Robert Choquette,
University of Ottawa,
1972.

"Linguistic and Ethnic Factors in the French-Irish Catholic Relations in Ontario."

I-Introduction

Since the British conquest under Wolfe in 1759, Canada has been made up of two major linguistic and cultural groups, the French and English. Although insignificantly small in numbers atthe outset, the ranks of the Anglophone group were soon swelled by the immigration of some thirty-five thousand Loyalists from the United States after the American Revolution; the Canadiens in 1760 numbered some seventy thousand Francophones. In 1791, in order to satisfy the demands of the increasing Anglophone community who felt ill at ease under the civil laws and customs of French Canada, the British Government divided its Canadian colony into two semi-autonomous entities, namely Lower Canada for the French, and Upper Canada for the English, the latter being largely a frontier territory. In 1840, the two Canadas were reunited under a common government with each section electing fifty percent of the Legislature of the United Canadas. Since the British North-America Act of 1867 establishing Canadian Confederation, the country has been divided into provinces, Ontario being the wealthiest and most powerful.

Until the 1850's, Francophones constituted a majority of the Canadian population; since Confederation the reverse has been true, and increasingly so. The growth of the French Canadian population has been due almost exclusively to a phenomenally high birth-rate to which immigration has added hardly at all. In fact almost every immigrant to the country adopts the English language, even in the predominantly Francophone province of Québec. From 1760 until Québec's Quiet Revolution of the nineteen sixties, the Roman Catholic Church held an unchallenged sway over French Canadian society, serving as its only native and powerful social structure.

The scarcity of arable land in Québec's Saint Lawrence river valley coupled with the density of the area's population and periodic economic crises, prompted Francophones, in the last three quarters of the nineteenth century, to migrate in ever increasing numbers to the adjacent province of Ontario. Needless to say, their Church accompanied them. During this same period, Irish immigrants also began coming to Canada, as a result of the critical conditions prevalent in Ireland in the mid-nineteenth century. Although Ontario had previous settlements of Francophones in its southwestern tip, namely the descendants of farmers who had fed the Detroit outpost of the French colonial empire, as well as Scottish Anglo-catholics who had settled with their priest Alexander MacDonell in the southeastern part of the Province in the early nineteenth century, the phenomenon of large-scale Catholic immigration,

both French and English, became a subject of concern and a springboard for nativist feelings among Ontario's Protestant Anglophone population.

At the outset, during the eighties and nineties, the main conflict was religious; the Protestants, led by the Orangemen, and the Protestant Protective Association (1891-1897), feared a Catholic takeover of their country, and the Catholics, in spite of their ethnic differences, stuck together in order to ward off the attacks of the Protestants. Within this context, schools became the foci of debate, the Catholics wanting full equality in tax-sharing for their public (but separate) schools. Indeed, Ontario had a system of public (or common) schools, all subject to the Ontario Department of Education, but wherein local school boards could declare their schools denominational, and thereby become 'Separate' schools. The Protestants as a rule wanted one faith, one flag and one language.

The issue which was allegedly a religious conflict at its inception, slowly transformed itself in the three decades between 1883 and 1913 into an explicitly ethnic, linguistic and cultural conflict, and the Roman Catholics who had resisted the Orangemen's sallies in unison during the eighties and nineties, became progressively more divided along linguistic and cultural lines. By 1910 the latter issue took precedence over the Protestant-Catholic quarrel. Bishops, clergy and faithful began to line up according to their ethnic affiliation and to see

their principal opponents as either Irish or French-Canadian Catholics, and by the same token the Protestant 'enemy' receded into the background. In a rather intriguing 'about-face,' in the second decade of the twentieth century, the Irish Catholics of Ontario were defending the same cause as their traditional enemies the Orange Lodges, against the French Catholics, their erstwhile allies.

Although, on a province-wide scale the English-French conflict appeared primary only by 1910, in two exclusively Roman Catholic institutions, namely the Church hierarchy and the University of Ottawa, the Irish-French battle came to a head somewhat sooner. The engagement within the hierarchy developed during the last quarter of the nineteenth century and continued through the first quarter of the twentieth; knowledge of the skirmishing was usually hid from public view. The University of Ottawa's difficulties occurred particularly between 1898 and 1908; this ethnic, racial and linguistic war made the headlines of several newspapers.

Since my topic is not Ontario nativism but English-French conflict within Ontario Catholicism during the first quarter of the twentieth century I begin by studying in a first part the question of the University of Ottawa, and the factors leading up to the 1910 ACFEO congress, presenting these as preliminary skirmishing prior to the main French-English engagement studied in a second part. The latter will consist in studies centering first on Bishop Michael Francis

Fallon of London, and second on the Ontario Department of Education's Circular of Instructions No. 17 , the two foci of the ethnic and linguistic quarrels between 1910 and 1927.

