principles on this issue; that we could not surrender to the enemy, that we should not refuse."[249] King's government resigned before it could be defeated in the House, and Byng called upon Meighen to form a government. Less than three days later, the new Conservative government fell on a motion of non-confidence orchestrated by the Liberals. Instead of calling upon King to attempt to govern, Byng consented to Meighen's request for a dissolution.

Even if Byng was justified in refusing King's initial request for a dissolution, the subsequent election would demonstrate that a significant number of both Anglo- and French Canadians supported the Liberals' program of Canadian independence. King was brimming with confidence that he could win on the constitutional question: "we could

[248] WLMK Diaries, 28 June 1926.
[249] WLMK Diaries, 29 June 1926.

wish for no finer election issue," he confided in his diary.[250] After hearing on 2 June that Byng had granted Meighen a dissolution, King met with his shadow Cabinet, "and on entering proposed three cheers. I said now we have the issue in a manner that permits of no mistaking it."[251] King was especially confident that the issue would resonate with "young men & ... women electors." He advised his caucus "to focus attack on Meighen as advisor of crown of such a course, to prepare at once for battle, organize their constituencies" and assemble corresponding "campaign material."[252]

The Liberals played up the constitutional question in Quebec to great effect. It certainly impressed Henri Bourassa. King's rejection of such an affront to Canadian autonomy, Bourassa declared, showed that the Liberal leader was "'essentiellement canadien. Ses adversaires l'accusent de tendances américaines. C'est la vieille rengaine tory contre tout Canadien qui ne veut pas servir l'Angleterre aux dépens de son pays.'"[253] Chubby Power, one of the party's campaign leaders in Quebec, was pleased. Bourassa's support, he wrote, "clinched the situation in so far as the ultra-nationalists were concerned."[254] More significantly, Power observed, the 1926 election marked the first time that "the discussion of conscription pretty well disappeared from the hustings." The importance of this shift should not be overlooked: French Canadians were more interested in voting *for* an independent Canada that could be achieved in partnership with Anglo-Canadians than they were in voting *against* them for the perceived wrongs of the

---

[250] WLMK Diaries, 1 July 1926.
[251] His caucus, whom he met later that afternoon, was equally energized by the election issue: "I was given a great reception when I went in.... I could only say our whole position had been vindicated, that we had a first-class [election] issue." WLMK Diaries, 2 July 1926.
[252] *Ibid*.
[253] In Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.212.
[254] Power, *Memoirs*, p.115.

past.[255] The more ardent nationalistes even invoked the dual rebellions of Lower *and* Upper Canada of 1837-1838 for greater self-government.[256]

In the eyes of much of the public, Byng had meddled in the internal affairs of Canada. He was portrayed (unfairly) as an arrogant English lord, and Canadians from both cultural-linguistic backgrounds were indignant at the thought of having been treated as mere colonials.[257] "King's appeal to the rising consciousness of the Canadian people was extremely effective," recalled Power.[258] The results of the 14 September 1926 election were telling: the Liberals came away with 126 seats, sweeping much of western Canada and Quebec (where they won sixty of sixty-five seats), enough for a majority. The Conservatives won 91 seats, and Meighen lost in his own riding. He resigned as party leader shortly thereafter. The embarrassment of Meighen's three-day government all but ended his political career – he would never sit in the House of Commons again.

1926 was a watershed year in the development of Canadian autonomy from Britain. The Canadian delegation to the Imperial Conference of October-November 1926 arrived with the recent experience of the constitutional crisis fresh in their minds. Having just been re-elected on the autonomy question, they knew that they could push the issue

---

[255] "The strongly nationalist sentiment was more easily appealed to by references to the constitutional question [than by references to conscription]." Power, *Memoirs*, p.114. During the 1930 election, Quebec Liberal candidates "found early in the campaign that references to conscription bored the audiences" – so much so that it was looked down upon as a sure sign of "ignorance of the matters of real importance." P.116. In his long travels during the 1930 campaign, Power found that "throughout the whole of the province, even in the most isolated communities, ... [veterans'] tales of heroism and derring-do attracted far more interest and attention than the tales of those who had adventurously escaped to the woods, been arrested, and brought to barracks." P.118.

[256] See *Ibid*., p.113.

[257] The event, explained Bernard Saint-Aubin, solicited "une réaction nationaliste aussi bien chez les anglophones que chez les francophones." Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.210. It was "'a victory of nationalism.'" Nolan, *Foundations*, p.49.

[258] "[I]n Quebec the fact that a leader of a political party had not only talked back to a representative of the imperial government but had defied him and was actually campaigning against the power and strength of the imperial government was sufficient to carry all before it." Power, *Memoirs*, p.113.

with the support of most Canadians.[259] Headed once again by King, Lapointe and Skelton, the delegation included several other civil servants and officials sympathetic to the autonomist position and cross-cultural accommodation: Canadian High Commissioner to London Peter Larkin, soon-to-be Minister Plenipotentiary to Washington Vincent Massey, Skelton's recent recruit to External Affairs Jean Désy, National Archivist Arthur Doughty, the young Quebec City lawyer and Lapointe's personal assistant Philippe Picard, and Chief of Staff General James MacBrien.[260] Henri Bourassa also played an unofficial role. When they arrived in London, King and Lapointe met with Bourassa at the Ritz Hotel to discuss the upcoming conference. Bourassa commended King and Lapointe for their ongoing assertion of Canadian autonomy, and all three agreed that they should continue to make common cause with the Irish Free State and South Africa.[261]

At the conference, Lapointe hammered out terms for establishing more formalized equal relations between all of the self-governing countries of the Commonwealth, including the UK. Britain's chief negotiator, Lord Balfour, attempted to retain some control over foreign policy through the creation of a central imperial foreign policy committee, whereby Britain would sign international agreements on behalf of the Empire. Skelton rejected this completely, asserting that such an arrangement would diminish "'equal status, either in the League or elsewhere.'"[262] Lapointe agreed, and was joined by

---

[259] Power, *Memoirs*, p.115.

[260] See D.B. Macrae to J.W. Dafoe, 29 October 1926, in Cook, "A Canadian Account of the 1926 Imperial Conference," pp.54-56.

MacBrien was "a neighbour of [civic nationalist C.A.] Bowman in Rockliffe." He was "commissioned to prepare the draft on Canada's position as it related to Imperial defence. Bowman and Skelton were close colleagues." Nolan, *Foundations*, p.51.

[261] Bourassa wrote to Lapointe: "'En faisant bloc avec les Irlandais et Afrikanders (*sic*) vous pouvez faire ce que vous voulez à la conférence.'" In MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence*, p.57.

[262] In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.125. See also D.B. Macrae's letters to J.W. Dafoe during the

Prime Minister Hertzog of South Africa, who threatened to declare outright independence. The British Chancellor, George Cave, "stamped out of the conference," declaring that "he was not going to be a party to the breaking up of the British Empire," and a deal was signed.[263]

The terms were announced in the 18 November 1926 Balfour Declaration. The Declaration made clear that the Commonwealth was a free association of equal nations, none subordinate to any other, and each free to develop its external relations as it saw fit.[264] The Declaration also stipulated that Governors General were representatives of the Crown, and not of the British Government. This symbolically significant measure flowed directly from the Canadian constitutional crisis of that year.[265] Canadian Governors General would from now on take their direction from Ottawa, not London, and inform the Crown directly. Relations would henceforth be handled by diplomats appointed by each government. As Gustave Lanctot asserted, the declaration had effectively changed the role of the Governor General from British representative to "souverain du Canada."[266] The terms of the declaration would be constitutionally formalized with Parliament's passage of the 1931 Statute of Westminster.

The Balfour Declaration emboldened both Anglo- and French-Canadian officials in External Affairs. Lapointe proudly pointed out that the Declaration was not merely the

---

conference, in Cook, "A Canadian Account of the 1926 Imperial Conference," pp. 50-63.

[263] D.B. Macrae to J.W. Dafoe, 21 November 1926, in Cook, "A Canadian Account of the 1926 Imperial Conference," p.61.

[264] Along with Britain, the Dominions were "autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, and in no way subordinate to one another in any respect of their domestic or external affairs." *Balfour Declaration* (1926), p.2, accessed 4 June 2012, http://foundingdocs.gov.au/resources/transcripts/cth11_doc_1926.pdf.

[265] As D.B. Macrae reported at the beginning of the conference, "The Canadian plan is to have him (the Governor General) made a viceroy. He would be appointed by cooperation between the British and Canadian governments but once appointed would be responsible directly to the Crown and no longer an official of the British government." D.B. Macrae to J.W. Dafoe, 29 October 1926, in Cook, "A Canadian Account of the 1926 Imperial Conference," p.55.

[266] See Lanctot, *Le Canada*, pp.164, 205.

product of British benevolence, but rather a formal recognition of established fact, "'une reconnaissance par des égaux.'"[267] Lester B. Pearson, then a young civil servant new to the department, recalled the exuberant mood: "The future was to be based on cooperation between free governments within a Commonwealth of Nations, rather than on a single, centrally administered, imperial policy.... The new principle of equality had been accepted."[268] As Canada's representative to the League of Nations, Senator Raoul Dandurand, explained in 1926, "'Je ne consens pas à être le sujet des sujets du roi. J'entends être le sujet direct du roi, tout comme les citoyens de Londres.'"[269] In one heated exchange, when Canada's vote on several League Council items had not been officially recorded owing to its being part of the British Empire, Dandurand banged his fist on his desk and shouted that Canada was not "'under anybody's wing and Canada should appear like any other member.'"[270] In 1917, French Canadians had had virtually no say in the conduct of Canada's international affairs, resulting in the full-scale imposition of conscription in the name of imperial solidarity and collective security. Less than a decade later, Canadian foreign policy was being shaped with French-Canadian and moderate Anglo-Canadian priorities in mind.[271]

The reception of the Balfour Declaration in the newspapers reflected the ongoing divisions within Anglo-Canadian opinion over the country's role in the British Empire. The staunchly conservative Toronto *Mail and Empire* and the Orangist *Telegram* bemoaned the undermining of the imperial connection.[272] The *Manitoba Free-Press*,

---

[267] In Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.277.
[268] Pearson, *Memoirs*, pp.68-69.
[269] In Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.278.
[270] In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.164.
[271] See MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence*, pp.197-198.
[272] See *Ibid*., pp.127-128.

however, commended Lapointe in particular for having "played a large part" in negotiating and drafting the document.[273] It dubbed the Declaration "the Charter of Dominion Independence," and dismissed naysayers as simple reactionaries who were out of touch with the times:

> This achievement of status ... has been bitterly resisted by a considerable body of opinion ... in Canada on the ground that it would break the British connection and put an end to the British Empire. If the people holding this view were right these disasters are now upon us; but, of course, they were wrong and we shall hear little more from them. They will accept the change, as people of like reactionary bias have accepted other changes in the past.[274]

The French-language press, meanwhile, welcomed the Balfour Declaration and the efforts of Canada's representatives. *Le Devoir* called it "la 'grande charte' des Dominions," and emphasized "l'égalité absolue ... pour les questions étrangères et domestiques."[275] It reprinted the entire declaration in French, pointing out that Canada could no longer be committed to a war against its will.[276] While by no means an Anglo-Canadian 'defeat,' then, the Balfour Declaration was undoubtedly a French-Canadian victory.

Cross-cultural compromise requires an awareness and acknowledgement of the sensibilities of both sides. As Dandurand would later explain in his memoires, "je n'avais jamais cessé d'être un Canadien intégral, anti-impérialiste, sans oublier toutefois le respect que je devais aux sentiments très naturels de mes compatriotes envers leur mère

---

[273] "Play Large Part in Drafting Report," *Manitoba Free Press*, 22 November 1926, p.1.
[274] "The Charter of Dominion Independence," *Manitoba Free Press*, 23 November 1926, p.13. Liberal editor Charles A. Bowman's *Ottawa Citizen* struck a similar tone. See *Ottawa Citizen*, 20-24 November 1926.
[275] "La 'grande charte' des Dominions," *Le Devoir*, 20 novembre 1926, p.3. *Le Droit* also welcomed the motion, but called for greater clarity as to what Canada's obligations remained to the new 'Commonwealth.' See Charles Gauthier, "Les relations interimpériales," *Le Droit*, 24 novembre 1926, p.3.
[276] "Texte français du rapport de la conférence," *Le Devoir*, 22 novembre 1926, p.1.

patrie."[277] In February 1927, King and Lapointe hosted a huge banquet in Toronto at which they reassured some fourteen hundred members of the British-Canadian élite of Canada's ongoing commitment to the Commonwealth. Lapointe shone in his address to the audience. Through autonomy, Lapointe asserted, Canada would not drift toward republicanism, but rather, become a true constitutional monarchy. Those who feared freedom and equal status within the Commonwealth, he argued, were "'timid souls'" who harboured an "'inferiority complex, the subordinate state of mind.'" As a French Canadian, Lapointe explained, he was proud of his role in furthering Canadian autonomy. But he reassured the crowd that autonomy was the best means to preserve both national unity and the best elements of Canada's historical connection with Britain:

> 'Let me tell you the men of my race have been in the very forefront of the battle for responsible government in this country; that they believe in self-government, freedom and national status within the British empire and under the British throne, and they do not believe that a condition of subordination and colonial inferiority is essential to the preservation of their sacred rights.'[278]

The speech was a success, captivating Lapointe's audience and receiving acclaim in the local press.[279]

Having secured the country's unofficial independence in foreign affairs, the Liberal Government moved quickly to formalize its diplomatic presence abroad. In November 1926, immediately after the Balfour Declaration, King appointed Vincent Massey as Canada's representative to the United States, establishing a formal mission there. At Skelton's insistence, the Canadian mission in France, headed by Philippe Roy,

---

[277] Dandurand, *Le sénateur-diplomate*, p.135.
[278] In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.129. Moreover, he was also making the point to the crowd that, as a French Canadian, he had developed greater confidence in the good will of Anglo-Canadians. A decade earlier, Lapointe had feared like many others that the complete removal of British authority – such as final appeals to the JCPC and British control over constitutional amendments – would allow the British-Canadian majority to roll back French-Catholic rights. In 1927, he no longer held this anxiety, seeing that French Canadians could play a greater role in directing the federal government.
[279] Toronto *Daily Star*, 4 February 1927, p.1.

was also given formal standing, and a mission in Tokyo was established.[280] In the summer of 1927, Lapointe, Dandurand and Skelton lobbied for and narrowly won a seat for Canada on the influential League of Nations Council, much to the consternation of some British officials who feared the potential embarrassment of a disagreement with a fellow Commonwealth country. Canadian bilingualism, other countries' admiration of Canada's assertion of autonomy, and the personal popularity of Dandurand also helped make the case. In addition, Canada's advocacy at the League of minority rights, wrote one observer, "did not pass unnoticed among the ex-enemy states."[281] Lapointe was thrilled: "'Canada has grown into full nationhood,'" he declared, "'and now takes her place in the international Council of Nations.'"[282] *Le Devoir* reported with approval that Canada had confirmed "ses droits souverains comme membre indépendant de la Société des Nations."[283]

The principle of equality among Commonwealth nations was acknowledged further at the Imperial Conference of 1929, where Lapointe and Skelton took the lead in negotiations. Lapointe benefitted from the legal advice of other constitutional experts, including Nova Scotian scholars John Read and Charles Burchell, and House of Commons law clerk Maurice Ollivier.[284] Skelton teamed up with the Irish and South African delegates once again, who, much like the Canadians, were keen on asserting independence for cultural and political reasons. The British delegation complained to

---

[280] Hillmer, "National Independence and the National Interest," p.22.
[281] Dandurand had famously declared that: "'It [is] the highest expression of civilization for a government to make a minority forget that it [is] a minority.'" In Frederic H. Soward, "The Election of Canada to the League of Nations Council in 1927," *American Journal of International Law*, vol. 23, no. 4 (October 1929): 753-765, pp.761-762, 765.
[282] In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.134
[283] "Le Canada est élu à la SDN," *Le Devoir*, 16 septembre 1927, p.8.
[284] See Hillmer, "O.D. Skelton: Innovating for Independence," p.64.

Lapointe that Skelton was "'the most extreme nationalist in the whole conference.'"[285] Lapointe told the conference that "'[w]e want to make clear to the world that we are a self-governing nation,'" but that he also considered Canada's long-term membership in the Commonwealth to be a given.[286] The purpose of the conference was to reach an agreement on the legislative terms that would give legal effect to the Balfour Declaration (the eventual Statute of Westminster). Under Lapointe's stewardship, the conference agreed that British laws would no longer apply to any Dominion except at its explicit request, and that each Dominion would henceforth have extraterritorial jurisdiction over its citizens. Further cementing the equality of the Dominions with the UK, any future changes to Royal succession would require the approval of each country's parliament. At the last minute, the chief British representative, Lord Passfield, threatened to renege on the terms. "'Mr. Lapointe, very pacific hitherto,'" Skelton reported to King, "'put the fear of the Lord into Passfield.'"[287] The agreement was signed, unaltered, on 4 December 1929.

