

21-1923/1-1-0

sp. 13

#3.95 copy.

**BI**  
**LINGUAL**  
**ISM & BI**  
**CULTURAL**  
**ISM**

An abridged version  
of the Royal Commission Report

**HUGH R. INNIS**

Z 1-1963/1-1-0  
ISBN 0-660-00216-7

INFORMATION CANADA

# Bilingualism and Biculturalism

SEP 14 1973

BIBLIOTHÈQUE DES DOCUMENTS

An abridged version of the Royal Commission Report

**Hugh R. Innis**  
*Ryerson Polytechnical Institute*

Published by McClelland and Stewart Limited  
in co-operation with  
The Secretary of State Department  
and Information Canada

NOV 25 1976

BIBLIOTHÈQUE DES DOCUMENTS

# Contents

Foreword/Royce Frith *iv*

GENERAL INTRODUCTION: KEY WORDS OF THE TERMS OF  
REFERENCE *1*

BOOK ONE: THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES *7*

Part One: Bilingualism in Canada: Its Foundations *7*

Part Two: Towards a Regime of Linguistic Equality *14*

Recommendations *31*

BOOK TWO: EDUCATION *35*

Part One: Official Language Minority Schools *36*

Part Two: Second-Language Teaching in Canada *54*

Part Three: Education and Cultural Duality *61*

Recommendations *68*

BOOK THREE: THE WORK WORLD *75*

Part One: Socio-Economic Status and Ethnic Origin *80*

Part Two: The Federal Administration *90*

Part Three: The Private Sector *105*

Recommendations *118*

BOOK FOUR: THE CULTURAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF OTHER ETHNIC  
GROUPS *129*

Part One: Immigration *136*

Part Two: Economic, Political and Social Problems *137*

Part Three: The Maintenance of Language and Culture *151*

Recommendations *157*

BOOK FIVE: THE FEDERAL CAPITAL *161*

The Capital City *161*

The Role of the Federal Government *165*

Recommendations *168*

BOOK SIX: VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS *171*

Equal Partnership *171*

Language and Culture *173*

Structure *175*

Conclusion *179*

APPENDIX: THE TERMS OF REFERENCE *184*

## *Foreword*

Almost ten years have passed since ten Canadians, of whom I was one, were appointed to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Our terms of reference asked us to—

“inquire into and report upon the existing state of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada and to recommend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races, taking into account the contribution to the enrichment of Canada and the measures that should be taken to safeguard that contribution.”

We came, not as politicians or social technicians, but as citizens, who, through research studies, public hearings and in the light of our own backgrounds, could report as eyewitnesses on the Canadian condition in the areas of language and culture. We came not as teachers, but as students. We were undertaking an inquiry, not launching a movement.

Virtually no research existed in our fields of interest. As a result our research program was costly both as to time and money and the books of our Report emerged slowly. I believe the long evolution of the Report and its careful and reasoned approach helped to reinforce its message. More Canadians seemed to be viewing our country as we viewed it and coming to similar conclusions. Public discussion of the work of the Commission helped to deepen the understanding that, as held in the Preliminary Report, Canada was passing through the “greatest crisis” in its history. The time seemed right for our Report and our Report right

for the time. Few reports of royal commissions can have been as little read and yet so quickly, with general public concurrence, acted upon.

Our Preliminary Report saw both the public and commissioners coming to grips with enormous problems arising from French speaking Canadians' historical disenchantment with their place and status and English speaking Canadians' apparent failure to perceive the situation. As our studies progressed, both groups came to appreciate and assess one of Canada's central difficulties. The Commission was able to raise the level of public understanding and to act as a catalyst in the process of searching for solutions. We all learned of the inequalities endured by French Canadians in their relations with the Federal Government, at school and at work. The Commission, like Canadians generally, viewed the problem without dwelling on recriminations over past injuries, or who started what; it began to search out a just accommodation to the present and in the future. Slowly an effective consensus was reached on problems and solutions.

The Commission's work has produced changes. The debate is still not ended on whether many of the reforms have gone too far, or not far enough. New Government policies were announced as early as 1966 by the then Prime Minister Lester Pearson. The Official Languages Act of 1969 gave French and English equal status as official languages of the Parliament and Government of Canada. The ground work was laid for the bilingual districts which we had recommended in the first volume of the Report. A Commissioner of Official Languages was appointed to ensure recognition of the status of the two languages. Reforms have taken place in the Provinces, notably in New Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba. French Canadians appear to be playing a more important role in the private sector and French is increasingly becoming a language of work in Quebec. The recommended French language units in the Federal Public Service have been started.

While all of these and other developments are important, perhaps most impressive is the common-sense, Canadian way in which we have analyzed our bilingual and bicultural nature and quietly but determinedly begun to make necessary changes.

This book is not an "official" or Commission-approved abbreviation of the six report volumes. I do however compliment and thank Mr. Innis for his very good work. The book will help to clarify some of the ongoing changes for a public not reached by the very large original report. While it contains the exact words of the Commission, much is necessarily omitted. If, however, it contributes to a broader understanding of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism and, indeed, sends many people back to read the report itself, it will have served a very useful purpose.

*Royce Frith*

Toronto

1 November, 1972

# GENERAL INTRODUCTION – Key Words of the Terms of Reference

After a long period of listening we believe it is now necessary to indicate the meaning we shall give in particular to the words “bilingualism” and “biculturalism”, and to the expression “an equal partnership between the two founding races”. Since these terms are understood in different ways it is important at the outset to be clear about which meaning or meanings we shall use.

## “Race” and “People”

This wording, particularly the use in the English text of the word “race”, has been a source of misunderstanding. Should it be taken to mean that two “races” or two “peoples” will receive special treatment at the expense of the “other ethnic groups”?

In our view the reference to the two “founding races” or “peoples who founded Confederation” is an allusion to the undisputed role played by Canadians of French and British origin in 1867, and long before Confederation. The word “race” is used in an older meaning as referring to a national group, and carries no biological significance.

## “Ethnic group”

In both popular and academic language the term “ethnic group” is used in several different ways. Generally, this term expresses a

## 2 *Bilingualism and Biculturalism*

sense of identity rooted in a common origin, mainly in the biological sense, whether this common origin is real or imaginary. The concept of ethnic group is useful since it corresponds to unquestionable realities: every person is the offspring of his father and this notion of descent, found in the word "ethnic," has important consequences. Thus, quite apart from heredity, much of the culture of one's forbears can be preserved even when one no longer speaks their language. Moreover, it would be particularly difficult to eliminate the idea of "ethnic origin," for it is the only available statistical measure – admittedly indirect – of certain phenomena, a knowledge of which is indispensable to our inquiry; many of our studies draw upon official Canadian statistics, which are based on ethnic origin.

The Commission has been charged with the task of inquiring into "the existing state of bilingualism and biculturalism" and "the contribution made by the other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada". In both cases it is primarily a question of linguistic and cultural matters, or linguistic and cultural aspects of political and socio-economic matters. Therefore, we shall speak more often of linguistic and cultural groups, rather than of ethnic groups.

### **Bilingualism**

The bilingualism which here concerns us applies only to Canada's two official languages, English and French.

In practice, people who are considered bilingual know, more or less, two languages. We know that complete bilingualism – the equal command of two languages – is rare and perhaps impossible. Generally, the bilingual people one meets combine a knowledge of their mother tongue with a more or less extensive and active knowledge of the second language.

We therefore have to be cautious. When the 1961 census speaks of approximately 2,230,000 bilingual people in the country, about 12 per cent of the population, this does not mean that these people can speak French and English equally well, and are therefore interchangeable. The figure includes approximately



1,666,000 Canadians of French origin, for whom English is generally only a second language; nearly 318,000 Canadians of British origin, for whom French is in most cases only a second language; and nearly 248,000 Canadians of other origins, for whom French and English may very well be merely second languages which have been acquired in varying degrees. It will be seen throughout the Report that these distinctions – and many others of a less simple character – have practical consequences.

Up to this point, we have spoken only of the bilingualism of individuals. But the bilingual nature of an institution, a province, or a country is a totally different matter. A bilingual country is not one where all the inhabitants necessarily have to speak two languages; rather it is a country where the principal public and private institutions must provide services in two languages to citizens, the vast majority of whom may very well be unilingual. The same is true for a bilingual province or a bilingual institution. Consequently, “the existing state of bilingualism” in Canada is not so much a question of the number of bilingual people as of the position of each of the two languages in everyday life and of the opportunities actually offered to each of them.

Consider the importance of language for a particular group, and the political dimensions of this problem when the group is sufficiently important and moved by a common will to exist. This is very much a contemporary problem, which is dividing many countries – especially states born of post-war decolonization. Occasionally a desire is expressed that our country should not be engulfed in similar disputes, as if the countries so beset had deliberately provoked them and, perhaps, had even created them artificially. We feel that this attitude stems from a failure to appreciate the importance of the language problem and the explosive character which it often acquires, especially when it is not solved in a sufficiently liberal spirit.

On one hand, language, viewed as a means of expression, is at the core of the intellectual and emotional life of every personality. On the other hand, viewed as a means of communication, it “makes possible social organization.” It is used for the trivia of everyday living, on the labour market, in professional activities, in several forms of recreation, in church, in clubs, in schools, and

so on. Human contacts are established in one language. We shall mention later the difficulties, which may be dramatic in their intensity, faced by a bilingual person who must work in his second language—his sense of being diminished, the irritation which frequently results, and his loss of efficiency.

Language is the most evident expression of a culture, the one which most readily distinguishes cultural groups even for the most superficial observer. In terms of our mandate, this statement means that the problem of bilingualism and biculturalism are inseparably linked.

## Biculturalism

Culture is a way of being, thinking, and feeling. It is a driving force animating a significant group of individuals united by a common tongue, and sharing the same customs, habits, and experiences. Clearly the two cultures designated in our terms of reference are those associated with the English and the French languages in Canada. But as there are the two dominant languages, there are two principal cultures, and their influence extends, in greatly varying degrees, to the whole country.

In our view the term “biculturalism” covers two main realities. The first is the state of each of the two cultures, and the opportunity of each to exist and flourish. The second is the coexistence and collaboration of these two cultures within our country; that is to say, the set of conditions which will enable members of these two cultures to co-operate effectively.

## Equal Partnership

The languages and cultures of this country can be thought of in many different ways. However, our mandate clearly states the problem in terms of equality: it postulates an “equal partnership between the two founding races” (*“le principe de l'égalité entre les deux peuples fondateurs”*). As we understand our mandate, this equality should be the equal partnership not only of the two

peoples which founded Confederation but also of each of their respective languages and cultures. What we are aiming for, then, is the equal partnership of all who speak either language and participate in either culture, whatever their ethnic origin. For us the principle of equal partnership takes priority over all historical and legal considerations, regardless of how interesting and important such considerations may be.

It will be for Canadians to decide, mainly through their political parties and through their governments, whether to accept or to reject the principle of equality. Our task is, first of all, to determine the measure of equality now existing; but it is, above all, to propose a set of measures or a pattern which would make this equality possible.

Equality may be simply that of the members of a linguistic and cultural group, or that of the group itself considered collectively. Individual equality means essentially that everybody has the same access to the various benefits of a society without being hindered by his cultural identity. Thus, it is not enough for members of a minority group to have access to the same activities, institutions, and benefits as the members of the majority group; that simply requires an absence of discrimination against individuals as such. The equality to which we refer requires that a person who engages in some activity or associates with some institution need not renounce his own culture, but can offer his services, act, show his presence, develop, and be accepted with all his cultural traits.

The principle of equality implies respect for the idea of minority status, both in the country as a whole and in each of its regions. Within the provinces or smaller administrative entities, both Anglophones and Francophones live in some cases as a majority, in some cases as a minority. Since the English-speaking population is larger across the country, its members are less often in the minority; but they are the minority in some areas, especially in the province of Quebec. The Francophones are usually in the minority outside Quebec. In either case, however, the principle of equality requires that the minority receive generous treatment.

This proposal may seem Utopian, but is it really so? Recogniz-

## 6 *Bilingualism and Biculturalism*

ing the rights of a linguistic minority does not reduce those of the majority: with a little good will, the rights of both can be exercised without serious conflict, as is clearly demonstrated by the examples of Switzerland and Finland. In other words, a majority does not abdicate when it resolves to take a minority into consideration; it remains the majority, with the advantages its situation implies, while at the same time demonstrating its humanity.

# BOOK I: THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

## *Part I: Bilingualism in Canada: Its Foundations*

### Bilingualism of Individuals and States

All bilingual persons are not bilingual in the same ways. The quality of bilingualism differs according to the languages concerned, the uses each language is put to, the degree of interference between the languages, and the way in which the speaker keeps them apart. To these factors, inherent in the speaker, is usually added the stability and prestige of the languages involved and the geographic distribution of those who speak them.

Bilingualism has many other aspects. The person struggling in another language illustrates quite clearly the dimension of proficiency. The daily activities of many people force them to change their language to suit what they are doing, illustrating the functional aspect of language. The dominance of one language over another is shown by the fact that most bilinguals prefer one of their languages to the other, or allow one to influence the other, as their characteristic accents and typical sentence forms will indicate. But these factors are always relative, so that bilingualism itself is never an absolute quality.

Bilingual states were most often developed to maintain or preserve the cultures and languages of their surviving national groups. In bilingual states there are usually two or more unilingual nuclei – that is, two or more groups of persons who habitu-

ally live and work in one language, resorting to the other language only to communicate with fellow citizens of that language. These unilingual nuclei form the great mass of the population of bilingual states; they are the centres around which each of the major language groups tends to cluster.

The bilingual state is characterized by a wide variety of bilingual institutions, designed to guarantee that citizens are not disadvantaged because they belong to a minority linguistic group. Such institutions may include the legislature, the courts, the civil service, and the schools; but these institutions can have many different forms in different bilingual countries. A bilingual public service, for example, usually means one that can serve the public in any of the official languages. But, depending on circumstances, the extent that it does so may vary from one country to another. A bilingual public service may work in the official languages either permanently or intermittently and either nationally or regionally, depending on the type of bilingual state.

The world-wide prestige and influence of English and French, the isolation and the minority situation of the French-speaking community in North America, the deep roots of the French language in Quebec and in Canada—all these make Canada a bilingual state of a unique kind. The two languages and the two communities which speak them coexist in this country under conditions duplicated nowhere else.

## Population: The Two Main Language Groups

Two principal factors largely determine the linguistic composition of the Canadian population. First, people of different origins, in addition to the French and British, have immigrated to Canada. Second, most of these people or their descendants have progressively and in varying degrees adopted one of the country's two main languages and have been integrated to the official-language group of their choice. To understand the linguistic make-up of the population of Canada we shall have to ask two essential questions: What are the ethnic origins of the various components of the country's population? To what extent do they keep their

original languages, and what choices do they make about the two official languages?

For all practical purposes, the Canadian population at the time of Confederation was composed of two main groups, the British and the French. Since 1867, however, the continual increase of heterogeneity in the population has been most remarkable. First of all the relative size of the population of British origin has decreased (from 59 per cent in 1881 to 44 per cent in 1961), and even this, for statistical purposes, is often said to comprise various ethnic groups. On the other hand, the proportion of the French community has remained at the same level (30 per cent in 1881 and 1961). Finally there was the appearance and then the constant growth of the proportion of people of non-British, non-French extraction (from 11 per cent in 1881 to 26 per cent in 1961). The result has been as though, for every 100 Canadians, 15 of the 59 of British extraction present in 1881 had been replaced in 1961 by 3 Ukrainians, 2 Poles, 2 Italians, 2 Scandinavians, 1 Dutchman, 1 Jew, and 4 people of various origins (Austrian, Hungarian, Yugoslavian, and so on), while the 30 French and the 6 Germans remained. The country's two principal communities, which accounted for about 90 per cent of the Canadian population in 1867, have since declined in relative importance – because of the decrease of the British-origin group – to only 74 per cent of the population in 1961. Immigration from continental Europe certainly appears to be the principal reason for this growing diversity, but other factors such as emigration from Canada to the United States and the unequal birth-rate of Canada's various ethnic groups were also involved.

Since we do not know the principal language – the most used or the most familiar language – of each person living in Canada, we shall try to measure the phenomenon of language choice in this country – and consequently the degree of linguistic assimilation of Canadians of different ethnic origins – through the mother-tongue criterion.

The first thing to note is the increasing homogeneity of the Canadian population according to mother tongue in spite of increasing heterogeneity according to ethnic origin. The situation can be roughly summarized: those of British origin generally

speak English; 9 out of 10 people of French origin retain French as their mother tongue; those of other origins tend progressively to adopt English, except in Quebec where the situation is more complex. In fact, about one out of six Canadians no longer speaks the language of his forbears. Of those who changed languages, 93 per cent are English-speaking today. The tendency towards English is so strong that 25 per cent of those who now claim it as their mother tongue – 2,775,000 people – can be considered “immigrants to English” or, as it is popularly called, “Anglicized.” Table 1 gives the percentage distribution according to mother tongue of Canadians of different ethnic origins.

There is one notable feature of the Canadian situation as a whole: the steadily increasing transfer to English through the years. Reckoning from current trends, it is quite possible that, by 1981, 80 per cent or more of all Canadians of non-French origin, except perhaps those of Italian extraction as well as the most recent immigrants, will have English as their mother tongue. Outside Quebec and adjacent regions, where the environment acts as a brake, marriages between Anglophones and those of another language usually lead to the choice of Canada’s predominant language, English, for the children. Such “mixed” marriages thus intensify the preponderance of English.

It follows from all this that, despite the constant increase in numbers of Canadians of other ethnic origins, as a result of immigration, linguistic duality remains the basic characteristic and foundation of the Canadian community. The integration of Canadians of non-British and non-French origin into the two linguistic groups gives each a pluralistic character, even if assimilation to English is much stronger and more marked than assimilation to French.

## Language Rights in Canada: The Legal Foundations

The existing state of language rights in Canada is one very important aspect of the present situation which we found to be the subject of many different views and misconceptions. The



historical development of these rights has indeed characterized the political and constitutional history of Canada almost from the beginning. True enough, in earlier times there appears to have been less concern about the preservation of language than about the right of French Canadians to practise unhindered their Roman Catholic religion. It was only later that language itself became an issue, intimately bound up with the struggle for cultural survival.

The expression "language rights" is not easy to define. In our context it is obvious that this term does not refer merely to the right of a citizen to communicate with his fellow citizens in his own language, whatever it may be. This right has never been legally challenged, though individuals may have used social pressures to force linguistic conformity. The rights chiefly concerning us in this Report are those which a Francophone or Anglophone possesses, either by law or by well-established custom, to use his mother tongue in his dealings with public authorities. Strictly speaking, a linguistic "right" is a specific legal protection for the use of a given language. It involves the use of language in the conduct of public affairs: in the parliamentary and legislative process; in the day-to-day administration of government; in the rendering of justice; and in the public school system. It may also involve private activities. Thus language rights are measured by the degree to which a given language receives formal and practical recognition in the constitution of a country and in its political, social, educational, and economic life.

The present legal foundation of linguistic rights in Canada is to be found in section 133 of the B.N.A. Act of 1867:

Either the English or the French language may be used by any Person in the Debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those Languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those Languages may be used by any Person or in any Pleading or Process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under this Act, and or from all or from any of the Courts of Quebec.

The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legisla-

ture of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those Languages.

The section is not intended to secure fully the linguistic rights of the French-speaking or English-speaking minorities in Canada. At best it represents embryonic concepts of cultural equality, and it cannot be expected to provide for the many complex situations that must now be faced. Such language rights as are exercised in Canada are generally based on custom, practical considerations, political expediency, or result from the exercise of incidental jurisdiction. While we do not underrate the role of custom or of incidental legislation in fleshing out the existing provisions of the Constitution, we must not forget that these rights are not entrenched and thus can be abrogated at will. Nevertheless, we similarly cannot forget that this constitutional provision was the outcome and a basic guarantee of the substantial and worthwhile system of linguistic rights that had evolved in Quebec.

We have already referred to the growth since the beginning of the century of administrative boards and commissions exercising quasi-judicial functions. Those administrative tribunals not only assume the duties entrusted to them by modern social legislation – such as in the fields of labour law or pension rights – but also tend to take over the solution of traditional problems with which the ordinary courts have been unable to cope satisfactorily – such as workmen's compensation. In other words, we are witnessing both a new type of adjudication and removal of classes of jurisdiction from the traditional law courts to more efficient and less formal administrative entities.

We made a study of 12 of the 15 leading federal boards and commissions. The mother tongue of 79 per cent of all their members was English. An extremely small number of these could read, write, or speak French well or fairly well. This made it nearly impossible for them to conduct hearings in French. The situation was aggravated by a lack of adequate facilities for interpreters and bilingual stenographers. On the other hand, all French-speaking members were found to be fluently or nearly

fluently bilingual. Only 7 per cent of all cases were conducted in French, practically all of them emanating from Quebec. Of all decisions, 89 per cent were rendered in English and the remainder in French.

As we have seen, there are no constitutional provisions governing the language of public administration either at the federal level or within the provinces. Such federal or provincial legislation as there is on the subject is generally incidental or secondary.

Provincial legislation is often surprisingly inconclusive about the language of instruction in the schools. In most provinces the schools act or its equivalent makes no reference whatsoever to the language of instruction; thus in the Atlantic Provinces, in Quebec, in Ontario, and in British Columbia, neither English nor French is given a special legal status in the relevant legislation. The schools of the three Prairie Provinces are exceptional, for in these statutes English is declared to be the official language of instruction. Since the amendments of 1967, however, French may be used as a language of instruction with specific permission, for periods up to half of the instructional time per day in Manitoba, and to a lesser extent in Saskatchewan. With the exception of these two provinces, the provincial statutes are silent on the right of the official-language minority to receive instruction in its own language in the provincial schools. One must turn to current practice to discover the *de facto* language rights of these minorities in education.