II-Thesis

Ethnic, cultural and linguistic awareness, passion and prejudice were a primary motivation for Ontario Roman Catholics during the first quarter of the twentieth century. Indeed, whenever these factors appeared at odds with other norms of decision (such as the pronouncements of the hierarchy, the civil governments, or the courts) the former overshadowed the latter among both Francophone and Anglophone Canadians.

This study is important for several reasons, the most manifest being that it constitutes a key part of the historical inquiry into French-English relations in Canada, an issue involving the very survival of the country. It may serve to defuse an explosive situation fostered in part by ignorance of the history of these relations, and may thereby contribute to the building of a really bilingual and bicultural Canadian nation.

While English-French conflict during my chosen period is crucial to the understanding of the contemporary Canadian scene, the role of the Roman Catholic Church in this problem is largely ignored; yet that Church's part in this controversy was central. Churchmen played a leading though not exclusive part therein. Furthermore .the..study shows that the French Canadian hierarchy and clergy, rather than

'selling-out' to the English 'establishment' in return for varied favors (a charge frequently repeated in French Canada), were the main leaders and defenders of the Franco-Ontarian in his struggle for equal rights. It will also be shown that the Irish Canadian hierarchy and clergy, led by Bishop Fallon, were the foremost opponents of the French Canadians and the most militant apostles of the unilingual-English political ideology in Ontario. While the few publications on or around this subject present the entire issue in a political and educational setting, I will show how Roman Catholic Churchmen initiated, led and largely controlled the entire struggle from beginning to end among both French and English Catholics.

Just as the Anglo-Protestants of Ontario were responsible for the outbreak of hostilities in the late nineteenth century, they were to be, ironically enough, the main agents of the restoration of peace and harmony in the twenties. This serves to underline the fact that ethnic, linguistic and cultural bitterness and prejudice were more consistently manifested by Catholics of Ontario than they were by the Protestants. It will also be suggested that within the ranks of Catholicism, the most insecure faithful, that is to say those feeling 'conquered,' namely the Irish Canadians and the French Canadians, will constitute the most virulent and uncompromising antagonists.

The analysis of this English-French clash in the early twentieth century will bring to light the different ideologies

and presuppositions of each party. The Anglophone Catholics merely reflected the mood of the times in their 'progressive' faith in Imperialism and Anglo-Saxon superiority; they only outdid their Protestant fellow-citizens in the intensity of this faith, nourished by the insecure and therefore agressive militancy of the large Irish Canadian contingent within Ontario Catholicism. The French Catholics on the other hand, educated in a minority psychology, both politically and religiously, were endeavoring to preserve and develop a French Canadian Catholic culture in a majority English Protestant province. They thus fought for bilingualism and biculturalism in Ontario, and it is interesting to see that the editorials in Le Devoir by Henri Bourassa, the man whom Fallon saw as his arch-enemy in his 'Nationalist' capacity, could be taken verbatim as the present-day policies of the governments led by L.B. Pearson in the 1960's and P.E. Trudeau in the late sixties and early seventies.

Both camps made use of every weapon available, including their church and diplomatic pressures by foreign governments. The French and English Canadian Roman Catholic hierarchy each appointed an agent in Rome to defend their respective causes. The study shows the vast amount of misunderstanding of each party by the other, and the unquestionable sincerity of most of the actors. It also shows how, an ethnic minority group in Ontario, supported by the Francophone Catholics of Québec, succeeded in breaking an Ontario law unfavorable to themselves, and how they succeeded in reversing the policies

of Rome with regard to the language and cultural affiliation of episcopal nominees to Ontario sees.

Finally, given that the Canadian Roman Catholic Church is the only large Canadian institution with deep roots in all parts of the country and with a relatively unified government, knowledge of its involvement in Canada's foremost national problem may foster its greater participation in the construction of a bilingual and bicultural but united country.

Therefore, while recognizing the importance of Catholicism in the building of Canada, I will be arguing that whenever ethnic, cultural and linguistic factors appeared at odds with Church directives between 1897 and 1927, the former took priority among both French and English Catholics.

III-The Story

My study is set in a framework of developing ethnic, linguistic and cultural awareness, beginning to grow on several fronts during the last three decades of the nineteenth century, reaching a peak of virulence during the first fifteen years of the twentieth century, and slowly ddclining thereafter until its public termination in 1927. I have chosen the year 1897 as a point of departure for that is when Archbishop Duhamel of Ottawa sent a lengthy report to Rome arguing against the division of his Archdiocese as solicited by Ontario's Anglophone Catholic hierarchy. Also, the Reverend M.F. Fallon, O.M.I., had been appointed Vice-Rector of the University of Ottawa in 1896, and was just getting in stride by 1897 as leader of Ottawa's

Irish-Catholic community. The year 1927 was the time when the Ontario Legislature abrogated the Ontario Department of Education's Circular of Instructions No. 17 , the ruling which had fed the fires of nativism and racism since 1912.