Conservative Opposition Leader R.B. Bennett initially protested these developments for speeding along the end of the British Empire, but, like most Canadians, he eventually accepted the new reality of *de facto* independence and moved on.[288] Bennett, although outwardly an imperialist, still placed Canada's interests above those of Britain and the Empire. Moreover, he recognized that the anti-autonomy position had become more of a political liability than anything else – it simply no longer reflected

[285] In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.165.
[286] In *Ibid*., p.165.
[287] In *Ibid*., p.166.
[288] See Power, *Memoirs*, p.115; Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.278.

popular opinion among Anglo-Canadians.[289] His government promptly ratified the Statute of Westminster in 1931, putting an end once and for all to the old British-Canadian dream of Imperial Federation. The following year, at the Commonwealth Conference in Ottawa, Bennett's hard-nosed negotiating with Britain eliminated the prospect of establishing a common Imperial tariff zone. Instead, Bennett wrestled concessions from Britain that favoured Quebec and Ontario manufacturing. As a disgruntled Neville Chamberlain confided in his diary, Bennett espoused a devotion "'in body and soul to the Empire, [but] he did little to put his sentiments into practice. Instead of directing the conference in his role as chair, he conducted himself simply as the leader of the Canadian delegation.'"[290]

French-Canadian observers were noticeably proud of Canada's gradual achievement of independence.[291] "Dans l'histoire immédiate du Canada," wrote Gustave Lanctot in 1934, "le fait qui domine, c'est son ascension au statut international."[292] Even clerico-nationalists like Groulx could not resist celebrating the Statute of Westminster.[293] Even more, this process toward independence had been led by one of their own, Ernest Lapointe. But it had also been supported by most English-speaking Canadians. The apparent change in Anglo-Canadian identity gave French Canadians hope in the possibility of a shared allegiance to a Canada that was no longer beholden to Britain.

---

[289] Indeed, his campaign in 1930 was relatively silent on foreign affairs questions and focussed instead on "the remedies he thought would cure unemployment." Power, *Memoirs*, p.115. He was also influenced in these views by Skelton, who managed to keep his job despite the change in government. See Hillmer, "O.D. Skelton: Innovating for Independence," p.66.
[290] In Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.239.
[291] Achievements like the Balfour Declaration had "attracted considerable attention from the intellectuals in Quebec." Power, *Memoirs*, p.115.
[292] Lanctot, *Le Canada*, pp.163-164.
[293] Groulx was a keynote speaker at a particularly large rally in Montreal organized by nationalistes to celebrate the anniversary of the statute, on 27 November 1938. See Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.255.

Perhaps Confederation could, after all, meet the aspirations of both peoples.[294] The genius of the Statute, according to Lanctot, was its ability to reconcile the views of both English- and French-speaking Canadians; it provided French Canadians with the independence in foreign policy that they so desired, while at the same time maintaining an imperial link for British Canadians by creating "le dominion impérial et indépendant."[295] The last, formal step to cement this independence, Lanctot concluded, would be for Canada to exercise its right to declare war or peace independently from Britain.[296]

Returned to power in 1935, the Liberals continued to avoid commitments to collective security out of a concern for national unity. In late 1935, King reversed an initiative under the Conservative government that would have implemented severe League of Nations economic sanctions against Italy for its illegal invasion of Abyssinia. This was a clear concession to French-Canadian opinion. "In the minds of the people of Quebec," explained Chubby Power, "it became the first test of the government's seriousness with respect to Canadianism and to a strongly Canadian policy."[297] Within cabinet, Lapointe, Power and Cardin, who believed that the League had become a platform for imperial rivalries, sought to limit Canada's commitment to a minimum. Above all, they dreaded the possibility of drawing Canada into a war against Catholic Italy. More ardent supporters of the League, like Minister of Revenue J.L. Isley, called for sanctions in the face of fascist aggression. The division in opinion was also reflected

[294] For Lapointe, especially, it was "important ... for francophone Quebecers to know that their views were not ignored by the majority." MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence*, p.199.
[295] Lanctot, *Le Canada*, p.204.
[296] The country would do just that in 1939, when King made the point of delaying Canada's entry into the war until 10 September, a week after Britain. The significance in French Canadians' eyes of King's delaying the declaration of war should not be underestimated – it provided a sense that Canada had entered the war legitimately, by its own volition, if not enthusiastically. See Lanctot, *Le Canada*, p.167.
[297] Power, *Memoirs*, pp.120-121.

in the English- and French-language presses. Lapointe privately advised King that he would resign if the government endorsed the sanctions, and King relented. National unity, the prime minister confessed in his journal, was more important than any perceived international obligations. King went on vacation, and Lapointe, acting as interim prime minister, announced Canada's withdrawal of its support for the sanctions against Rome.[298]

In September of 1936, King headed the Canadian delegation to the League of Nations for a meeting in the wake of Germany's reoccupation of the Rhineland. There, he made it clear that Canada would not back harsh economic sanctions against Germany, and that he opposed the idea of collective security generally.[299] Attending the Imperial Conference in London in April 1937, King went further, advising Commonwealth leaders that Canada might even remain neutral in a future European conflict. Acting on Skelton's advice, King made no commitment to the principle of collective security among Commonwealth nations. The prime minister was convinced that he was representing the opinion of a majority of Canadians.[300] In the fall of 1938, Lapointe, accompanied by Skelton and by the young Franco-Ontarian MP Paul Martin, travelled to Geneva to make it clear that Canada alone would decide whether or not it would participate in any future conflict.[301] King reiterated his government's inclination for neutrality to the House of Commons on 30 March 1939. It was utter folly, King explained, to assume that "'every twenty years Canada must automatically and naturally take part in a European war to

---

[298] See MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence*, pp.94; Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, pp.283-284.
[299] He used his speech at Geneva to point out that "'The nations of the British commonwealth are held together by ties of friendship ... rather than by commitments to join together in war.'" In Stacey, *Canada in the Age of Conflict*, p.195.
[300] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.300.
[301] See Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, pp.249-250.

save democracy and ... a continent that cannot conduct its own affairs on its own.'" Such a doctrine, King concluded, would expose Canada to "'ruin and political disunity.'"[302] At the very least, King promised, his government would not impose conscription for overseas service in any future conflict. King was joined in his opposition to conscription by Lapointe, Woodsworth and, notably, Conservative Leader R.J. Manion. All agreed that conscription as a military measure was ineffectual and unnecessary, and not worth the price of dividing and possibly destroying the nation – it was a remarkable change from the political climate of twenty years earlier.[303]

By the late 1930s, many Anglo-Canadian moderates, both in and out of the Liberal government, had spoken in favour of Canadian neutrality. They included politicians, academics and public servants, like Escott Reid, O.D. Skelton, Percy Corbett, Lester Pearson, Jack Pickersgill, Hugh Keenleyside, Frank Underhill, J.S. Woodsworth and F.R. Scott.[304] It was for some a question of principle, to assert Canadian independence. "[S]elf-respecting Canadian nationalists," Scott asserted, "want Canada first of all to have complete control over the major issues of peace and war, whatever path she may choose to follow in the future."[305] Scott had been convinced for years that most Anglo-Canadians had grown ambivalent about the imperial relationship, and that they considered Canada's place in the League of Nations to be at least as important. He argued that most Canadians would not want Canada to be dragged into another European war simply because of an outdated political connection with Britain.[306]

---

[302] In Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.304.
[303] See Power, *Memoirs*, pp.122-123.
[304] See Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, pp.160-161, 165, 177-178; Oliver, "F.R. Scott: Quebecer," p.167.
[305] Scott, "A Policy of Neutrality for Canada," p.410.
[306] F.R. Scott, *Canada Today: A Study of Her National Interests and National Policy* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1938), pp.83, 87, 98.

Scott elaborated on the logical inconsistencies in the pro-interventionist position. A European war would have little to do with Canadian interests, given Canada's geographical position and American protection. Moreover, "'If we go into the expected war we shall not be fighting for a new world order, … we shall simply be joining for racial and sentimental reasons in one more battle for a temporary domination of continental Europe.'"[307] If the pro-war camp argued for Canadian intervention on the principles of democracy and defence against tyranny, then why was Canada not sending troops to defend China from militaristic Japan? "'Why is Canada's frontier not on the Yantse (*sic*)?'" Why, Scott asked, should Canadians come to the aid of bombed out Londoners and not the citizens of Nanking if not out of a base racialist sentiment?[308] It was a bold question, and one that spoke to the extent to which some Anglo-Canadians (but by no means all) were already attempting to shake off the last vestiges of their ethnic British identity.

Many of the Anglo-Canadian foreign policy isolationists like Scott were driven by another consideration: a desire to accommodate French Canada. They feared that without full independence, the country would be vulnerable to another major division, which would then enflame territorial-based Québécois nationalism.[309] Quebec-centred French-Canadian nationalism had undergone a resurgence during the mid-1930s. This was in large part a result of the effects of the Great Depression. Where the 1920s had witnessed relative prosperity and improved conditions for most Quebecers, including French Canadians, the 1930s certainly did not. French Canadians, who were more likely to be

[307] F.R. Scott, "What Kind of Peace Do We Want?", *Saturday Night*, 15 July 1939.
[308] In Oliver, "F.R. Scott: Quebecer," p.170.
[309] During 1937-1938, Escott Reid and Percy Corbett encouraged Scott to write *Canada Today*, a position paper that asserted that Canada had a right to neutrality in part because of its cultural-linguistic division over wartime participation. Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, pp.177.

working class or unskilled wage-earners instead of skilled salary earners, and whose entrepreneurs were more likely to operate small businesses than to head larger companies, felt the full effects of the Great Depression. Moreover, the depression laid bare the ongoing socio-economic inequality that separated English- and French-speaking Quebecers. This provided ample fodder for nationalistes of the Groulx variety. Provincial government deals with large natural resource companies based in the US, for instance, received significant criticism, especially when it came to hydroelectricity, pulp and paper. Politically liberal but dissatisfied with the Taschereau government's open approach to outside investment, Paul Gouin (son of Lomer) formed l'Action libérale nationale. Its primary objective was to break the big trusts, reign in high finance, and bring about greater government control over natural resource development so as to ensure that it benefitted French Canadians.[310] Gouin's party was effectively swallowed up by the provincial Conservatives, led by Maurice Duplessis, in November 1935, giving rise to l'Union Nationale. Meanwhile, Taschereau's Liberals had been plagued by a corruption scandal involving the premier's brother. Duplessis's new party swept to power during the August 1936 provincial election, much to the consternation of observers in and outside of Quebec concerned about Canadian unity.

In other words, it was the spectre of Québécois secessionism – years before the Second World War and decades before the Quiet Revolution – that influenced these Anglo-Canadian moderates to begin casting off the British imperial connection.[311] In the fall of 1938, for instance, Alan Plaunt and Norman Lambert, head of the National Liberal

[310] See Patricia Dirks, *The Failure of l'Action Libérale Nationale* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1991), pp.26, for a more detailed discussion of the historical context in which the ALN was created.
[311] José Igartua has emphasized the post-WWII period in understanding this phenomenon. Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution* (2006).

Federation, created the non-partisan Neutrality League. A League petition secured signatures of prominent individuals from across Canada, including in Ottawa and Montreal. The League's *Canadian Unity in War and Peace: An Issue of Responsible Government* (March 1939), co-authored with Scott, emphasized Canada's autonomy in foreign policy matters.[312] Initiatives like those of the Neutrality League were important because the discourse they promoted helped minimize the jingoistic rhetoric that had been characteristic at the outset of the Great War and had led to so much animosity against French Canadians. The French/English dynamic of Fall 1939, then, would be far different from the French/English dynamic of Fall 1914.

As renewed conflict in Europe appeared increasingly likely, Scott's advocacy of Canadian independence in foreign affairs took on a new urgency. It also led to collaboration with French-Canadian nationalistes who were equally keen on delineating a non-interventionist foreign policy for the country. Leading these was the young nationaliste politician and *l'Action Nationale* director, André Laurendeau. As part of the Groulx-inspired nationaliste Jeune-Canada movement of the 1930s, Laurendeau had at one point seriously flirted with Quebec secessionism.[313] As a student in France, however, Laurendeau's exposure after 1935 to the French-Catholic Left led him to question the corporatism and conservative social teachings that had been promoted by Groulx. Moreover, during his studies under the renowned French-Protestant sociologist and historian André Siegfried at the Collège de France, Laurendeau began learning more about Canada outside "Laurentie." Anglo-Canadians, he discovered, were not all

[312] Nolan, *Foundations*, pp.156-157.
[313] André Laurendeau, *Notre nationalisme*, tract no.5, Jeune-Canada, octobre 1935 (Montréal: *Le Devoir*), accessed 12 March 2012, faculty.marianopolis.edu.

belligerent imperialists.[314] Returning to become editor of *l'Action Nationale* in 1937, Laurendeau remained a nationaliste and an admirer of Groulx, but he was determined to establish a less racist and ultra-conservative tone for the journal and to focus instead on the need for social and economic reforms. Moreover, Laurendeau wanted to meet Anglo-Canadians of his own age and political leanings, as Siegfried had counselled him to do. He came to suspect that the perceived Anglo-Canadian threat had been exaggerated owing to "la survivance des attitudes historiques."[315] In 1938, Laurendeau enrolled in a sociology class at McGill, and discovered a left-wing, anti-imperialist group of Anglo-Canadian students and professors, including Scott, who shared many of his views. By early 1939, they had become close acquaintances.[316]

Scott, whose pacifism and neutrality appealed greatly to Laurendeau, saw an opportunity to work against "a replay of the conscription crisis of 1918," which he feared would destroy the country.[317] In spring 1939 the two spearheaded a group of "Quebec nationalists and left-of-centre English and French Canadians on Canadian foreign policy."[318] It included such diverse figures as École de Hautes Études Commerciales professor, *l'Action Nationale* contributor and St. Jean-Baptiste Society head François-Albert Angers, the Union des cultavateurs catholiques's Gérard Filion, McGill student and eventual Bloc populaire supporter Dr. Georges E. Cartier, LSR secretary and Marxist

---

[314] Cook and Behiels, *The Essential* Laurendeau, p.8.
[315] He argued that the United States posed a much greater threat. André Laurendeau, "Menaces de l'américisme," *L'Action nationale* 10, no.4 (décembre 1937): 312-323. He had learned from Siegried that Anglo-Canadians retained their Britishness out of a desire to prevent assimilation into the materialist American model. It was on this basis that Anglo- and French Canadians could make common cause. See André Siegried, *Le Canada: puissance internationale*, 2e édition (Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1937), pp.69-71.
[316] See LaForest, *Trudeau and the End of a Canadian Dream*, p.63; Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*, p.111.
[317] LaForest, *Trudeau and the End of a Canadian Dream*, p.63.
[318] Oliver, "F.R. Scott: Quebecer," p.167.

trade unionist Madeleine Parent, the Student Christian Movement's Neil Morrison and Alec Grant, and George Laxton from the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order.[319] Angers and Scott became good friends through this endeavour. Both men "want[ed] to take each other's ideas seriously" and sought to challenge the stereotypes each side held of the other. As Scott explained to Angers in Fall 1939: "'Many of our people make the mistake of thinking you desire poverty for your people, just as some of your people think we make a god of wealth. There are errors in both views.'"[320] Despite its idealist membership, the group attempted a certain pragmatism. The members reluctantly accepted that Canada could not escape being drawn into the coming conflict in one way or another. But they insisted that French- and English-speaking Canadians must agree beforehand as to what exactly Canada's role would be. Their policy piece, intended for submission to the federal government as, in their words, "'the only one acceptable to all those who have the peace and prosperity of the country at heart,'" was entitled *Toward a Canadian Foreign Policy in the Event of War / Pour une politique canadienne en cas de guerre prochaine*.[321]

Setting out a foreign policy tailored to Canada's bicultural dynamic was the document's central purpose. "'[T]he two official [cultural-linguistic] groups,'" the authors wrote in their preamble, were "'striving to create together one Canadian nation based on a mutual respect for each other's ideals.'" The fact that Scott had been able to forge a common position in which an unabashed nationaliste like Angers and a former secessionist like Laurendeau endorsed the idea of "'une nation canadienne'" was no small

[319] Djwa, *Politics of the Imagination*, p.183.
[320] Oliver, "F.R. Scott: Quebecer," pp.170-171.
[321] The document was originally drafted in French, by F.A. Angers, and sent to Frank Scott in June 1939 for translation. War broke out before it could be submitted to the government, but its main points were published in André Laurendeau, "La guerre," *L'Action nationale*, 14, no.1 (septembre 1939): 3-10.

achievement.[322] The authors argued that Canadian foreign policy must not jeopardize national unity – it must at all costs be a compromise between both national groups. Canadian interests *alone* must be supreme in the formation of any foreign policy. The policy paper went to lengths to accommodate the neutrality favoured by French Canadians and by many Anglo-Canadians, and acknowledged the understandable desire of some English-speaking Canadians to come to the aid of Britain, the Empire, and other democratic allies in their hour of need. Those Canadians who felt duty-bound to enlist in the militaries of British or her allies would be permitted to do so. At the same time, Canada would observe its official neutrality by making no financial contribution whatsoever to those belligerent forces and their Canadian volunteers. Still, Canadian foreign policy would favour Britain in that the country would place an embargo on exports to Germany and its allies while allowing Britain to buy whatever it required.[323] In practical terms, it was essentially the same policy that Laurier had adopted for the Boer War forty years earlier, and that Henri Bourassa had roundly condemned as a 'slippery slope' toward greater military involvement. It was telling that Laurendeau, a huge admirer of both Groulx and Bourassa, was prepared to make such an accommodation.