In spite of the lack of legal protection for English as a language of instruction in the schools, Quebec continued to respect the unwritten tradition that associated language rights with religious rights. The history of language privileges in the schools of the other provinces has been very different, and such opportunities as do exist have been achieved by the vigorous and persistent efforts of the French-speaking minority. Even though at times there was co-operation or at least tacit consent from provincial officials, these efforts most often met great financial hardship and administrative difficulties.

## *Part 2: Towards a Régime of Linguistic Equality*

So far we have described and explained the present state of bilingualism in Canada. The second part of this book will deal with the future of the official languages in Canada. In a general way we shall outline the measures that the public authorities should take to assure an equal status for English and French. After first weighing the experience of various foreign countries we shall suggest what the public authorities should do, in the immediate future, to put certain guiding principles into practice.

In short, we are recommending a new status for the official languages in Canada. We do not propose merely to paper over an unsatisfactory situation: we shall present a new concept of an officially bilingual country in which the two official languages will have new rights and better guarantees. It therefore becomes a question of genuine linguistic planning.

### The Territorial Principle and the Personality Principle

In this chapter we begin by looking closely at some of the countries which have to face language problems similar to Canada's. Following that, we shall attempt to deduce guiding principles for a truly viable Canadian bilingualism. Only a few countries have accorded full equality to their linguistic minorities.

Though it was not always so, language rarely seems to be a subject of serious discord in Finland nowadays. Given the smallness of the Swedish minority and the lack of widespread individual bilingualism (some 11 per cent had a knowledge of the two languages in 1960), it is accepted on both sides that the equality spoken of by the constitution should be implemented principally by regions. Such a territorial principle restricts an individual's right to receive services in his own language to certain defined districts. As the Swedish-speaking community is for the most part concentrated in the coastal areas and in certain cities and towns rather than scattered across the country, this is not as great a restriction as it might first appear.

The commune is the unit of local government in Finland. It will be officially bilingual if it includes in its territory a linguistic minority of at least 10 per cent of the population or at least 5,000 persons. If the proportion of the minority is smaller, the commune will be unilingual in the language of the majority, whether Finnish or Swedish. For administrative purposes, one or more communes may form a district; this will be unilingual if all the communes making it up are of the same language. But if there are bilingual communes or communes of different languages, the administrative district will be considered bilingual. School districts, whose boundaries do not necessarily coincide with those of administrative districts, are similarly organized: for more than a given number of students who speak Finnish or Swedish, an education in their own language must be assured.

This, in very broad outline, is how the people of Finland have established linguistic equal partnership. By impartially subjecting minorities of both language groups to the territorial principle, on the basis of the most recently available census figures, they have met their constitutional requirement of official equality. Yet at the same time they have never lost sight of the practical limits imposed by the country's demography and history on the provision of equal service.

Like Finland, South Africa has made explicit constitutional provision that its two official languages, English and Afrikaans, "shall be treated on a footing of equality."

For its white population, South Africa does not employ any form of the territorial principle. Instead, in fulfilment of its constitutional guarantee, it has adopted a personality principle. Each citizen uses his own language in dealing with government authorities.

The personality principle in South Africa has been made necessary by the interpermeation throughout the country of the two large language groups; it has been made possible by the high level of bilingualism existing both outside the civil service and within it. As far as we can discover, this is a unique combination of circumstances and has given rise to a unique approach to linguistic equality.

The principle of territoriality is clearly apposite when a bilin-

gual country consists predominantly of unilingual regions (Belgium and Switzerland) or mainly so but with a few linguistically mixed areas (Finland). It has two advantages: the minority language is guaranteed priority in some areas and a large majority of the total population may be served in its own language. However, where members of the two language groups are widely scattered across the country, as in South Africa, a principle of personality rather than of territoriality is considered more appropriate.

The proportion of the population that can speak the official languages is also relevant. As we know, South Africa has an exceptionally high percentage of bilingual persons and this makes possible the application of the principle of personality. That is, a citizen may use his own language in dealing with public authorities throughout the country. On the other hand, Finland and Belgium, with a rate of individual bilingualism comparable to the Canadian figure of 12 per cent of the population, have inclined towards a principle of territoriality.

Finally, the relative size of linguistic groups seems to have little to do with the successful development of equal partnership. Although the two main groups are reasonably balanced in Belgium and South Africa, the minorities in Finland and Switzerland are small. In all cases, however, a formula had to be found to deal with the language problems.

## Application of These Principles to Canada

If we look carefully at the most central similarities and differences, we can begin to discern in broad outline how far the various types of language régime existing elsewhere would be appropriate to the Canadian situation. We may expect that the application to Canada of any of the principles that we have discussed would necessarily involve – as it has in other countries – adapting them to suit the particular institutional context.

Certain broad similarities between Canada and the other four countries stand out at the start. Each has the problem of the

coexistence of two or three major language groups, and the legal and constitutional structure of all five has accorded official status to the languages concerned. But the similarities are soon overshadowed by the contrasts, and it is to these that we now turn our attention.

In the first place, the constitutional and legal terms of the recognition given the official languages in the other four countries have established a more fundamental principle of equality than has section 133 of the B.N.A. Act. In addition to this basic principle, Belgium and Finland in particular have firm, precise legislation, to which there is no equivalent in Canada, in such key realms as education and the public service.

Canada differs sharply from South Africa in both the level of individual bilingualism and the pattern of distribution of official languages throughout the country. Only 12 per cent of Canadians claim to be bilingual, as against 66 per cent of the South African white population. Canada's official-language minorities make up less than 14 per cent of the population in nine provinces out of ten; in South Africa the official-language minorities range from 23 to 39 per cent of the provincial populations. Canada therefore would find it difficult to pursue effectively a policy of the South African type, where a full range of governmental and educational services is provided in both official languages in all provinces of the country. Such a thorough-going policy seems not to be required in many parts of Canada; but more important, our present linguistic resources are no doubt inadequate to carry it out.

Canada's geographical distribution of language groups seems in general to be closer to those of the three European countries that we have examined. Her level of individual bilingualism is broadly comparable with those found in Finland and Belgium.

There is no doubt that Canada can draw some inspiration and understanding from the varied experience of language régimes in other countries. In particular the Commission intends to borrow and to adapt into the Canadian context an idea from Finland. However Canada, like any other country, must develop a formula tailored to its own nature and needs, and adjusted, for

example, to its federal system. Since this involves coming to grips with a very complex reality, we know in advance that this formula cannot be a simple one.

## The Canadian Reality

A new status for Canada's official languages will thus be acceptable only if the proposed solution respects Canadian reality in all its breadth and diversity. The first aspect of this reality is the existence of an English-speaking and a French-speaking community, whatever the ethnic origin of their members, or their distribution throughout Canada.

Population studies show that 58 per cent of all Canadians have English as their mother tongue and 28 per cent have French. The mother tongue of the remaining 14 per cent is neither of the two official languages. These are the percentages we shall go by

**TABLE 1**

**Totals and Proportions of Canadian Language Groups by Mother Tongue, 1961**

Mother tongue	Totals	Percentage of population
Canada	18,238,247	100.0
English	10,660,534	58.5
French	5,123,151	28.1
German	563,713	3.1
Italian	339,626	1.9
Dutch	170,177	0.9
Polish	161,720	0.9
Scandinavian	116,714	0.6
Ukrainian	361,496	2.0
Yiddish	82,448	0.5
Indian and Eskimo	166,531	0.9
Others	492,137	2.6

*Source:* Census of Canada, 1961



**TABLE 2**

**Distribution of the Population by Mother Tongue, Canada and Provinces, 1961 (Percentages)**

Province or territory	Mother tongue									Indian and Eskimo	Others and not stated
	English	French	German	Italian	Dutch	Polish	Scandinavian	Ukrainian	Yiddish		
Canada	58.5	28.1	3.1	1.9	0.9	0.9	0.6	2.0	0.5	0.9	2.6
Newfoundland	98.6	0.7	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.3	0.3
Prince Edward Island	91.3	7.6	0.1	—	0.4	—	0.1	0.1	—	0.1	0.3
Nova Scotia	92.3	5.4	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.9
New Brunswick	63.3	35.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1
Quebec	13.3	81.2	0.6	1.7	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.7	0.3	1.3
Ontario	77.5	6.8	2.9	3.3	1.4	1.3	0.3	1.4	0.5	0.4	4.2
Manitoba	63.4	6.6	9.1	0.5	1.4	2.2	1.4	9.2	1.0	3.0	2.2
Saskatchewan	69.0	3.9	9.7	0.1	1.9	1.1	2.1	7.3	0.1	2.8	3.0
Alberta	72.2	3.2	7.3	0.7	1.8	1.3	1.9	6.3	0.1	2.1	3.1
British Columbia	80.9	1.6	4.4	1.5	1.5	0.6	2.0	1.2	0.1	1.3	4.9
Yukon and N.W.T.	50.6	3.8	3.0	0.7	0.4	0.5	1.2	1.1	—	36.5	2.2

Source: Census of Canada, 1961

— always remembering, however, that they overestimate the strength of the “other” languages and reduce the size of the English-speaking group. Population studies also tell us there are areas of the country where one of the two official languages is spoken to the virtual exclusion of the other. They also remind us that there are vast regions inhabited by English-speaking or French-speaking minorities, some large, others small, some concentrated, others scattered. We shall therefore have to respect these two basic facts: in some areas one of the two official languages is completely dominant; in others the two language groups interpenetrate.

The adoption of uniform criteria for defining these unilingual areas is a factor in treating the two official languages equally. We believe each group would find the absence of its language more acceptable in one area if the rule were applied to the other official language in other areas.

This idea could have far-reaching consequences. Narrowly and rigorously applied, it would lead in the direction of an official French unilingualism in Quebec and an English unilingualism in the other provinces, with bilingual federal institutions in the centre: it would be a triumph for the territorial principle based on provinces. Such a solution would doubtless have the advantage of simplicity and would follow the tradition established in several English-speaking provinces. However, it would lead to the recognition of only the majority’s rights and to oppression of the official-language minorities. As an immediate consequence it would deprive minority groups *en bloc* (the English-speaking in Quebec and the French-speaking in the rest of the country) of essential language rights. It would place them in a situation of sharp inequality in areas where they have been long established; they would be affected in their daily lives, in activities and situations in which they are more directly involved than they can be in central institutions. We do not and should not approve equality in privation for members of the two groups when they form minorities at the provincial or local level. Injustices do not become acceptable because they are equally shared.

Instead we shall take an approach determined by the realities of Canadian life. In the various fields and jurisdictions to be

considered and in conformity with what we hope will be the future spirit of Canada, we take as a guiding principle the recognition of both official languages, in law and in practice, wherever the minority is numerous enough to be viable as a group. Evaluation of the "circumstances" will be the only problem; each case will need its own assessment. In short, we have adopted an approach aimed at attaining the greatest equality with the least impracticality.

Questions will come up in all provinces of Canada, for every one of them, without exception, has a minority speaking one of the official languages. Every province demonstrates the linguistic complexity of Canada: from Newfoundland and British Columbia where the French-speaking minorities are less than 2 per cent of the population, to New Brunswick where the minority is 35 per cent, and Quebec where the minority of English mother tongue is 13 per cent. There are about 700,000 Canadians in Quebec whose mother tongue is English and some 850,000 scattered throughout the rest of the country whose mother tongue is French.

For the former it is matter of obtaining clear and lasting confirmation of rights enjoyed and exercised for two centuries, but which a segment of Quebec opinion is now challenging. According to the definition stated above, Quebec is officially bilingual through the provisions of section 133 of the B.N.A. Act. Moreover, a well-established tradition of respect for the rights of the English-speaking minority, and statutes and regulations which go beyond section 133, have made Quebec bilingual officially and in practice—in relations between provincial administrative bodies and citizens as well as in local public activities where appropriate.

The situation is quite different for the French-speaking minorities. In some provinces, we find a degree of recognition of the French language; here we can speak of *de facto* bilingualism. For example, the Public Service Commission, since the 1961 Public Service Employment Act, has taken into account areas in some provinces where a significant minority speaks French; and several Canadian provinces, notably Ontario and New Brunswick, have granted a certain recognition to French consisting

mainly of compromises, particularly in education. However, comparison of these situations with that in Quebec shows that this *de facto* bilingualism is very fragile. It is often at the mercy of intolerance on the part of local or regional majorities, and it puts constant strain on those minority groups inevitably forced to fight for its implementation. Actually, the language of the official minorities in these regions has survived only because of the intense determination of individuals and groups. Despite immense sacrifices and frustrations incurred by those concerned, the price has been inferior institutions which will condemn these groups to linguistic assimilation if the situation is not remedied quickly. Therefore we must find solutions assuring that both the French-speaking minorities outside Quebec and the English-speaking minority in Quebec are able not only to exist but to thrive.

## Governments and Language Régimes

Wherever he may live, man comes into almost daily contact with government. Generally he does so through employees or representatives of various governments; for example, he deals with the postman or the customs officer, the public school teacher, the policeman, the public health officer, and so on. Most of the time he does so without noticing that he is moving from one level of government to another.

Because he has to communicate in speech or writing, the language question arises each time. In a unilingual area there is no problem. However, when there are two languages in the same area – and especially when one is a minority language – difficulties can arise in a hundred different ways. It is especially in these situations that governments exert an influence on language: they bring all their weight to bear on the side of the majority language, thereby hastening the linguistic assimilation of the minority.

In this chapter we shall describe the linguistic régimes which we believe will be appropriate for each level of government.

Next, we shall deal with the necessity of establishing regional language areas which we shall call bilingual districts. These districts will be of major importance in our total plan. Finally, we shall touch briefly on the special language problems associated with the existence of the federal capital. The topics of the four sections of this chapter will thus be the language régimes for the federal level, the provincial level, the bilingual districts, and the federal capital.

## At the Federal Level

The Constitution formally recognized both French and English in 1867 in the federal field (and in Quebec). However, it has become evident to us that this recognition was incomplete in many respects and often disputed where the French language was concerned. If the principle of equality is accepted today, this situation must be changed without delay, and the equal status of the two languages must be established without shadow of doubt.

Therefore, we recommend that English and French be formally declared the official languages of the Parliament of Canada, of the federal courts, of the federal government, and of the federal administration. This equality of the French and English languages must be complete and must apply also to all bodies and agencies deriving from Parliament and the federal government. It must be indisputable. The administration in Ottawa must be able to communicate adequately with the public in both languages. All government publications, as well as forms and notices, must be simultaneously available in either language. Federal government offices and Crown corporations across the country must be able to deal with people in either French or English. For example, in the immigration and customs offices at all ports of entry, in important transportation terminals, on Canadian National's trains, and on Air Canada's airplanes - everywhere, even in the completely unilingual sections of the country, where there is contact with the travelling public - services should be available in both languages as a matter of course.

## At the Provincial Level

We wish to repeat that our mandate leads us to formulate recommendations to provincial governments which did not request them. In this respect these recommendations are different from those directed to the federal government. Nevertheless, our recommendations to the provinces remain recommendations in the fullest sense and represent our conviction that their implementation is necessary if the objectives stated in our terms of reference are to be realized.

The dominant fact of our population maps is the concentration of the official-language minorities (both French and English) in three provinces: Quebec, New Brunswick, and Ontario. It is immediately obvious that Anglophones are a minority in Quebec only. If each of these provinces declared itself officially bilingual, 89 per cent of all Canadians belonging to official-language minorities would live in a province where their language was officially recognized.

Most of the French-speaking citizens of Ontario and New Brunswick live in areas adjacent to Quebec: the geographical contiguity of French-speaking residents is almost unbroken. In these adjoining areas their linguistic and cultural vitality shows the most strength and durability. Here the rate of retention of French is the highest. Although French social institutions in these areas are sometimes embryonic, their development is more advanced than anywhere else outside Quebec. Finally, it is in Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick that the linguistic majority groups seem, on the official level at least, to show the most understanding towards their official-language minorities. We are thus justified in concluding that in these three provinces the factors favouring official bilingualism are both numerous and strong.

Therefore we recommend that the provinces of New Brunswick and Ontario themselves declare that they recognize English and French as official languages and that they accept the language régimes that such recognition entails.

The declaration would demonstrate forcefully that the French language in Canada is not confined to Quebec; there would be

no further justification for speaking of the Quebec "reserve" or "ghetto". By accepting linguistic equality, both Ontario and New Brunswick could help change the climate in which many of the current discussions are taking place. New Brunswick would show it is not ignoring the substantial French-speaking minority living in the province. Ontario, a key province because of its role in history, its population, and its wealth, would be doing the same for a proportionally smaller French-speaking minority. The moral effect of such actions would go far beyond the boundaries of these two provinces.

We have now to consider the practical consequences for a province which declares itself officially bilingual: what language régime will be appropriate and what obligations will such a province have to assume?

An officially bilingual province must first legalize the use of both English and French in the debates of its legislature. As well, the laws and principal regulations of that legislature must be published in both languages and the same must apply to its records, minutes, and journals.

Being an officially bilingual province entails establishing in the provincial administration certain services in the minority language as they are needed in the central provincial administrative offices and in branches located in bilingual regions. The dominant working language of the public service in New Brunswick and particularly in Ontario will still be the language of the majority, as it is in Quebec. But each bilingual province will have to grant its minority the right to deal with the government in the official-minority language and to receive an answer from the provincial offices in this language.

## The Bilingual Districts

Up to this point we have focussed on language practices at the federal and provincial levels. These practices will apply to the whole country or to the provinces chiefly through the centralized services of these jurisdictions and through citizens' direct contact with federal and provincial legislative and administrative centres.

However necessary and beneficial these reforms might be, wherever they could be instituted, they would not by themselves assure genuinely equal opportunities for both official languages. We must also provide for a set of language practices of federal and provincial jurisdictions within the communities they serve. We must set out language laws and practices for school boards and other municipal institutions.

Consequently, we are going to propose the creation of "bilingual districts" – special areas within which a defined language régime would be established for federal, provincial and local jurisdictions. These districts would be areas where the official-language minority is numerous enough to warrant the kind of linguistic reorientation we feel desirable. We will propose that they be defined essentially by regional clusters of the official-language minority. This geographic framework will thus be closely related to real language needs.

The bilingual district is neither a new jurisdiction nor, technically speaking, a new administrative structure. Rather it is designed to bring about linguistic co-operation in the services of existing governments. Our goal is to be just toward members of an official-language minority, without imposing too heavy obligations on the majority.

Which census divisions provide a potential for the creation of districts? Obviously, those with sufficient members of an official-language minority, as indicated by census "mother tongue" figures. We shall suggest 10 per cent of the population as a criterion for this first stage. This will cover most members of English and French-speaking minorities.

All courts within bilingual districts throughout Canada should permit pleadings in both English and French, and should provide, whenever necessary, appropriate translation services. All forms and court orders will have to be drawn up in both official languages. Bilingual stenographic and interpretation services will have to be available, and this may require travelling teams.

On the administrative level, the creation of bilingual districts will have important consequences. All federal and provincial offices located in a bilingual district will be so staffed that residents can communicate in either English or French, orally or in writing. Let-



ters and inquiries will be answered in either language. Forms, notices, information sheets, and so on will be bilingual or available in either language. Signs will be bilingual (or possibly, in the case of road signs, nonlingual).

Local governments within a bilingual district should make all administrative services, written and oral, available in both official languages. Priority should be given to personal services – those rendered by welfare officials, municipal hospital staffs, and police.

We consider the bilingual district the cornerstone of our proposed system. Without forcing the majority to adopt a system which would quickly become unbearable, the institutions of bilingual districts can provide a just, flexible, and realistic system which does not impose rigid rules and unjustified obligations on anyone.

We anticipate a constantly recurring objection: that a bilingual area is one in which everyone must speak both languages. If the meaning of a “bilingual institution” is not patiently and clearly explained, there is a risk that the inhabitants of an area declared bilingual might bitterly oppose the imagined obligation to speak both languages.

Certainly the establishment of bilingual districts will not eliminate all inconveniences for members of an official-language minority. But there will be three practical advantages. They will feel that they are accepted as such. They will have at their disposal a certain number of actual services in their own language – something necessary for unilingual members of the minority and often useful even for bilingual persons who do not know the other language perfectly. A balance will be achieved – the French-language minority will know that it can obtain, in a given area of Ontario or New Brunswick, the same services accorded to the English-language minority in Quebec.

## The Federal Capital

Everything said in the preceding sections about the linguistic régime in the bilingual districts applies *a fortiori* to the federal

capital means that more than the establishment of a linguistic régime is required.

In our view the federal government should be actively concerned with changes in the language regime in the federal capital area, and in its accompanying educational developments. It should do all it can to help bring about the necessary changes. We believe it should provide special financial assistance. The federal government has important responsibilities in all bilingual districts, but especially in the federal capital area. It already spends a great deal on physical developments in the capital region; expenditures and joint arrangements that will help create a capital truly reflecting the dual nature of Canada would be fully justified, in our opinion.

## The Necessary Legislation

Our first recommendations concern amendments to the British North America Act. The essential thing, we believe is to write specific principles into the formal law of the Constitution, both as a solemn recognition of their importance and as an added protection for their observance.

Section 133 is the only one in the Act specifically referring to the use of the English and French languages. But in this section the guaranteed usage of both languages is limited to debate in the parliament of Canada and in the legislature of Quebec, official publication of statutes in Ottawa and in Quebec, and pleadings and processes of all federal and all Quebec courts. There is no explicit provision for the use of English or French in either the federal or the Quebec administrative services, or in delegated legislation.

It is our belief that constitutional provisions regarding the use of official languages, as contrasted with official languages acts, should be general in character, and cannot and should not attempt to resolve all the problems involved in formally recognizing the two languages. Nevertheless, we believe that what the B.N.A. Act says about language rights has great symbolic as well as practical value.

We believe that the federal government must legislate at once on language matters in order to give French and English equal status within its own jurisdiction; and must help create the necessary institutions and mechanisms to ensure the establishment and effective operation of a number of officially bilingual districts.