English-French conflict within Ontario Catholicism during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was manifest in two areas, the ecclesiastical and the educational, the latter area leading simultaneously to political conflict. I will deal with each of these in turn.

The fourth Provincial Council of Québec in 1868 divided Canada into three ecclesiastical provinces, namely Québec, Toronto, and Saint-Boniface, the norm of division being that Québec was for the French, Toronto for the English, and Saint-Boniface for the 'mëtis' or half-breeds (mixture of Indian and French Canadian Voyageurs), the latter being centered in the prairies of Western Canada. The diocese of Ottawa, Ontario, straddled the boundary between the two civil provinces of Québec and Ontario, but since the majority of its Roman Catholic faithful was Francophone, the Bishop was Francophone and was a suffragan of the Québec Archbishop and belonged to the ecclesiastical province of Québec. The Archbishop of Toronto disliked this state of affairs and informed Ottawa's Bishop Guigues as early as 1868 that he would ask Rome to make Ottawa part of the T^{o}ronto ecclesiastical province. Guigues resisted until his death in 1874, whereupon the English bishops of Ontario submitted a petition to Rome arguing the same case.

J.T. Duhamel, Guigues' successor in Ottawa in 1874, also objected to the Toronto move, claiming it was merely an attempt by the English of Ontario to remove the French-speaking Bishop of Ottawa and replace him by an English-speaking one. Rome temporized, and the Toronto group reiterated its plea in 1879 and again in 1881. The latter attempt was prompted by a petition by the Archbishop of Québec in 1881 requesting that Rome promote Ottawa to the level of Archdiocese, and make it the head of a new ecclesiastical province, continuing to straddle the Ontario-Québec boundary. This was done in 1886. However, Toronto continued to pressure Rome, demanding that the Ottawa Archdiocese be split to conform with the civil boundaries and that Ottawa become a part of the ecclesiastical province of Toronto. Increased pressures in this regard forced Archbishop Duhamel to write a rebuttal in 1897.

In 1899, Rome established a permanent Apostolic Delegation in Ottawa, and thereafter a new series of actors or middlemen would participate in all of Canadian Catholicism's problems.

Ecclesiastical French-English quarrels were to come to a head in 1910, for on April 25 of that year, the Reverend M.F. Fallon O.M.I. was consecrated Bishop of London, Ontario, a bi-ethnic diocese, and in August, Archbishop C.H. Gauthier of Kingston was transferred to the see of Ottawa, vacant since Duhamel's death in 1909. Fallon's appointment was unfortunate, for the man was already seriously compromised by his involvement in

the University of Ottawa affair; he would detonate the ethnic explosive which had become very unstable by 1910. By the same token, Gauthier's sympathies were all with the English camp : he had called and chaired an August 15, 1910 meeting of Ontario's Anglophone Bishops which pressured the Ontario Premier to disregard the requests of the January, 1910, Congress of Franco-Ontarians. Yet Rome appointed Gauthier to direct the destinies of an Archdiocese and ecclesiastical province whose faithful were 4/5 French.

Thereafter there was no end to controversy over ecclesiastical affairs. Zealots of both parties compiled statistics to show the numbers of English or French faithful in parishes, dioceses, schools, and mission posts. In mixed parishes the comparative length of French and English sermons, catechism classes, and singing was tabulated. Any and all episcopal vacancies were the occasion for lengthy and varied petitions by an increasing number of interested parties including Bishops, clergy, and politicians, requesting a successor of their persuasion or at least the transfer of their 'bigot' elsewhere in order to make room for their man. Appeals by Rome or by other men of good will were of no avail; the disease had to run its course.

The clash between French and English Catholics over education was somewhat more extensive and complex. It first came to a head during the first decade of the twentieth century at the University of Ottawa. This skirmish would train the war-

riors for the broader provincial stage during the next decade.

Incorporated in 1848 as Saint Joseph's College in Bytown (later Ottawa), and chartered in 1866 at the last session of the Parliament of the United Canadas, the University of Ottawa was from the outset a bilingual school established by its founder Bruno Guigues, O.M.I., a Frenchman, to serve the needs of the Ottawa area. Guigues was also the first Bishop of Ottawa as well as Provincial Superior of the Oblates in Canada. Upon his death in 1874, the school became unilingual English and remained so until 1901 when it reverted back to its bilingual policy.