Moreover, the group's efforts were a sign of the shift that had already occurred in Anglo-/French-Canadian relations. Laurendeau was extremely encouraged by the fact that Anglo-Canadian opinion on the war was far from monolithic. The imperialists, he told readers of *l'Action nationale*, were but a small minority, albeit a vocal one. Laurendeau noted that some Anglo-Canadians, especially on the left, were even more opposed to imperialism than he was! Still, he explained that the policy had been written

[322] Oliver, "F.R. Scott: Quebecer," p.168.
[323] See Laurendeau, "La guerre," pp.3-6.

in the spirit of compromise, out of an acknowledgement of Anglo-Canadians' ideological and racial sympathies that were "aussi sincères que les notres."[324] The achievement of this compromise, and the personal relations that it developed, would have consequences that went beyond the Second World War itself. As Michael Oliver explains:

> The attempt through reasoned discussion to create a common position among anglophone and francophone Quebecers was, in a strange way, a preliminary microscopic version of the enquiries of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. The 1939 meetings included two future commissioners (Laurendeau and Scott) and a co-secretary of the commission (Neil Morrison).[325]

Scott would go on to mentor another future advocate of bilingualism and biculturalism, Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

While French- and Anglo-Canadian intellectuals had been busy attempting to avert a cross-cultural schism, Canada's political leaders had not been idle. When, in March 1939, Hitler abrogated the Munich Agreements by annexing what remained of Czechoslovakia, it was clear that war was imminent. In anticipation of the intensification of Anglo-Canadian pro-war and French-Canadian anti-war sentiment, King and Lapointe skilfully manoeuvred to placate both as best they could. In parliament, King reassured Anglo-Canadians that Canada would not sit idly by in the event that Germany and Britain went to war. He attempted to reassure French Canadians by insisting that the country would not resort to conscription for a foreign war.[326] In his follow-up address, Lapointe attempted to persuade Quebecers to support entry into the war for the sake of national unity. Strict neutrality would hardly be fair to Anglo-Canadian sentiments. "La politique du Canada doit rallier l'adhésion aussi générale que possible de sa population," he

[324] Laurendeau, "La guerre," p.8.
[325] Oliver, "F.R. Scott: Quebecer," p.175, note 3.
[326] "Pas de Conscription," *La Presse*, 31 March 1939, pp.1.

explained. "L'orientation de notre politique étrangère est une phase du problème de l'unité nationale."[327]

In a similar vein, Lapointe appealed to Anglo-Canadian MPs to understand that conscription had to be avoided for the sake of national unity. He implored them to try to appreciate "les sentiments, la mentalité" of French Canada. French Canadians, he explained, had "seulement un pays, une patrie."[328] They would fight for Canada, but could never acquiesce to being forced to fight on the other side of the Atlantic. Lapointe's speech was widely hailed in the Anglo-Canadian press. "Lapointe had risked his influence in French Canada to tell his compatriots that neutrality was out of the question because it would break the country apart," explained his biographer, and English-speaking Canada knew it.[329] *Saturday Night* called Lapointe "'Canada's Number One Statesman'" for having delivered "'the most courageous utterance ever made by a French Canadian.'"[330]

When the royal couple visited as King and Queen of *Canada* in May 1939, the reception across the country, including in Quebec, was overwhelmingly positive. Lapointe and Rinfret convinced Cardinal Villeneuve – a Prince of the Church and thus French Canada's closest equivalent to a 'royal' – to provide visible support for the visit. Villeneuve issued a directive to parishioners to welcome the royals upon their arrival at Quebec City. The reception was enthusiastic. Huge crowds gathered in the lower town to meet the arriving ship, while still more awaited along the Plains of Abraham. No one harboured any illusions – George VI was visiting Canada in an effort to shore up support

[327] "Le très hon. M. Lapointe prend parti à son tour," *La Presse*, 1 April 1939, p.24.
[328] *Ibid*.
[329] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.267.
[330] In *Ibid*., p.267.

for the impending war. For King and Lapointe, however, the event marked an opportunity to once again underscore Canadian autonomy and reinforce national unity. The royals opened the new Supreme Court building, and King and Lord Tweedsmuir agreed that the governor general would remain at home, while the prime minister accompanied the royal couple throughout their tour as a demonstration of Canadian autonomy and equal status within the Commonwealth. Lapointe and Secretary of State Fernand Rinfret had also insisted on this symbolic assertion of Canadian sovereignty.[331] Lapointe took pleasure in the Queen's bilingual parting remark: "'Que Dieu bénisse le Canada, God bless Canada.'"[332]

By mid-1939, the militant ethno-centric clerico-nationaliste fervour to which the Great Depression had given rise in Quebec had begun to dissipate (although by no means disappear). The Liberals' convincing provincial and federal election victories of 1939 and 1940 over the anti-war nationaliste parties bore testament to this. In October 1939, a rejuvenated Quebec Liberal Party led by former Taschereau ministers Adélard Godbout and T.D. Bouchard, progressive in outlook and advocating greater cross-cultural understanding, was returned to power.[333] To be sure, the electoral defeat of Maurice Duplessis's anti-war Union Nationale government was in part the result of his administration's many failures; he had failed to lower taxes and the debt, unemployment continued to rise and inept legislation resulted in lower take-home pay for employees. Moreover, more moderate young pan-Canadian nationalists like André Laurendeau and

---

[331] J. William Galbraith, "Fiftieth Anniversary of the 1939 Royal Visit," *Canadian Parliamentary Review*, Autumn 1989: 7-11; Stacey, *Canada in the Age of Conflict*, pp.243-248.
[332] In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.281.
[333] See T.D. Bouchard, *Mémoires: Quarante ans dans la tourmente politico-religieuse* (Montréal: Beauchemin, 1960), pp.83, 123; T.D. Bouchard, *L'Enseignement de l'histoire*. Bouchard founded the Institut démocratique canadien and the Canadian Unity Alliance in 1943. See Archives du Musée de la civilisation (Québec), Fonds T.D. Bouchard, P31, archival description, accessed 25 February 2013, http://www.mcq.org/fr/complexe/ craf_fonds/craf_fonds.php?idEv=w515.

Frank Scott had also come to the fore.[334] On balance, the Liberals had been able to win as a result of Lapointe and King's deft handling of Canadian foreign policy throughout the course of the interwar period. In 1939, Duplessis's cultural isolationism did not resonate with Quebecers as it had before, just as the unconditional imperialism of the past had failed to stir the hearts of most Anglo-Canadians.

[334] See Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.271.

CONCLUSION

The relative national unity with which Canada confronted the Second World War was the result of a twenty-year process to construct a more dynamic and unifying relationship between Anglophones and Francophones. This process had been driven not only by political élites at the top, but also from the ground up – by formal reconciliationist initiatives, the coming together of important elements of Anglo- and French-Canadian civil societies, and a greater acceptance among the public for Canada's cultural duality. During the 1920s and '30s, members of this movement managed to infiltrate the national Liberal Party. Collectively, these developments pushed the Liberal Party into becoming the country's main political vehicle for cross-cultural accommodation, and allowed for major compromises on the two most contentious issues in the country's history: language, and foreign policy.

Both the English- and French-language historiographies would agree that Canadian identity changed significantly after the Great War. Much of the similarity ends there. Anglophone historians tend to emphasize how Canada's impressive wartime participation created a sense of pride and a desire to assert greater autonomy from Britain.[1] Francophone historians tend to emphasize how Canada's conscription crisis created a sense of pessimism and helped transform French-Canadian nationalism into Québécois nationalism.[2] I do not contest either of these assertions. The Great War was indeed a turning point in the identity formation of both Anglo- and French Canadians. It

[1] See Desmond Morton, "Was the Great War Canada's War of Independence?" Images of a Forgotten War (National Film Board, 2011) accessed 15 September 2013, http://www3.nfb.ca/ww1/independence.php.
[2] See, for instance, Denis Monière, *Le développement des idéologies au Québec, des origines à nos jours* (Montréal: Québec/Amérique, 1977), pp.361.

affected different people in different ways. But I think it affected both cultural-linguistic communities in a singular way that has not been fully explored by historians. For moderates from both groups, the war laid bare the fragility of a national unity that had been undermined for decades by the conflict between imperialism and ultramontanism. The war created a sense of urgency for rapprochement.

It would be a great exaggeration to suggest that a wholesale reconciliation was achieved between Anglo-Canadians and French Canadians after the Great War. Indeed, the limitations of rapprochement left enough disequilibrium for ongoing dissatisfaction, resentment, and conflict for decades to come. Despite the advances made during the interwar period, French Canadians continued to lag behind Anglo-Canadians economically and in the federal public service. During the Second World War, the ethnic nationalism of Canon Lionel Groulx gained traction alongside the anti-war movement. Some French Canadians would never again embrace the pan-Canadian civic nationalism of George-Étienne Cartier, Wilfrid Laurier and Ernest Lapointe. The country endured another conscription crisis (albeit on a much more limited scale), and the conservative nationalistes of Maurice Duplessis were returned to power. Some British Canadians, meanwhile, continued to bitterly oppose greater recognition of Canada's French fact, both in and outside Quebec. They were British subjects born and British subjects 'til they died, deeply and emotionally attached to the Empire, and unequivocal in their support for British military adventures.[3]

While it is important to acknowledge the limitations of rapprochement, it would also be an exaggeration to assert that no meaningful improvement was made to French-

[3] See Granatstein and Hitsman, *Broken Promises*, pp.185-244, for a more complete account of the second conscription crisis and its fallout.

/Anglo-Canadian relations between the world wars. I have argued here that an important, albeit 'partial,' rapprochement was achieved. Crucially, it began when cross-cultural relations were at their lowest point, during the Great War. The early Bonne Entente League provided the first formal attempts to restore the process of élite accommodation. It began amidst the furious conscription debate and endured into the Great Depression. Without the 'baby steps' that it took towards élite accommodation, longer-term rapprochement would not have been possible. The successes (and the failures) of the early bonne entente movement helped set the tone for future attempts at bringing about rapprochement. It demonstrated to both peoples that there were moderates on both sides, and that actions would have to follow words. The personal connections that this movement created were crucial. Many of the early bonne entente members would go on to join other movements to lobby for biculturalism and Canadian autonomy, and some would even gain influence within the Liberal Party.

The emergence of an alternative identity for moderate Anglo-Canadians was especially important in making rapprochement possible. Imperialists were increasingly challenged by a more liberal, North American, and Canadian-centred nationalism – one more open to Canadian independence within and even outside the Empire and more tolerant towards French-Canadian Catholics and the European immigrants who had poured into Canada during the Laurier years. Significantly, a number of English-speaking intellectuals recognized that British-Canadian intransigence, more so than any wrong committed by French Canadians, had contributed the lion's share toward the ill feeling that had developed during the war – it was their side that was in need of enlightenment. By war's end, a great many Anglo-Canadians had lost their zeal for the aggressive,

exclusive and ethno-centric *British*-Canadian nationalism of the pre-war period. Proud of their war-time achievements yet disillusioned by the violence and destruction begot by aggressive imperialism, many were convinced that the achievement of a uni-lingual, Protestant and culturally homogeneous Canada was no longer realistic, just, or even desirable.[4] A growing segment of Anglo-Canadian society was prepared to accept a more pluralistic 'two founding peoples' view of the country. Moreover, Anglo-Canadians' desire for autonomy from Britain after 1918 would prove more compatible with French Canadians' conceptions of the country's place in the world.[5] By the end of the interwar period, most Anglo-Canadians appeared to perceive Canada as a nation independent from Great Britain.[6] Moderate intellectuals played a crucial role in effecting this change – as authors, teachers, journalists, and bureaucrats.

For them, history stood out as a means for British Canadians to understand and so accommodate the different outlook of French Canada, but also to identify those things they shared in common. Anglo-Canadian intellectuals like Arthur Hawkes, Percival Morley, William Moore, George Wrong, and A.L. Burt, to name a few, increasingly took a personal ownership of, and pride over, French-Canadian history as a part of their revised conception of Canada's national story. They attempted to incorporate French-Canadian history into a larger Canadian narrative, and argued that Anglo-Canadian society would be 'all-the-richer' if it would only embrace the French language and certain aspects of French-Canadian culture.

---

[4] See Pearson, *Memoirs*, p.67.
[5] David E. Smith, *Federalism and the Constitution of Canada*, p.158.
[6] See *Toronto Daily Star* 19 August; Ryerson, French Canada, p.234. When asked: "Do you think of Canada as an independent country or still dependent on Great Britain?", 52% of Anglo-Canadian respondents answered "Yes," 6% were undecided, and 42% answered "No." If asked in 1939, the number of "Yes" respondents might have been even higher, given the prewar context.

In French-speaking Canada as in English-speaking Canada, the debate over identity raged among intellectuals. With the disillusionment that followed the Great War and the conscription crisis, many French Canadians appeared ready to abandon the pan-Canadian bicultural nationalism once advocated by Henri Bourassa in favour of Canon Lionel Groulx's brand of clerico-nationalism and his deep skepticism of Anglo-Canada. Some of his disciples even called for outright secession from Confederation. While Groulx achieved great prominence during the interwar period, the discourse was far from monolithic. Bourassa, it is often forgotten, remained an influential figure – as a speaker, an author, and as an occasional advisor to the Canadian government.[7] Moderate intellectuals both in and outside the Church, like Thomas Chapais, Canon Camille Roy, Jean-Charles Harvey, Gustave Lanctot, Canon Arthur Maheux, Édouard Montpetit and Father Georges-Henri Lévesque, among others, insisted that French Canadians throughout Canada could and should claim a more meaningful and rewarding role in the federation by engaging with Anglo-Canadians.[8] Without ignoring the importance of protecting their distinct culture and language, they emphasized historical examples of cross-cultural collaboration, and pointed out that French Canadians had long played an important role in the historical development of Canada, and not just Quebec.

Moreover, these intellectuals established important links with the Anglo-Canadian moderate liberals. Together, they successfully lobbied for greater recognition of Canada's French fact. Convinced of the sincerity of some in English-speaking Canada, French-

[7] See, for instance, Trofimenkoff, *Action Française*, p.6.

[8] John MacFarlane maintains that "French-Canadian socioeconomic views were much more complex and varied and suggest that the sort of liberalism represented most notably by Laurier and Lapointe, not conservative nationalism, was the major political ideology during period from 1867 to 1940." MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence on Canadian Foreign Policy*, pp.14-15. Claude Couture makes a similar argument in *Le mythe de la modernisation du Québec: Des années 1930 à la révolution tranquille* (Montreal: Méridien, 1991), pp.10-11, 49-110.

Canadian moderates endeavoured to persuade the public and their colleagues that rapprochement with Anglo-Canadians was both desirable and possible. These moderate intellectuals provided the leading edge for a broader trend of positive cross-cultural exposure for a growing number of middle-class Anglophones and Francophones, especially in Ontario and Quebec.