The keystone of any general programme of bilingualism in Canada should be a federal "Official Languages Act," the main aims of which will be:

- a) to ensure that Canadian citizens can deal with federal administrative and judicial bodies in the two official languages;
- b) to provide for the appointment of a high state official, independent of the government, with responsibility for inquiring into and reporting upon the implementation of the federal Official Languages Act;
- c) to give the Governor in Council the necessary authority for negotiating with the provincial and local authorities involved – in the latter case with the consent of the province concerned – to widen the opportunities for Canadian citizens to deal with the branches of government in both official languages.

Moreover, every officially bilingual province and, ideally, every province which sets up bilingual districts or helps to establish them within its borders, should pass a provincial Official Languages Act.

The Official Languages Act should also empower the Governor in Council to appoint an officer of state for language matters, who might be styled the "Commissioner of Official Languages."

The Commissioner of Official Languages in Canada should play a dual role. In the first place, he will be the active conscience – actually the protector – of the Canadian public where the official languages are concerned. His duty will be to examine particular cases in which the federal authorities have failed to respect the rights and the privileges of individuals or groups of Canadians. The Commissioner will in a sense play the role of a federal "linguistic ombudsman" by receiving and bringing to light the grievance of any residents concerning the official languages.

The Commissioner of Official Languages will also offer criti-

cism of the manner in which the federal Official Languages Act is implemented. He will have to scrutinize the linguistic aspects of the acts of the federal government and its representatives in their relations with the public in all parts of the country, and especially in the federal capital and in the bilingual districts. Since he will have to report annually, the Commissioner will, in matters of language, function at the federal level as the Auditor General functions respecting government expenditures and property.

## Postscript

In this first Book of our Report we have proposed a new charter for the official languages of Canada, a charter founded upon the concept of equal partnership. We have seen that, in a country such as ours, this principle cannot be applied in any mechanical way: some of our proposals are complex but we believe that they are in keeping with the equally complex realities of the situation.

The nature of our subject had led us to focus our attention on the official-language minorities. Majorities generally can and do effectively assert their interests and defend themselves, and governments have to listen to them. Minorities are always liable to be overlooked even in a régime of equality. The minority needs legal protection – fair play demands it. But that is not all: the impossibility of living a full life in French outside Quebec (and even in certain parts of Quebec) is certainly one cause of the present crisis in Canada. Living in French must be made possible in every part of Canada where there are enough French-speaking people. Linguistic equality will exist in Canada only if Franco-phones are treated in other provinces as Anglophones now are in Quebec.

We have spoken at length about governments, because we felt it was important to define the legal framework for equal partnership. The language used by the individual in his dealings with the three levels of government has both a great potential importance and a definite symbolic value. And governments, by their attitudes, often set examples for everyone.

At the same time, we have tried throughout our analysis to devise our proposals with the individual in mind. In recommending measures of a general nature we have tried to take into account their impact on the daily life of the individual Canadian. This is one of our main reasons for recommending the creation of bilingual districts, because it is on the district level that our proposals will most directly affect people's day-to-day lives.

In some of our forthcoming Books we shall be concentrating on social and economic life, and we shall examine the principal institutions of the country in terms of the two official languages and dominant cultures. The Commission need not concern itself with the objectives of these institutions, public or private. We have not studied, for example, all the problems of the Public Service, of education, or of the mass media. Yet in each of these institutions, the issue of language and culture continually arises, and in each case it is intimately linked to the activities of the institution itself. It is in these institutions – at school, at work, in every situation where there is communication between people – that the future of English and French in Canada is to be decided. In fact, it would be more accurate to speak of the future of French language and culture, for English is in a position of strength in North America. French language and culture will flourish in Canada to the extent that conditions permit them to be truly present and creative.

## Recommendations

We recommend that English and French be formally declared the official languages of the Parliament of Canada, of the federal courts, of the federal government, and of the federal administration.

We recommend that the provinces of New Brunswick and Ontario themselves declare that they recognize English and French as official languages and that they accept the language régimes that such recognition entails.

We recommend that any province whose official-language

minority reaches or exceeds 10 per cent declare that it recognizes French and English as official languages and that it accepts the language régime that such recognition entails.

We recommend that the provinces other than Quebec, New Brunswick, and Ontario declare that both English and French may be used in the debates in their legislatures and that these provinces provide appropriate services in French for their French-speaking minorities.

We recommend that bilingual districts be established throughout Canada and that negotiations between the federal government and the provincial government concerned define the exact limits of each bilingual district.

Should the negotiations between the federal government and a province break off before agreement, we recommend that each, acting in its own right, immediately declare officially bilingual, for its purposes, areas which it has itself delineated.

We recommend the establishment of a federal-provincial review council whose main duties would be: a) to recognize as bilingual districts or as parts of bilingual districts new areas where the official-language minority attains or surpasses 10 per cent, and b) to remove from officially bilingual districts those areas where the numerical importance of the official-language minority has substantially decreased.

We recommend that provincial governments amend their municipal legislation to remove all obstacles to the use of both the French and English languages in local government.

For the federal capital area we recommend: a) that the English and French languages should have full equality of status throughout the area; b) that all services should be available at all levels of public administration in the two languages; c) that the use of both English and French should be permitted in the deliberations of all local government bodies, that all by-laws and regulations should be

recorded and printed in the two languages, and that all important public documents and all administrative services should be available in both languages; d) that all courts should permit pleadings in the two languages, and that lower courts should be equipped to function in both; e) that publicly supported education should be as available in French as in English and should be of the same quality; f) that the two provincial governments concerned and the federal government should discuss and negotiate the necessary measures.

We recommend that the right of Canadian parents to have their children educated in the official language of their choice be recognized in the educational systems, the degree of implementation to depend on the concentration of the minority population.

We recommend that the following paragraph, to be known as section 93A, be added to the B.N.A. Act: Every province shall establish and maintain elementary and secondary schools in which English is the sole or main language of instruction, and elementary and secondary schools in which French is the sole or main language of instruction, in bilingual districts and other appropriate areas under conditions to be determined by provincial law; but nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit schools in which English and French have equal importance as languages of instruction, or schools in which instruction may be given in some other language.

We recommend the adoption of a new version of section 133, which might read as follows:

1. English and French are the two official languages of Canada.
2. Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of Parliament of Canada and in the legislatures of all the provinces, and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and

journals of the Houses of the legislatures of the provinces of New Brunswick, Ontario, and Quebec, and either may be used by any person in any pleading or process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from any of the Superior Courts of the provinces of New Brunswick, Ontario, and Quebec. The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and the legislatures of the provinces of New Brunswick, Ontario, and Quebec shall be enacted and published in both English and French.

3. The provisions of subsection 2 shall apply to any additional province in which those persons whose mother tongue is either English or French shall reach or exceed 10 per cent of the population of the province; and to any province which declares that English and French are official languages.
4. Whenever in any province the English-or French-speaking population of the appropriate administrative unit reaches a substantial proportion, this unit shall be constituted into a bilingual district, and there shall be enacted federal and provincial legislation making judicial and administrative services in such bilingual district available in both official languages.
5. Nothing in this section shall be taken to diminish or restrict the use, as established by present or future law or practice, of any other language in Canada.

We recommend: a) that the federal Parliament adopt a federal Official Languages Act; b) that the Governor in Council appoint a Commissioner of Official Languages charged with ensuring respect for the status of French and English in Canada.

We recommend: a) that the legislature of each officially bilingual province adopt an Official Languages Act; b) that each officially bilingual province establish, for its own purposes, a post equivalent to that of the federal Commissioner of Official Languages.



# BOOK 2: EDUCATION

## Introduction

Education is vitally concerned with both language and culture; educational institutions exist to transmit them to a younger generation and to foster their development. The future of language and culture, both French and English, thus depends upon an educational régime which makes it possible for them to remain “present and creative”. In a minority situation education is even more significant, because the school can offer a cultural environment which the community cannot provide.

We are not suggesting that education as such is a panacea. The school is only one of many institutions which must reflect our linguistic and cultural duality. Other institutions impose a structure on our economic and social life and their importance cannot be underestimated. Subsequent Books of our Report will deal with the problems of communication between Canadians in these institutions. Changes in education, however, will facilitate reforms elsewhere and are a prerequisite for some of the other changes which must be made.

Part 1 of this Book is concerned with the education of the official language minorities in each province, whether Franco-phone or Anglophone. Our terms of reference instructed us “to recommend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races.” The ideal of equal partnership is difficult to define and even more difficult to achieve. This is especially true in the field of education – here, aims and methods have always been the subject of controversy, and the concept of equal partnership injects yet another complication.

Part 2 of this Book deals with the teaching of French and

English as second languages. Our terms of reference specifically instructed us "to recommend what could be done to enable Canadians to become bilingual."

In Part 3 we examine the image of the other cultural group which students may derive from their studies. Our mandate instructed us to report on the role of various organizations in promoting "a more widespread appreciation of the basically bicultural character of our country . . . and to recommend what should be done to improve that role." Cultural duality is a basic aspect of Canadian identity and is therefore of fundamental importance. An awareness of this cultural duality is essential to an understanding of Canada. Our aim has been to ensure that all students will become more conscious of this aspect of our national identity.

## *Part 1: Official-Language Minority Schools*

### The Implications of Equal Partnership

The aims of education are as diverse as the aims of society itself, for in the final analysis they are determined by the values accepted by the society. The values stressed have varied greatly over the years – as the contrasts between Spartan and Athenian education or French *lycées* and British public schools will attest – but in every case they were consistent with the social purposes of the educational authorities. Any proposal for change in our educational systems must therefore be ultimately based on our view of what Canada is or should be.

Our terms of reference make it clear that the Canadian Confederation should recognize the principle of equality between English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians. This concept of equal partnership is the mainspring of our terms of reference. As we noted in the general introduction to our Report, equal partnership is an ideal, an absolute, which can never be fully or finally achieved. It is nonetheless possible to propose measures

which can reduce the present gulf between reality and this ideal. Equal partnership must be seen as one of the fundamental values of our Confederation and all institutions should reflect and foster this equality.

Equal partnership in education implies equivalent educational opportunities for Francophones and Anglophones alike, whether they belong to the majority or the minority in their province. More specifically, it implies a special concern for the minority. The majority, by force of numbers, is able to develop its educational system in response to its own needs. The minority, on the other hand, can draw attention to its special needs but it must rely on the understanding and generosity of the majority if it is to have access to an educational régime which reflects these needs. Educational systems devised in the past to meet the requirements of the linguistic majority in the English-speaking provinces must be equally responsive to those of the minority.

Minorities, whether French or English, inevitably give priority to their own language. If the majority language is the sole language of instruction in the provincial schools, the survival of the minority as a linguistic group is menaced. Almost by definition a minority is exposed to a social environment in which the majority language is always present. The school must counterbalance this environment and must give priority to the minority language if the mother tongue is to become an adequate instrument of communication. Language is also the key to cultural development. Language and culture are not synonymous, but the vitality of the language is a necessary condition for the complete preservation of a culture. In the words of the recent Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education in the Province of Quebec, the Parent Commission:

The language of a group of people reflects the culture proper to itself: dominance of logic or poetic intuition, continuous or broken structures, semantic precision or rich imagery, it is according to these contrasting ideas that the character of a language becomes clear. It is the reflection and mirror of those who speak it, the vehicle of their thoughts and dreams.

On the other hand, the objective of preserving language and

culture must not be interpreted narrowly. An educational system should aim to give every student the opportunity to develop his special talents and skills. In terms of equality, this opportunity should not involve any sacrifice of the student's cultural identity. But, for practical reasons, minority groups because of their smaller numbers cannot always have equivalent educational opportunities in their own language – for example, a secondary school must have a large enrolment before it can offer a wide range of courses and programmes. Furthermore, education is not merely an end in itself: it is expected to serve some social purpose and to prepare the student for a productive adult life. As well as linguistic and cultural equality, equality of access to higher education and equality of economic opportunity are also educational ideals which must be considered.

If the Canadian Confederation is to develop on the basis of an equal partnership between the two main cultures, adequate schooling must be provided in the language of each. English- or French-speaking parents should have the right to have their children educated in their own language, and this right should find concrete expression in the opportunities afforded them through the educational facilities of their province. It is taken for granted today that all children have the right to attend public schools. The principle of equal partnership implies an extension of this right – not only should children be guaranteed access to public schools, but English and French should have equal status as languages of instruction.

## The Objectives of Minority-language Schools

In Canada, the principle of equal partnership leads logically to the provision of minority-language schools, whether French or English. These schools are essential for the development of both official languages and cultures; they are the only means of providing Canadians of either language group who are in a minority situation with access to an education in their mother tongue. At the same time, it is in the interests of both the minority and the majority in each province to ensure that the academic standards

in these minority schools are equivalent to those of the majority-language schools. In brief, the aim must be to provide for members of the minority an education appropriate to their linguistic and cultural identity, but one which will not isolate them from the mainstream of educational developments in their province.

We recognize that minority-language schools will not be equally feasible under all circumstances. Student enrolment will affect the provision of educational facilities. At the elementary level, classes of fewer than 10 students are likely to be prohibitively expensive. At the secondary level, with the proliferation of programmes and options, the problem is even more acute, so a separate school at this level might well be restricted to a simple programme, or might not be practical under any circumstances. Provincial departments of Education have limited funds at their disposal and must justify their expenditures on pedagogical grounds.

The right to minority-language schools does not imply an obligation on the parents from the minority-language group to send their children to this school. In any community where both French- and English-language public schools exist, parents should have the option of choosing which school their children will attend. Obvious as this may seem to Canadians, the point should be underlined because parents do not have this choice in some officially bilingual countries.

Minority-language schools, it must also be pointed out, do not mean schools in which only French or only English will be the language of instruction. All Canadians should have some knowledge of both French and English, but for those who are in a minority situation an adequate knowledge of the second official language is essential. The second language will be taught as a subject in minority-language schools and it may also be used as a language of instruction in some other subjects. The minority language will be the normal language in these schools, but it may not be the sole language of instruction.

The fundamental principle, however, is unaffected by these implications. Anglophone and Francophone parents should have the right to have their children educated in their own language.

To implement this principle, minority-language schools will have to be provided. The nature of these schools must be carefully considered – the language of instruction, the curricula, the courses of study, the links with the majority-language schools, the administrative structure, the provision of teachers, textbooks, teaching aids, the financing. All these aspects must be clarified before our specific proposals for minority-language schools can be fully understood. The principle, however, follows inevitably from the idea of equal partnership.

Our recommendations in this Part will be primarily concerned with the education of the official-language minorities. Some of the recommendations will involve interprovincial co-operation; others will involve federal assistance to the provinces. All of them, however, will depend on provincial authorities for implementation. It is already the objective of these authorities to provide the best education possible in their province. We are convinced that greater concern for the linguistic and cultural needs of the official-language minorities is not only desirable but essential if this objective is to be achieved. We take it for granted, therefore, that the co-operation of provincial authorities is assured.

In a country with two official languages, the need for bilingual citizens is apparent. Minority-language schools can make a significant contribution towards enabling Canadians to become bilingual. In areas where the minority is small or isolated, these schools may be the only means of retaining a knowledge of the mother tongue. Such schools might also provide an opportunity for some parents from the majority-language group to have their children learn the other language. Such schools would preserve the existence of the non-dominant language and would also stimulate the interest of the majority population in acquiring the second language.

These schools would have great importance, moreover, as vital expressions of our cultural duality. They would symbolize in a concrete way the principle of equal partnership in areas where the existence of the other cultural group is easily overlooked. Such schools, in addition to the direct benefits to their students, would give the minority-language group a sense of being fully

accepted despite their differences, and would give the majority a greater awareness of the minority language and culture. In some provinces, at the moment, it is difficult for citizens to realize that the other cultural group really exists; minority-language schools would heighten their awareness of our duality.

These arguments for minority-language schools have been couched in the broad perspective of the national interest, but they apply with equal force to all regions of the country. Each province is part of the federal union and each citizen is a Canadian citizen; if this country is to develop as a partnership of the two founding races, each province and each citizen must accept the implications of this partnership.

## The Development of Education in Quebec

The transformations in Canadian systems of education stem from the extension of educational facilities to all children. In every province the same trends are obvious. Children spend more years in school and the kinds of training available are becoming more diversified. These changes, however, have been extensions or modifications of the existing provincial systems. All the provincial educational systems had developed some unique characteristics and these are still reflected in the emerging educational structures. Our concern is with the place of the official-language minorities within the provincial school systems, but our recommendations cannot be divorced from the legacy of the past. An historical survey of minority-language education is a necessary introduction to a description of minority-language education in the Canadian provinces of today.

In the past, Quebec and the English-language provinces developed very different educational systems. Most English-language provinces in Canada have one educational system; education for French-speaking children is provided within that system. There is one minister of Education, one department of Education, one curriculum, and most of the laws and regulations affecting education apply to all provincial schools, regardless of language of instruction or the religious affiliations of teachers or students.

Students are expected to attain academic standards established for the province and may even write the same province-wide examinations. Teachers' certificates are issued on the basis of criteria established by the provincial department of Education.

The provincial system may recognize differences in religion and language. Roman Catholic students may be given special instruction in religion and Francophone students may receive some of their education in French. Otherwise, the schools offering these special considerations resemble other schools within the province. Even "separate schools" in such provinces as Ontario, Saskatchewan, and Alberta are in fact public schools and are part of a single provincial school system.

In this respect Quebec is not a province like the others. When André Siegfried visited Quebec shortly after the turn of the century, he commented on the complete separation of English and French schools within the province: "From the point of view of the relations between the French Catholics and the English Protestants, the educational system of Quebec has produced the best results: the two sets of schools co-exist without fear of conflict or dispute, because they have no points of contact. The situation is exactly that of two separate nations kept apart by a definite frontier and having as little intercourse as possible." Not only were the schools separate, but they were part of separate and quite different educational systems. There were two reasons for this situation. First, Francophones preferred a separate French Roman Catholic system for their children because of the danger of close contacts with an alien and menacing society; by giving Roman Catholic churchmen a prominent role in education, they limited secular influences and prevented the development of a single educational system within the province. Second, concern of the Francophone majority for their own distinctive system of education also meant a willingness to give the Anglophone minority the freedom and the resources to develop a separate system according to its own values. This right has never been seriously questioned by the French Catholic majority and, in the words of an Anglophone educator, the result is "a model of understanding and respect for the dissenting opinion of others." This respect for the language and religious beliefs of the



minority is so firmly rooted that even today, when the educational system is being radically transformed, few suggest that French should be the normal language of instruction and nobody suggests that Roman Catholic attitudes should predominate in all provincial schools.

Our primary concern is with the educational facilities available to the English-speaking minority in Quebec. The development of these facilities, however, can only be understood within the provincial context. The educational system of the majority is unique in many ways, but we are chiefly concerned here with showing the contrast between the majority and minority systems in the province and with emphasizing the autonomy of the minority in educational matters.

English is the mother tongue of fewer than one out of six Quebec residents. In many aspects of provincial life, however, English-speaking Quebecers cannot be considered a minority. There are corporations, institutions, and residential districts where they are in the majority, and many have found it possible to spend a lifetime in Quebec without ever using the language of the provincial majority. The educational régime is part of this almost paradoxical minority situation. At school the English-speaking children are not a minority group—they can attend English-language schools from kindergarten to university post-graduate level and these schools are part of a separate school organization, distinct from and different from the French-language schools in the province. The fact that the English-speaking children belong to a numerical minority does affect the schools in some ways, and proposed educational reforms may affect them even more. It remains true that Anglophones have access to complete educational opportunities in their own language in the French-speaking province. In the past, the Protestant school system has determined its own structure, established its own curriculum, set its own examinations, trained and certified its own teachers, and levied its own taxes.

The significant point is that an impressive English-language minority school system has been established in Quebec, through the public schools out of tax funds. It has been developed and administered by English-speaking Protestants for English-

speaking children in the province, and has thus reflected the aims and aspirations of the minority. When we consider the history of the education of the French-speaking minorities in the other provinces, their desperate struggles to obtain small "concessions" for French-language education, and the enormous costs they have had to bear to provide anything resembling a complete education for their children in French, it will be apparent that the two situations cannot be compared.

### The Development of French-language Education in the Other Provinces

The provincial educational systems in Canada differ from province to province, for within each province education is marked by unique historical traditions as well as by the structure of the provincial society. In spite of these differences, the English-language provinces have developed systems which have much in common. There has been a trend towards secular control of education, with public authorities accepting increasing responsibility in this area. This responsibility has usually taken the form of financial assistance at the beginning. Public authorities have inevitably been involved in determining which institutions were eligible and, eventually, in supervising curricula and academic standards and imposing social and economic goals.

It is important to emphasize this last fact, because the decision in the English-speaking provinces not to provide for the special education needs of their French-speaking minorities has had fateful consequences. The main reason put forth in defence of this policy has been the need for a centralized administration and uniform academic standards. The avowed aim was to ensure equal opportunities in all parts of the province, but the insistence on one uniform English-language system of education resulted effectively in a denial of equal opportunity for the Francophones. Uniformity is not an end in itself: rigid uniformity may defeat the aim of equal education opportunities if the students do not fit the majority pattern.

The existing educational systems in these provinces evolved

gradually, but each major innovation was seen in the context of the provincial majority, and the appeals of the French-speaking minorities to provincial authorities fell for the most part on deaf ears. Starting from a different option – that is, respect for the right of members of the official-language minority to an education in their mother tongue – it would still have been possible to achieve administrative efficiency within one system through two régimes. In the past, provincial authorities in the English-speaking provinces have failed to take account of this elementary fact.

Schools for Francophones were established in many English-speaking provinces, usually because the authorities were lenient in not enforcing regulations, or because they modified the regulations in such a way as to exempt the minority. These schools were exceptions to the provincial pattern, but they were nowhere part of a distinctive and separate system.

When these provincial governments set out to establish certain academic standards in education, they did not recognize a necessity to provide equally for the needs of both linguistic groups. The French-language minority was expected to adjust to an English-language system of education, and ultimately to the language itself. The French-speaking minorities, on the other hand, had expected that their language rights would be respected and that they would have the means to develop an educational régime suited to their needs.