The Reverend M.E. Fallon,O.M.I., newly-ordained (1894) was appointed in 1894 to the University as a Professor of english. In 1896 he was also appointed Vice-Rector and during these years he became the foremost leader of Ottawa's Anglophone Catholic population. For reasons unknown, but perhaps because of his manifest Anglophilia and Francophobia (he claimed to love the French language and the French people, but he could never get along with them) he was removed as Vice-Rector in 1898, and was appointed Pastor of the campus' St. Joseph Church. Fallon led the resistance to the University's reversion to bilingualism in 1900-1901, and in the summer of 1901 he was made Religious Superior of the Oblate 'Holy Angels' parish in Buffalo N.Y. He later claimed his removal from Ottawa resulted from a plot.

However, although stationed outside the country, Fallon

remained the central figure in the University of Ottawa ethnic war which raged from 1901 to 1908. His Ottawa partisans made him just as effectively present as if he had been there in person. Through a series of short visits back to Ottawa, Fallon managed to remain very much in the center of things. The English camp protested and fought every move by the University authorities which could possibly be construed as partial to the French and prejudicial to the English. One headline followed another in the local newpapers as Ottawa's Catholic University became a racist battlefield. At one stage or another the partisans managed to enlist Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Apostolic Delegates, Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, and, necessarily, the international administration of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. No churchman or church decree carried enough weight to quell the controversy.

In spite of the above episode's virulence however, the educational conflict between French and English Canadians that was to determine much of Canada's future history only erupted during the second decade of the century.

Since 1883, as a result of extensive French Canadian migration into Ontario and the simultaneous English Canadian migration from Ontario to the Western provinces and to the United States, nativism began to characterize Ontario politics. The Orange lodges became very active in shaping public opinion and in pressuring the Ontario government, primarily through the parliamentary Opposition Conservative party. The result

was a series of government-sponsored inquiries into the status and quality of Ontario's bilingual schools (the schools of the Francophone minority), and some provincial regulations requiring that the teaching in these schools be done in the English language (1885, 1891). But legal loopholes in these rulings allowed the bilingual schools to continue operations as before, and Ontario's Liberal government tolerated the situation.

During the nineties Ottawa was the scene of initial educational skirmishing between French and English Catholics. The Ottawa Separate School Board, elected by Separate School ratepayers, operated both the English and bilingual schools of its jurisdiction. Because of growing discontent and ethnic-linguistic consciousness among parents and their representatives on the Board, it was decided at a public meeting of 1886, chaired by Archbishop Duhamel, that the Board would thereafter divide itself into a French and an English Committee, each being responsible for the handling of funds and the enactment of educational regulations applicable to bilingual and English Separate Schools respectively. It is significant that Fallon, then a student at the University of Ottawa, attended this meeting. The arrangement was based on an agreement whereby each city ward would be entitled to have one English and one French trustee, and whereby English voters would not interfere in the election of the French trustee and vice-versa. This arrangement appears to have worked to the mutual satisfaction of both parties until 1903, when because of the controversy

which was raging around the University of Ottawa, Francophone rate payers intervened in one city ward's Separate School Board election helping to defeat the English candidate who was unsympathetic to bilingualism and thereby electing an Anglophone candidate who was sympathetic to the claims of the Francophones. The French thereby gained an effective majority on the Separate School Board and in 1906, the system of dual Committees was abolished and all schools, both bilingual and English, reverted to the direct control of the full Board of Trustees. By this time, Francophones constituted a sizeable majority (2/3) of the Catholics subject to the Ottawa Separate School Board but were nevertheless electing only nine of the Board's eighteen Trustees.

In this context, the Anglophone Catholic faction claimed that it was contributing more tax dollars than the Francophone Catholic and that the School Board was spending more on the bilingual Schools than on the English Separate Schools. This claim appears to have been unfounded.

The turn of the century, also witnessed another French-English issue in Ottawa. 'Les Frères des Ecoles Chrétiennes,' a Roman Catholic Congregation of teaching Brothers, had established themselves in Ottawa in the early 1860's and had grown by the nineties into the largest teaching Order in the city, staffing most of the boys' schools. In 1893-1894, they were accused of a series of misdemeanors in their administration of several Ottawa Separate Schools (e.g. outdated pedagogical

theory, mediocre manuals, overpricing of textbooks, arbitrary discipline), and a movement to oust them from Ottawa was initiated by some prominent Ottawa Francophones. It happened that these same French ratepayers were members of an Ottawa liberal intellectual group and members of the Ontario Liberal party. Archbishop Duhamel, supported by his clergy, saw their move against the Brothers as a manifestation of anticlericalism and excessive anglophilia. In fact these liberals even wrote newspaper articles on Roman Catholic ecclesiology, which were anything, but, ultramontane. They succeeded in having the 'Frères' removed from the city's schools in 1897, much to the Archbishop's regret; by then, however, even this controversy had begun to take on linguistic and ethnic overtones. The Brothers were to return in 1902.