Socio-economic and cultural convergence played an important role in making greater unity between Anglophones and Francophones possible. As the Anglo- and French-Canadian middle-classes grew, many of their social, economic and cultural experiences converged, following similar yet different paths. This helped bring elements of Anglo- and French-Canadian civil society together in common cause. Some civil society leaders were motivated by idealism and a genuine desire to construct a better cross-cultural relationship. Just as many were driven by pragmatism – it simply made sense for people with similar professional, business, or religious interests to work together toward common goals. The interwar period witnessed a proliferation of national fraternal, professional, commercial and trade associations and clubs that facilitated this process. Church leaders who recognized the costs of religious and cultural hatreds also worked together to smooth relations, and imparted their sentiments on priests and parishioners. Whereas previous generations of British and French Canadians had lived in relative isolation from each other, during the interwar period more Canadians from both communities had the chance to experience something different, thanks to cultural and technological changes taking place in both societies. Through an expansive popular culture – in books, newspapers, on radio and the silver screen, through language instruction and history lessons in the classroom and the lecture hall, via travel and

tourism – more Canadians had opportunities to learn about or interact with the 'other' in a positive way. Public celebrations, like the sixtieth anniversary celebrations of Confederation, and other official measures, like bilingual stamps and currency, also promoted cultural dualism to the masses. Young Canadians also experienced this change. Those who were anxious to distinguish themselves from their parents' generation attempted to demonstrate a greater open-mindedness toward the other 'solitude.' They, too, had a shared interest in working and lobbying together for greater respect and recognition. Like the social progressives in both English- and French-speaking Canada, they had been exposed to new political ideas that demanded a greater role for the state in the creation of a more just society.[9] Even in the depths of the Great Depression and on the eve of another global conflict, these young Canadians were optimistic about their ability to change the country, if not the world.

Developments in the intellectual world, within civil society, and among the general public helped compel the political leadership to contribute to the construction of a more meaningful and unifying Anglophone/Francophone relationship. The early bonne entente movement had laid the groundwork for élite accommodation, and now it could occur at the highest levels – among government ministers, premiers, opposition leaders and prime ministers. The influence of the intellectual moderates on Canadian politics also became apparent – in the personal connections established between intellectuals, academics and politicians, and in the moderate discourse that the politicians increasingly appropriated. The new discourse of English/French cooperation could be observed even within Conservative ranks, and in new parties like the Cooperative Commonwealth

[9] See Michael Behiels, "The Bloc Populaire Canadien: Anatomy of a Failure, 1942-1947," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 18, no. 4 (Winter 1983-84): 45-74; Horn, *The League for Social Reconstruction*, pp.vii.

Federation. The Liberal parties of Quebec and Canada, however, were especially important in implementing real policies that helped restore national unity. Moreover, they were increasingly confident that public opinion had grown more understanding of cultural federalism. The deft handling of Canadian language and foreign policy by Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King and Justice Minister Ernest Lapointe helped restore French-Canadians' confidence that they, too, had a meaningful say in the direction of the country.

When it comes to the Second World War and its implications for cross-cultural relations, there is a temptation to read history backwards; to assert that any desire for rapprochement on the part of Anglophones before 1939 had been meaningless. Under this line of reasoning, what good had been accomplished was undone by conscription in 1944 and the re-election of Maurice Duplessis. Such an assessment is far too simplistic.

It bears reminding that the country was far more united entering the Second World War than it had been exiting the Great War. This could not have been possible without some level of meaningful cross-cultural compromise. First, the language issue in Ontario that had undermined national unity during World War I had been effectively resolved. Second, Prime Minister King and Ernest Lapointe had steadfastly refused to make any formal commitment to collective security with Britain. When Britain and France finally declared war on 3 September 1939, King and Lapointe insisted that the country remain neutral until having made its own, sovereign declaration. This formal assertion of neutrality was unprecedented in Canadian history. Even the nationaliste press had to concede that the Canadian government had done everything in its power to avoid a

blind commitment to war.[10] It was only after Anglo- and French-Canadian MPs had voted overwhelmingly to declare war that Canada entered the conflict, on 10 September 1939.[11]

A fortnight later, on 24 September 1939, Quebec Premier Maurice Duplessis called a snap election in the hopes of capitalizing on French-Canadian anti-war sentiment. He accused Ottawa of plotting to use its war-time powers to centralize government, undermine provincial autonomy, and assimilate French Canadians.[12] In a radio address on 9 October, Ernest Lapointe laid out his manifesto for national unity to Quebecers:

> J'ai travaillé toute ma vie à la réalisation de l'unité canadienne. J'ai réussi à cicatriser bien des blessures. J'ai tenu haut et ferme la bannière du Canada, convaincu que l'intérêt sacré de ma province repose dans la préservation de l'idéal canadien. Il faut que le Canada reste uni. Toute tentative de rompre cette union est fratricide et criminelle. Il nous faut la tolérance, le respect les uns des autres.[13]

As André Laurendeau explained, the election was "'a kind of plebiscite'" on participation.[14] The results on 25 October 1939 were decisive. The Liberals of King's ally Adélard Godbout swept to power with 70 seats. Duplessis's Union Nationale was reduced to 15.[15] Quebecers had apparently opted for national unity instead of provincial isolation. Moreover, their willingness to compromise had been borne out of the knowledge that they had had a meaningful voice in establishing the foreign policy of the past two decades.[16]

---

[10] See MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence*, pp.151; Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, pp.273-274.
[11] Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.281; Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.308.
[12] Saint-Aubin, *King et son époque*, p.316.
[13] "Il faut que le Canada reste uni," *La Presse*, 10 October 1939, p.11.
[14] In Betcherman, *Ernest Lapointe*, p.287.
[15] The Liberals captured 54% of the popular vote to the UN's 39%. CBC, "History of Quebec Elections: A Timeline of Elections Since 1867" (August 2012), http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/quebecvotes2012/features/electionhistory/, accessed 20 July 2013.
[16] As Chubby Power surmised, "it would have been far more difficult, when the great testing time came

The federal election of 1940 was equally symbolic. In January, Ontario Premier Mitch Hepburn had accused the federal government of a lacklustre war effort, and hinted at the need for a coalition government after the fashion of Borden's disastrous 1917 Union Government. King immediately called an election and ran on his pledge to avoid conscription.[17] On 26 March 1940, the Liberals won the greatest landslide since Confederation, with 184 seats (including 64 of 65 in Quebec) to the Conservatives' 39, and a combined 18 for the CCF and Social Credit.[18]

Five years later, the state of national unity at the end of the Second World War, although strained, was far better than it had been a generation earlier. The Liberals had placated early calls for conscription with a system of obligatory national registration for home service. In terms of maintaining national unity, the compromise was an initial success. Nationaliste petitions against the measure "found few signers," and Quebecers complied with few exceptions – even André Laurendeau registered, albeit unenthusiastically.[19] By and large, most Anglo-Canadians had also hoped to avoid conscription early on for the sake of national unity.[20]

Significantly, Quebecers demonstrated more support for the war effort than they had twenty years earlier. Enlistment rates in Quebec were more than double what they had been in 1914-1918, and Quebecers bought war bonds at the same rate as other

---

over the question of participation in the European war of 1939, for a government so imperialistically and internationally minded to carry Quebec with it. That was a difficult enough task as it was, but it could have been impossible." Power, *Memoirs*, p.121.

[17] See MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence*, p.157Saint-Aubin, King et son époque, p.317; Betcherman, Ernest Lapointe, pp.302; Power, *Memoirs*, p.131.

[18] See Parliament of Canada, "History of Federal Ridings Since 1867 – Results of Federal Election of 1940," (n.d.), http://www.parl.gc.ca/About/Parliament/ FederalRidingsHistory/, accessed 20 July 2013.

[19] Betcherman, Ernest Lapointe, p.318; Saint-Aubin, King et son époque, p.321. See also MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence*, p.175.

[20] The *Globe* reminded readers that "the French Canadians, equally concerned for the freedom assured by British institutions but without the same background [as us].... lack the urge to go back to Europe to fight for a cause sponsored by a nation to which allegiance has no direct appeal." "The Conscription Issue," *Globe*, 19 September 1939.

Canadians.[21] Whereas in 1914 Minister of Defence Sam Hughes had opposed any accommodation of French in the military, in 1939 the top brass were anxious to demonstrate a greater openness to French Canadians for the sake of national unity. By 1941, one French-language and two bilingual training centres had been established.[22] During the Great War, only one field unit (the 22nd battalion) had operated in French. During the Second World War, the military employed six French-speaking units in the field.[23] From early on, the generals placed the French-speaking units in brigades alongside English-speaking units in the hopes that it "'would give French and English speaking Canadians wider contacts. Men from the prairie would be working daily with French speaking Canadians from Quebec. The result would be a contribution of great national value to the future life of the Dominion.'"[24]

To suggest that the sum effect of the Second World War was to unite Anglo- and French Canadians in common cause would be wishful thinking. But it did not divide them to nearly the same extent as the previous war. With pressure mounting for conscription after the disastrous fall of France and German and Japanese advances in the

---

[21] The rate of enlistment among men of military age in Quebec was 10% during WWI and 26% during WWII. Some 161,000 French Canadians volunteered during WWII, making up roughly 20% of Canada's armed forces – a much higher rate than in 1914-1918, and above the 13% that they represented in the public service in 1939. See Craig Brown and Loveridge, "Unrequited Faith: Recruiting the CEF, 1914-1918," p.58; and Veterans Affairs Canada, "Military – Historical Background," (n.d.), http://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/collections/lff/military, accessed 10 July 2013; MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence on Canadian Foreign Policy*, p.177

[22] MacFarlane, *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence*, p.177.

[23] These were le Royal 22e, le Régiment de la Chaudière, le Régiment de Maisonneuve, le Régiment des Fusiliers Mont-Royal and le 4e Régiment d'artillerie moyenne, all in the Army, plus the 425e "Escadrille des Alouettes" in the Royal Canadian Air Force. Le Régiment blindé des Sherbrooke Fusiliers was also dominated by Francophones. See Jean-Pierre Gagnon, "Les Historiens canadiens français et la participation canadienne française à la Deuxième Guerre mondiale," *Bulletin d'histoire politique*, vol. 3, no. 3, 1995; Jean-Yves Gravel, *Le Québec et la Guerre* (Montreal: Boréal, 1974), p.108.

[24] General Odium to General McNaughton, in C.P. Stacey, *Official History of the Canadian Army in the Second World War, Vol. I: Six Years of War, the Army in Canada, Britain and the Pacific* (Ottawa: National Defence, 1955), p.45. See also Jean Pariseau and Serge Bernier, *Les Canadiens français et le bilinguisme dans les forces armées canadiennes, Tome I, 1763-1969: Le spectre d'une armée bicéphale* (Ottawa: National Defence, 1987), ch.5.

East, Prime Minister King called and won a plebiscite in 1942 to release his government from its initial promise, although Quebec voted overwhelmingly against doing so. Under intense pressure, King held out as long as he could. Instead of imposing across-the-board conscription for overseas service (as in April 1917), in November 1944 he acceded to a one-time 'instalment' of men who had already been conscripted and trained for home service to be sent overseas. Only 2,500 conscripts served at the front, ten times less than in 1917-1918.[25] The measure sparked protest in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada. Soft nationalistes like André Laurendeau were deeply disillusioned.[26] But there were no violent riots like those of Easter Monday 1918.[27] Quebecers expressed their dismay over the renewed call for conscription at the ballot box, ousting Adélard Godbout's Liberals in August 1944 and electing Duplessis's Union Nationale. Still, the provincial Liberals managed to win the popular vote, and many Quebecers proved more upset over war-time economic controls than by the change in policy over conscription.[28] Laurendeau's vigorously anti-conscription Bloc populaire, meanwhile, captured only four seats. In the federal election of June 1945, the results were even less impressive for the Bloc, and Quebecers helped re-elect the Mackenzie King Liberals.[29] After the war, working- and middle-class Anglophones and Francophones moved on to embrace the new Canadian

---

[25] 69 of whom died. By comparison, 24,000 Canadian conscripts served at the front in the last months of the Great War, and thousands became casualties. See Morton, *A Military History of Canada*, p.221.

[26] Laurendeau wrote a memoire of the event. See André Laurendeau, *La Crise de la conscription: 1942* (Montréal: Les Éditions du Jour, 1962).

[27] As Chubby Power explained, "the anti-conscription feeling in Quebec was neither so deep-seated nor so bitter as it had been in the 1917 election." Indeed, conscription in 1944 had not been preceded by the same level of anti-French vitriol as in 1917. Power, *Memoirs*, p.140.

The greatest threat of violence occurred not in Quebec, but in BC, when a group of conscripts from Saskatchewan threatened to turn their guns on their superiors. See "Armed Violence Threat Holds Unit in Camp," *Globe*, 28 November 1944.

[28] See Power, *Memoirs*, pp.146-147, 176-177. Duplessis established his razor-thin majority of 48 seats with 38% of the popular vote to the Liberals' 39.4% of the popular vote. CBC, "History of Quebec Elections."

[29] See Parliament of Canada, "History of Federal Ridings Since 1867 – Results of Federal Election of 1945," (n.d.), http://www.parl.gc.ca/About/Parliament/ FederalRidingsHistory/, accessed 20 July 2013.

social-welfare state of King and Louis St. Laurent, in spite of the misgivings of the Union Nationale and some of the clerico-nationaliste élite.[30]

There is an ebb and flow to cross-cultural relations – two steps forward and one step backward as historical actors push for change against the limitations of the times in which they live. But momentum builds, and more substantial change is made possible by the developments that preceded it. The 'partial' rapprochement of the interwar period helped lay the groundwork for further rapprochement post-WWII. It gave rise to a new conceptualization of Canada that in turn would allow for an official Canadian citizenship, complete independence in foreign affairs, the country's second French-Canadian prime minister, a Royal Commission on Canadian culture, Radio-Canada and CBC Television's *La famille Plouffe/The Plouffe Family*, a Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, a new Canadian flag bereft of British symbolism, and, remarkably, an *Official Languages Act*.[31] Such developments would be propelled by Canadians who had encountered the accommodationist movement of the interwar years – people like Louis St. Laurent, Hume Wrong, Vincent Massey, Lester Pearson, André Laurendeau, Thérèse Casgrain, and Paul Martin (Sr.), among others. In academia, authors like Arthur Maheux, Gustave Lanctot, Arthur Lower and Frank Scott continued to promote cross-cultural understanding and rapprochement, and counted budding young intellectuals like Pierre Elliot Trudeau among their disciples.[32]

---

[30] See Dominique Marshall, *The Social Origins of the Welfare State: Quebec families, compulsory education, and family allowances, 1940-1955* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2006), pp.161.

[31] José Igartua has chronicled these developments at length. See his concluding remarks in Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution*, pp.222-227.

[32] See Michael D. Behiels, *Prelude to Quebec's Quiet Revolution: Liberalism versus Neo-Nationalism, 1945-1960* (McGill-Queen's, 1985), p.116.

The examples of Frank Scott and Pierre Trudeau should remind us, as Magda Fahrni and Jeffrey Vacante have done, that we must not overlook the reciprocating influences of Canada's French- and English-speaking peoples. Moreover, these histories are not territorially limited – the history of one is not confined to Quebec, nor is the other confined to an imaginary 'Rest of Canada.' Canadian federalism, as David E. Smith explains, has a cultural as well as a territorial dimension. Finally, while looking forward in time to recognize the long-term effects of historical developments, we must avoid the temptation to dismiss interwar rapprochement from a twenty-first century hindsight. The conscription crisis of the Second World War divided Canadians, true. The Quiet Revolution and Charles DeGaulle's declaration for a "Québec libre" reinvigorated Québécois secessionism. The economic ascendancy of Toronto and Alberta engendered Anglophone indifference toward Montreal and French Canada. But these later developments do not mean that the cross-cultural rapprochement of the 1920s and '30s was not important for those who lived it, or that it did not have long-term implications of its own.

Indeed, the 'partial' rapprochement of the interwar period stands as a reminder of just how intertwined – inseparable even – are the histories of French and English Canada. Hugh MacLennan spoke of two solitudes. John Ralston Saul mused about Siamese twins. I might also posit a sibling analogy – brothers or sisters, it does not matter, but certainly not joined at the hip. Autonomous from each other, yet dependent on each other, living under the same roof, not out of choice, *per se*, but circumstance, even necessity.

For all his skepticism of forging links with English-speaking Canada, even Groulx would make a few positive connections with Anglo-Canadian intellectuals later in his career, most notably Arthur Lower, whose *Colony to Nation* (1946) was influential on Groulx's later work. Rudin, *Making History in Quebec*, p.107.

Relations wax and wane. Siblings grow apart, then grow closer, then grow apart again. Sometimes the relationship ruptures, and ties are irreparably severed. Siblings fight against each other, and sometimes for each other. They may or may not share the same genes, but for better or for worse, they share a past and similar formative experiences; the words and actions of one influence the other, for good or for bad. Siblings can never fully know each other – each remains a mystery to the other, slightly out of reach, familiar yet alien. Still, they understand each other in ways that no one else can. Each lives his or her individual existence. Each can be studied independently from the other. But Mother knows: to understand one, you must attempt to understand both.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival documents

Bibliothèque et archives nationales du Québec (BANQ), Côte P175, Centre Montreal, Fonds Dupras et Colas, P175.

BANQ. Cote P113, Centre Gatineau, Fonds Théophile Éthier.

Library and Archives Canada (LAC), Canadian Fraternal Association papers (CFAP), MG28-I3.