The resulting clash between the linguistic minority and the provincial authorities meant a loss to both groups – principally, of course, and tragically, to the minorities themselves, because their schools were disrupted and their education suffered. When the provincial authorities encountered strong opposition to the law, they agreed to certain concessions or closed their eyes to evasions of the law. But this was a far cry from providing the resources to enable the French-speaking minority to be assured of an adequate education in their mother tongue. As a consequence, educational standards in the minority-language schools were frequently low, and the obstacles to continuing their schooling in the French language discouraged many from completing their education. Since it is in the interests of the whole society that all

its members receive an adequate education, the loss in human resources was incalculable.

It is clear, therefore, that the objectives of official minority-language schools must be clarified and must be accepted by both groups if disputes are to be avoided. The ultimate aim must be the best possible education—one that will foster the use and development of the mother tongue and, at the same time, ensure an adequate knowledge of the majority language. Provincial governments have insisted on establishing educational standards for all public schools, and they should continue to accept this responsibility. Since it is to the advantage of both the minority-language group and the majority to have high educational standards, there need be no dispute over the principle, but there will need to be an equal respect for both official languages.

## Education in Quebec: The Present Situation

The educational structures within Quebec are undergoing radical changes and, until the new structure is complete, nobody can speak with assurance about the educational régime which will be available to the linguistic minority. Our concern is to what extent the linguistic and cultural identity of the minority is likely to be recognized and fostered by the new educational system in the province.

One point is clearly established. The English-speaking minority has been given official status within the department of Education and the Superior Council of Education. Although this legal recognition is based on religion rather than language, it is clear that Protestant will be equated with English-speaking when the language needs of the Roman Catholic Anglophone minority are involved.

A second point is also clearly established. The right of the minority to English-language schools has not been questioned. The Parent Commission suggested minimum enrolments which would close some schools. At the same time, however, the commission assumed that the principle of instruction in English for English-speaking students could be adhered to in almost all cases

by special transportation arrangements, by grouping Anglophone Protestant and Roman Catholic students, and by establishing English-language classes in majority schools where necessary.

It is less easy to decide whether the English-language schools in the future will adequately reflect the distinctive cultural needs of the minority. The new administrative structures will ensure that Anglophone officials will be involved in the administrative planning and in preparing any new programmes, but they do not guarantee that decisions will reflect cultural differences apart from language. There is no guarantee, and there can be no guarantee, because nobody can define such cultural differences with any assurance. What is more, cultural differences cannot easily be dissociated from language. It may be, as the Parent Commission suggests, that language is the central element in cultural identity and that the structures of thought and the emotional content of the language are the basis of cultural distinctions. When it is remembered that language teaching includes a study of the literary heritage of the cultural group and when, in addition, the course of study for history is intended to acquaint students with the history of their society, there is certainly some assurance that the minority English-language schools in Quebec will preserve and foster the cultural identity of this minority.

### **French-Language Education in the Other Provinces: The Present Situation**

The departments of Education in the English-speaking provinces have never based their programmes on the right of Canadian parents to educate their children in the official language of their choice. Each of the provinces responded to the needs of the minority group in its own way. Those concessions allowed in the English-speaking provinces were made in response to persistent pressures from the Francophone minorities. The result was a lack of co-ordination and very limited opportunities in French-language education in these provinces.

The education provided for the French-speaking students in Ontario is presumably intended to give them educational oppor-

tunities equivalent to those available to English-speaking students: it attempts to foster their knowledge of their mother tongue and to give them a good knowledge of English. These are commendable objectives, but the educational régime has never been consistently structured on the basis of these objectives.

Recent legislation marks a dramatic change in educational policy. Provincial authorities have tended to emphasize the diversification of educational opportunities at the secondary level, and spokesmen for the Francophone minority have stressed the importance of instruction in the mother tongue. The proposed French-language schools may make it possible to combine these two objectives. Agreement has been reached on the language of instruction. It is now possible to concentrate on providing an education in French which will be equivalent in academic standards and in variety to the education now provided in English.

Although many of the changes described are of recent origin and although the minority-language school system is still at an early stage of development, New Brunswick has more explicitly recognized the special educational needs of its Francophone minority than has any other English-language province - with the possible exception of Ontario, which has through its recent legislation shown an increased concern for the needs of its minority.

The emerging pattern is a radical change from the past and that it represents a coherent and logical plan for French-language education. This pattern is one of two parallel systems, one for Francophone and one for Anglophone students. The apparent enthusiasm for the plan, among both Acadian and Anglophone educators, augurs well for the future.

There are French-speaking communities in the provinces of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland. In each province, however, the Francophone population is too small to make a distinct French-language educational régime feasible.

In all three provinces there are schools in which French is the language of instruction. The educational systems assume that English is the normal language of instruction but concede that children need to be taught in a language they understand if they are to learn anything. The policy of English-language schools systems has not been rejected, but it has been modified to allow

a period of transition during which French-speaking students learn English. In practice, however, this policy has never been rigorously implemented in any of the provinces, and little effort has been made to solve the difficult pedagogical problems involved in teaching a second language so effectively that Acadian students could study in English without being handicapped. At the same time, these Acadian communities have not fully accepted the policy and have tended to resist the emphasis on English without presenting a clear alternative. The result is that most of the "bilingual" schools operate on the fringe of the provincial systems. Recent reforms of these systems, such as the consolidation of secondary schools and the diversification of the secondary programmes, have accentuated this isolation. Unless these schools can benefit from such reforms their students will be further deprived of educational opportunities and the Francophone minorities, as well as the provinces as a whole, will be the poorer as a result.

It is difficult to summarize the educational situation for French-speaking Canadians in the four western provinces, because this situation varies from province to province depending on patterns of settlement, the historical background, and the attitude of the Anglophone majority. Nevertheless, the Francophones in the West face common problems in their efforts to preserve their language. In each of the four provinces they are relatively few in number, they are scattered geographically, and they do not constitute the largest minority group. As a result there are few places or institutions in which French is the normal language of communication. In addition, the Anglophone majority has been reluctant to consider the situation of the French-speaking minority in the context of the place of French language and culture in Canada.

The aspirations of Francophone westerners are tempered by these facts. The initiatives taken by their voluntary associations illustrate their determination to preserve their mother tongue and to pass it on to their children, but at the same time they recognize the necessity of a sound grasp of the English language. In other words, the French Canadian organizations assume that the objective of the education régime for Francophones in the

West is to graduate bilingual students. Departments of Educational have in general responded to this aspiration with an arrangement whereby the French language may be taught in a special course for an hour or so a day in each grade. All other instruction is in English.

The consequences of this régime should be obvious. The present system assures an adequate knowledge of the English language and the gradual disappearance of the French language. When English is the dominant language within the school, it is not surprising that English becomes the common language of communication in the school yard. English is so pervasive in all areas of the child's life that it can almost be said that it is becoming the first language of the French Canadian minority in the West.

## Official-language Minority Schools

For the purpose of discussing education, the official-language minority groups in Canada can be classified in two broad categories. The first category includes the minority groups which form a significant proportion of the total population of a region. These groups are numerous enough to justify the full range of elementary and secondary schools, with programmes designed to meet their special needs. The bilingual districts recommended in Book I encompass these large blocs of the Anglophone minority in Quebec and the Francophone minorities in the other provinces. The second category includes the members of these minority groups who live outside the bilingual districts. These amount to less than 10 per cent of the official-language minorities, dispersed from Newfoundland to British Columbia. But they are not a negligible group, and the school can be a more important factor in preserving language for them than for members of the first category. Educational arrangements will of necessity be different for them than for residents of bilingual districts.

Our first recommendation is that public education be provided in each of the official minority languages at both the elementary and secondary levels in the bilingual districts.



This recommendation means that there will be education in the languages of both the minority and majority in the bilingual districts. In many cases there will be enough students to warrant separate school buildings, and transportation facilities will make it possible for each secondary school to serve a large area. In some communities it may be necessary to have minority- and majority-language classes in the same school, with both groups sharing such facilities as the auditorium, the laboratory, and the machine shop. Even in these cases, however, the students will attend separate classes, and the education provided will be no different from that in the schools attended only by the minority.

The nature of the minority-language schools will be determined to a large degree by the language of instruction used in the classroom. To communicate effectively, students must learn to use their language in a variety of situations and for a variety of subjects. If they are to develop a capacity for sophisticated analysis and expression, they must develop the modes of thought to which the language gives form. The precise and sensitive command of his language is essential to the development of the child's intellect.

The use of the minority language as the language of instruction involves more than speaking that language in the classroom. Textbooks and other teaching aids must be provided in the same language, and special care must be taken in the preparation of these aids. Wherever possible they should be written in the original language and from the point of view of the minority culture. In some cases they will have to be adapted from those used in the majority-language schools of the province, but it is important that they be carefully adapted. Translation is an art - a good translator must re-think the ideas in the second language in order to present them effectively. A literal translation would defeat the purpose of teaching the child to assimilate the modes of thought of the mother tongue.

The need to teach the majority language in minority-language schools is recognized by provincial authorities and minority spokesmen alike. Most graduates of these schools will establish their homes within their own province, and a knowledge of the majority language of the province is an invaluable asset.

The objectives of high academic standards and broad educational opportunities in minority-language schools can best be achieved within a provincial context. These objectives depend on similar programmes in all the schools in the province whatever the language of instruction may be. We recommend that the curricula for the official-language minority schools follow the broad outlines of the curricula for the majority-language schools in each province.

Less than 10 per cent of the Anglophone and Francophone minorities live outside the bilingual districts, but these people still have the moral right to have their children educated in their mother tongue. Where minority populations are small, the double objective of fostering the linguistic and cultural heritage of the minority and of ensuring equivalent academic standards and educational opportunities is still valid. But outside the bilingual districts, the means of achieving these objectives will depend largely on the number of students involved. The special educational facilities which can and should be provided will vary according to the local situation. It may not be possible to have separate schools at the elementary and secondary levels. It would not be feasible to provide even an academic secondary school programme for two or three students and, even if the numbers might justify one stream at this level, it would not be desirable if it meant that minority-language students would be prevented or hindered from choosing another stream more appropriate to their interests and abilities.

The rights of the minority must nonetheless be clearly established. Regulations are required which will state explicitly the conditions under which the minority-language group in any community is entitled to special educational facilities and which will ensure that local school boards will provide these facilities. We recommend that in each province the department of Education shall formally state the requirements and procedures by which an official-language minority living outside the bilingual districts can establish its right to special educational facilities.

The costs of the official-language minority school system cannot be dissociated from the costs of an effective educational

system. School attendance is already compulsory in every province to a certain age. Education in the minority language will not increase the number of students of this age group who will attend provincial schools. Classrooms must be built whether English or French is the language of instruction. Teachers must be hired and textbooks must be provided. We believe that more students than before from the French-language minority groups will continue their education beyond this compulsory age, but even this cannot be considered an additional cost. All provincial authorities encourage further education because they believe that this investment in human skills and talents is worthwhile. From this point of view, the real cost is incurred when these skills and talents are not developed. The increased enrolment of minority-language students at the secondary and post-secondary levels should therefore be seen as a social benefit and not as an additional cost.

This does not mean that there will be no extra costs. It will sometimes be more expensive to have the students divided into two streams, French and English, than it would be to have a single system. In some communities the division of the student body into two streams may mean that a secondary school will fall below the optimum size. If we assume, for example, that the optimum size of a secondary school is 1,000 students, the cost per student will be slightly higher if a school is built for only 700 students. When the cost per pupil is higher because of the division of the student body into two language streams, this additional cost can be attributed to the existence of minority-language schools.

Who should pay for these additional expenditures? Provincial governments are responsible for the basic costs of education, and it can be argued that the cost of providing a suitable education for the provincial minority is included in this responsibility. It must be remembered, however, that provincial authorities cannot meet all demands for educational services simultaneously. They must establish priorities based on the needs of all students in the province. They may decide to give higher priority to all educational needs of underprivileged children in urban areas. From a national perspective, however, the minority-language

students have a higher priority, because minority-language schools are essential if Canada's bilingual and bicultural character is to be confirmed.

The objective of a suitable education for the minority-language students is shared by both provincial and federal authorities, but the federal government has special reasons for having this education provided as soon as possible. This does not mean that the federal government should pay for minority-language schools; the basic costs of education must remain a provincial responsibility. But it is reasonable to expect that the federal government should reimburse the provincial government for the extra costs involved. In this way the provincial authorities will be able to provide minority-language schools within the province as part of the normal programme of educational services. We recommend that the federal government accept in principle the responsibility for the additional costs involved in providing education in the official minority language.

## *Part 2: Second-Language Teaching in Canada*

### Attitudes towards Second-language Teaching in Canada

The good effect of the new course in French is very noticeable and the policy of requiring the students to become acquainted with French, a living tongue, and to use it in speech as well as for reading, has already been amply justified. It is safe to say that within a year or two high-school students on leaving school for business or the University will carry with them a real training in French which will prove vastly more useful to them than a mere grammar and reading course in that language could possibly be. Many teachers are making an effort to live up to the ideal of using French as the language of instruction during the teaching periods in that branch.

This optimistic statement could have appeared in the latest annual report of any provincial department of Education in Canada. The objective of all departments is to teach French as a living language, with an emphasis on oral skills rather than grammar and translation, and the new methods being introduced are intended to transform second-language teaching in the schools. In fact, this statement appeared in the annual report of the Manitoba department of Education in 1920, almost half a century ago. The objective – and the optimism – are not peculiar to our generation.

The sobering fact is that in the past the objective has not been attained and the optimism has not been justified. There was general agreement in the briefs presented to us that our English-language schools are not graduating students who can speak French. Most graduates of these schools would echo the dissatisfaction recently expressed by a teacher in an English Protestant school in Quebec:

Why is it that our pupils spend nine years, from Grade 3 to Grade 11, studying French, and when they come out of school most of them are afraid, unwilling or unable to use the language in practical situations? It seems a little strange to me: nine years of studying French and still no fluency with the language even among academically-minded pupils! This in spite of the stated aims of the Department of Education. . . .

They might be reassured to some extent by the reply of an official to the effect that much had been done to improve the situation and that more reforms were planned. Until now, however, there has been little justification for complacency.

The teaching of English as a second language to Francophones is also open to criticism. We received briefs deploring the fact that Francophones did not learn to speak English adequately. The Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education in the Province of Quebec – the Parent report – supports this claim: “When one thinks that a normal bachelier from our classical colleges after eight years of English is often incapable of speaking or reading it . . . it seems urgent to look into the quality of the foreign-language teaching in our provinces.”

These criticisms may be exaggerated. We may all be inclined to demand too much of our schools; the same people who are critical of second-language teaching would probably also criticize the teaching of the mother tongue or of other subjects. It is difficult to acquire skill in speaking a second language, and it is not likely that many will ever be fully satisfied with the results of second-language teaching in the public schools.

Behind all these comments, however, is the shared belief that a knowledge of a second language – and especially an ability to converse in a second language – is worth the effort. This is reflected in the enthusiasm of provincial authorities for new methods and new programmes. Indeed, one of the major difficulties we encountered in our survey of second-language teaching in the school systems across Canada was that in every province the programmes were undergoing major revisions. New curricula, new methods, and new equipment were being introduced, with a larger number of experimental projects being initiated by both provincial and local school authorities. A high priority is certainly being given to second-language teaching in the schools. At the same time, the criticisms reflect the increasing importance given to this teaching, for the critics began with the assumption that children ought to acquire second-language skills.

The logical beginning of any discussion of second-language teaching in Canada is to note that most Canadians believe that a second language should be taught in the schools and that it should be the second official language of the country.

Second-language learning also has more utilitarian benefits. There is a growing demand for bilingual citizens in every country because of increasing commercial and diplomatic contacts with other countries. Improved methods of transportation and higher standards of living have made it easier for individuals to visit foreign countries. When few people travelled and when commercial transactions were conducted by correspondence, a reading knowledge of a language was sufficient. The conversational skills have become more useful in the age of the communications satellites and jetliners. Whether the emphasis is literary or oral, however, foreign languages have always had a prominent place in school curricula in most countries. Today, on all continents with

the possible exception of North America, the study of a second language is as much taken for granted as the study of geography or mathematics.

It is fortunate, if fortuitous, that the two official languages of Canada are at the same time two of the most important international languages. If all Canadians were Francophones, most of them would still choose English as the most useful second language to learn. It is equally true that if all Canadians were Anglophones, most of them would choose French as the most useful second language; French has retained its popularity as a second language in the United States in spite of the close links with Spanish-speaking countries in the western hemisphere. Not only are there powerful pressures for learning a second language – pressures unconnected with the language situation within Canada – but these pressures favour the learning of French or English as second languages.

Today's child will live in a mobile and highly competitive society. What parent in 1968 can know with any certainty where his child will live in the year 2000, or even what career opportunities his child will have? It is apparent, however, that the child who learns French or English as a second language will have career opportunities that other children will not have. Learning a second language is also a valuable educational experience because it brings the child into contact with a different culture. In Canada, such contact can provide our children with knowledge and appreciation of the culture of many other Canadians. Another great advantage of second-language learning in schools is that languages are more easily learned at an early age, and language skills acquired young may be regained with greater ease after a long period of disuse. Language learning can increase the number of bilingual Canadians and so reduce the language barrier in our country. It can play a significant role in increasing the mutual understanding of the two cultural groups.

The need for bilingual Canadians is apparent, and this results in increasing pressures on individuals to learn the second language. But bilingualism is a complex phenomenon. Bilingualism in the sense of having an equal command of two languages is exceptional, if not practically impossible. Some people may

acquire only the receptive skills of understanding the written or spoken language. This form of receptive bilingualism, limited though it may be, nonetheless gives access to ideas expressed in the second language and may be sufficient on many occasions. Even the bilingual person who can also write and speak the second language may not be as fluent or as sophisticated in that language as in his own. Individual bilingualism is not an absolute. It is and must be a relative concept. The need for bilingual Canadians, therefore, does not imply that these Canadians should always aspire to an equal command of the two languages. For some, receptive bilingualism will be adequate. Others will need the ability to communicate in the second language but they need not become as proficient as they are in their first language.

The need for second-language teaching cannot be seriously questioned. The majority of Canadians are aware of this need and feel that all children should study either French or English as a second language in school. The national interest also underlines the need for Canadian children to study the second official language. The question, therefore, is not so much whether it should be taught but rather how it can be better taught.

## Teaching the Second Language in Canadian Schools

In the past, the objectives of provincial programmes for the teaching of modern languages have been stated in very general terms, such as the ability to understand, speak, read and write the target language. In many provinces today, however, the programme lays special emphasis on the spoken language. In Ontario, for example, the course of study for the elementary level stresses "the ability to understand spoken French and to express one's ideas in this language." Courses of study often also include an appreciation of the culture of Canadians who speak the second language as their mother tongue.

It has not been easy to achieve these aims. The traditional emphasis on grammar and translation cannot be modified by a mere statement of objectives. Until teachers have special training in the methodology of language instruction and some fluency in



the language they are teaching, much of the classroom time will still be spent in talking about the second language rather than talking in it.

There is a general trend across Canada towards longer training sequences, beginning in the elementary grades, for French-language teaching. There is also a trend towards greater use of audio-visual and audio-lingual materials, at least in the early stages of instruction. In all provinces French revision committees are at work studying new programmes with a view to updating existing courses. Pilot projects using the new courses described above are in operation in selected classrooms throughout Canada. In most cases, a six-year sequence terminating in the last year of high school is being planned. In Ontario, long-range plans call for a nine-year sequence. The Protestant and English Roman Catholic schools of Quebec are still thinking in terms of a nine- or 10-year programme, but there is a strong feeling that the present approach is obsolescent and must be replaced. Alberta and Saskatchewan have already produced new courses for teaching French, and most other provinces will have prepared such courses by 1970. This does not mean that by 1970 all traditional courses will have been abandoned; the necessity for continuing the older courses will remain until suitably fluent teachers are available in the numbers required.

If the courses of instruction just described are to produce good results, they must be in the hands of capable teachers. Provincial reports will make it clear that there is a serious lack of well-qualified language teachers from coast to coast in Canada. There are many reasons for this. The number of bilingual teachers with the necessary professional training and with a desire to teach the second language is strictly limited. The extension of second-language teaching to the elementary grades has greatly intensified the teacher scarcity. Many other factors adversely affect the supply of teachers, including teachers of language. The student population explosion, falling drop-out rates, and the competitive bidding of business and industry for personnel suited to teaching – all these have contributed to the increased demand. Low pay scales, particularly in the Atlantic provinces, have led to the granting of letters of permission and “local licences” to individu-

als with very rudimentary qualifications for teaching. In some areas, almost any candidate who presents himself as a language instructor is hired with no questions asked.

Students' attitudes towards learning a second language are difficult to assess and even more difficult to explain, but it is obvious that unless the student attaches some importance to second-language learning, curriculum planners and teachers are likely to be disappointed by the results of their efforts. The attitude of a student, however, will also reflect community attitudes, and the value which parents and other students in the class give to the learning of the second language. If the student gains the impression that French or English is an artificial acquisition or an unnecessary frill, even the best programme taught by the best teacher will have little impact.

In general, English-speaking students appear uncertain as to why they are studying French. The responses of some freshmen students at Canadian universities suggest that for many of them French is a "foreign" language, offering abstract cultural or academic benefits but having little relevance to their careers or to their lives as citizens of a bicultural country. Questions on attitudes were administered to students enrolled in first-year French courses at 25 English-language universities. This was not a representative sample of all university students—because a second language may or may not be required for a university degree, depending on the faculty or the university—but the number of students was large enough to warrant some inferences. Few of these students had had any significant contact with French as a living language, either by meeting French-speaking Canadians or by watching French television, listening to French radio, or reading French newspapers. Even in the classroom they might not have much contact with French; most students reported that they had never had a teacher who spoke mainly French during French periods. In Ontario and Quebec, two out of three students had had this experience, but in the other provinces the proportion ranged from one in four to one in 10. Students' attitudes towards French may reflect this lack of contact.