In 1907, after a prolonged judicial dispute, the King's Privy Council in Great Britain upheld an Ontario Court ruling that 'Religious' (Nuns and Brothers) teachers in Ontario, had to obtain provincial certification just as any other teacher. Ontario's Catholic hierarchy had fought this regulation, particularly because of its effect on the bilingual Catholic schools. In fact these schools were largely staffed by 'Religious' coming from the province of Québec where no provincial certification laws existed apart from those enacted by particular congregations of 'Religious'. If these teachers were required to qualify by Ontario standards, many would return to Québec and Ontario's bilingual schools would lose many of

its cheap laborers.

This prompted the Ottawa Franco-Ontarians to meet in late 1908, the outcome being a resolution to call a Congress representative of all the French of Ontario. The meeting was held in January 1910, attended by some 1,200 delegates. The Congress, via its Executive, sent a list of requests to the Ontario Government in February, 1910.

Meanwhile, Ontario's Bishops were on the verge of obtaining more advantageous tax-sharing for Ontario's Separate schools. The Government, in late 1909, agreed to submit to the Legislature a revised bill to that effect, the text of which had been hammered out to the mutual satisfaction of the Bishops and the Government. But after receiving the requests of the Association Canadienne-Francaise d'Education d'Ontario (ACFEO), the Premier informed the English Bishops that this so complicated matters that their tax-sharing bill would not be submitted to the Legislature in the foreseeable future. The Bishops were furious, and began calling meetings of Ontario's English-speaking Bishops only, whereas both the English and French hierarchies of Ontario were invited to former meetings. It is at this time (April 1910), that Fallon was consecrated Bishop of London, and at a meeting of August 15, 1910, the English-speaking Bishops of Ontario, delegated him as their spokesman to pressure the provincial government against any compromise with the Franco-Ontarians.

Fallon had seen ethnic action before this, however. Less

than a month after his consecration of April 25, 1910, he had convened a high official of the Ontario Department of Education in order to express to him, in most categorical terms, his determination to suppress all bilingual schooling in his diocese and to handle any and all clerical agitators defending that cause; he wanted the government to do its share on the political and administrative side. Mr. Hanna reported this conversation to his superior, Doctor Pyne, Minister of Education, in a lengthy letter, which was released to the press four months later, by a Francophone sympathizer working for an Ontario Cabinet Minister, and published in Le Devoir in October 1910. On June 5, 1910, the Detroit Free Press in an article entitled "French and Irish War in Ontario," made the issue a public one and stated that the Irish Catholics of Ontario were now defending the same cause as the Orangemen, their traditional enemies, against the French Catholics. In July, Bishop Fallon reiterated his stand in a diocesan retreat for priests, and in August, Premier James Pliny Whitney wrote the A.C.F.E.O. telling them that the law as it then stood allowed the Franco-Ontarians all desirable freedom.

In September of 1910, at a Montreal Eucharistic Congress, Archbishop Bourne of London, England, made a speech arguing that the Catholic Church in Canada had better adopt the English language as its sole mode of expression, for English was the language of the future. This prompted Henri Bourassa, former federal Member of Parliament, and editor in chief of Le Devoir

in Montréal, to respond by defending the French Canadians' right to speak French in their country, and to advise churchmen to 'be all things to all men' and thus to speak French with Francophone people. His newspaper thereupon published the Hanna-Pyne letter of May 1910, relating the Fallon-Hanna conversation in Sarnia, Ontario. Fallon then reentered the play by a public speech in Goderich, Ontario, arguing anew his belief that bilingualism was pedagogically unsound, its only result being to make the French Canadians 'hewers of wood and drawers of water.'

Meanwhile the Ontario Gobernment had established another Commission of Inquiry led by Dr. Merchant, and bearing again on Ontario's bilingual schools. The Commissions's Report led to the enactment of Circular of Instructions No. 17 by the Ontario Department of Education in June of 1912, this being made a permanent law in August of 1913. The Circular, commonly referred to as 'Regulation XVII,' forbade the use of French as a language of instruction or communication in any school of Ontario, except in cases where in the judgment of the Chief Inspector of Schools, the children could not understand English. In the latter case, French could be used in the first two years of schooling but not thereafter.