LAC. Canadian National Railways fonds (CNR), RG30, accession 1981-82/004 GAD, volume 20, file 4400-20-2, "Data prepared in connection with royal commission on transportation – 1931."

LAC. Graham Spry fonds, MG30-D297, reel M-7470.

LAC. Canadian Dental Association fonds (CDAF), MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441. Vol.1.

LAC. Canadian 4-H Council fonds, MG28-I427. Volume 1.

LAC. Canadian Medical Association fonds (CMAF), MG28-I343, reels M-7486, M-7487.

LAC. Sir Wilfrid Laurier papers (LP), MG26-G, Vol.699.

LAC. Arthur Meighen papers (MP), MG26-I, Vol.100, 178.

LAC. Corporations Branch fonds (CBF), RG95, Vol.1172.

LAC. Frank and Libbie Park fonds, Canadian Youth Congress, 1935-1940 (CYC fonds), MG31-K9, Vol 6, 7.

LAC. Junior Chamber of Commerce of Canada (JCCC) fonds, MG28-I489, Vol. 28, 29.

LAC. Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169.

LAC. Nursing Sisters of Canada Association fond, 1885-1998. R9986-0-1-E.

LAC. Canadian Chamber of Commerce (CCC) fonds, MG28-III62.

LAC. Canadian Medical Association fonds, MG28-I343.

LAC. Canadian Dental Association fonds, MG28-I235, Accession 1975/0441.

LAC. Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, vol. 16, 17.

LAC. Godfrey Papers (GP), MG30-C11, Vol.1-2.

LAC. MG28-I339, "Certificat de membre de la Ligue 'Bonne Entente du Canada' (Inc.)."

LAC. Canadian Medical Association fonds, MG28-I343, Vol. 4.

LAC. Canadian Fraternal Association papers (CFAP), MG28-I3.

LAC. Montreal Board of Trade fonds, MG28-III, Vol. 44, reel M-2806, Council Annual Reports, 1912-1926.

LAC. Canadian Chamber of Commerce fonds, MG28-III62, Vol. 16-17, 74.

LAC. Canadian Bar Association fonds, MG28-I169, Vol. 1, 2, 38.

LAC. William Lyon Mackenzie King papers, MG26-J1, Vol.176.

LAC. William Lyon Mackenzie King fonds, MG26-J13, Diaries (WLMK Diares). Accessed 23 January 2011, http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/databases/king/index-e.html.

Université de Montréal (UM). Fonds Édouard-Montpetit, P004.

Université d'Ottawa (UO). Centre de recherche en civilisations canadienne-françaises (CRCCF). Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/88/6.

Université d'Ottawa. CRCCF, Fonds Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario (C2), C2/ 64/1.

UO. CRCCF. Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/21/6.

UO. CRCCF. Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/97/10.

UO. CRCCF. Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/257/8.

UO. CRCCF. Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/21/5.

UO. CRCCF. Fonds ACFO (C2), C2/98/19.

Serials

Calgary Herald

Canadian Education

Canadian Forum

Canadian Gazette

Daily Ontario

Daily Telegraph

Globe

Halifax Chronicle

Hamilton Herald

Intelligencer

L'Action catholique

L'Action française

L'Événement

La Patrie

La Presse

Le Devoir

Le Droit

Le Jour

Le Nouvel Ontario

Le Soleil

Maclean's

Mail & Empire

Manitoba Free-Press

Montreal Star

Montreal Witness

Ottawa Citizen

Quebec Chronicle

Quebec Daily Telegraph

Royal Society of Canada Mémoires

Saturday Night

Scotsman

Times

Toronto Daily Star

Vassar Miscellany News

Winnipeg Tribune

Books and articles

Akenson, Donald H. *The Irish in Ontario: A Study in Rural History*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1984.

Allaire, Gratien. *La Francophonie canadienne: Portraits.* Sudbury: AFI-CIDEF Québec, 1999.

Ajzenstat, Jennifer and Peter Smith. *Canada's Origins: Liberal, Tory or Republican?* Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1995.

Amyot, Chantal and John Willis. *Country Post: Rural Postal Service in Canada, 1880 to 1945.* Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 2003.

Armstrong, Elizabeth H. *The Crisis of Quebec, 1914-1918*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937.

Bank of Canada. *Art and Design of Canadian Bank Notes.* Ottawa, 2006.

Assemblée nationale du Québec. "Thomas Chapais." Accessed 3 April 2012. http://www.assnat.qc.ca/fr/patrimoine/anciens-parlementaires/chapais-thomas-97.html.

Association canadienne-française d'éducation d'Ontario. *Programme d'enseignement*

bilingue, (Ottawa, 1925), cover page. Université d'Ottawa, CRCCF, Collection générale, BRO-1925-16.

Axelrod, Paul. "The Student Movement of the 1930s", in Paul Axelrod and John G. Reid, eds., *Youth, University and Canadian Society*, 216-245. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989.

Balfour Declaration (1926). Accessed 4 June 2012, http://foundingdocs.gov.au/resources/transcripts/cth11_doc_1926.pdf.

Bank of Canada. "Fact Sheet." 2010. Accessed 12 December 2011, http://www.bankofcanada.ca/2010/07/secondary-page/fact-sheet-bank-of-canada-celebrates-75-years.

Bank of Canada. "1937 Series" (n.d.). Accessed 26 September 2011. http://www.bankofcanada.ca/banknotes/bank-note-series/past-series/1937-series/.

Bastarache, Michel et al., *The Law of Bilingual Interpretation.* Markham: Lexis Nexis, 2008.

Bastien, Hermas. *Le bilinguisme au Canada.* Montréal: Éditions de l'A.C.F., 1938.

Beattie, Christopher, Jacques Désy and Stephen Longstaff. *Bureaucratic Careers: Anglophones and Francophones in the Canadian Public Service*, Documents of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1972.

Bélanger, Claude. "Parti 'Bleu'." *L'Encyclopédie de l'histoire du Québec*. Marianopolis College, 2006. Accessed 10 August 2013, http://faculty.marianopolis.edu/c.belanger/quebechistory/readings/partibleuparty.html.

Bélanger, D.-C., Sophie Coupal, and Michel Ducharme, eds. *Les idées en mouvement: perspectives en histoire intellectuelle et culturelle du Canada*. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 2004.

Bélanger, D.-C. *Prejudice and Pride: Canadian Intellectuals Confront the United States, 1891-1945*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

Bélanger, D.-C. "Les historiens révisionnistes et le rejet de la 'canadianité' du Québec." *Mens: Revue d'histoire intellectuelle de l'Amérique française*, 2, 2001, pp.105-112.

Bélanger, Réal. "L'élite politique canadienne-française et l'Empire britannique: trois reflets représentatifs des perceptions canadiennes-françaises (1890-1917)." In Coates, *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917*, pp.122-141. University of Edinburgh Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997.

Behiels, Michael. "The Bloc Populaire Canadien: Anatomy of a Failure, 1942-1947."

Journal of Canadian Studies 18, no. 4 (Winter 1983-84): 45-74.

Behiels, Michael D. "Georges-Henri Lévesque: Father of Quebec's Lucid Integration into Confederation, 1930-1962." In Michael D. Behiels and Matthew Hayday, eds., *Contemporary Quebec: Selected Readings and Commentaries*, 165-181. Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 2011.

Behiels, Michael D. *Prelude to Quebec's Quiet Revolution: Liberalism versus Neo-Nationalism, 1945-1960*. McGill-Queen's, 1985.

Behiels, Michael D. and Matthew Hayday, eds. *Contemporary Quebec: Selected Readings and Commentaries.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 2011.

Bercuson, David. *True Patriot: the Life of Brooke Claxton, 1898-1960.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Berger, Carl, ed. *Imperialism and Nationalism, 1884-1914: a conflict in Canadian thought.* Toronto: Copp Clark Publishing, 1969.

Berger, Carl. "The Other Mr. Leacock." *Canadian Literature*, 55 (Winter 1973): 23-40.

Berger, Carl. *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism*.. Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1970.

Berger, Carl. *The Writing of Canadian History: Apects of English-Canadian Historical Writing Since 1900*, Second edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Bergeron, Léandre. *Petit manuel d'histoire du Québec.* Éditions Québécois, 1970.

Berton, Pierre. *Hollywood's Canada: the Americanization of Our National Image* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975.

Betcherman, Lita-Rose. *Ernest Lapointe: Mackenzie King's Great Quebec Lieutenant.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

Bilodeau, Charles. "Suite au Rapport du Comité des Manuels D'Histoire du Canada," *Canadian Education*, Vol.1, No.4 (Summer 1946), pp.193-197.

Bock, Michel. "Overcoming a National 'Catastrophe': The British Conquest in the Historical and Polemical Thought of Abbé Lionel Groulx." In Phillip Buckner and John G. Reid. *Remembering 1759: the Conquest of Canada in Historical Memory*, pp.161-185. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012.

Bock, Michel. *Quand la nation débordait les frontières: les minorités françaises dans la pensée de Lionel Groulx.* Montréal: HMH, 2004.

Bock-Côté, Mathieu. "Le 30 octobre 1995 – Le référendum sur la souveraineté: il était une fois l'indépendance." Lecture organized by La Fondation Lionel Groulx, 16 April 2013. Accessed 6 December 2013, http://www.fondationlionelgroulx.org/10e-conference-Le-referendum-sur.html.

Boggs, Winthrop S. *The Postage Stamps and Postal History of Canada.* Chambers Publishing Company, 1945.

Bonne Entente League. *The Bonne Entente: How it began, what it has done, and its immediate programme.* Toronto: Office of the Bonne Entente, 1917.

Bouchard, Gérard. *Les Deux Chanoines: Contradiction et ambivalence dans la pensée de Lionel Groulx.* Montréal: Boréal, 2003.

Bouchard, Gérard and Yvan Lamonde, eds. *Québécois et Américains: la culture québécoise aux XIXe et XXe siècles*. Saint-Laurent: Fides, 1995.

Bouchard, T.D. *L'Enseignement de l'histoire: discours prononcé au Sénat le 21 juin 1944.* Saint-Hyacinthe, Québec, L'Imprimerie Yamaska, 1944. University of Ottawa Archives Pamphlets, 01-CRC 1944-6.

Bouchard, T.D. *Mémoires: Quarante ans dans la tourmente politico-religieuse.* Montréal: Beauchemin, 1960.

Bourassa, Henri. "Discours à Notre Dame," 10 September 1910. In Yvan Lamonde and Claude Corbo, *Le rouge et le bleu: Une anthologie de la pensée politique au Québec de la Conquête à la Révolution tranquille*, 315-320. Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1999.

Bourassa, Henri. "Reply to Capt. Talbot Papineau, August 2, 1916." In *A Country Nourished in Self-Doubt: Documents in Post-Confederation Canadian History*, 150-153. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Bourassa, Henri. *Le Patrimoine canadien-français: ce qu'il est, ce q''il doit être. Discours prononcé au Monument national, le 27 avril 1902*. Montréal: Cie de publication de la Revue canadienne, 1902. University of Ottawa archives, 01-CRC 1902-5.

Bovey, Wilfrid. *Canadien: a study of the French Canadians.* Toronto: J.M. Dent, 1933.

Bovey, Wilfrid. *The French Canadians Today: A People on the March.* Toronto: J.M. Dent, 1938.

Boyd, John. *Sir George-Étienne Cartier, Baronnet, His Life and Times: A Political History of Canada from 1814 to 1873.* Toronto: MacMillan, 1914.

Boyd, John. *Sir George-Étienne Cartier, Baronnet, Sa Vie Et Son Temps: Histoire*

politique du Canada de 1814 à 1873. Montréal: Librairie Beauchemin, Ltée., 1918, traduction: Sylva Clapin.

Boyd, John. *Canadian nationalism, a speech delivered at* Le Devoir *dinner, Windsor Hotel, Montreal, 28 January 1911, to commemorate the first anniversary of the founding of* Le Devoir*'s newspaper.* Montreal: [s.n.], 1914.

Boyd, John. *The Nationalist Movement, An article written for the* Canadian Magazine, *January 1911*. Montreal: [s.n.], 1911.

Boyd, John. *Fair Play for the Province of Quebec.* Montreal: [s.n.], 1917

Boyd, John. *The death of Dollard and other poems.* Montreal: [s.n.], 1914.

Boyd, John. *The Greatness of Quebec: an address delivered to the Montreal Publicity Association.* Montreal: Librairie Beauchemin, 1919.

Boyd, John. *The future of Canada: Canadianism or Imperialism.* Montreal: Librairie Beauchemin, 1919.

Boyd, John. *Canada: an appeal for racial concord and national unity, speech delivered in proposing the toast of 'Canada' at the annual banquet of the St. Patrick's Society, Windsor Hotel, Montreal, 17 March 1920.* Montreal: Canadian National League, 1920.

Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto. Souvenir Booklet of the visit to Toronto of His Eminence Cardinal Villeneuve, O.M.I., Archbishop of Quebec, June 5-9, 1934. Toronto: St. Michael's College, 1934.

Bracq, Jean-Charlemagne. *L'évolution du Canada français.* Montréal: Librairie Beauchemin, Ltée., 1927.

Bray, R. Matthew. "A Conflict of Nationalisms: The Win the War and National Unity Convention, 1917," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Winter 1980-81): 18-30.

Brown, William. *Baseball's Fabulous Montreal Royals: The Minor League Team That Made Major League History.* Montreal: R. Davies, 1996.

Brown, William. *The Montreal Maroons: the Forgotten Stanley Cup Champions*. Montreal: Véhicule Press, 1999.

Brunet, Michel. *La présence anglaise et les Québécois.* Montréal: Intouchables, 2009.

Buckner, Phillip. "Presidential Address: Whatever happened to the British Empire?" *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*. Vol.4, No.1 (1993): 3-32.

Buckner, Phillip and John G. Reid. *Remembering 1759: the Conquest of Canada in Historical Memory.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012.

Burt, A.L. *Guy Carleton, Lord Dorchester, 1724-1808*, La société historique du Canada, brochure historique No 5, Ottawa, 1973. Translation from the English version (1937).

Burt, A.L. *The Old Province of Quebec.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1933.

Call, Frank Oliver. *The Spell of French Canada.* Boston: L.C. Page & Co., 1932.

Cameron, Brian. "The Bonne Entente Movement, 1916-1917: From Cooperation to Conscription, *Journal of Canadian Studies*, Vol.13, No.2 (Summer 1978), p.53.

Campbell, Sandra. "From Romantic History to Communications Theory: Lorne Pierce as Publisher of C.W. Jefferys and Harold Innis," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 30, 3 (Fall 1995): 91-116.

Canada. *British North America Act*, 1867. Accessed online (10 October 2012), http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/Const/FullText.html.

Canada. *Bank of Canada Act, 1934*. Accessed 10 October 2012, http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/B-2/.

Canada. *The 100 Years of the Public Service Commission of Canada, 1908-2008.* Ottawa: Public Service Commission of Canada, July 2008.

Canada. *Report of the Royal Commission on Technical and Professional Services* Ottawa: F.A. Acland, 1930.

Canada. *Report of the Royal Commission on Administrative Classifications in the Public Service*, Chief Commissioner Walter L. Gordon. Ottawa: E. Cloutier, 1946.

Canada. *Census of Canada, 1880-1881*, Vol.I. Ottawa: Maclean, Roger & Co., 1882.

Canada. *Fourth Census of Canada, 1901*, Vol 1: Population. Ottawa: S.E. Dawson, Printer to the King, 1902.

Canada. *Fifth Census of Canada, 1911*, Vol. II Religions, Origins. Ottawa: C.H. Parmelee, Printer to the King, 1913.

Canada. *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, Vol. I: Population: Number, Sex, and Distribution - Racial Origins – Religion. Ottawa: F.A. Acland, Printer to the King, 1924.

Canada and Newfoundland Education Association (CNEA). "The Program for the Promotion of Canadian Unity." *Canadian Education*, Official publication of the CNEA,

Vol.1, No. 1, October 1945, pp.36-38.

Canadian Dental Association. "List of past presidents." (N.d.) Accessed 12 November 2011, http://www.cda-adc.ca/en/cda/about_cda/past_presidents/ default.asp.

Canadian Heritage. "History of Bilingualism in Canada." November 2008. Accessed 2 February 2011, http://www.pch.gc.ca/pgm/lo-ol/bllng/hist-eng.cfm.

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC). "History of Quebec Elections: A Timeline of Elections Since 1867" (August 2012). http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/quebecvotes2012/ features/electionhistory/, accessed 20 July 2013.

Cannadine, David. *Ornamentalism: How the British Saw Their Empire.* Oxford University Press, 2001.

Cardinal Villeneuve's Visit to Toronto. Souvenir Booklet of the visit to Toronto of His Eminence Cardinal Villeneuve, O.M.I., Archbishop of Quebec, June 5-9, 1934. Toronto: St. Michael's College, 1934.