French-speaking students react differently to learning English. When a similar questionnaire was administered to some 2,000

students at French-language universities or classical colleges, a much higher proportion replied affirmatively to the positive reasons and four out of five rejected academic credits as a reason for studying the second language. Just over half of these students gave as the most important reason that English would be necessary or useful for their career. A further question suggested disadvantages to learning English, such as the danger of becoming anglicized, or impoverishing their French, that English was not necessary for a career, that the time could be better spent on other subjects, or that Anglophones should first give greater importance to learning French. When asked which of these was the most relevant for them, almost half the students rejected them all. It is clear that most French-speaking students believe that a knowledge of English is a valuable acquisition.

### *Part 3: Education and Cultural Duality*

#### The Teaching of Canadian History

Cultural duality in Canada depends upon the coexistence of the two major cultures and on co-operation between them. Education is of vital importance because it can help create the conditions which will allow each culture to survive and flourish. Thus, an adequate education in the mother tongue is one of the prerequisites for cultural development. We have therefore dealt specifically with the problem of schools for the official-language minorities across the country.

Education can also make a major contribution to fostering co-operation between the two cultures. Contacts are inevitable between institutions and individuals, and these will become more frequent and more profound as our cultural duality is more adequately reflected in our national institutions and our national character. This interaction will depend on effective communication between the two linguistic and cultural communities. We have therefore been concerned with improving the teaching of

the second language in order to facilitate this communication.

Effective communication between the two groups, however, depends on more than the ability to translate the written or spoken word. One does not need to be an expert in semantics to realize that words can be misunderstood if they are torn from their cultural context. In attempting to express our ideas we all rely on metaphors and similes, quotations drawn from our literary heritage, and references to a shared tradition. Within the two cultural groups not everybody will understand some regional or local terms, but the difficulty of effective communication is obviously greater where there are different literary and historical traditions. Here it is not a simple question of vocabulary, but one of meaning and nuance. Indeed, the difficulty of communication becomes itself a confirmation of the existence not merely of two linguistic groups, but of two cultural groups.

We have already referred to the importance of the cultural context in our discussion of the curricula of the minority-language schools and in the teaching of the second official language. But the problem of effective communication between the two cultural groups is too important to be treated indirectly. It is not peculiar to the linguistic minorities or even to those who come into direct contact with the second language. It is a problem concerning all Canadians, because all of us are affected in some way by our cultural duality. Political decisions at the federal, provincial and even municipal levels will often affect citizens belonging to each cultural group; so will the decisions of administrators, businessmen, and private individuals. Unless the decisions take cultural differences into consideration, there may be resentment and the good intentions of the decision-makers may even be nullified. Cultural duality and partnership affect us all.

It is important to know the value judgements encountered by the student. If textbooks and teachers all start from different premises and offer differing interpretations, the student may find it confusing but he will not unwittingly accept one point of view as the truth. If, on the other hand, each cultural group has a conventional interpretation of our cultural relations, and this conventional approach pervades all the courses which refer to

Canada, the student will almost certainly adopt this version as his own. In the long run, conventional attitudes determine the relations between the two cultures. The nature of the Canadian partnership depends on what one group believes about the other.

During our public hearings we were often reminded of the importance of Canadian history, and this concern was also reflected in many of the briefs. One brief stated explicitly, "We believe the subject of history to be of extreme importance in education, for it is partially through it that attitudes towards one's country and others are formed." This widespread belief that a study of the past affects present attitudes was expressed frequently and forcefully, because there was general agreement that Canadian history as it is taught today tends to maintain and even strengthen cultural antagonisms. The history taught to English-speaking Canadians was criticized for paying only cursory attention to the pre-Conquest era. The history taught to French-speaking Canadians was criticized for ignoring more recent events outside Quebec. The writers of the briefs were concerned because the interpretations of past events were so different that there seemed to be not one but two versions of Canadian history. The criticisms were not confined to references to the major cultural groups. In the schools, it was claimed, Indians are indelibly associated with tomahawks and firewater in the early days and then forgotten, while central Europeans appear as peasant immigrants in sheepskin coats and then vanish forever. The consensus of the briefs was that by omissions and – more seriously – by cultural biases, we are fostering cultural divisions and animosities in Canada.

The treatment of still-controversial events clearly reveals the extent to which Canadian history textbooks are dominated by the point of view of the society to which the author belongs. As a Commission we are not primarily concerned with the historical accuracy of the textbooks selected, nor are we suggesting, where historical interpretations differ, that one is preferable to the other. Our objective is to see the images of the two cultural groups as they are mirrored in the school textbooks the images or stereotypes which may have a lasting impression on students.

The quotations selected are not intended to single out specific textbooks; they are intended only to illustrate the point of view common to most textbooks written in each language.

English-language textbooks find little space for the concern of French Canadians about their cultural survival. National development is seen in a predominantly English Canadian context. The establishment of a continental Canadian economy, for example, is pictured as the most significant step in fostering Canadian unity, but little attention is paid to the special implications of railway and immigration policies for French Canada. One English-language textbook in use states simply that:

The next task was to create a true national feeling in the face of the strong sectional sentiments that still survived and to develop a sense of common interests that would outweigh local or provincial attachments. . . . This meant first of all the building of a national economy. . . . If (this) could be realized, Canadians would more and more think of themselves as citizens of a single national community in whose fortunes every individual Canadian had a stake.

Most Francophones would resent the implication that strong sectional sentiments are incompatible with a "true" national feeling. For them the sense of common interests with other Canadians is not to be achieved by outweighing local interests but must be compatible with their continuing attachment to French Canadian society. The author is certainly entitled to express his own opinion but he does not make it clear that this opinion would be challenged by many of his compatriots. If the Anglophone students are to appreciate the difficulties of the task of creating a national feeling, the attitude of the other cultural group cannot be ignored.

The view that national unity is almost synonymous with a single national community is sometimes presented even more directly. One text almost expresses regret that French Canadian society has survived, although conceding that this survival was probably inevitable:

The Quebec Act meant that the province of Quebec had been put on a special basis by an imperial act of parliament. This

would complicate the future development of Canadian government. The chance to fit Quebec from the beginning into the ordinary pattern of British institutions had been lost. No doubt there was never any likelihood of completely assimilating (which, after all, meant swallowing) the French Canadians in an English-speaking Canada. But in some ways the future co-operation between the two language groups in Canada was made more difficult by this measure which increased the French feeling of separateness.

In discussing Bourassa, one English-language textbook is more openly critical of French Canadian efforts to maintain their cultural identity:

A grandson of Papineau, he made himself the champion of the fullest preservation of French cultural separation and French racial and religious privileges. Once again, as earlier under Mercier, there evolved in Quebec a narrow and tenacious nationalism whose concern was with French Canada and which showed indifference to the wider national interests of the Dominion.

Anglophone students who read such paragraphs doubtless draw the inference that the "wider national interests of the Dominion" do not include the cultural survival of French Canada.

We have no intention of suggesting any specific reforms in the teaching of Canadian history. The problems of curriculum and methodology are too complex to be resolved by *obiter dicta*. But we are directly concerned with the image one cultural group has of the other, because stereotypes can inhibit effective communication and so muddy the relations between the two groups. Our research on Canadian history textbooks has shown the need for revising the versions of Canadian history now taught in the schools. We do not believe that the restricted perspectives we have found are conscious or deliberate. No provincial authorities, textbook authors, or teachers would intentionally denigrate one of the cultural groups in Canada. The first step is to become aware of the points of view that are unwittingly being fostered in the students now in the classrooms. Precautions can then be taken to eliminate prejudicial attitudes and to foster an awareness

of the distinctive characteristics of each cultural community as well as an appreciation of our common cultural heritage.

## Conclusion

Since language is the basic ingredient of culture, our major concern in this Book has been the opportunities for each of the two main linguistic groups in Canada to have access to an education which would allow the fullest expression and development of the mother tongue, and at the same time ensure an adequate communication between the two societies. The two general principles stemming immediately from this premise, in our view, are the right of Canadian parents to have their children educated in the official language of their choice, and the opportunity to learn the second language.

It is readily apparent that a majority can assure for itself the kind of education appropriate to its social values and aspirations. Except for purposes of illustration, therefore, we have not discussed education for either linguistic group when it was in a majority situation. If the concept of a bicultural country is to be maintained, however, the language must remain strong wherever Francophones and Anglophones are located in Canada, which implies a special responsibility for the minority groups. We found that the right of the English-speaking minority has been fully recognized in Quebec – the only province where it is the minority. Part I of this Book described, therefore, the formal education of the French-speaking minorities outside Quebec, and proposed recommendations designed to make available to them similar opportunities to retain their language and culture. Our aim was to propose an educational system which would provide an appropriate linguistic and cultural milieu without sacrificing the educational opportunities offered by the majority-language schools of the province. We may draw two general conclusions: first, that the extent and conditions of minority education are linked to the concentration of French-language population; second, that if the milieu is predominantly Anglophone, the education will need to be predominantly in French. In other words, the language milieu must



be considered a vital element influencing language retention, and there will be situations where an education wholly in the minority language will be required even to satisfy the limited objective of graduating bilingual students.

Citizens of a country with two official languages should be provided with an education which allows them to participate in either society. At the same time, communication between the two cultural groups implies the existence of an adequate number of bilingual individuals. We have stated that our interpretation of bilingualism in Canada means that the major social and political institutions will function in the two languages, but that individual Canadians will not be required to know the second language. It is nevertheless true that effective co-operation between the two linguistic groups depends on the willingness of individual Canadians to become bilingual. Part 2 of this Book deals, therefore, with the opportunities available to all Canadians to learn English or French as a second language. Our recommendations, besides being designed to improve the effectiveness of second-language programmes, emphasize the fact that in order to have a true opportunity of decision, all children must be given an introduction to the second language through the school system. Our aim here is that all Canadian children should study the second official language in order to develop one or more of the language skills when this seems necessary or desirable.

In Parts 1 and 2 of this Book we have limited our study to formal schooling. A study of education has no clear limits, however, even within the restricted context of our mandate, because the subject itself has no boundaries. Formal education, even for a child, accounts for only a small portion of his activities, and outside the classroom every experience should be considered educational. Part 3 of the Book presents certain illustrations of those more intangible aspects of education which nevertheless exercise a significant influence on all Canadians, young and old. We have pointed out that learning the second language, for instance, does not ensure awareness, understanding, and sensitivity to the traditions and aspirations of the second culture. In order to achieve understanding and effective communication between the two cultures, attention must be drawn not only to

the language but to the society itself. The aim here is to make Canadians so conscious of our cultural duality that they will be accustomed to think of cultural partnership as one of the factors to be weighed when decisions are made. We have made no specific recommendations in these areas because attitudes cannot be imposed. We are convinced, however, that this third component is as vital to the realization of the true potentialities of Canadian duality as are mother-tongue schooling and second-language learning.

It is necessary to add one further observation. This Book is not an isolated study, but is a segment of the total Commission Report. It is intended to contribute a certain documentation and offer certain recommendations in one area of the investigation. It will supplement the other Books, and be supplemented by them. Education in itself should not be seen as offering the only, or even the major, solution to the present problem of the relationships between our two main linguistic and cultural groups. Language rights and the institutions of education are nevertheless essential elements in the concepts of equal partnership, and reforms in these areas will facilitate improved relationships between the two societies.

## Recommendations

1. We recommend that public education be provided in each of the official minority languages at both the elementary and secondary levels in the bilingual districts.
2. We recommend that the normal language of instruction in schools for the official minority-language group in bilingual districts be the mother tongue.
3. We recommend that the mother tongue be taught as a subject in all grades and all programmes of the official-language minority schools.
4. We recommend that the majority language be taught as a subject in all programmes offered in official-language minority schools.

5. We recommend that the curricula for the official-language minority schools follow the broad outlines of the curricula for the majority-language schools in each province.
6. We recommend that the provincial social studies programmes for official-language minority schools be suited to the special circumstances of students attending these schools.
7. We recommend that in each province the department of Education shall formally state the requirements and procedures by which an official-language minority living outside the bilingual districts can establish its right to special educational facilities.
8. We recommend that official-language minority schools be established in major urban centres whenever the number of minority-language students in the metropolitan area makes this practicable.
9. We recommend that when both types of school exist in the community, the right of parents to send their children to either the majority-language school or the official-language minority school be recognized.
10. We recommend that the linguistic and cultural character of the official-language minority schools be preserved by limiting, where necessary, the numbers of majority-language students attending these schools.
11. We recommend that the right of the official-language minority to have its own schools be dissociated from any consideration of the confessional character of these schools.
12. We recommend that there be no division within provincial departments of Education for the administration of physical services and school finances for official-language minority schools.
13. We recommend that special divisions, sections, or individuals within provincial departments of Education be responsible for services in official-language minority schools which

directly reflect language or cultural differences. The departments should be organized in such a way as to ensure collaboration in the development of comparable services for minority- and majority-language schools.

14. We recommend that in Quebec, Ontario, and New Brunswick the administration of official-language minority schools be under the direction of an administrator at the associate or assistant deputy minister level, and that this administrator be provided with an adequate staff and budget.
15. We recommend that one school board be responsible for the administration of all schools at the elementary or secondary level in the school district.
16. We recommend that all official minority-language instruction at the secondary level be removed from the jurisdiction of elementary school boards in Ontario.
17. We recommend that a school board shall include representatives of both majority-language and official minority-language schools whenever the board has both kinds of schools under its jurisdiction.
18. We recommend that the teachers destined for majority-language schools and for official-language minority schools be trained in separate institutions.
19. We recommend that the Teachers' College at Moncton become the training institution for teachers for official-language minority schools in the Atlantic provinces, and that one training institution be established to serve the needs of the four western provinces.
20. We recommend that the training programmes for teachers in French-language minority schools be extended in order to develop a higher competence in French.
21. We recommend that French-language education at the university level be provided for the Francophone minority whenever the potential enrolment makes it feasible to do so.

22. We recommend that the University of Ottawa and Laurentian University give priority to increasing the number of degree programmes offered in French.
23. We recommend a federal grant to official minority-language students to enable them to study in their own language at a Canadian university outside their province, when courses are not available in their own language within the province.
24. We recommend for these out-of-province students that a federal grant, equivalent to the normal provincial grant to the university, be paid to the host university or to the provincial government concerned.
25. We recommend that, pending the resolution of the constitutional problems involved, agreements be concluded between the federal government and the provinces concerned in order that these provinces receive the help required to meet the special needs of their French-language universities.
26. We recommend that the federal government accept in principle the responsibility for the additional costs involved in providing education in the official minority language.
27. We recommend that the federal grant to each province be based on the number of students attending official-language minority schools in the province, and that the grant be 10 per cent of the average cost of education per student within the province.
28. We recommend that the federal grant to Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick be based on the number of students attending official minority-language teacher-training institutions, and that the grant be 10 per cent of the cost per student, together with 10 per cent of the capital costs for such institutions in the future.
29. We recommend that for students attending the French-language teacher-training institution for the western provinces and for Francophone students from Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia attending the

Teachers' College at Moncton, the federal grant to the province be 25 per cent of the cost per student. We further recommend that, for the western provinces, the federal grant should cover 75 per cent of the capital costs of the training institution. For the Teachers' College at Moncton, the grant should cover 50 per cent of the capital costs which can be attributed to out-of-province students.

30. We recommend that for official minority-language universities the federal grant to the province be equal to 10 per cent of the provincial grants, whether operating or capital grants, made to these universities.
31. We recommend that the study of the second official language should be obligatory for all students in Canadian schools.
32. We recommend that second-language courses be planned in a continuous sequential programme.
33. We recommend that all programmes for the teaching of the second official language should extend to the terminal year of secondary school.
34. We recommend as a desirable objective the introduction of the second official language in Grade I in English-language schools and in Grade III in French-language schools.
35. We recommend that the provincial second-language programmes in the elementary schools be extended downward by stages until the provinces reach the objective of introducing French in Grade I in the English-language schools and English in Grade III in the French-language schools.
36. We recommend that French and English as second languages should be taught not as foreign languages but with an emphasis on the Canadian milieu in which these languages are used.
37. We recommend that more emphasis be given to Canadian authors and to the Canadian milieu in the teaching of

French and English as second languages at universities and colleges, especially in introductory courses.

38. We recommend the establishment by provincial authorities of French- and English-language centres for the training of second-language teachers for elementary and secondary schools.
39. We recommend that the basic operating costs of the second-language training centres be paid by the respective provincial governments.
40. We recommend the establishment of an interprovincial bureau of second-language training centres to co-ordinate the training programmes.
41. We recommend a federal grant to the interprovincial bureau of second-language training centres to assist in the operating costs of the centres.
42. We recommend that the capital costs of required specialized teaching facilities for second-language training centres be shared by the federal government and the government of the province in which these facilities are constructed, with the federal government paying at least 50 per cent of the capital costs.
43. We recommend that the equivalent of university entrance in the second official language should be a minimum requirement in all provinces for graduates of a teacher-training institution. We further recommend that all elementary and secondary school teachers who may teach the second official language should complete a course in second-language teaching methods.
44. We recommend that the federal government meet the cost of a one-year transfer programme for university students specializing in the second official language.
45. We recommend that the Association of Universities and

Colleges of Canada administer the transfer programme for students specializing in the second official language.

46. We recommend the establishment by the federal government of a language research council concerned with research and development related to second-language teaching in Canada.



# BOOK 3: THE WORK WORLD

## Introduction

The Commission's terms of reference charged us "to recommend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races." We believe that this partnership—which is essentially one between Francophone and Anglophone Canadians, whatever their ethnic origin—involves the underlying social and economic aspects of equality, as well as formal rights for the two languages.

Official equality of language has very limited significance if it is not accompanied by equality of economic opportunity. Unless a language can flourish in the world of work, legal guarantees of its use by government services, courts, and schools will not be able to ensure its long-term development. Formal linguistic equality is of little importance to those living under a system that always places them in inferior social and economic conditions. Such a partnership is not only unequal, but may in the long run imperil Confederation; the fate of the two cultures and the two dominant languages of Canada, within two distinct societies, ultimately depends on their positions in the work world and in the economy at large.

Statements made at our regional meetings, formal briefs, surveys we commissioned, and our own observations impressed on us the importance of the socio-economic aspects of equality. The dissatisfaction of Francophone Canadians derives in large part from what they perceive to be their inferior position *vis-à-vis* Anglophones in the work world. Again and again we came across such phrases as: "I have to hang up my language with my coat when I go to work"; "The bosses all talk English"; "The

English-speaking always get the best jobs." As well, many Francophones in Quebec expressed resentment at having little influence and control over many of the economic decisions that affect both their material well-being and the capacity of their institutions (schools and the mass media, for example) to provide for their special needs. Detailed and systematic research confirmed many of the opinions we heard expressed.

In the General Introduction to our Report, we said:

equality between the two dominant languages and cultures cannot mean absolute equality of the members of both groups. The point at issue is essentially equality of opportunity, but a real equality of opportunity – an equality ensuring that the fact of speaking English or French would be neither a help nor a handicap to a person seeking entry into the institutions affecting our individual and collective life.

Thus, when we speak of equality of opportunity or of the participation of Francophone Canadians, we mean an equality and a participation that do not interfere with the maintenance of their language and culture. It would be a travesty of the concept of equal partnership to say, as some people do, that Francophones have the same advantages as Anglophones because they can rise as fast and as far if they have the ability to work in both languages. As we said in the General Introduction to our Report:

The equality to which we refer requires that a person who engages in some activity or associates with some institution need not renounce his own culture, but can offer his services, act, show his presence, develop, and be accepted with all his cultural traits.

The question of language use is central. Working in a second language is a handicap to almost everyone. Few Anglophone Canadians would like to have their competence judged by their performance in work they were required to carry out in French. Yet, in both government and private enterprise, the higher the post, the more important is the precise, effective use of language.

There is often a psychological effect on the person trying to function in a language not his own: realizing that his writing is laboured and his speech marred by faulty constructions, he becomes self-conscious, which in turn leads him to withdraw from events in which he might otherwise have taken an active part. Although effective written and oral presentation of ideas is not required of the majority of the labour force, a language barrier hindering easy oral communications with superiors and colleagues would represent a handicap for almost everyone.

Because so little pertinent data were available, we had to carry out extensive research studies, the findings of which form the body of this Book. Our efforts to comprehend and assess the basic problems led to substantial investigations into the realms of income, occupation, and educational levels, and a study of the ways they are related to Francophone participation in federal agencies and large private business corporations. Because all these questions are closely interrelated, we decided to treat them in this one Book.

The results of these studies show that, socially and economically, Francophones are in a far weaker position than Anglophones in the work world. They are decidedly and consistently lower in average income levels, in schooling levels, in occupational scales, and in the ownership of industry. Reflecting these findings were those showing the meagre participation of Francophones in the upper levels of the federal Public Service and private industry and the restricted use of the French language in these institutions. The existence of disparity between Francophones and Anglophones is not new, but the depth and the extent of the differences revealed by our data emphasize the fact that the development of the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership calls for a determined attack on the sources of the disparities.

Because the costs of being Francophone tend to be greater and the benefits less, our purpose in this Book is to propose measures that will give Francophones a comparable status with Anglophones. This emphasis on the situation of Francophones does not mean that the present Anglophone position is in all

respects ideal; there is room for improvement on both sides. However, if an equal partnership is to develop, Francophones must first acquire the same advantages that Anglophones now have.

Language use and participation in the institutions of the work world are closely linked. The lack of Francophones in key posts in many public and private organizations is usually not the result of conscious discrimination. Rather, the very atmosphere, culture, and language arrangements are such that Francophones are handicapped in developing their capacities and in performing their work. Without the opportunity for self-expression in their own language, few Francophones are attracted to these organizations; so the use of the French language in the organizations atrophies and the presence of French culture is weakened. Some Francophones do become highly proficient in the use of English in their careers and still maintain their culture and the use of French in their family and social lives, but they are the exceptions.