Since the regulation only affected French-speaking pupils, and since the latter were almost all Catholic, and therefore the great majority being in Separate schools under the strong control of the provincial Bishops, the 'Regulation

XVII' controversy was particularly acute within Catholicism. Bishop Fallon led the Anglophone Catholic camp, the ACFEO prompted by Franco-Catholic Bishops and clergy led the Franco-Ontarian camp, and the Ottawa Separate School Board, advised by the ACFEO led the open defiance of the Ontario Government's 'Regulation XVII.'

Samuel Genest, Chairman of the Ottawa Board and future President of the ACFEO (1919-1921), informed the Ontario Department of Education in September 1912, that Ottawa would not comply with 'seventeen'. Toronto thereupon threatened and cajoled the Ottawa Trustees but to no avail. Meanwhile, Ottawa Anglophone Catholics became progressively more vociferous and menacing, particularly after the Toronto Government withheld all grants from the Ottawa Separate School Board until they complied with the infamous Regulation. Genest was not to give in. Teachers went unpaid, all building programs were discontinued, collections were taken up throughout the Province of Québec, and the Québec Legislature passed special legislation enabling Québec school boards to contribute to the Ottawa cause. Whenever English school Inspectors appeared in bilingual schools, children left their classrooms by windows and fire escapes.

In an attempt to break its bilingualist opposition, the Ontario Legislature passed special legislation in 1915 dissolving the Ottawa Separate School Board and appointing in its place a three man Commission. The Ottawa Board thereupon

appealed to the Courts claiming the Ontario Legislature's move was ultra vires. The King's Privy Council ultimately upheld the Genest appeal, the Commission was dissolved, the elected School Board reinstated, and the three member Commission was sued for illegitimately spending the Ottawa Separate School Board's funds.

Ottawa's Francophone resistance had its dramatic moments. When the three man Commission of 1915 took over a local school, ousting its regular teachers and mounting a police guard to prevent the rebels from returning, Ottawa's Franco-Catholic parents converged on the school and while the men kept the police busy, the regular teachers reentered through the windows. The women then mounted a day and night guard around the school to prevent a recurrence of the incident; they used hat pins as weapons. Lady Laurier, wife of Canada's former Prime Minister, chaired a drive to collect money to purchase coal for the schools, and Ottawa's teaching Brothers led the local schoolchildren in demonstrations and protest parades.

The Canadian Catholic hierarchy divided along linguistic and cultural lines, for or against 'seventeen'. The Anglophone Catholic hierarchy to a man, favored the new ruling; the Franco-Catholic hierarchy just as unanimously rejected it. Rome endeavored to obtain a compromise solution, but to no avail; indeed the Cardinal-Archbishop of Québec and Primate of the Catholic Church in Canada warned Rome that if the French Canadian observed many more instances of a pro-Anglicization

policy by the Church, particularly in the nomination of Bishops, there were strong possibilities that schism would ensue, for the French Catholics were resolved to defend their rights at all costs.

While several appeals in the Courts were being decided (1914-1916) in favor of the Government's stand, Pope Benedict XV, in 1916, sent a letter to the Canadian Bishops urging peace and understanding, defending the right of Francophones to learn and speak their language, and urging the Government's right to require that they learn English. This was the position the French Canadians had defended all along; the English Bishops agreed but insisted that the first two years of elementary schooling were sufficient for the French language: thereafter all should speak English. A meeting of all Ontario Bishops was held in January 1917 in Ottawa, whereupon Fallon published a lengthy (60 pp.) memorandum to his episcopal colleagues, defending his stand on Regulation XVII, decrying the abuse he was subjected to by French newspapers, and calling upon the assembled Bishops to do nothing about 'seventeen'. The assembled Lords did manage, however, to publish a joint pastoral letter to their faithful which rather blandly repeated the Pope's statement, but hardly added anything to it. This letter did however show a willingness to stay together, for it was signed by all Ontario Bishops, both French and English. It marks the end of the period of open warfare among the Catholics of Ontario. Bilingual and bicultural

peace gradually returned during the next ten years (1918-1927), and Regulation XVII was abrogated in September 1927.