Cartier, George-Étienne. "Défense du projet de Confédération," 7 février 1865. In Yvan Lamonde and Claude Corbo, *Le rouge et le bleu: Une anthologie de la pensée politique au Québec de la Conquête à la Révolution tranquille.* Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1999. Pp.202-214.

CRCCF. "Le Règlement XVII" (Université d'Ottawa, 2004), http:// www.crccf.uottawa.ca/passeport/IV/IVD1a/IVD1a.html, accessed 10 October 2012.

CRCCF. "La Commission Scott-Merchant-Côté." Université d'Ottawa, 2004. Accessed 10 October 2012, http://www.crccf.uottawa.ca/passeport/ IV/IVA1b/IVA1b09.html.

CRCCF, "Louis-Alexandre Taschereau," *Le Règlement XVII* (2012), accessed 10 July 2013, http://www.crccf.uottawa.ca/reglement17/page/louis-alexandre-taschereau.

CRCCF. "Thomas Chapais." Université d'Ottawa, CRCCF, 2012. Accessed 10 August 2013, http://www.crccf.uottawa.ca/reglement17/page/thomas-chapais.

Chapais, Thomas. *Cours d'Histoire du Canada, Tome III, 1815-1833*, 2nd Edition. Québec: Librairie Garneau Ltée., 1933.

Chapais, Thomas. *Cours d'Histoire du Canada, Tome IV, 1833-1841*, 2nd Edition. Québec: Librairie Garneau Ltée., 1933.

Chapais, Thomas. *Cours d'Histoire du Canada, Tome VI, 1847-1851.* Québec: Librairie Garneau, 1934.

Chapais, Thomas. *Cours d'Histoire du Canada, Tome VIII, 1861-1867.* Québec: Librairie

Garneau, 1934.

Chapais, Thomas. “Discours de Thomas Chapais au Conseil législatif, 10 janvier 1898.” In *Quebec History, Documents in Quebec History.* Marianapolis College, 2000. Accessed 10 August 2013, http:// faculty.marianopolis.edu/c.belanger/quebechistory/docs/meq/31.htm.

Chapais, Thomas. “La Province de Québec et la minorité anglaise.” *La Nouvelle France*, Vol. XV, No. 4, (April 1916): 145-164. Accessed 11 August 2013, http://faculty.marianopolis.edu/c.belanger/quebechistory/ encyclopedia/Chapaisminoriteanglaise.html.

Charbonneau, François. *La crise de la conscription pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale et l’identité canadienne-française*. Thèse de maîtrise (science politique). Université d’Ottawa, 2000.

“Charles Fitzpatrick.” Assemblée Nationale du Québec, 2009. Accessed 20 July 2013, http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/fitzpatrick-charles-3165/ biographie.html.

Charpentier, Marc. “Broadway North: Musical Theatre in Montreal in the 1920s,” PhD dissertation. Montreal: McGill University Department of History, 1999.

Chisholm, Barbara. *Castles of the North: Canada’s Grand Hotels.* Toronto: Lynx Images, 2001.

Choquette, Robert. *Language and Religion. A History of English-French Conflict in Ontario*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1975.

Choquette, Robert. “Linguistic and Ethnic Factors in the French-Irish Catholic Relations in Ontario,” in *Canadian Catholic Historical Association Study Sessions*, 39 (1972), 35-43.

Cloutier, J. Edmond. *Quinze années de lutte, 1910-1925: cathéchisme de la question scolaire ontarienne.* Ontario: sn, 1970 [1925?].

Cody, H.J. *President’s Report for the Year Ending 30th June 1934.* Toronto: University of Toronto, 1934. University of Toronto Library.

Comeau, Robert and Bernard Dionne, eds., *À propos de l’histoire nationale.* Sillery: Septentrion, 1998.

Comeau, Robert. *Histoire intellectuelle de l’indépendentisme québécois – Tome I, 1834-1968*. Montréal: Études québécoises, 2010.

Conklin, Edwin P. “Sports,” in Wood, William, ed. et al., *The Storied Province of Quebec: Past* and *Present*, Volume II. Toronto: Dominion Publishing Company, Ltd.,

1931. Pp.1026.

Cook, Ramsay. "A Canadian Account of the 1926 Imperial Conference," *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1965: 50-63.

Cook, Ramsay. *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1966.

Cook, Ramsay and Réal Bélanger, eds., *Canada's Prime Ministers: Macdonald to Trudeau.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

Cook, Ramsay. "J.W. Dafoe at the Imperial Conference, 1923," *Canadian Historical Review*. Vol. XLI, no. 1 (March 1960): 19-40.

Cook, Ramsay. *Provincial Autonomy, Minority Rights and the Compact Theory, 1867-1921*. Ottawa: Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1970.

Cook, Ramsay. *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.

Cook, Ramsay and Michael Behiels. *The Essential Laurendeau*. Toronto: Copp Clarke, 1976.

Couture, Claude. *Le mythe de la modernisation du Québec: Des années 1930 à la révolution tranquille.* Montreal: Méridien, 1991.

Craig Brown, Robert and Ramsay Cook, *Canada, 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, Ltd., 1981.

Craig Brown, Robert. "Sir Robert Borden," in Ramsay Cook and Réal Bélanger, eds., *Canada's Prime Ministers: Macdonald to Trudeau.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

Craig Brown, Robert and Donald Loveridge. "Unrequited Faith: Recruiting the C.E.F., 1914- 1918," *International Review of Military History*, 51 (1982), pp. 57-72.

Creighton, Donald. *The Commercial Empire of the St. Lawrence, 1760-1850*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1937.

Crowley, Terry. *Marriage of Minds: Isabel and Oscar Skelton Reinventing Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.

Cupido, Robert. "The Medium, the Message and the Modern: The Jubilee Broadcast of 1927," *International Journal of Canadian Studies*, 26, Fall 2002: 101-126.

Dandurand, Raoul. *Le sénateur-diplomate: Mémoires, 1861-1942.* Québec: Laval, 2000.

Davies, Stephen. "'Reckless Walking Must Be Discouraged': The Automobile Revolution and the Shaping of Modern Urban Canada to 1930," *Urban History Review* 18, 2 (October 1989): 123-138.

MacGregor Dawson, R. *William Lyon Mackenzie King: A Political Biography, 1874-1923*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.

Defert, Jean-Jacques and Claude Couture. *Récits du XIXe siècle. Structure et contenu du discours historiographique au Canada au XIXe siècle: Garneau, Kingsford, Rameau et Smith*. Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2009.

Delisle, Jean. *Au coeur du trialogue canadien. Croissance et évolution du Bureau des traductions du gouvernement canadien, 1934-1984.* Ottawa, Secretary of State, 1984

Désilets, Andrée. "Joseph-Adolphe Chapleau." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, Vol. XII. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 1990. Accessed 12 May 2011, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/ chapleau_joseph_adolphe_12E.html.

Désilets, Andrée. "Jean-Charles Chapais." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, Vol. XI. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 1990. Accessed 10 August 2013, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio.php?id_nbr=5431.

Desjardins, Marc. "Théodore Robitaille." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, Vol. XII. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 1990. Accessed 10 August 2013, http://www.biographi.ca/en/ bio.php?id_nbr=6403.

Dickenson, John and Brian Young. *A Short History of Quebec*, Fourth edition. Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 2008.

Dirks, Patricia. *The Failure of l'Action Libérale Nationale*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1991.

Djwa, Sandra. "The *Canadian Forum*: Literary Catalyst." *Studies in Canadian Literature*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1976): 1-20.

Djwa, Sandra. *The Politics of the Imagination: a Life of F.R. Scott*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1987.

Donaghy, Greg. "A Catholic Journey: Paul Martin, Politics & Faith." Lecture delivered to the Ottawa Historical Association, 9 April 2013.

Ducharme, Michel. "Canada in the Age of Revolutions: Rethinking Canadian Intellectual History in an Atlantic Perspective," in Christopher Dummit and Michael Dawson, eds., *Contesting Clio's Craft: New Directions and Debates in Canadian History*, pp.162-186. London: Institute for the Study of the Americas, 2009.

Ducharme, Michel and Jean-François Constant, eds. *Liberalism and Hegemony: Debating the Canadian Liberal Revolution.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Dumont, Fernand et al., eds. *Idéologies au Canada français, 1900-1929*. Québec: Université Laval, 1974.

Dupont, Antonin. *Taschereau*. Montréal: Guérin, 1997

Dupuis, Jean-Claude, "Nationalisme, séparatisme et catholicisme dans l'entre-deux-guerres." In Michel Sarra-Bournet, ed., *Les nationalismes au Québec, du XIXe au XXIe siècle*, pp.95-105. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2001.

Dutil, Patrice A. "Against Isolationism: Napoléon Belcourt, French Canada, and 'La grande guerre.'" In David Mackenzie, ed. *Canada and the First World War: Essays in Honour of Robert Craig Brown*, 96-137. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

"Editorial: Thanksgiving," *The Canadian Forum*, October 1933. In J.L. Granatstein and Peter Stevens, eds., *Forum: Canadian life and Letters, 1920-1970, Selections from* The Canadian Forum. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

Esdras, Terrien. *Quinze années de lutte contre le règlement XVII.* Ontario, s.n. 1970 [1929?].

Ewart, John S. *Canadian Independence.* Ottawa: S.n., 1911.

Ewart, John S. *Canada, the Empire, and the United States*. New York: S.n. 1927.

Ewart, John S. *Canada's Constitutional Status.* Ottawa: John S. Ewart, 1929.

Fahrni, Magda. "Reflections on the Place of Quebec in Historical Writing on Canada." In Christopher Dummitt and Michael Dawson, eds., *Contesting Clio's Craft: New Directions and Debates in Canadian History*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2008.

Farrell, John K. A. "Michael Francis Fallon, Bishop of London, Ontario, 1909-1931: The Man and His Controversies," *Canadian Catholic Historical Association Study Sessions*, 35 (1968): 73-90.

Ferguson, Barry. *Remaking Liberalism: The Intellectual Legacy of Adam Shortt, O.D. Skelton, and W.A. Mackintosh, 1890-1925*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.

Fink, Howard. "English-Language Radio Drama." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Historica-Dominion, 2012. Accessed 6 January 2013, http:// www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/englishlanguage-radio-drama.

Fischer, David Hackett. *Champlain's Dream.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 2008.

Foisy-Geoffroy, Dominique. "Les idées politiques des intellectuels traditionalistes canadiens-français, 1940-1960." Doctoral thesis. Université Laval, 2008.

Forsey, Eugene. *The Royal Power of Dissolution of Parliament in the British Commonwealth.* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Francis, R. Douglas et al., *Destinies: Canadian History Since Confederation*, Vol. II, 6th edition. Toronto: Nelson, 2008.

Francis, R. Douglas. *Frank H. Underhill, Intellectual Provocateur*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Fraser, Graham. "Linguistic Duality, Language Narratives and the National Conversation," J.R. Mallory Annual Lecture, McGill University, 14 March 2007, accessed 10 September 2011, http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/ speeches_discours_14032007_e.php.

Fraser, Graham. "Linguistic duality in Canada and narratives on language: for a different reading of history," address to the Société d'histoire de Toronto and the Alliance française de Toronto, 22 September 2010, accessed 12 September 2011, http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/ speech_discours_22092010_e.php.

Gaffield, Chad. *Language, Schooling, and Cultural Conflict: the Origins of the French-Language Controversy in Ontario.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1987.

Gagnon, Jean-Pierre. *Le 22e bataillon (canadien-français) 1914-1919. Étude socio-militaire*, (Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1986.

Gagnon, Jean-Pierre. "Les Historiens canadiens français et la participation canadienne française à la Deuxième Guerre mondiale." *Bulletin d'histoire politique*, vol. 3, no. 3, 1995.

Galbraith, J. William. "Fiftieth Anniversary of the 1939 Royal Visit." *Canadian Parliamentary Review*. Autumn 1989: 7-11.

Gauvreau, Michael. *The Catholic Origins of Quebec's Quiet Revolution, 1931-1970.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 2005.

Gervais, Gaétan. "Le Règlement XVII (1912-1927)," *Revue du Nouvel Ontario*, Numéro 18 (1996), pp.175-186.

Gibbon, John Murray. *Canadian Mosaic. The Making of a Northern Nation*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Ltd., 1938.

Gingras, Pierre-Philippe. *Le Devoir*. Montréal: Libre-Expression, 1985.

Girard, Philip. "British Justice, English Law, and Canadian Legal Culture." In Phillip Buckner, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Canada and the British Empire*, Companion Series, pp.26-275. Oxford University Press, 2008.

Godbout, Jacques. "Notre libération." *Liberté*, vol.14, no.3, (81) 1972, pp.30-39.

Gosselin, Émile. "Perspective historique," *Canadian Public Administration* 6 (December 1963), pp.407.

Gowans, Alan. "Parliament Buildings." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Historica-Dominion, 2012. Accessed 10 July 2012, http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/parliament-buildings.

Graham, Roger. *Arthur Meighen: A Biography*, Vol. 2. Toronto: Clarke, 1965.

Granatstein, J.L. and J.M. Hitsman. *Broken Promises: a History of Conscription in Canada.* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Gravel, Jean-Yves. *Le Québec et la Guerre.* Montreal: Boréal, 1974.

Griffiths, Naomi. "Acadians." In Paul Robert Magocsi, ed., *Encyclopedia of Canada's Peoples*, 114-136. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Groulx, Lionel. *L'Appel de la race*. Montréal: Bibliothèque de l'Action française, 1922.

Groulx, Lionel. *Nos luttes Constitutionnelles: La Responsabilité Ministérielle*. Québec: Le Devoir, 1916.

Groulx, Lionel. "Notre État français, nous l'aurons." Speech to the Congrès de la langue française, Quebec City, 29 June 1937. Accessed 6 December 2013, http://archives.vigile.net/00-2/groulx-etat.html.

History of the Guibord Case. Ultramontanism versus Law and Human Rights. Montreal: 'Witness' Printing House, 1875. University of Ottawa microfiche, CIHM no. 05643.

Harris, Donald F. "The Presentation of a British Canada in Shropshire c. 1890-1914." In Colin M. Coates, ed. *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917.* University of Edinburgh Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997.

Harris, R. Cole, Pauline Roulston and Chris de Freitas. "The Settlement of Mono Township." *Canadian Geographer*. Volume 19, Issue 1 (1975): 1-17.

Harvey, Fernand. *Le mouvement ouvrier au Québec.* Montréal: Boréal Express, 1980.

Harvey, Jean-Charles. *Les grenouilles demandent un roi.* Montréal: Les Éditions du jour, 1943.

Harvey, Jean-Charles. *Pourquoi je suis anti-séparatiste.* Montréal: Les éditions de l'homme, 1962.

Hawkes, Arthur. *The Birthright: A Search for the Canadian Canadian and the Larger Loyalty*. Toronto: J.M. Dent, 1919.

Hayday, Matthew. "Fireworks, Folk-dancing and Fostering a National Identity: The Politics of Canada Day," *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. 91, No. 2, June 2010: 287-314.

Heidenreich, C.E. "Ste Marie Among the Hurons." *The Canadian Encyclopedia.* Historica-Dominion, 2012. Accessed 24 July 2013, http:// www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/ste-marie-among-the-hurons.

Heintzman, Ralph. "The Spirit of Confederation: Professor Creighton, Biculturalism, and the Use of History," *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. LII, No. 3 (September 1971): 245-275.

Hering, Martin. "Consociational Democracy in Canada." In Philipps-Universität Marburg, *Ahornblätter: Marburger Beiträge zur Kanada-Forschung.* Schriften der Universitätsbibliothek Marburg, 1998. Accessed online (10 August 2013), http://archiv.ub.uni-marburg.de/sum/84/sum84-6.html.

Heriot, A.A. "School Inspectors of the Early Days of Manitoba." *MHS Transactions*, Series 3 (1947-1948). Accessed 7 June 2011, http://www.mhs.mb.ca/docs/transactions/3/ schoolinspectors.shtml.

Hillmer, Norman. "O. D. Skelton: Innovating for Independence." In Greg Donaghy and Kim Richard Nossal, eds. *Architects and Innovators: Building the Department of External Affairs and International Trade, 1909-2009*, pp. 59-73. Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 2009.

Hillmer, Norman. "National Independence and the National Interest: O. D. Skelton's Department of External Affairs in the 1920s." In Greg Donaghy and Michael K. Carroll, eds. *In the National Interest: Canadian Foreign Policy and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 1909-2009*, pp.11-26. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2011.

Hodgetts, J.E. *The Canadian Public Service: a Physiology of Government, 1867-1970.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.

Hopkinson, Michael. *The Irish War of Independence*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 2002.

Horn, Michel. *The League for Social Reconstruction: Intellectual Origins of the Democratic Left in Canada, 1930-1942*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.