Thus, while we have concentrated on language practices in the work world, we have been continually conscious of the related question of effective participation. Our recommendations are framed with the purpose of securing an active Francophone and Anglophone presence at all levels of the work organizations.

A new climate has developed in French-speaking Canada in recent years. Whatever may have been true of earlier periods is no longer true in the same way. Francophone Canadians are now showing a desire to take their place in every field of contemporary life. Great emphasis is being placed on science, technology, new initiatives, and new approaches. The Quebec educational system is in the midst of fundamental reform. To understand and evaluate such developments as these—which are changing the terms of Canada's bicultural existence—they must be seen in the context of present and likely future trends in the country's society and economy.

The problems confronting Canadians must be seen in the context of an advanced industrial society, with all the characteristics that apply to such a society. Large organizations, public and

private, have come to dominate the scene. Governments have a broader role than formerly; their actions continually affect many aspects of life and mould developments in society.

Advanced techniques of many kinds are becoming increasingly important in industry, and opportunities are becoming more and more scarce for the unskilled and the poorly trained. At the current rate of innovation, Canada seems to be moving into a post-industrial stage of development in which a large portion of the work force will not be engaged in the actual production of goods but in the provision of services of various kinds, many of them requiring skills of a high order. Society appears to be transforming itself on a scale that is novel in human experience.

Along with these changes, new problems have developed and old, familiar ones have grown more acute. Industrialization favours some regions of the country more than others, with the result that the question of regional disparities – a question as old as Canada itself – is as serious today as ever. Studies have shown that a considerable proportion of Francophones live in economically backward areas.

Urbanization, a concomitant of industrialization, also raises a host of problems. More and more Canadians, both Francophone and Anglophone, are living in large cities. Future relations between Francophones and Anglophones will have to be worked out in the urban context and particularly in the great conurbation of Montreal, home of the second largest concentration of Francophones in the world.

A further element in the setting of Canada's problems of bilingualism and biculturalism is the fact that our country shares a continent with the United States. American initiatives in business, science and technology, and the communications media are a challenging influence throughout most of the world, but have a particularly marked effect on Canada. These initiatives are transmitted through the medium of the English language and thus have a different impact on Francophone and Anglophone society. Efforts to balance this massive Anglophone influence should take into account all the existing and potential resources of the world-wide French-speaking community.

## *Part 1: Socio-Economic Status and Ethnic Origin*

### Introduction

Three basic and interrelated conditions are required for the development of equal partnership in Canada on a socio-economic level. First, the centres of power must be open to both Francophones and Anglophones. As we said in the General Introduction to our Report, both groups must "share in the direction of economic life, in making those decisions which so largely determine everyone's future living conditions. The presence or absence of a strong representation from each language group in the strategic posts of command . . . will do much to determine whether a sense of partnership exists."

Second, "The individual must . . . be able to find, at all levels of human activity, a setting which will permit him to develop, to express himself, and to create in accordance with his own culture." Such a setting is not possible without the necessary educational and financial means. Obviously, the cultural flowering of a linguistic group is impeded if, for economic reasons, many of its young members have to enter the labour force without completing their education, and if the struggle to provide food, shelter, and clothing for themselves and their families consumes an undue part of their time and energies.

In the General Introduction we also stated that "Every stratum of Canadian society has redefined its notion of the good life in terms of easy access to the fruits of modern technology. This brings us to the third condition: these fruits of progress must be equally accessible to all Canadians, both Anglophones and Francophones.

It is clear that these three conditions of equal partnership are related. A wealthy man, for instance, will probably hold a position of influence and have the education to pursue his cultural development.

We have measured socio-economic status according to the following variables: income, education, occupation, and individual participation in the ownership of industry. Income is an index of material wealth. When the incomes of French- and English-speaking Canadians are compared, the present state of the partnership in terms of the fruits of economic and social progress will be described and illustrated. To develop his cultural expression, an individual must have an income large enough to enable him, among other things, to buy books, records, and art objects, to undertake studies in his own language, and to support either through taxes or directly the institutions which sustain his culture. Finally, a high income is almost invariably the reward for occupying a responsible and influential position.

Education is important for its effect on cultural opportunities and for its role in enabling an individual to progress to his full potential. In the context of this Book, however, its main importance stems from its close relation to occupation and income.

By examining the occupational distribution of Canadians, we can establish in a general way which people are filling the key positions. In addition, because high salaries are usually attached to such positions, the occupational variable can also tell us a good deal about the distribution of material wealth in Canada.

Traditional economic thought has not taken the cultural-linguistic affiliations of industry owners into account. However, we have chosen to do so for a number of reasons. First, we are seeking to identify the economic elite of the country. Second, the language of work in a given firm, particularly at the management level, is likely to be the language of the owners. Finally, because the names of firms and their proprietors are such visible features of social life, ownership of industry is for most people a much more immediate sign of the relative status of Francophones and Anglophones than are income, education, and occupation.

The four variables by which we shall measure socio-economic status are interrelated. For example, a meagre education will likely result in a low-level occupation, which in turn will probably produce a poor income. An examination of the interaction of these variables should lead to some understanding of the social processes that affect socio-economic status. Thus, our four vari-

ables are dynamic forces which work together to determine status and to impede or promote the development of equal partnership.

## Income

We discovered a very noticeable disparity in income between Canadians of French and British origin.

Canadians of French origin earned about 80 per cent of the average income of those of British origin. Those of Jewish origin earned more than the British, those of Italian origin less than the French. The Germans, Ukrainians, and Others fell between the British and French levels.

Regional factors played some part in determining incomes for the population as a whole and for Canadians of each ethnic origin. This was particularly true for those of French and British origin, although in Quebec the average income of the British exceeded the provincial average by much more than its usual advantage.

Relative income according to mother tongue was very similar to that according to ethnic origin, except in British Columbia. Bilingual Canadians tended to have higher incomes than unilingual Canadians, but in Quebec unilingual Anglophones had the highest incomes. In either case, compared with those of French origin, those of British ancestry achieved the highest average incomes, unless they happened to speak only French.

## Education

Education plays a key role in economic development. In an economy as advanced as Canada's, simple literacy is no longer enough. Rather, the minimum requirement for any person in the labour force is a good, all-round education; he must have the general knowledge and flexibility of mind to cope with the increasingly rapid changes produced by modern technology in both types and methods of work. For this reason, more and more stress is being placed on keeping students in school for a



longer period of time. This trend is manifested by the recent recommendation of the United States National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress that 14 years of free public schooling be the minimum standard henceforth.

Modern industry also requires a ready supply for workers with a specialized technical education and the necessary skills to employ the latest advances in scientific method. Indeed, the writing is on the wall for the unskilled labourers. Forming 13 per cent of the male labour force in Canada in 1931, this proportion had fallen to 7 per cent by 1961.

Modern industry also needs a properly-trained managerial and administrative staff. The upper ranks of today's corporations include not only lawyers, engineers, and accountants, but also physical and social scientists, as well as increasing numbers of graduates in business administration. There is little room for the untrained at these levels.

If the economy of a country is dependent for its continued development on the existence of such academic qualifications as these among the labour force, then any group which is cut off from attaining these qualifications will share only marginally in the social advantages stemming from industrial progress. Thus, when we compare Canadian Francophones and Anglophones on the scholastic scale, we are dealing with a matter that profoundly affects their relative positions in the Canadian society and economy, both now and in the future.

Four main points stand out. First, while the educational level of Canadians as a whole compared unfavourably with that achieved in the United States, levels of schooling also differed markedly among Canadians of different ethnic origins. The ranking strongly resembled the findings on levels of income. Those of British origin had an average of two more years of schooling than those of French origin.

Second, educational levels varied from one part of the country to another. British Columbia and Ontario stood well above the national average; Quebec and New Brunswick, for example, were below it. The ranking by ethnic origin did not change substantially in the different regions: those of French origin invariably had a level of schooling below the provincial average.

Third, until 1961 the prospects of the labour force of French origin reducing the gap in its level of education did not seem very bright. In Quebec, the proportion of students aged 15 to 19 years and 20 to 24 years still in school was one of the lowest in the country, and school attendance among the Roman Catholics was considerably lower than among the Protestants in the province. Further, Quebec Roman Catholic schools were retaining only 38 per cent of their students in Grade XI, in comparison with 50, 52 and 54 per cent for the New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec Protestant schools respectively. More recent data on enrolments in post-secondary institutions indicated a striking expansion at this level in Quebec, but this phenomenon was by no means unique to the province, so the original disparity remains.

Finally, the proportion of lay teachers in the Quebec Roman Catholic system considered fully qualified was 40 points lower than that of the provinces west of Quebec.

## Occupation

The kind of work a man does to earn his living provides a good measurement of his socio-economic status. It determines in large measure the monetary rewards he receives, and it indicates whether or not he is in a position to influence the lives of others. A comparable distribution of Francophone and Anglophone Canadians along the occupational scale would reflect the existence of an equal partnership; a greater concentration of one group in the low-paying, less influential occupations would be a symptom of inequality.

The rapidly-changing occupational structure of the country is an important factor in this analysis. The relative importance of the various occupations in an economy centred on agriculture is obviously very different from that in a largely industrial economy. As Canada moves through the stages of economic development some occupations are declining in significance while others are rising. If one section of the population is disproportionately clustered in the declining occupations, while another group is well to the fore in the expanding occupations, then any present

inequality in the sharing of wealth and influence will become much more acute unless some remedial action is taken.

On the scale of occupational status, Canadians of British origin clearly outranked those of French origin. However, the French fared better on this occupational scale than they did on the income scale.

As the Canadian economy develops, certain occupations are becoming more important and others are declining. In the first category are the managers and professionals and in the second, the unskilled labourers. Craftsmen formed an expanding occupation up to 1951 but have remained at the same level since then. Incomes were between two and three times higher in the managerial and professional categories than in the two blue-collar categories. The fact that 20 per cent of those of British origin and only 15 per cent of those of French origin were in the high-paying, high-prestige, and expanding occupations indicates a serious imbalance in socio-economic status between the two groups. This disparity applied not only to Canada as a whole, but to each of the provinces as well, and it is likely to grow more acute with every step forward by the Canadian economy.

Education accounted for a substantial part of the disparity, but neither education nor differing evaluations of occupation prestige could account for all of it. Immigration offered another explanatory factor. Since the number and proportion of immigrants intending to enter professional occupations was considerably higher among the British than among the French, the Canadian labour force of British origin has benefited much more from immigration than the labour force of French origin.

## Ownership of Quebec Industry

The individuals and groups who own or control industrial enterprises play a vital role in the economy. Generally, these are people of high income and a fair degree of economic power. Owners of business constitute an élite group, in which Canadians of both official languages should be represented if equality in the economic field is to be achieved. We have singled out for consid-

eration the industries of Quebec because – given the composition of this province's population – it is here, more than in any other part of Canada, that French-speaking Canadians should be most in evidence as participants in this economic élite.

Francophone Canadian industry in Quebec is concentrated in the agricultural and service fields. In the manufacturing sector, Francophone Canadian establishments accounted for a low proportion of the provincial value added; tended to be less productive; had fewer employees and paid them less; produced essentially for the Quebec market; and were based in the traditional industries. The foreign-owned establishments generally stood in complete contrast to this pattern, while those owned by Anglophone Canadian interests tended to share characteristics with both Francophone Canadian and foreign establishments, and thus to occupy a middle position. Industries in a diversified economy may be expected to show many different characteristics, but this does not explain the fact that Francophone Canadian establishments have consistently placed at the lower end of the various scales we have employed.

## Factors Contributing to Socio-Economic Disparities

Our examination of the social and economic aspects of Canadian life (based on 1961 census figures) shows that there is inequality in the partnership between Canadians of French origin and those of British origin. By every statistical measurement which we used, Canadians of French origin are considerably lower on the socio-economic scale. They are not as well represented in the decision-making positions and in the ownership of industrial enterprises, and they do not have the same access to the fruits of modern technology. The positions they occupy are less prestigious and do not command as high incomes; across Canada, their average annual earnings are \$980 less than those of the British. Furthermore, they have two years less formal education. Quebec manufacturing firms owned by Francophones produce only 15 per cent of the provincial output. In this chapter we try

to determine the relative importance of the factors lying behind this inequality.

It is obvious that the identification and analysis of the causes of income disparities are subject to many difficulties. However, the various methods we have used lead us to conclude that schooling and occupation are the two most important factors explaining the income disparities between Canadians of British and French origin. The other factors which we considered – age, underemployment, industry, and region – all influence the disparities, but to a lesser degree. All these factors, taken together, explain the greatest part of the income disparities, which we have discovered. Bilingualism, period of immigration, and the factors related to ethnicity have a secondary although still significant influence. These are the results of a purely statistical analysis, which takes into account neither the cumulative effects of the factors nor their dynamism over a period of time. Therefore, we must extend our analysis to consider the deeper causes at the root of the socio-economic disparities.

Why do the forces that produce the income disparity between Canadians of French and British origin affect the two groups in a different manner? Why, for instance, do the French have a lower level of schooling than the British? To give satisfactory answers to these questions would require a complete explanation of the way in which a society operates. We aim only to indicate some of the more obvious processes whereby the existing state of inequality has been produced.

No matter how free schooling may be – and in most provinces university education at least is far from being free – the cost of maintaining a student in school is still high. Many families, especially the larger ones, simply cannot afford to continue supporting their children after they are old enough to join the labour force. The children's level of schooling is thus curtailed and, with it, the range of occupations open to them. The level and quality of public education are also dependent upon the resources that a society can devote to it and ultimately upon the prosperity of that society. As the average income for those of French origin has always been well below the national average, their educational achievements suffer.

Any particular figure for schooling levels, for instance, bears the imprint of the whole history of school system in Canada. This history is in turn closely related to the process of economic development. If the economy of a region is underdeveloped, the educational system will not be required to produce a highly qualified labour force. Conversely, in a fully industrialized province, the educational system will have greater demands placed on it. If the economy is to develop, education must meet the needs of the work world by adapting itself to the technological evolution in the society it serves.

The Canadian economy has been undergoing rapid development in this century. We have already noted the changing occupational patterns. As well, real per capita income increased by about 70 per cent between 1925 and 1955, while the average number of years of schooling of the male labour force went up by nearly two-fifths between 1911 and 1961. However, not all Canadians have benefited equally from this progress; on this fact turns much of the present socio-economic disparity between Francophones and Anglophones.

The history of economic development in Quebec illustrates this point well, since the impact of industrialization in this province was quite different for its Francophone majority and its Anglophone minority. The present distribution of industry ownership in Quebec—with its Anglophone predominance, particularly in the technologically advanced and highly productive industries—reflects a long tradition in the province's economic affairs.

Many explanations of this have been put forward. For instance, at the onset of industrialization, Anglophones were already established in the cities as merchants; they had the necessary capital for expansion and trade contacts in the North American and British markets. Francophone and Anglophone communities in Quebec had different characteristics at the time, and the Anglophones were better prepared to participate in and reap the advantages of Quebec's industrial expansion.

John Porter has noted that "the British in Quebec have always been much more industrial and commercial in their occupations than the French." The Francophones, in contrast, were more rural as industrialization got under way, while later "a combina-

tion of historical factors destined the French-Canadian habitant to the role of forming an industrial proletariat." The Francophone elite turned to the liberal professions rather than industrial careers: between 1939 and 1950, the priesthood, medicine, and law accounted for 69 per cent of the graduates of Quebec's classical colleges.

Although economic development has benefited Anglophones relative more than Francophones, there are persons in both groups who have been left behind. The process of development requires a labour force of sufficient basic skills to be able to adapt to modern technology and to move on to new industries and jobs. Yet, in 1964, 42 per cent of the total male labour force in Canada had only an elementary level of schooling or less. Many of them must now be experiencing increasing difficulty in their relations with the work world. They may be out of the labour market altogether, or unemployed, or underemployed.

Data on poverty, even when this is simply defined on an income scale, are relatively scarce in Canada, and this is particularly true in the case of any breakdown by ethnic origin or mother tongue. But there are indications that poverty, while not limited to any section of the population, is more frequently found among Francophone than Anglophone Canadians. In 1961, relatively more Francophones than Anglophones had lower incomes and thus were caught in the poverty cycle. Larger percentages among the Francophones showed such characteristics of poverty as unemployment, low schooling levels, and manual occupations. An examination of the census divisions containing high concentrations of "hard-core" farm poverty shows that many of the areas of French-speaking concentration fall within this category.

A fourth dynamic process associated with socio-economic status is to be found in the policies and practices of the institutions of the work world. Before he even joins the labour force, the individual's social and economic standing in life is certainly partially shaped by the various demographic, historical, cultural and other factors we have discussed. Yet, once he enters the institutions of the work world, a whole new set of factors enters into operation to check or advance his progress. These factors are particularly relevant to an explanation of the disparities in status

between Francophones and Anglophones, since it is within these institutions that linguistic and cultural differences become translated into social and economic ones. "Francophone" and "Anglophone" cease to be merely convenient labels for the two linguistic groups. They take on a new significance as we begin to discover the profound influence of language and culture on socio-economic disparities.

## *Part 2: The Federal Administration*

### Introduction

The federal government is involved in the life of every Canadian. Its vast financial bulk and the complexity of its interrelation with the economy have far-reaching effects, both national and regional, on industrial growth, employment and stability. Both as an employer and as a purchaser of goods and services, the federal government is a direct source of income to many Canadians. As well, in recent years, governments generally have been obliged to develop new and closer relations with private investment and industry.

It is more important than ever that the decisions and actions of the Canadian government should recognize and draw on the potential of the country's two linguistic communities. At the intergovernmental level this principle has become widely recognized, since the division of responsibilities and co-ordination of planning between federal and provincial governments are basic to the solving of contemporary problems. If the language and culture of French-speaking Canada are weakly expressed in the federal government or its Public Service, that government cannot even begin to execute its duties towards all Canadians - Francophones as well as Anglophones.

In 1966 this enormous institution, in all its departments and agencies, the Crown corporations, and the Canadian Armed Forces, employed 480,000 people, about 7 per cent of the whole



Canadian labour force. It is by far the largest single employer in Canada, with a total number of employees "roughly equal to the work force in the twenty-five largest industrial corporations in Canada . . . roughly double the total number employed by the ten provincial governments." The federal government's labour force is also extremely diversified, employing people in virtually every occupational category.

The Public Service has a larger proportion of semi-professional and technical personnel than the labour force as a whole; it also has slightly more managers and qualified professionals than most industries, and far fewer manual workers. In recent years its traditional whitecollar character has been continually augmented by the need for more and more scientists and technologists. Correspondingly, the Public Service is better educated than the labour force as a whole. For example, 19 per cent of its staff in 1961 had attended university, compared with 10 per cent of the total labour force.

Language rights must be respected by the Canadian Public Service. The Service is obliged to be bilingual; the Canadian citizen is not – nor is the Canadian public servant. The important distinction between individual and institutional bilingualism must be kept in mind. The federal Public Service itself must be bilingual; it should be able to provide adequate services in both French and English and, therefore, some members of its staff will have to be bilingual. However, many will continue to need only one language.

An individual should be free to work in the tongue in which he is most comfortable. Because he speaks one and not the other official language, he should not be unjustly penalized. In most fields, a "career in French" should be as readily available as a "career in English". Thus, as a bilingual institution, the federal administration must contain organizational arrangements designed to ensure that individuals can work and develop professionally in their own language.

For many public servants, of course, it will be wise to develop bilingual capacity, since it will increase their opportunities for advancement. These persons could work in either a Francophone or an Anglophone milieu, or serve as communication links

between the two milieux. Such individual bilingualism may not necessarily require complete familiarity and ease with all facets of the other language. Receptive bilingualism – the ability to read the other language and understand it when it is spoken, an ability significantly easier to acquire than total bilingualism – would enable a person to review documents and understand oral presentations prepared in the other language.

Another important distinction is that between biculturalism and bilingualism. This distinction is extremely difficult to make because, although in our view the main objective is a bicultural situation, the more easily definable factor is language. Structures adapted to the linguistic needs of cultural entities enable them to survive, develop, and play the role which is distinctively theirs. Yet, long before we make formal proposals for structural changes in the Public Service, we must determine whether and in what way the cultural qualities of Francophones and Anglophones are distinguishable and significant at work; whether such qualities, if they differ, have equal opportunities for expression; and, if they have not, what the consequences are. The most easily measurable of these cultural qualities – and the key factor – is, of course, language. However, culture consists of more than the language through which it is expressed; “culture is a way of being, thinking and feeling”. We must examine the expression of these other qualities in the work relations in the federal administration and evaluate their significance and opportunities.

“Language of service” and “language of work” are differentiated throughout our text. The former applies to any means of communication between the federal government and its clients, whether they be individual taxpayers, business corporations, or other governments. Language of work means the language used between individuals or agencies within the government. In Book I we touched on language of service in the federal government; it is treated in detail here. However, changes in the language of work in the Public Service present the most difficult problems and the greatest challenge.

A guiding theme in Part 2 is the participation of Francophones and Anglophones in the organizations of the federal

Public Service. Two facets of participation are examined. The first is participation in the sense of physical presence in various departments or agencies, at various salary levels, among persons with a certain type of university specialty, or in groups that have experienced slow or rapid advancement. We were interested in where Francophones and Anglophones were relatively concentrated or absent.

The second facet of participation by Francophones and Anglophones is their active involvement in and personal contribution to the work going on in their immediate environment. Are public servants from the two language groups equally interested and influential in their work? To what extent are Francophone and Anglophone cultural traditions expressed in the federal bureaucracies? As the history of the political issues arising from linguistic and cultural problems shows, the public administration has long considered itself devoid of cultural considerations. The claims of French-speaking Canada were usually labelled "political" and treated accordingly. Efforts are now being made to create an equal partnership in the federal administration, but so far these efforts consist almost exclusively of programmes to increase the number of bilingual individuals. Clearly, there is a need for organizational changes and structures to develop the viable use of both languages within specific work contexts.