The end of World War I and its French-English troubles about military conscription disposed the Canadian people to earnestly seek a settlement to their foremost domestic problem. The men responsible for the return to normalcy in French-English relations between 1918 and 1927 were Liberal Senator Napoleon Belcourt and the members of the Unity League of Ontario. Belcourt had been President of the ACFEO from 1910 to 1912 when he resigned, due to in-fighting within the Association. In 1920 he was asked by Cardinal Bégin of Québec in the name of the Francophone hierarchy to reassume command of the ACFEO, which he agreed to do; he was reelected to the Presidency in 1921. He immediately proceeded, in unison with some leading Toronto intellectuals, to found the Unity League of Ontario, whose avowed purpose was to recreate bilingual and bicultural unity in Ontario. This League was the primary instrument in changing Ontario public opinion during the twenties. It is significant that of the one hundred and fifty members of this Association, only one was Roman Catholic, namely Belcourt himself; every other member was Protestant. Although for political purposes, it was essential that the League be made up of Anglophones, the fact that none of these were Roman Catholic illustrates a key part of my thesis, namely that racism and Francophobia were much more prevalent among Ontario's

Irish-Catholics than they were among the Anglo-Protestant majority of the population. The significance of this point lies in the fact that Fallon and his followers would never admit that for them language and religious faith went hand in hand; indeed, they denied this categorically. The French Catholics, on the other hand, openly admitted and stated that their language and faith were inextricably bound; they wrote editorials and lengthy essays to defend this view.

Both the educational and ecclesiastical aspects of English-French conflict in Ontario will appear as a single problem in the part of my dissertation studying Bishop Fallon's troubles within his own diocese. Fallon's Francophobia was integral and applied to all areas subject to his power of decision. His activities aimed at eliminating French from the schools of his diocese are inseparable from his efforts at replacing Francophone religious orders by Anglophone ones; his efforts to anglicize his churches are also one aspect of his basic policy.

Fallon was to spend a lengthy part of his episcopal career (1910-1931) in ecclesiastical courts defending himself against several charges, most of them resulting from his alleged persecution of his French subjects, clerical and lay. Rome twice suggested he resign his see because of the constant trouble he was in, but the warrior-Bishop would refuse and then inform his priests that he had turned down an important promotion because of his love of them. Summarily Fallon was a fighter, and

he needed a fight at all times to make life worth living. Whenever things were too quiet on the home front, he went out of his way to pick a fight; at different times he attacked the Protestant churches, criticized the visit of a government envoy to Mexico, and defended the cause of Irish independence.

The London diocese proved particularly sensitive to English-French differences, but need not have become a major problem area, had a more tactful and pastorally sensitive Pastor been appointed. Though some local differences of opinion had occurred in the Windsor area around 1900, the diocese had a relatively unblemished record of English-French cordiality until the promotion of Bishop McEvay to the archbishopric of Toronto in 1908, indeed, until April 25, 1910, the day of Fallon's consecration.

The London troubles began before the date of the consecration, when the Francophone Apostolic Administrator of the see, asked Fallon if he would allow him to say a few words in French, after the English speech, on the day of the consecration ceremonies. Fallon refused. When Archbishop Bruchési of Montréal discreetly pressured Fallon to comply with his Vicar-General's request, he was told in no uncertain terms to mind his own business. Fallon then accepted to hear the French words of welcome. Once established in his see, and having begun to make himself known as a bigoted Francophobe (i.e. conversation with Hanna in May, 1910, statement to his priests in July, 1910, delegation to Premier Whitney in August, 1910, Goderich statement in October, 1910). Fallon closed a bilingual

teacher-training school in Windsor by removing the French Religious Order of Women who operated it, and replacing the Order by an English one. To the Windsor Separate School Board's protests he replied that as Bishop he alone would decide which Order belonged in the Diocese.

When one of his parish priests died, the Bishop, through his Vicar-General, appointed a replacement who was clearly not welcome to the Francophone parishioners. When the parishioners congregated before the priest's house in order to prevent the newcomer's installation, the police were called in to install the new pastor by force (they broke a few heads in the process) and a squad of soldiers was assigned to guard the house to prevent the faithful from throwing the man out.

Faced with numerous complaints of unilingual-English catechism instruction, Fallon would reply that since most children understood English, they should be content with English unilingualism. It was only after several complaints, petitions (by adults and children) and pressures brought to bear by the Apostolic Delegate that Fallon consented to have some catechism classes in French and some French preaching in mixed French-English parishes. The Bishop refused one of his senior Pastors permission to attend an annual meeting of a French Language Association in Québec city, for no valid reason, and when this same priest protested the Bishop's decision, Fallon removed him from his parish in spite of the parishioners' protests, and informed him that his services would no longer be

required in the London Diocese. The priest in question had been serving there for twenty-five years, and was no longer a young man. Finally, in 1913, Fallon was sued in ecclesiastical court by five of his Francophone priests for his alleged persecution of the French minority.

Throughout the second decade of the century, while Fallon was defending himself against two ecclesiastical lawsuits and one civil lawsuit, Rome's Consistorial Congregation at first intimated to Fallon (1913) that a large American diocese was his for the asking, and then, in 1918, explicitly suggested to him, in rather severe words, that he move elsewhere. As stated above, however, the Bishop of London refused to move.