Houston, Cecil and William J. Smyth. "The Orange Order and the Expansion of the Frontier in Ontario, 1830-1900." *Journal of Historical Geography*. Volume 4, Issue 3 (1978): 251-264.

Igartua, José. *The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945-1971*. Vancouver, UBC Press, 2006.

Ignatieff, Michael. *True Patriot Love: Four Generations in Search of Canada*. Toronto: Viking Canada, 2009.

Jacks, David S. "Defying Gravity: The 1932 Imperial Economic Conference and the Reorientation of Canadian Trade," working paper 17242 of the National Bureau of Economic Research. Cambridge, 2011.

Jackson, John D. and Paul Millen. "English-language radio drama: a comparison of central and regional production units," *Canadian Journal of Communication* Vol. 15, No. 1 (1990): 1-18.

Jolivet, Simon. *Le vert et le bleu: Identité québécoise et identité irlandaise au tournant du XXe siècle*. Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2011.

Karr, Clarence. "What Happened to Canadian Intellectual History?" *Acadiensis*, 18,2 (Spring 1989): 171-180.

Kelly, Stéphane, ed. *Les idées mènent le Québec: Essais sur une sensibilité historique.* Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 2002.

Kennedy, Dane. *Britain and Empire, 1880-1945*. Harlow, United Kingdom: Pearson Education, Ltd., 2002.

Keshen, Jeff and Nicole St-Onge. *Ottawa: Making a Capital*. University of Ottawa Press, 2001.

King, William Lyon Mackenzie. *The Message of the Carillon and Other Addresses.* Toronto: Macmillan, 1928.

Kingsford, William. *The History of Canada*. Volume 7. Toronto: Rowsell & Hutchison, 1887.

Lacasse, Danielle and Antonio Lechasseur. *Les Archives nationales du Canada, 1872-1997*. La Société historique du Canada, Brochure historique No. 58 (Ottawa 1997).

Lacombe, Sylvie. "Imperial Loyalism: the English-Canadian Ideal of Chrstian Universality," in Colin M. Coates, ed. *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917*, (University of Edinburgh Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997), pp.187-202.

Lacombe, Sylvie. *La rencontre de deux peoples élus. Comparaison des ambitions nationale et impériale au Canada entre 1896 et 1920*. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2002.

Lahaise, Robert. *La Fin d'un Québec traditionnel, 1914-1939.* Montréal: Hexagone, 1994.

Laforest, Guy. *Trudeau and the End of a Canadian Dream*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1995.

Lambert, Maude-Émmanuelle. "La promotion du tourisme automobile et l'élargissement du territoire touristique: vers l'effacement des frontières, 1920-1967." Presentation to the CHA (Victoria, BC), 3 June 2013.

Lamonde, Yvan. "American Cultural Influence in Québec: A One-Way Mirror." In Alfred O. Hero and Marcel Daneau, eds., *Problems and Opportunities in US-Québec Relations*, 106-126. Boulder: Westview Press, 1984.

Lamonde, Yvan. *Ni avec eux ni sans eux: le Québec et les États-Unis*. Montreal: Nuit Blanche, 1996.

Lamonde, Yvan. *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1760-1896*, Volume I. Fides, 2000.

Lamonde, Yvan. *Histoire sociale des idées au Québec, 1896-1929*, Volume II. Fides, 2004.

Lamonde, Yvan. *L'histoire des idées au Québec (1760-1960): Bibliographie des études.* Montréal: Bibliothèque nationale du Québec, 1989.

Lanctot, Gustave. *Le Canada d'Hier et Aujourd'hui*. Montréal: Éditions Albert Lévesque, 1934.

Lanctot, Gustave. *Les Canadiens français et leurs voisins du Sud*. Montreal: Bernard Valiquette, 1941.

Lanctot, Gustave. *Les historiens d'hier et l'histoire d'aujourd'hui*. Toronto: Canadian Historical Association, 1941.

Langlois, George, Jean Boismenu, Luc Lefébvre and Patrice Régimbald. *Histoire du XXe Siècle*. Laval: Beauchemin, 1999.

Lapointe, Ernest. *La situation internationale du Canada*. Montreal, 1928.

Latta, Ruth. *They Tried: the Story of the Canadian Youth Congress*. Ottawa: R. Latta, 2006.

Laurence, Gérard. "French-Language Radio Drama." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Historica-Dominion, 2012. Accessed 6 January 2013, http:// www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/frenchlanguage-radio-drama.

Laurendeau, André. "Bilinguisme intégral." *L'Enseignement secondaire* 21, no. 4 (janvier 1942): 306-309.

Laurendeau, André. *La Crise de la conscription: 1942*. Montréal: Les Éditions du Jour, 1962.

Laurendeau, André. "La guerre," *L'Action nationale*, 14, no.1 (septembre 1939): 3-10.

Laurendeau, André. "Menaces de l'américisme." *L'Action nationale* 10, no.4 (décembre 1937): 312-323.

Laurendeau, André. *Notre nationalisme*, tract no.5, Jeune-Canada, octobre 1935. Montréal: *Le Devoir*. Accessed 12 March 2012, faculty.marianopolis.edu.

Lavertu, Yves. *Jean-Charles Harvey: Le Combattant*. Montréal: Boréal, 2000.

Leacy, F.H., ed. *Historical Statistics of Canada*. Second Edition. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1983.

Lester, Normand. *Le livre noir du Canada anglais*. Montréal: Les Intouchables, 2001.

Linteau, Paul-André. *Histoire de Montréal depuis la Confédération*. Montréal: Boréal, 1992.

Lijphart, Arend. *Democracy in Plural Societies.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Lijphart, Arend. *The Politics of Accommodation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

Little, Jack I. "Watching the Frontier Disappear: English-speaking Reaction to French-Canadian Colonization in the Eastern Townships, 1844-1890," in Michael D. Behiels, ed., *Quebec Since 1880*, 369-395. Toronto: Irwin Publishing, 2002.

Low, D.A. *Eclipse of Empire*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Lower, Arthur. *Colony to Nation: A History of Canada.* Toronto: Longmans, Green &

Co., 1946.

MacFarlane, John. "Ernest Lapointe." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, Vol. XVII. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2000. Accessed 26 June 2013, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/lapointe_ernest_17E.html.

MacFarlane, John. *Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's Influence on Canadian Foreign Policy.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

MacLennan, Hugh. *Two Solitudes*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1945.

MacMillan, Margaret. *The Uses and Abuses of History*. Toronto: Viking Canada, 2008.

Maheux, Arthur. *Canadian Unity. What Keeps Us Apart?* Québec: Université Laval, February 1944.

Maheux, Arthur. "Report of the Committee for the Study of Canadian History Textbooks," *Canadian Education*, vol. 1, no. 1 (October 1945), pp.2-35.

Marshall, Dominique. *The Social Origins of the Welfare State: Quebec families, compulsory education, and family allowances, 1940-1955.* Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2006.

Martin, Ged. *Britain and the Origins of Canadian Confederation, 1837-1867*. London: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1995.

Martin, Robin. *Shades of Right: Nativist and Fascist Politics in Canada, 1920-1940.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.

McKay, Ian. "The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History." *Canadian Historical Review*, 81 (2000): 617-645.

McKay, Ian. *The Quest of the Folk: Anti-Modernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.

McGowan, Mark. *The Waning of the Green: Catholics, the Irish, and Identity in Toronto, 1887-1922*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1999.

McNaught, Kenneth. *A Prophet in Politics: A Biography of J.S. Woodsworth,* 2nd edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

McRae, Kenneth D. *The Federal Capital: Government Institutions*, Studies of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Volume 1. Ottawa: Roger Duhamel, Queen's Printer, 1969.

Michaud, Nelson. "L'alliance conservatrice-nationaliste: mariage de raison ou nécessité

politique?" In Michel Sarra-Bournet, ed., *Les nationalismes au Québec, du XIXe au XXIe siècle*, pp.79-94. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2001.

Miller, Carman. "William Stevens Fielding," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, Vol. XV. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2000. Accessed 20 February 2013, www.biographi.ca.

Miller, J.R. *Equal Rights: The Jesuits' Estates Act Controversy*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 2001.

Miller, J.R. "Unity/Diversity: The Canadian Experience; From Confederation to the First World War," *Dalhousie Review* 55, 1 (Spring 1975): 63-82.

Monière, Denis. *Le développement des idéologies au Québec, des origines à nos jours.* Montréal: Québec/Amérique, 1977.

Montreal Historical Guides Association. "How to Visit Montreal: Old France in North America, the Playground of the North," Official Tourist Map (Montreal, 1920), LAC. Amicus no. 2685055.

Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau. *Cosmopolitan Montreal* (Montreal, 1927), LAC. Amicus no. 2638855.

Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau. *Montreal: Ancient and Modern. Cosmopolitan Montreal* (Montreal, 1931), LAC. Amicus no. 10016233.

Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau. *Montréal: The Paris of the New World* (Montreal: 1937), LAC. Amicus no. 2724413.

Montreal Tourist and Convention Bureau. *You Are Invited to Visit Montreal* (Montreal: 1940), Amicus no. 12363658.

Moore, William Henry. *The Clash! A Study in Nationalities*, Sixth edition. Toronto: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1919.

Moore, William Henry. *Le Choc: étude de nationalités*, traduit par Ernest Bilodeau. Montréal: Librairie Beauchemin, Ltée., 1920.

Morgan, Henry James, ed. *The Canadian Men and Women of the Time: A Hand-book of Canadian Biography of Living Characters*, Second Edition. Toronto: William Briggs, 1912.

Morley, Percival Fellman. *Bridging the Chasm. A Study of the Ontario-Quebec Question.* Toronto: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1919.

Morris, Peter. "Film History." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Historica-Dominion, 2011.

Accessed 1 November 2011, http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=A1ARTA0002800.

Morton, Desmond. *A Military History of Canada*, fourth edition. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1999.

Morton, Desmond. "Was the Great War Canada's War of Independence?" Images of a Forgotten War (National Film Board, 2011). Accessed 15 September 2013, http://www3.nfb.ca/ww1/independence.php.

Morton, W.L. *The Progressive Party in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Mousseau, Roland-Gilles. "Letter to the editor," *The Canadian Forum* (August 1925), in J.L. Granatstein and Peter Stevens, eds., *Forum: Canadian life and Letters, 1920-1970, Selections from* The Canadian Forum. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972. P.30.

Moyles, R.G. and Doug Owram. *Imperial Dreams and Colonial Realities: British Views of Canada, 1880-1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Munro, Kenneth. "The Crown and French Canada: The Role of the Governors-General in Making the Crown Relevant, 1867-1917," in Colin M. Coates, ed. *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917*, pp.78-109. University of Edinburgh Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997.

Neatby, H. Blair. *Laurier and a Liberal Quebec: A Study in Political Management*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973.

Neatby, H. Blair. *William Lyon Mackenzie King, Vol. II, 1924-1932: the Lonely Heights.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.

Neatby, Nicole. "Meeting of Minds: North American Travel Writers and Government Tourist Publicity in Quebec, 1920-1955," *Histoire sociale / Social History*.,Vol.II (2003), pp.468.

Neiberg, Michael S. *Fighting the Great War*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Nelles, H.V. *The Art of Nation-Building: The Tercentennary Celebrations of Quebec*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Nicholson, G.W.L. *Official History of the Canadian Army in the First World War.* Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1962.

Nolan, Michael. *Foundations: Alan Plaunt and the Early Days of CBC Radio*. Montreal: CBC Enterprises, 1986.

Office of the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. "Henry Cockshutt." Accessed 14 September 2011, http://www.lt.gov.on.ca/en/History/Bio_ Cockshutt.asp?nav=7&sub=2.

Oliver, Michael. "F.R. Scott: Quebecer," in Sandra Djwa and R. St. J. Macdonald, eds., *On F.R. Scott: Essays on His Contributions to Law, Literature, and Politics*, 165-176. Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1983.

Ontario. *Report of the Minister of Education, Ontario, 1936*. Toronto: T.E. Bowman, 1937. Robarts Library, AFG-5659.

Ouellet, Fernand. *L'Ontario français dans le Canada français avant 1911: contribution à l'histoire sociale*. Sudbury: Prise de parole, 2005.

Owram, Doug. *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Owram, Doug. "Intellectual History in the Land of Limited Identities," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 24, 3 (Fall 1989), pp.110-121.

Owram, Doug. "Writing About Ideas." In John Schultz, ed., *Writing About Canada: a Handbook for Modern Canadian History*. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc., 1990.

Palmer, Howard. "Reluctant Hosts: Anglo-Canadian Views of Multiculturalism in the Twentieth Century," in Canadian Consultative Council of Multiculturalism, *Multiculturalism as State Policy*. Ottawa: Department of Canadian Heritage, 1976.

Paquin, Stéphane. "Raoul Dandurand: porte-parole de la conscience universelle." In Greg Donaghy and Kim Richard Nossal, eds. *Architects and Innovators: Building the Department of External Affairs and International Trade, 1909-2009*, 41-51. Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 2009.

Parisé, Robert. *George-Henri Lévesque: Père de la renaissance québécoise*. Montréal: Alain Stanké, Ltée., 1976.

Pariseau, Jean and Serge Bernier. *Les Canadiens français et le bilinguisme dans les forces armées canadiennes, Tome I, 1763-1969: Le spectre d'une armée bicéphale.* Ottawa: National Defence, 1987.

Parliament of Canada. "William Henry Moore." Accessed 1 May 2011. www.parl.gc.ca.

Parliament of Canada. "The Hon. Charles Benjamin Howard." Accessed 2 February 2011. www.parl.gc.ca.

Parliament of Canada. "William Edmund Newton Sinclair." Accessed 10 October 2012, www.parl.gc.ca.

Parliament of Canada. "The Parliament Buildings." December 2006. Accessed 6 June 2011, http://www.parl.gc.ca/About/Parliament/Publications/parliamentbuildings/parlblgs-e.asp.

Parliament of Canada. "History of Federal Ridings Since 1867 – Results of Federal Election of 1940." N.d. Accessed 20 July 2013, http://www.parl.gc.ca/About/Parliament/FederalRidingsHistory/.

Parliament of Canada. "History of Federal Ridings Since 1867 – Results of Federal Election of 1945." N.d. Accessed 20 July 2013, http://www.parl.gc.ca/About/Parliament/FederalRidingsHistory/.

"Parti Bleu." *Canadian Encyclopedia*. Historica-Dominion, 2012. Accessed 10 August 2013, http://thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/parti-bleu.

Pearson, Lester B. *Mike. The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson*, Volume I: 1897-1948. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

Petry, W.H. "Big Game and Fly Fishing," in Wood, William, ed. et al., *The Storied Province of Quebec: Past* and *Present*, Volume II. Toronto: Dominion Publishing Company, Ltd., 1931. P.1031.

Phillips, Charles E. "The Schools of Quebec." *Canadian Education*, Vol.1, No. 2 (January 1946): 58-81.

Pierce, Lorne. *A Canadian People*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1945.

Pierce, Lorne. *An Outline of Canadian Literature (French and English)*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1927.

Pigeon, Mathieu. "Education in Québec, before and after the Parent reform." Montreal: McCord Museum, 2008. Accessed 4 February 2012, http://www.mccord-museum.qc.ca.

Pitsula, James M. *Keeping Canada British: The Ku Klux Klan in 1920s Saskatchewan.* Vancouver: UBC Press, 2013.

Plouffe, Hélène. "Un Canadien errant." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, Historica-Dominion, 2012. Accessed 4 September 2012, http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/emc/un-canadien-errant.

Pocock, J.G.A. "The antipodean perception" in Pockock, J.G.A. *The Discovery of Islands: Essays in British History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Pocock, J.G.A. "The New British History in Atlantic Perspective: An Antipodean Commentary," *The American Historical Review*, Vol.104, No.2, (April 1999), pp.490-

500.

Powell, James. *A History of the Canadian Dollar*. Ottawa: Bank of Canada, 1999.

Power, Charles G. *The Memoirs of Chubby Power: A Party Politician.* Toronto: MacMillan, 1966.

Presthus, Robert. *Élite Accommodation in Canadian Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Prince Edward Island. "Premiers Gallery – Aubin-Edmond Arsenault." Accessed 2 February 2013, www.gov.pe.ca/premiersgallery/arsenault.php3.

Privy Council Office. "Guide to Canadian Ministries Since Confederation – Eleventh Ministry." Accessed 10 October 2011, http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/mgm/dtail.asp?lang=eng&mstyid=11&mbtpid=1.

Privy Council Office. "Guide to Canadian Ministries Since Confederation – Twelfth Ministry." Accessed 10 October 2011, http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/mgm/dtail.asp?lang=eng&mstyid=12&mbtpid=1.