The possibility of national disintegration has forced a reexamination of the linguistic policies of the Public Service. The debate is no longer about efficiency, merit, patronage, and representation, but rather between thorough-going reform and schism. Change is imminent and no institution requires reform more urgently than does the federal administration.

In an institution that is old, large and internally complex, the main reaction to the contemporary resurgence of French-speaking Canada seems to be fear. But such a resurgence – while it exacts legitimate and difficult changes in preconceptions about language use and culture – holds an enormous potential for the Public Service and Canada. This prospect has helped us approach the Public Service with optimism.

## History of Language – Use and Participation

The history of language use and participation in the federal Public Service, especially for the 30 years up to 1962, has been strongly influenced by a particular interpretation of the concept of efficiency.

Both Francophone and Anglophone federal politicians and public servants accepted the prevailing orthodoxies linking unilingualism with rationality and efficiency. For Anglophones, the concept of efficiency was an article of faith in a movement that, after 1918, reformed the federal administration on progressive principles. But the idea that language ability in French alone – or even in both French and English – might be a component of merit and efficiency rarely made an impression. Perceptive Anglophones could see that capable Francophone public servants were being held back by gross inequities, but this understanding in no way affected the dominant interpretation of merit and efficiency. They still assumed that English would be the main and, practically, the only working language of the federal administration. As late as the time of the Jean Committee, lack of French-language services in Quebec and discrimination against Francophones in the Public Service – especially at the top of the hierarchy – were viewed as unfortunate grievances which in no way challenged the guiding principles of the Service.

The failure of such pioneers as Lapointe might be attributed to the prevailing climate during World War II, bad tactics, or poor propaganda. French-speaking Canada's complaints could always be interpreted as a "political" appeal to return to the bad old days of patronage and, therefore, to inefficiency if not corruption; and the French-language partisans were put in the position of appearing to be opposed to efficiency as an administrative aim. At the time, it was not argued that use of the French language and increased participation by Francophones would make the Public Service more efficient. Partisans of reform probably did not press this vital point in the 1930's because of the Depression, in the 1940's because of the War, and at other times because they feared the intensity of the Anglophones' spontaneous resistance would prevent any gains from being secured. In

any event, most Francophone politicians and officials probably accepted the dominant Anglophone definition of the situation.

Anglophones enjoyed the benefits of a unilingual Public Service, but generally did so unconsciously, for consciousness implies some element of choice, and no alternatives were seriously debated. What we can consider today as effective discrimination against the French language and Francophones, earlier generations took to be the natural order of things. The situation was accepted, for the most part unquestioningly, by Francophones and Anglophones alike, although for different reasons. The Anglophones did not see that such one-sidedness corroded Anglo-French harmony and the continued existence of Canada; the Francophones were lulled into quiescence by patronage and honorific positions. All in all, the history of the Public Service from the two standpoints of language use and Francophone participation represents a tragic failure of Canadian political imagination.

## Language Use

When an individual is making a decision about the career he will pursue, the opportunity to work in his own language is an important consideration. A Canadian Anglophone might overlook this factor in making a career choice – he would assume that English would be the language of work in any occupation he might select. A Francophone could make no such assumption; for him, the opportunity to work in his own language cannot be taken for granted.

This language factor similarly affects an individual's decision to enter and make a career in the federal Public Service. It determines his capacity to contribute to the work of the organization, because cultural qualities carried by one language may be very difficult to put across in another. It also defines his career prospects: language problems may, in personnel assessment, obscure an individual's true ability and prevent him from feeling at ease in the work community.

An institution is bilingual not solely because individuals speak-

ing the two languages are involved in it, but also because members of both language groups and cultures are able to work and participate in their own language at all levels of the institution. This presupposes units with only one language of work. English-language units already exist in Canada's Public Service, in the sense that in the great majority of them English is the sole language of work. But an efficient bilingual institution is characterized by the coexistence of two languages of work in a rational organization of administrative units; bilingual individuals are key elements only at the points of direction and liaison.

An investigation of language use in the Public Service must include an examination of the existing degree of capacity of the two official languages among individual public servants of both mother tongues and of the changes in their language skills over a period of years.

Public servants of French mother tongue were more often bilingual than those of English mother tongue. Only one in 10 of the employees of other mother tongues reported fair or considerable competence in spoken French. About three-quarters of all bilingual public servants are of French mother tongue.

Pressures to use English at work, and particularly as the main working language, were felt more keenly in more senior posts. Fewer than 40 per cent of the managerial and professional staff who initially stated that French was their best language of work still retained this preference. By comparison, more than half of the clerical staff still performed their work best in French, as did 60 per cent of all those in other non-professional and non-managerial occupations. One in eight managers and professionals had changed to English as their best language of work.

Ability and willingness to work in English appear to be conditions of advancement in the Public Service for those of French mother tongue.

Most departments said that they replied in the language of the correspondent when it was French or English, but some indicated that they occasionally replied in English to avoid delay. When the language was other than French or English, the practice of the departments varied. In the department of National Defence, for example, if the foreign language was used, a letter

from outside Canada was answered in the language of the correspondent. In the Immigration division of the department of Citizenship and Immigration, letters received in languages other than French or English were always answered in English. In nearly all departments, replies to correspondence in French were drafted in English and then translated. Even if the information needed for the reply was gathered by a Francophone, English was used either because the person signing the letter was an Anglophone or because an English version was required in the file for use by unilingual Anglophone officials. In Quebec regional offices of federal departments, French correspondence was usually but not always dealt with in French.

The Translation Bureau and language schools are the main means by which the government of Canada has attempted over the years to develop a particular pattern of language use in the Public Service. Neither was set up and neither is now being developed within an overall framework of comprehensive language policy. The servicewide language-training programme launched in 1964 was, in particular, a specific response to political demands; it was not integrated or systematically planned with a view to the general goal of creating a bilingual Public Service. Some of the Translation Bureau's difficulties and shortcomings have also stemmed from a similar lack of overall planning and evaluation.

Language use reflects the lack of overall policy. A Francophone public servant cannot rely on an integrated structure of Service-wide policies and mechanisms applicable to all departments. The Anglophone tradition of the Public Service tends to be self-perpetuating. The current predicament leads to misuse of existing language agencies, such as the Translation Bureau, and of many other language resources which might otherwise contribute to a bilingual Public Service.

Change must take place on two levels: a comprehensive policy for the systematic creation of a bilingual Public Service is needed, as is a central organization for its supervision. In addition, each unit of government must set its own house in order so far as language use is concerned. These two ends of the structure of government can and should support each other.

The overall purpose of the policy we envision for the Public Service of Canada is equal partnership as defined in the General Introduction of this Report. From this principle and the Public Service's general goal of a bilingual institution, two specific aims can be derived. First, equal services for the public in both official languages must be country-wide. This aim would be effected mainly by increasing the bilingual capacities of the appropriate regional offices outside Quebec (for instance, in Cornwall and St. Boniface). Second, linguistic and cultural discrimination between employees in the Public Service must be terminated, through reorganization to ensure the use of French at work. For the first time, the language rights of employees, as well as of clients would be protected by the Public Service. It is also a huge task, since it involves changing the formal structure and intangible character and traditions of the Service as a whole. However, when broken down into sub-policies and mechanisms for their implementation, the task seems far less difficult and the results less remote.

The main administrative need is to enlarge the range of situations in which French can be used for government work, particularly at the middle and higher levels, giving Francophone public servants a real possibility to work in their own language and to make their own positive cultural contribution to the work in hand. This would obviously require reorganization far more sweeping than drawing up a list of criteria for selecting candidates for language classes.

Institutional as well as individual bilingualism is essential, for the aim is not merely to increase the number of bilingual individuals in the Service, but also to make it possible for Francophones to participate as Francophones at all levels of the administration and to the full range of their potential.

## Career Development

The rationalization of the federal Public Service along lines of efficiency and merit in the years after 1918 destroyed the old system of patronage under which there were always a number of Francophone civil servants appointed by Francophone cabinet



ministers. No procedure or doctrine was evolved to replace the old system and, with few Francophones in the guiding councils of the Public Service, its explicit qualifications and implicit assumptions became more and more unfavourable to Francophones.

The only replacement offered for the patronage system has been the practice evolved in response to the need for communication with the large sector of the Canadian population that does not speak English. This practice naturally failed to make the Public Service a bilingual institution, since it simply provided for a few "bilinguals" here and there to serve a Francophone public in French.

That young Francophone graduates should differ from their Anglophone colleagues in their response to the Public Service is, therefore, easily understood. They know its history of indifference to the French fact and are therefore reluctant to seek employment in Ottawa. Their suspicions of widely-discussed reforms that are less than radical stem from the failure of previously announced reforms to change matters significantly. The situation is aggravated by the traditional shortage of graduates from French-language universities, particularly in scientific and technical fields. The renewed industrial development of Quebec has multiplied the number of professional, scientific, and technical jobs available in the provincial administration and in business within that province, with the result that the federal Public Service faces more competition than ever before for Francophone university graduates.

The climate of opinion at French-language universities is neither wholly hostile nor unchangeably mistrustful, as the increase in recruitment in 1966-7 shows. However, the recruiting service of the administration needs to examine its procedures to make sure that Francophones are not penalized. So long as interviewers fail to establish confidence and communication with Francophone students, they are likely to discourage competent applicants. Also, since the Public Service Commission testing devices do not take into account the two major cultures of Canada, they are undoubtedly eliminating able people without even an interview.

It is not enough to tell public servants that they may speak

French if they wish; the whole milieu will have to be changed if the Public Service is to become a bilingual institution. At present, when a Francophone comes to work in a setting where English has always been the only language of work, he faces many difficulties and frustrations. He may find that there is no typewriter with French accents; the service personnel are likely to speak only English; most documents in circulation and publications in the library will probably be in the English language; and co-workers will almost be unilingual Anglophones. Clearly, it will take more than a new Public Service Commission regulation to make Francophones feel at home in the federal government. It is not surprising that the difficulties persist, despite many efforts to improve the situation.

The problem of providing equal opportunity is universal. Wherever persons of different languages and cultures work with and for each other, patterns of differential participation in the work process develop. The patterns are based on the realities of group differences in types of training and skills. But they also tend to be based on stereotypes that suggest which people are suitable for what work and what social status. To a certain extent the stereotypes merge with the realities of genuine cultural difference and even reinforce them; in this sense they are self-confirming. They can colour the whole environment of an organization. A supervisor who looks at subordinates of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds in terms of stereotypes will decide, on the basis of these stereotypes, whom to encourage and whom to ignore. As a direct result, some will become dynamic and self-confident, and others will become reticent and alienated. The upshot is not simply that people of ability or potential ability are overlooked (though this frequently happens), but that the environment itself partly determines who has ability by giving different labels to different types of people.

The general "English" character of the Public Service is largely a result of its linguistic composition. Those of English mother tongue were clearly in the majority everywhere except in Quebec, where they formed a significant minority. By contrast, those of French mother tongue were a majority in Quebec and a significant minority in the federal capital; elsewhere they were too few to exert any influence as a linguistic or cultural group.

Various aspects of the Public Service facilitate or block the advancement of Francophones. As we saw earlier, there is an acute shortage of Francophones in higher-salaried positions throughout the Public Service. This situation has existed for decades, but senior officials in many departments indicated that the political pressures and publicity generated by the issue of bilingualism have had a definite impact. Almost all the officials expressed a keen interest in obtaining Francophone personnel, and many even pointed out that nowadays Francophones with ability were likely to advance more rapidly than Anglophones.

The cultural ambience of the federal administration is that of a British model adapted to the politics and technology of English-speaking Canada. It is on the whole, an effective adaptation, but its great limitation is its lack of Francophones and, indirectly, French ways of thinking and operating. Everywhere in the Public Service there is great concern for recruiting Francophones, but the desire seems to be for men who will fit easily into the existing structure. The desire for Francophones was rarely complemented by a willingness to provide the intellectual atmosphere and working conditions for the development of their talents. Furthermore, there was apprehension that the Francophones would behave in the federal Public Service as "French Canadians." There was little recognition of the beneficial impact such Francophones might have in broadening departmental orientations. The department of External Affairs, for example, showed a limited interest in France and French-speaking Africa before 1965. The department of Finance has neglected the later developments in econometrics that have come from Francophone economists, both in France and in Quebec, and its libraries lack the leading French-language economic journals. The greatest drawback Francophone public servants must face is the cultural milieu of the federal administration: it is so overwhelmingly "English" that it is difficult for Francophones to identify with its problems or with the style of life, honour, and prestige of its officers. The result is that some Francophones either give up, drained of ambition, or simply become narrowly ambitious. Neither orientation is conducive to a successful or useful career. The Public Service must recognize the necessity of creating work milieux in which the normal language will be French, where Francophones will constitute a

majority, and where their experiences will incline them to stay in the Public Service.

## French-Language Units

The federal Public Service should be transformed so that French will become a functioning language of work. Indeed, the transformation we foresee is similar in scope to the one involved in the introduction some 50 years ago of the merit principle in recruitment and promotion. It took decades for this principle to become a vital part of the operation of the federal Public Service. Today, the imperatives of the political situation demand that the transformation be implemented in a matter of years and months. Thus, in order to give expression to the principle of equal partnership in the federal Public Service, we recommend that the federal government adopt the French-language unit as a basic organizational and management principle, and that it therefore provide for the creation and development, in all federal departments, Crown corporations, and other agencies, of organizational units in which French would be the language of work; these units would be established in a variety of locations and would be of different sizes and functions.

The essential idea of the French-language unit is that its personnel – both Francophone and Anglophone – will use French as the language of work. This requirement will not entirely exclude the use of English, but it will sharply circumscribe it. Generally, only French will be used within designated French-language units and between these units and the senior officers of their departments. In communication between the French-language units and other units, a policy of receptive bilingualism will apply.

Senior public servants in all departments and in the central agencies must be fully capable of planning and supervising the operations of French-language units. Therefore, the heads of all French-language units and all those above them – Anglophones as well as Francophones – will necessarily have to be skilled in both languages, receptively so in the immediate future and fully bilingual in the longer run.

The proportion of French-language units will vary widely throughout the federal organization, and the units will vary as to size, location and function. However, each department should contain some French-language units, and in each department the major internal services—personnel management, administrative management, libraries, information bureaux, and legal services—will have to develop capacity in both languages.

The application of the concept of the French-language unit must also be subject to a detailed knowledge of the special conditions in each department and agency. However, certain considerations should be taken into account in the implementation of the proposed policy. First, the French-language units must perform important and integral functions within departments and agencies—they must be essential to the overall work of the department. We are not proposing a separation of the federal administration into two parallel sectors defined by language: the functional responsibilities of the units themselves we take as given, and change in the language regime should not alter their role. The functions remain but the language régime changes; we expect that this change will affect the way the functions are carried out.

Ideally, the unit structure should fully provide for upward career paths in the French language. Such prospects need not all be located in one department but should be available within the ranks of a given occupation. Although our priority is to change the working conditions in the middle and upper levels of the Public Service, we also stress the importance of extending the proposals to the entire structure of the Service. The units must also be open to Anglophones who have adequate French-language skills. Finally, the French-language units should be located in Ottawa, in Quebec, and in other communities where the French language and Francophone culture are viable or potentially viable.

The language régime we have projected involves an operational need for the acquisition of second-language skills and a new role for translation as an effective communication facility. French-language training would be made available to those Anglophones who expect to assume positions in French-language units, positions in service units that require bilingual skills, posi-

tions in other units that involve dealing directly with the French-language units or the French-speaking public, and senior supervisory positions. English-language training would be made available to Francophones on a similar basis. All training should be tied to the language requirements for the various positions.

While recruiting and source of supply are fundamental to a staffing policy, an equally important element is staff training and development. In this area the French-language unit is vital to the presence and participation of Francophones at a level commensurate with their capacity. Working in French will substantially reduce, if not eliminate, the barriers to effective work and career improvement created by working in a second language and a second cultural milieu. By encouraging recruitment of Francophones, the programme of French-language units will lead to substantial progress towards equal partnership in staffing – with immense benefit for the Public Service. But it is obvious that Francophones should not be required to work in French-language units, nor should Anglophones work as completely in English as they generally do under the present régime. If the federal Public Service is to be bilingual and bicultural, there must be an increase in the sensitivity of the entire organization to the duality of Canadian life.

Doubtless our specific recommendations and other suggestions do not foresee all the difficulties that will arise in the course of the plan's implementation. Nevertheless, it is imperative that the federal government immediately proclaim the system of French-language units as federal policy and set in motion the planning and implementing machinery proposed in this chapter. As in any rapid organizational transformation, the actual implementation of the system will not be easy, and it must be carried out with sensitivity to the feelings and interests of those concerned. The goals of any new administrative order can be subverted by those who are concerned only with meeting the letter of new regulations rather than with realizing the spirit of the plan itself. Those involved in the plan's implementation must be committed to the ultimate goals of institutional bilingualism so that in carrying out their difficult responsibilities they do not compromise its fundamentals. In the federal Public Service, an institution common to all Canadians, equal partnership must not fail.

## *Part 3: The Private Sector*

### Introduction

Despite the importance of the federal government as an employer and despite the rapid increase in employment by provincial and municipal governments, the vast majority of employed Canadians work in the private sector. In this Part we shall examine the private sector in terms of bilingualism and biculturalism and make recommendations designed to create an equal partnership between the Francophones and Anglophones who work in this sector.

The private sector is made up of a heterogeneous network of institutions, ranging in size from national and international corporations whose employees number in the tens of thousands to small proprietorships comprising only one or two persons. Some firms mobilize vast sums of capital and use sophisticated technologies to produce goods and services that are sold throughout the country and, indeed, throughout the world. Others require little capital, use simple technologies, and cater solely to the needs of their own communities. The former frequently seek the highly skilled managerial and technical talent they need on the national and international labour market; the latter usually rely on the local community to meet their more simple skill requirements.

Because of the size and diversity of the private sector, our research studies had to be selective. Our selection reflects our judgment as to where the problem is most acute and, consequently, where marked and immediate change is most vital. We chose to concentrate on the managerial and technical occupations and on the large manufacturing corporations, particularly those in Quebec.

### Barriers to Equal Partnership in Business

At the managerial and professional levels in the large manufacturing corporations in Quebec, there is a generally low level of

Francophone participation and very limited use of the French language. This situation is reflected in the rest of the Canadian manufacturing industry and in other industries where large Anglophone-controlled corporations predominate. Several factors have helped to produce and maintain this situation. Among them are the policies and practices of Anglophone-controlled firms and their managers, as well as the institutions, qualifications and habits of thought of Francophone Canadians. Each set of factors influences the other, and the present situation is a product of their interplay in the past. If this situation is to be corrected, both groups will have to make changes in their policies and practices.

As we saw in Part 1, 13 per cent of those of British origin in the non-agricultural male labour force of Canada in 1961, compared with 6 per cent of those of French origin, had attended university. With the exception of those of Italian origin, the French had the lowest rate of university attendance among the six ethnic groups we considered. Compared with the English-language schools, the French-language institutions granted a considerably higher proportion of all their degrees in the arts and social sciences and a much lower proportion in the natural sciences and engineering. Relatively fewer Francophones had either the level or the kind of educational qualifications required for managerial and professional functions in modern industry. This is particularly true for those disciplines geared to provide entry to business careers - commerce and business administration, and the sciences and engineering.

Although the more limited supply of Francophone candidates qualified for industrial careers has undoubtedly been a factor in the lower participation by Francophones in the higher levels of industry, their patterns of employment have compounded the situation. Even among candidates with the educational qualifications suited to careers in industrial management, there appear to be substantial differences between Francophones and Anglophones as to where they actually choose, or are chosen, to work.

For instance, in 1964, commerce graduates of McGill were employed in industry to a greater extent than graduates of the *Ecole des hautes études commerciales*. The latter, particularly



those with a licentiate rather than a bachelor degree in commerce, were much more likely to be employed in chartered accountancy firms and in government service.

The membership list of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Quebec showed a similar pattern of employment. More than 90 per cent of the chartered accountants employed by the provincial and municipal government were Francophones; in industry and commerce less than 40 per cent were Francophones. Among both commerce graduates and chartered accountants, however, there was a trend among the younger Francophones towards greater participation in the private sector. Even so, Anglophones still outnumbered Francophones to a considerable extent among the younger employees.

While our data are admittedly fragmentary, they do reveal a pattern of action that includes elements of both choice and necessity. The figures themselves can be summarized briefly: fewer Francophones than Anglophones go to university; those that do so show a different pattern of concentration in the various fields of study, and after graduation they exhibit a different pattern of occupational practice. As a result, proportionately fewer Francophones than Anglophones enter the professional and managerial functions in large private corporations.

The links between industry and the universities are much looser for French-language than for English-language institutions. The graduates of the English-language universities now occupy most of the top places in industry, and these close contacts ensure that the curricula are continually adapted to the current needs of industry. A different sector of the work world has been served by the French-language institutions: their graduates are less prominent in the major industrial enterprises, but are concentrated instead in the clergy, the liberal professions, small enterprise, and public service. Therefore, the contacts between the French-language universities and the economy mainly concern the needs of these sectors. Thus, the concentration on these fields and the relative isolation from the world of big business are perpetuated.

Clearly, Francophone students perceive definite obstacles to obtaining the necessary training for, and making a smooth transi-

tion to, the modern work world. These perceptions relate both to deficiencies in university facilities and curricula and to real obstacles to employment in such predominantly Anglophone work institutions as the federal Public Service and the large private corporations. Ways must be found to build more bridges between French-language educational institutions and the important sectors of a modern economy.

Since the Parent Commission presented its report, the government of Quebec has made great efforts to improve its educational system and bring it into line with the demands of modern society. More students now have the opportunity to reach university, and the French-language universities themselves are expanding their programmes in the industrially-oriented fields. There is also evidence that new links are being forged between post-secondary institutions and industry. Perhaps the most significant development is the creation of the *Colleges d'enseignement général et professionnel* (CEGEPS)—institutions designed to provide new routes to university and to offer technical training related to the needs of modern industry. These developments are gradually breaking through the traditional relative isolation of the French-language educational institutions from the world of industry.