IV-Conclusion

It is a well-known fact in Canadian history that the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were a time of increasing linguistic and cultural tension between French and English, as well as a time of growing nativism in Ontario. The French-English troubles of 1910-1927 are usually seen as an effort by Anglo-Protestant Ontario to curb French-Catholic expansion in the province.

While recognizing the truth of this for the late nineteenth century, my study shows that after the year 1910, Roman Catholics of English speech were just as responsible as the Anglo-Protestants for limiting the linguistic rights of the Francophones. Moreover it will appear that Anglo-Protestants were much more active in reestablishing the rights

of the French Catholics during the 1920's than were the Anglophone Catholics. I will argue that this was the case partly because of the minority consciousness of the English Catholics as opposed to the Protestants, and partly because of the more tightly-structured religion of the Catholics, assuming that once religion supports a cause, good or bad, that cause can be made to outlast its usefulness. Indeed by the end of World War I, the cause of Ontario's Orange Lodges reflected in the slogan "One Faith, One Flag, One Language" was no longer viable, for the fact was that ten percent of Ontario's population was Francophone, French and English had fought and died side by side in the war, and the Canadian people were tired of continued fighting and strife.

Two novels pleading for mutual understanding and goodwill were published (The Clash, Bridging the Chasm), Ontario businessmen began good-will visits to Québec, and the Unity League of Ontario was founded. It was easier for the Protestants to modify their attitudes in regard to the French Canadians, for religion was not as determining a factor in their ideological make-up as it was for the Roman Catholics. The Francophone Catholics did not need to change their attitude substantially for they still stood for the same rights as they had in 1910. The English Catholics were however compelled, by the new mood and climate of opinion to change their policies to a significant degree; this proved more difficult for them than for the Protestants, for Anglo-Catholic leaders had in fact

identified the cause of their faith with that of their language, and the rigid determinism of Catholic doctrine in the early twentieth century did not allow substantial alterations to its teachings.

I therefore argue that within the boundaries of Ontario Catholicism, between 1897 and 1927, linguistic, ethnic and cultural factors always took priority over Church directives whenever the former appeared at odds with the latter.

My assumptions as they bear upon the study are that Roman Catholicism must maintain a policy of universalism as opposed to narrow parochialism in every sphere of its activity, that Canada is worth maintaining as a nation and that bilingualism and biculturalism are the only viable means to achieve this goal. I also believe that the Canadian Roman Catholic Church had both the right and the duty to become involved in the controversies of the period, even though some of its activities did more harm than good, and that the separation of Church and State, though most desirable in the legal and fiscal realms, must never be understood to mean that whatever the State lays claim to is necessarily out of bounds to the Church (e.g. education).

Interpretative histories:

Wade, Mason, The French Canadians, 1860-1967, Rev. ed., Toronto, Macmillan of Canada; New York, St. Martin's Press, 1968, 2 vol., 1128 p.

Sissons, C.B., Bilingual Schools in Canada, London, England, 1917.

Walker, F.A., Catholic Education and Politics in Ontario, Toronto, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1968.

Appendix

Sources

I-Publications

Barber, Marilyn, "The Ontario Bilingual Schools Issue: Sources of Conflict," in Canadian Historical Review, Vol.XLVII, No. 3, September 1966, p. 227-248.

Prang, Margaret, "Clerics, Politicians and the Bilingual Schools Issue in Ontario, 1910-1917," in Canadian Historical Review, Vol. XLI, No. 4, December 1960, p. 281-307.

Sissons, C.B., Bilingual Schools in Canada, London, England, 1917.

Wade, Mason, The French Canadians, 1860-1967, Rev. ed., Toronto, Macmillan of Canada; New York, St. Martin's Press, 1968, 2 vol., 1128 p.

Walker, F.A., Catholic Education and Politics in Ontario, Toronto, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1968.

II-Unpublished sources are not found in any one major collection but are scattered at random throughout Ontario. The main sources of documentation are entries 1 and 2 of the following list.

1. Archives of the Diocese of London, Ont.
2. Archives of the ACFEO
   a) papers held at the U. of Ottawa Library
   b) papers held at ACFEO headquarters, Ottawa.
3. Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa.

4. Archives of the Province of Ontario, Toronto.

5. University of Toronto Library - Special Collections.

6. Archives of the Archdiocese of Ottawa.

7. Archives of the Archdiocese of Kingston, Ont.

8. Archives of the Diocese of Alexandria, Ont.

9. Archives of the Diocese of Hearst, Ont.

10. Archives of the University of Ottawa, held at Saint-Paul University, Ottawa.

All of the above archives, with the exception of the University of Ottawa archives and of the papers held by the University of Toronto Library, are unclassified, the documents being held in varying states of chaos and confusion.