Provencher, Jean. *Québec sous la loi des mesures de guerre, 1918*. Montréal: les éditions du boréal express, 1971.

Province de Québec. *Rapport du Ministère de la Voirie, 1923*. Québec: Imprimateur de sa Majesté le Roi, 1923. LAC. Amicus no. 28581627.

Province de Québec. *Roads Department 1925 Report*. Québec: The Printer to His Majesty the King, 1925. LAC. Amicus no. 28581627.

Province de Québec. *Roads Department 1928 Report*, Québec: The Printer to His Majesty the King, 1928. LAC. Amicus no. 28581627.

Province de Québec. *Department of Highways 1929 Report*. Québec: The Printer to His Majesty the King, 1929. LAC. Amicus no. 28581627

Province of Quebec Tourist Association. "Presented to the Visitor With Compliments of the Province of Quebec Tourist Association," (Quebec, 1925), LAC. Amicus no. 8613350.

Province of Quebec Tourist Association. "How to Visit Montreal, 'The Gate-Way City' to Old France in North America, 'The Playground of the North,'" Official Guide (Montreal, 1928), LAC. Amicus no. 2630143, p.iv.

Puissance du Canada. *Débats Chambre des Communes, Vol. I de la troisième session – quatorzième* législature. Vol. CLX. Ottawa: F.A. Acland, Imprimeur du Roi, 1924.

'Quebecer.' "French Canadian Nationalism," *The Canadian Forum* (March 1936), in J.L. Granatstein and Peter Stevens, eds., *Forum: Canadian life and Letters, 1920-1970, Selections from* The Canadian Forum, 143. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

Reid, J. Addison. "Secession in Canada: Quebec," *The Canadian Forum* (June 1924), in J.L. Granatstein and Peter Stevens, eds., *Forum: Canadian life and Letters, 1920-1970, Selections from* The Canadian Forum. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

"Review of *The Clash*," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 6, No. 3. Dec. 1919. P.430.

Richer, Geneviève. "'L'apôtre infatigable de l'irrédentisme français': la lutte de Napoléon-Antoine Belcourt en faveur de la langue française en Ontario durant les années 1910 et 1920." *Francophonies d'Amérique*, no 31 (printemps 2011), pp.87-108.

Robert, Lucie. "Camille Roy et Lionel Groulx: la querelle de l'Appel de la race." *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*. Vol. 32, No 3 (décembre 1978), pp.400.

Romney, Paul. *Getting it Wrong: how Canadians forgot their past and imperilled Confederation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Rothney, Gordon O. Review of K.W. McNaught, "J.S. Woodsworth and a Political Party for Labour, 1896 to 1921," *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. 30, No. 2, June 1949: 123-143, in *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1949: 281-283.

Rouillard, C.D. et al. "French Studies at the University of Toronto: 1853-1993." University of Toronto, n.d. accessed online at http://french.chass.utoronto.ca/dept-of-french/history/ (1 May 2011).

Rousseau, Guildo. "Jean-Charles Harvey." *Canadian Encyclopedia.* Historica-Dominica, 2012. Accessed 12 January 2013, http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/jeancharles-harvey.

Roy, Camille. *Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne*, fifth edition. Québec: Imprimerie de l'Action Sociale Ltée., 1930.

Roy, Camille. *Historiens de Chez Nous*. Montréal: Éditions Beauchemin, 1935.

Roy, Camille. *French-Canadian Literature*. Toronto: Glasgow, Brook, 1913.

Roy, Camille. *Manuel d'Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne de Langue Française*, 14e édition. Montréal: Librairie Beauchemin Ltée., 1939.

Roy, Camille. *Manuel d'Histoire de la Litérature Canadienne de Langue Française*, 21e édition. Montréal: Librairie Beauchemin Ltée., 1962.

Roy, Camille. "Le message de Québec à nos frères de l'Ouest," in Roy, *Études et Croquis, Pour faire mieux aimer la Patrie*, 162-170. Montréal: Les Éditions du Mercure, 1928.

Roy, Camille. *Pour conserver notre héritage français.* Montréal: Éditions Beauchemin, 1937.

Roy, Camille. "L'Appel de la race, Par Alonié de Lestres." In Roy, *À l'ombre des érables*, 273-296 Québec: Imprimerie de l'Action Sociale, Ltée., 1924.

Roy, Camille. "Le patriotisme de nos vieux maîtres. (À propos de *L'Appel de la Race*.)." In Roy, *À l'ombre des érables*, 297-311. Québec: Imprimerie de l'Action Sociale, Ltée., 1924.

Roy, Christian. "La 'nouvelle sensibilité' en quête d'une autre Révolution tranquille." *Bulletin d'histoire politique*, vol. 18, no. 2., (winter 2010), pp.195-204.

Roy, Fernande. *Histoire des idéologies au Québec aux XIXe et XXe siècles*. Montréal: Boréal, 1993.

Roy, Ferdinand. *L'Appel aux armes et la réponse canadienne-française: étude sur le conflit de races*. Québec: J.-P. Garneau, 1917.

Roy, Fernande. *Progrès, harmonie, liberté: le libéralisme des milieux d'affaires francophones de Montréal au tournant du siècle*. Montréal: Boréal, 1988.

Rudin, Ronald. "Lionel Groulx and the Building of the Infrastructure for the Quebec Historical Profession," in Michael D. Behiels, ed., *Quebec Since 1880*, 9-25. Toronto: Irwin Publishing, 2002.

Rudin, Ronald. *Making History in Twentieth-Century Quebec*. University of Toronto Press, 1997.

Rumilly, Robert. *Maurice Duplessis et son Temps, Tome II, 1944-1959*. Montréal: Fides, 1973.

Rumilly, Robert. *Histoire de la province de Québec*, Vol. XXI. Montréal: Montréal-Éditions, 1940.

Rumilly, Robert. *Histoire de la province de Québec*, Vol. XXVI. Montréal: Les Éditions Chantecler, Ltéé., 1940.

Russell, Frances. *The Canadian Crucible: Manitoba's Role in Canada's Great Divide.* Winnipeg: Heartland, 2003.

Ryerson, Stanley B. *French Canada: A Study in Canadian Democracy*. Toronto: Progress Books, 1943.

Saint-Aubin, Bernard. *King et son époque*. Montréal: Les éditions La presse, ltée., 1982.

Saint-Jacques, Denis et Lucie Robert. *La vie littéraire au Québec, Tome VI, 1919-1933: Le Nationaliste, l'Individualiste et le Marchand*. Quebec: Université Laval, 2011.

Savard, Pierre. "Relations avec Québec," in Cornelius J. Jaenen, ed., *Les Franco-*Ontariens, 239-250. Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1993.

Scott, F.R. *Canada Today: A Study of Her National Interests and National Policy*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Scott, F.R. "The Cardinal Speaks," *Canadian Forum* (January 1939), pp.294-295.

Scott, F.R. (pseud. S.). "Embryo Fascism in Quebec," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.16, No.3 (April 1938), pp.454-466.

Scott, F.R. (pseud. J.E. Keith). "The Fascist Province," *Canadian Forum* (April 1934), 251-252.

Scott, F.R. "A Policy of Neutrality for Canada," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.17, No. 2 (January 1939), pp.402-416.

Scott, F.R. "What Kind of Peace Do We Want?" *Saturday Night*, 15 July 1939.

Seary, Victor. *A Postage Stamp History of Canada*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1972.

Siegfried, André. *Le Canada: puissance internationale*, 2e édition. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1937.

Simard, David Éric. "Jean-Charles Harvey, défenseur des libertés et promoteur de la modernité: *Le Jour* (1937-1946)." Master's thesis in Political Science. Université du Québec à Montréal, December 2007.

Simons, David. "The Man Behind the Scene," Society for American Baseball Research (2007). Accessed 3 October 2012, http://quebec.sabr.org/1930.htm.

Smith, David E. *The Canadian Senate in Bicameral Perspective.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.

Smith, David E. *Federalism and the Constitution of Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Smith, David E. "James G. Gardiner," in Gordon L. Barnhart, ed., *Saskatchewan Premiers of the Twentieth Century*, 90-108 Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 2004.

Smith, Janet Adam. *John Buchan: a Biography*. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1965.

Silver, Arthur I. *The French-Canadian Idea of Confederation, 1864-1900*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Skelton, O.D. *Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Vol. II, 1896-1919*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1965 [1921].

Smith, Allan. *Canada: An American Nation? Essays on Continentalism, Identity and the Canadian Frame of Mind*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1994.

Soward, Frederic H. "The Election of Canada to the League of Nations Council in 1927" *American Journal of International Law*, vol. 23, no. 4 (October 1929): 753-765.

Spalding Official Baseball Guide, Canadian Edition, 1925. Montreal: Canadian Sports Publishing Co., 1925. Online at Society for American Baseball Research. Accessed 3 October 2012, http://quebec.sabr.org/ 1920.htm.

Spry, Graham. *Passion and Conviction: The Letters of Graham Spry*, Rose Potvin, ed. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1992.

Stacey, C.P. *Canada and the Age of Conflict, Vol. 2, 1921-1948: the Mackenzie King Era* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

Stacey, C.P. *Official History of the Canadian Army in the Second World War, Vol. I: Six Years of War, the Army in Canada, Britain and the Pacific.* Ottawa: National Defence, 1955.

Stamp, Robert M. "Henry John Cody." *The Canadian Encyclopedia* Historica-Dominion, 2012. Accessed 10 October 2012. http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/ henry-john-cody.

Stanley, Della M.M. "Peter John Veniot," *Canadian Encyclopedia.* Historica-Dominica, 2012. Accessed 19 February 2013, http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/ peter-john-veniot.

Stein, Zara. *The Lights That Failed: European International History, 1919-1933*. Oxford, 2005.

Stevenson, Garth. *Ex Uno Plures: Federal-Provincial Relations in Canada, 1867-1896*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.

Talbot, Robert. *Negotiating the Numbered Treaties: An Intellectual and Political Biography of Alexander Morris*. Saskatoon: Purich, 2009.

Talbot, Robert. "Une réconciliation insaisissable: le mouvement de la bonne entente," *Mens. Revue d'histoire intellectuelle de l'Amérique française*, (automne 2007) vol. VIII, no. 1, pp.67-125.

Tardivel, Jules-Paul. *Pour la patrie: roman du XXe siècle*. Montreal: Cadieux et Derome, 1895.

Taschereau, Louis-Alexandre. *L'habitant de Québec: Noblesse Canadienne-Française. Conférences prononcés à Toronto devant l'Empire Club et le Women's Canadian Club, le 27 avril 1922*. S.n., 1922.

Taylor, Brook. *Promoters, Patriots, and Partisans: Historiography in Nineteenth-Century English Canada*. University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Teboul, Victor. *Le Jour: émergence du libéralisme moderne au Québec*. Montréal: Éditions Hurtubise, 1984.

Thompson, Andrew S. *Imperial Britain: The Empire in British Politics, c. 1880-1932*, Harlow, United Kingdom: Pearson Education, Ltd., 2000.

Tippett, Maria. *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts Before the Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Tippett, Maria. *The Making of English-Canadian Culture, 1900-1939: The External Influences*. Toronto: Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies Lecture Series, 1988.

Tourist Bureau of Quebec. *The French-Canadian Province. A Harmony of Beauty, History and Progress*. Roads Department of Québec, March 1926. LAC. Amicus no. 8652444.

Tourist Bureau of Quebec. *The Gaspé Peninsula. History, Legends, Resources, Attractions*. Québec: Department of Highways and Mines, April 1930. LAC. Amicus no. 2717922.

Tourist Bureau of Quebec. *Visit "La Province de Québec."* Québec: 1939. LAC. Amicus no. 12748967.

Translation Bureau, PWGSC, Canada. "Directors of Translation in the Government of Canada." June 2012. Accessed 27 October 2012, http://www.btb.gc.ca/btb.php?lang=eng&cont=1472.

Translation Bureau, PWGSC, Canada. "Libraries and Reference Materials at the Translation Bureau." June 2012. Accessed 27 October 2012, http://www.btb.gc.ca/ btb.php?lang=eng&cont=1180.

Translation Bureau, PWGSC, Canada. "Our History." June 2012. Accessed 27 October 2012, http://www.btb.gc.ca/btb.php?lang=eng&cont=841.

Translation Bureau. PWGSC, Canada. "Translation before the Bureau." June 2012. Accessed 27 October 2012, http://www.btb.gc.ca/ btb.php?lang=eng&cont=1153.

Translation Bureau. PWGSC, Canada. "Training and Development of Professional Translators in the Government of Canada Over the Years." June 2012. Accessed 27 October 2012, http://www.btb.gc.ca/ btb.php?lang=eng&cont=1189.

Trofimenkoff, Susan Mann. *Action Française: French Canadian nationalism in the twenties*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

Trofimenkoff, Susan Mann. *The Dream of Nation: a Social and Intellectual History of Quebec*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Trudeau, Christian. "Le baseball à Montréal en 1927," Society for American Baseball Research (2007). Accessed 3 October 2012, http://quebec.sabr.org/1920.htm.

Trudeau, Pierre et al. *La grève de l'amiante*. Montréal: Cité Libre, 1956.

Trudel, Marcel. *Mythes et réalités dans l'histoire du Québec*. Montréal: HMH, 2001.

Underhill, Frank H. "North American Front," *The Canadian Forum*, September 1940. In J.L. Granatstein and Peter Stevens, eds., *Forum: Canadian life and Letters, 1920-1970, Selections from* The Canadian Forum. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972. Pp.192-193.

"Un programme électoral catholique." In Albert Desbiens, ed. *Histoire du Canada. Une expérience tricentenaire*, 118-121. Montréal: Éditions Sainte-Marie, 1967. Originally in *Le Journal des Trois Rivières*, 20 April 1871.

United States Bureau of the Census. *Historical National Population Estimates.* Population Estimates Program, 2000. Accessed 10 June 2012, http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/nation/popclockest.txt.

Université de Montréal. "Exposition virtuelle: Édouard Montpetit." Accessed 25 November 2012, http://www.archiv.umontreal.ca/exposition/ montpetit/accueil.htm.

Vacante, Jeffrey. "Hugh MacLennan and the Question of Authenticity in Canadian Historical Writing." Paper presented to the CHA, 2011, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, NB.

van Schendelen, M. "Consociational Democracy: The Views of Arend Lijphart and Collected Criticisms." *The Political Science Reviewer*, 14 (1985): 143-183.

Vaughan, Frederick. *The Canadian Federalist Experiment: From Defiant Monarchy to Reluctant Republic*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press 2003.

Veterans Affairs Canada. "Military – Historical Background." N.d. Accessed 10 July 2013, http://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/collections/lff/ military.

Vigod, Bernard. *Quebec Before Duplessis: the Political Career of Louis-Alexandre Taschereau*. Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1986.

Vipond, Mary. *Listening In: the First Decade of Canadian Broadcasting, 1922-1932*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1992.

Vipond, Robert. "1787 and 1867: The Federal Principle and Canadian Confederation Reconsidered," *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 22, 1 (March 1989), pp.2-25.

Wardhaugh, Robert. "'Gateway to Empire': Imperial Sentiment in Winnipeg, 1867-1917." In Colin M. Coates, ed. *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917*. University of Edinburgh Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997.

Weir, Earnest Austin. *The Struggle for National Broadcasting in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965.

What Quebec wants: reply of La Presse to a question from Ontario for the English speaking people of the Dominion, with a foreword by John Boyd. Montreal: Librairie Beauchemin, 1918.

Wood, William, ed. et al. *The Storied Province of Quebec: Past* and *Present*, Volume I. Toronto: Dominion Publishing Company, Ltd., 1931.

Woodley, E.C. *Canada's Romantic Heritage. The Story of New France*. Toronto: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1940.

Wright, Donald A. "Donald Creighton and the French Fact, 1920s-1970s." *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, vol. 6, no. 1 (1995): 243-272.

Wright, Donald A. *The Professionalization of History in English Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Wrong, George M. *The Canadians. The Story of a People*. London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1938.

Wrong, George M. "The Bilingual Question," *The New Era in Canada*, ed. J.O. Miller Toronto, 1917.

Wrong, George M. "Problems Issuing From Confederation," *Addresses Delivered Before the Canadian Club of Toronto, Season of 1927-28* (Toronto, 1928).

Wrong, George M. *The Rise and Fall of New France*, Vols. 1 & 2. Toronto: The MacMillan Co. of Canada, Ltd., 1928.

Wrong, George M. "The Two Races in Canada." Lecture delivered before the Canadian Historical Association, Montreal, May 21st, 1925, University of Ottawa Archives, 01-CRC-1925-5.

Young, Brian. "Les anglophones et l'historiographie Québec/Canada." In Marie-Andrée Beaudet, ed. *Échanges culturels entre les Deux solitudes*, 41-51. Québec: Université Laval, 1999.