Although Francophone students now have more real equality of opportunity to prepare themselves for careers in the private sector, they still perceive barriers to obtaining satisfactory employment. Access to education is of limited significance unless there is also free access to suitable employment afterwards. The practices of enterprises must be examined in order to isolate the real and perceived barriers to Francophone participation.

## Corporate Policies on Bilingualism and Biculturalism

Most of the largest firms in Quebec and in bilingual districts elsewhere were founded by Anglophones who hired Anglophone managers to run them. The Anglophone element in management traditionally extended right down to the foreman level, and the language of management was English. Even many of the Franco-

phone blue-collar workers needed some facility in English in order to communicate with their supervisors. In those companies where the workers were represented by a union, English was the language of industrial relations even when the Francophones far outnumbered the Anglophones. In most instances, this was not just a display of authority; it was a necessity occasioned by the management representatives' inability to speak French. Behind these language practices was the assumption that English was and would remain the language of work at the management level: there was little thought of ever having to change, for there seemed to be no compelling reasons to do so.

Many executives of the large corporations simply did not see that the conditions under which they expected Francophones to work were in themselves a deterrent to the hiring and retention of Francophones. Because few Anglophone executives had ever had to work in a second language, they failed to grasp the extent of the difficulties involved. Moreover, they showed little understanding of the impact of cultural differences – of the fact that Francophones might possess values, expectations, and ways of doing things that would affect their reactions and performance in the work setting.

In general, the Anglophone managers tended to see the problems of Francophones primarily in terms of language. The majority of Anglophone managers endorsed the statement that "The more a French Canadian gets ahead in a big English Canadian company, the more he loses his language." The Francophones were much more aware of the cultural dimension: half the Francophone managers agreed that "The French Canadians who have succeeded in large companies are more English than French." but one quarter of the Anglophones agreed with the statement. The differences were even more pronounced on the statement that "Most French Canadians who have obtained several promotions in large English Canadian companies have to protect English Canadian interests at the expense of those of French Canadians." Over 45 per cent of the Francophones, but less than 15 per cent of the Anglophones, expressed agreement with this viewpoint.

Clearly, both language differences and cultural differences have

far-reaching implications for the participation of Francophones in large business enterprises. They have discouraged participation in the past and, despite changes, continue to do so now. The hardships – the Francophones' sense of alienation, their difficulties in communication, and their inability to work as effectively as they might – cannot be removed by making minor adjustments to the existing situation. Francophones must be able to work and evolve more closely attuned to their own cultural milieu.

### Corporate Personnel Practices

Many companies are now making it a policy to hire more Francophones than ever before. However, candidates for white-collar jobs are still usually required to have a certain degree of fluency in English. In the large manufacturing firms which answered our questionnaire on policy, almost 70 per cent of the Francophones hired at salaries of from \$5,000 to \$9,999 during 1963-4 had to have a knowledge of English. The firms owned by Francophones, which hired relatively few people, placed an even greater insistence on the ability to speak English.

Training, both formal and informal, is obviously of key importance in the development of an individual's career. At present, the amount of formal training given to Francophones seem to be proportionate to their numbers but, if Francophone participation at the upper echelons is to be increased, it may be necessary to assign to them a more than proportionate share of the training budget. While training will help ease the progress of a Francophone in an Anglophone corporation, it cannot overcome the difficulties raised by cultural differences, and, when the dominant cultural tone is Anglophone, the informal socialization of Francophones will be impeded.

On the whole, however, Francophones were less mobile than Anglophones. Their reluctance to move is readily understandable when a transfer is to a location outside Quebec where the necessity to work in English is even stronger than in Quebec. Perhaps more important, because of the lack of a French-speaking community and French-language schools and facilities, such moves will probably inflict hardships on employees' families,

and their opposition to the move may well be decisive. Many of the companies surveyed claimed that in the light of this imputed reluctance among their Francophone employees, they were less often asked to move. While this displays a sensitivity to the employees' feelings, it may mean a reduced opportunity for Francophones to take advantage of higher paying vacancies that arise in different regions or to acquire the broad experience obtained by working in different plants. Thus their advancement within the organization will be less rapid and will result in the salary disparities already noted.

Systematic promotion procedures usually work to eliminate discrimination at the subjective, personal level. Linked with a manpower inventory and a regular performance appraisal, they form an integral part of the past modern management development plans. Ideally, such procedures ensure that all qualified candidates are considered and that they are objectively assessed solely on the basis of clearly understood criteria of merit. Therefore, it might be expected that, the more such systematization exists, the less promotion procedures can be used to explain the lower proportion of Francophones in the higher salary brackets.

The use of systematic techniques does not in itself guarantee that Francophones have an equal opportunity of advancement. Despite the impartiality of such procedures, existing institutional arrangements are such that when judgments are made on past work performance, the whole series of linguistic and cultural handicaps facing Francophones comes into play to prejudice their chances of promotion. Francophones working in their second language are compared with Anglophones working in their first. The former are judged by how well they fit into the firm's way of doing things – when their own cultural upbringing may incline them towards a different approach – and by their ability to mix and communicate with Anglophone colleagues and superiors. Anglophone candidates do not face similar demands to overcome cultural barriers. Then again, factors such as the reluctance of some Francophones to take advantage of rewarding job openings in areas outside Quebec, and the lack of French-language management training courses, may reduce the Francophones' chances for promotion.

We must conclude that, in the struggle up the corporate

ladder, the present work system in the large corporations gives Anglophones a built-in advantage over their Francophone colleagues, which systematic promotion procedures may accentuate. To achieve real equality of opportunity, the system as a whole needs to be changed in a rational and systematic manner. Unfortunately, although top-level executives in large corporations are now directing much more attention to the recruitment and training of Francophones than ever before, the implications of equal opportunity in both cultures in the work world have yet to be fully perceived and the process of providing for the "French fact" remains mainly piecemeal and pragmatic.

## Hydro-Québec

The problem of socio-economic relations between Francophones and Anglophones exists throughout Canada, but it is particularly acute in Quebec. This province has the greatest number of institutions ripe for a policy of economic regeneration and development, and it is here that the principle of equality of opportunity in the work world for Francophones and Anglophones would appear to be most fully attainable.

In the preceding chapters we have painted a rather cheerless picture of the place of Francophones in the upper echelons of the private sector – both in Quebec and throughout Canada – and of the position of French as a language of work. Competence in English is essential for most managerial positions, and Francophone aspirants must often become anglicized to some degree in order to obtain such positions. Young Francophone university graduates tend to turn away from private enterprise and gravitate towards the public sector or small enterprises where they can carry on most of their activities in their own language. In Quebec, the limited participation of Francophones and the almost total absence of the French language in key areas of the private sector are highly detrimental to the entire cultural life of Francophone Canadians.

However, we must consider whether these conditions do in fact fully reflect the present situation. For example, if the admin-

istration of large enterprises in the private sector is closed to Francophones, must we draw the conclusion that the same applies to all economic activity in Quebec? Since the manufacturing industry is not the whole economy, are there sectors where Francophones may expect advancement and participation in important decisions, using their own language? Are there cases where big industrial enterprises have made serious efforts to correct the situation described in the preceding chapters?

The radical change in the use of language at Hydro-Québec is a special case. It could not be extended to all major enterprises in Quebec, since conditions differ greatly from one to another. We may nevertheless learn some useful lessons from Hydro-Québec's experience. What impresses us most forcibly is the striking change in attitudes to language since the nationalization in 1963.

The Brazeau-Dofney study noted the scepticism prevailing at Hydro-Québec at the time with regard to the official adoption of French as the language of work at all levels of the company. The preponderance of English in the technical, commercial, and administrative sectors in North America seemed to present an insurmountable obstacle. Particular concern was voiced over the necessity of communicating with the surrounding Anglophone world. In such a context, the adoption of French as a language of work seemed unrealistic, and there was fear that this might turn Hydro-Québec into an enclave.

But the use of French as a language of work has succeeded, and the early fears have proved unfounded. We have reason, therefore, to wonder whether perhaps the use of English had been traditionally maintained only because company executives were unilingual Anglophones, and whether the real needs of the situation had simply been overshadowed by the sheer weight of tradition and historical circumstance.

It was the vitality of the relationship between superiors and subordinates above all that assured the success of Hydro-Québec's linguistic reorganization. When the top management of an enterprise breaks away from certain established practices, employees may be disposed to accept the change; but to be fully effective, a break with the past needs methodical and sustained

effort, as well as concrete measures for carrying it out. In Hydro-Québec's case the challenge was a formidable one; originality and inventiveness were essential, as well as the outlay of considerable resources on what, in North America, was a new technical language.

The story of Hydro-Québec shows how closely supply and demand of qualified personnel are related. Custom in recruiting and language of work seem to have contributed as much as technical training—or the lack of it—to the division of work between the two linguistic groups. Francophones did not occupy key positions, but this was not necessarily because of a lack of technical and administrative training. If they were not trained differently in their professional schools, it was also because of the paucity of opportunities open to them.

For the time being, Hydro-Québec is a unique example. In other enterprises, past experience and efforts have been attended by different circumstances. Hydro-Québec leads the way because it embarked on new paths and has shown them to be practical and capable of producing results. This is perhaps its most important contribution to the field of language and culture which interests us.

## Equal Partnership in the Private Sector

English is generally the language of work at the managerial and technical levels in the private sector in Canada, even in Quebec outside Montreal, where Francophones are strongly in the majority. Clearly, this situation frequently makes it difficult for Francophones to enter and advance in many of the most modern and rewarding positions of the work world. In the past, this barrier has undoubtedly contributed to income and occupational disparities; at present, it is a major impediment to a real equality of economic opportunity for Francophones and Anglophones.

The present patterns of language use also affect the vitality of the French language and culture in Canada. If a language is not used in modern economic and technological activities, it faces the risk of losing its dynamism and its usefulness. English has



become the sole language of work of many Canadians of French mother tongue, and there is little long-term hope for the French language in Canada if it is used in the workplace only by blue-collar workers.

In Book 1 we presented a blueprint for formal language rights in a truly bilingual and bicultural Canada. This blueprint was designed to entrench the rights of Francophones and Anglophones to be educated in, and to receive service from, governmental institutions in their own languages. Our recommendations concerning bilingual provinces and bilingual districts were designed to protect the language rights of Francophone and Anglophone minorities. Since then, Parliament has adopted the Official Languages Act and New Brunswick has declared itself officially bilingual. Other provinces have also taken concrete steps in this direction. But these laws and measures are not enough to create a truly equal partnership between the two language groups. These formal rights must be accompanied by measures altering the linguistic situation in the work world.

There is little reason to suppose that the free play of economic forces will in itself bring about real equality of opportunity for Francophones or lead to a strengthening of their language and culture in Canada. Left to themselves, the current pressures are most likely to lead to the opposite result. If Canadian Francophones are to reshape their economic "role", they must have the co-operation of the major employers who affect huge portions of the economy or control its growth.

For both governments and the private sector, we are recommending a commitment to the concept of institutional bilingualism. We are not recommending that all Canadians become bilingual but rather that major companies operating in Quebec (and, where feasible, in bilingual districts outside Quebec) rationalize their use of employees so that these employees may contribute to their full potential in the official language of their choice. The burdens, and the rewards, of bilingual capability must be shifted so that they fall equally on Anglophones and Francophones.

Changes of this magnitude, even though they could be initiated, probably cannot be fully realized by individual companies acting on their own. The support of public policy and

co-ordination will be needed, as well as the co-operation and advice of industry, educational institutions, and employees. For this reason we have recommended provincial government task forces, particularly in Quebec.

Our focus has been mainly on Quebec. But Quebec is not an isolated unit, and Canadian Francophones are part of the wider Canadian community. If real equality of opportunity is to be achieved in Canada, Francophones must be able to work and live outside the borders of Quebec without threat to their linguistic and cultural identity.

Although our proposals for the public and private sectors are very different in detail and application, one concept is essential to both of them – the French-language unit. In our view, it is only with adoption of the French-language unit plan as a fundamental element that any real progress can be made towards the goal of equal partnership within Canada's major work institutions.

If someday, as we hope, the survival of the French language is assured, it may then be opportune to place a renewed emphasis on individual bilingualism among Canadians of both language groups in all parts of the country. However, the indispensable first step is institutional bilingualism, which we recommend as the only answer to the needs of the present and the near future.

Our recommendations regarding language training, translation, recruitment of personnel, career planning, and other matters are closely related to the language-unit proposal. Taken together, these measures constitute a plan for partnership in the federal Public Service and in the large private corporations. The implementation of our recommendations should result in greater Francophone participation in the major work institutions, particularly at the higher levels; an improvement in the socio-economic status of Francophones; and a greater and more real reflection of the culture and values of French-speaking Canada in the development of public and corporate policy. It should also result in the increasing development of French as a language of administration, science and commerce, able to express fully the realities of the Canadian situation and at the same time to meet the standards of the language used in France and other French-speaking

areas of the world. Francophones will have greater opportunities to participate, both individually and collectively, in modern management and policy-making; Francophone educational institutions will be stimulated through increased support of their research, training and social development activities.

These will be substantial results. Complete success in the implementation of internal reforms of the large work institutions would be a great step towards the goal of equal opportunity, but it would only indirectly and partially remedy the existing inequalities in income, education, occupation and economic control. The broadening of their participation in large corporations will have little effect on the position of Francophones outside these institutions – it is no substitute for better education, nor can it give Francophones a renewed spirit of self-confidence or encourage them to prepare themselves for and to take advantage of openings in the work world. Furthermore, these structural changes will not affect the ownership patterns of the Quebec economy. Therefore, the adaptations which we suggest must be reinforced by a variety of efforts from within the French-speaking community – efforts whose aim is to provide Francophones with effective, dynamic, and strong economic and social institutions of their own, so that they can respond to opportunities on an equal footing with Anglophones.

Canadian development and ultimate success depend to a large extent on the active and equal participation of Francophone and Anglophone Canadians in the work world and in the economy as a whole. Canada is an economic unit of immense developmental potential, and Canadians have the human and natural resources to develop this potential. They also have the considerable advantage of using the two main languages of the western world. The building of a truly bilingual and bicultural Canada will be invaluable in providing the country with the stimulus to move ahead. The existence of two equal but distinct societies, each with its own contribution to make to the country as a whole, presents the formidable challenge of creating a strong, dynamic and united country.

## Recommendations

1. We recommend that the federal government adopt the French-language unit as a basic organizational and management principle, and that it therefore provide for the creation and development, in all federal departments, Crown corporations, and other agencies, of organizational units in which French would be the language of work; these units would be established in a variety of locations and would be of different sizes and functions.
2. We recommend a) that in each federal department, Crown corporation, and other agency there be established French-language units (regional, headquarters, and/or cluster types) which correspond to existing units in their functions and organizational arrangements; b) that service units be reorganized into Anglophone and Francophone sections or in other appropriate ways to provide the normal range of services in both English and French; and c) that, within the larger regional French-language units, provision be made where necessary for the establishment of English-language units organized on the same pattern as the French-language units.
3. We recommend that the appointments to the posts of deputy minister, associate deputy minister, assistant deputy minister, and equivalent positions in Crown corporations and other federal agencies be administered so as to ensure effectively balanced participation of Anglophones and Francophones at these levels.
4. We recommend that on all federal planning and advisory bodies, including task forces, there be effectively balanced participation by Anglophones and Francophones.
5. We recommend a) the use of French in written and oral communications from the French-language units to other units in the Public Service; and b) the use of either language in the written and oral communications originating

from within the Public Service and addressed to the French-language units.

6. We recommend a) that within two years all notices, directives, forms, and other formal written information and instructions (except manuals) used within federal departments, Crown corporations, and other agencies be made available in both languages and that, effective immediately, new documents of this kind be issued simultaneously in French and English; b) that within five years all manuals now in use be translated into French and that, beginning immediately, all new manuals be issued simultaneously in both languages; and c) that the order of priority for the translation of such documents be determined in accordance with the needs of the French-language units.
7. We recommend the immediate amendment of the Public Service Employment Act and its Regulations, of collective bargaining agreements between the federal administration and its employees, and of similar laws, regulations, and agreements affecting the Crown corporations and other federal agencies, to require that communications in the general area of employee-employer relations take place in either English or French, according to the choice of the employee.
8. We recommend that all positions throughout the federal departments, Crown corporations, and other agencies be classified as to language requirements, and that these requirements be specifically taken into account in the determination of remuneration.
9. We recommend that the Language Training Directorate adapt the teaching of French and English to the needs of the French-language and English-language units.
10. We recommend that language training for federal public servants increasingly emphasize receptive knowledge.
11. We recommend that the Language Training Directorate

accelerate, at all levels of instruction, the development of courses using vocabulary appropriate to the work of Canadian public servants.

12. We recommend a) that the Public Service Commission's Language Training Directorate establish, as a matter of priority, courses to improve the French used by the federal administration; and b) that these courses be made available primarily to those Francophones and fully bilingual Anglophones who have assumed or intend to assume positions within a French-language unit, or positions which require regular communications with Francophones.
13. We recommend that immediate and urgent attention be given to the preparation of a bilingual glossary of terminology appropriate to work in the Public Service.
14. We recommend a) that the practice, current in many federal government departments, of translating as a matter of routine all letters and documents written in French cease immediately; b) that the federal government increase its support of translation courses at universities; and c) that the programme of financial aid for students of translation be accelerated and expanded.
15. We recommend that the practice of original drafting in French be encouraged and that there be an end to the federal administration's current practice of originating almost all texts in English and subsequently translating them into French.
16. We recommend that specific discussions among university, federal, and provincial representatives be initiated for the purpose of expanding programmes for teaching and research in public administration.
17. We recommend that the federal government's recent efforts to recruit qualified people from France and other French-speaking countries be both intensified and expanded.
18. We recommend that the actual process of recruiting for

federal departments, Crown corporations, and other agencies involve more direct contact between senior public servants and placement officers, faculty, and students in French-language universities.

19. We recommend a) that the process of testing and selecting candidates for federal departments, Crown corporations, and other agencies take into account the differing linguistic and cultural attributes of Francophone and Anglophone applicants; and b) that interviews and examinations related to recruiting, evaluation, and promotion of Francophones be conducted in French by public servants fluent in French, unless the candidate or employee opts for English.
20. We recommend a) that the practices of staff rotation in the Public Service be extended to include the movement of personnel with the requisite language skills from one language environment to the other; and b) that all Public Service training and development programmes provide for the same opportunities in French as in English.
21. We recommend that a system of educational allowances be introduced to help defray the costs of elementary and secondary education for the children of Francophone or Anglophone public servants who accept posts in places within Canada where adequate educational facilities in their own language are not available.
22. We recommend the creation of a Public Service Language Authority. This new body will be responsible for: a) planning, implementing, and maintaining institutional bilingualism; b) acting as a guide for the government as a whole and giving encouragement to the individual components of the Public Service, including departments, Crown corporations, and other agencies; c) co-ordinating, aiding, and overseeing the activities of departmental language bureaux; d) defining general translation policy; and e) undertaking continuing research into the programme of institutional bilingualism and evaluating the results of the programme.

23. We recommend that within each federal department, Crown corporation, or other agency, a language bureau, reporting directly to the deputy minister or his equivalent, be created and given the responsibility for planning, implementing, and maintaining a system of institutional bilingualism and for performing within the department the functions assigned to the Public Service Language Authority.
24. We recommend that the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Official Languages be interpreted as including the language rights of public servants.
25. We recommend that the National Defence Act be amended so as to recognize officially the equality of the two languages, and to establish a system of procedures which would guarantee the application of the ensuing language rights.
26. We recommend a) that the Queen's Regulations for the Canadian Forces, Canadian Forces Administrative Orders, Canadian Forces Supplementary Orders, notices, directives, forms, and other documents of this nature be drafted jointly and issued simultaneously in both official languages; and b) that the practice of originating almost all documents in English and subsequently translating them into French cease at once.
27. We recommend that the "English-French - French-English Military Dictionary" be the official source for military and organizational terms and expressions used in the Canadian Forces and that it be continuously revised by a permanent team of experts.
28. We recommend that in all disciplinary procedures, both verbal and written, an individual have the right to choose which of the official languages will be used; and that he have a right to formulate his personal complaints and grievances in the official language of his choice; and that a system of appeal be established in respect of these rights.
29. We recommend that the department of National Defence



provide for French- and English-language instruction of dependent children: a) by keeping up-to-date personnel records of the language or languages of instruction in which individual service members want their children to study and by giving full consideration to these preferences in the case of each new posting; b) by co-operating with provincial authorities in the organization of French- or English-language schools or classes wherever the proportion of personnel seeking such instruction justifies it; and c) by paying – without any form of language test – all financial costs incurred by parents in sending their children away from home to study in French or English when such schooling is not available or cannot be organized on or near a military base.

30. We recommend that in the formulation of regulations, rules, and conventions governing social, cultural, leisure, commercial, and financial activities, the department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces recognize officially and in practice the linguistic and cultural equality of the two language groups.
31. We recommend that the department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces take all necessary measures to ensure that in their relations with the public they fully respect the linguistic and cultural duality of the Canadian population, both within the country and abroad.
32. We recommend a) that a French-language sector be created within Mobile Command; b) that French be the military language of work within this sector; c) that the sector include land and air units, as well as bases and other functional components; and d) that the French-language units and bases be situated in French-speaking areas of the country.
33. We recommend a) that each base and unit within Mobile Command be designated as either a French-language or an English-language base or unit; b) that the bases and units of one language group communicate in their own language

with bases and units of the other language group and with the rest of the Canadian Forces; and c) that communications from superior formations be sent in the language of the base or unit which is to receive them.

34. We recommend a) that bilingual positions within Mobile Command be formally designated; b) that the level of bilingual proficiency be set for each of these positions; c) that such positions, including those requiring full bilingual proficiency be filled according to set criteria of proficiency; and d) that personnel be trained or retrained in order to attain the required level of bilingual proficiency.
35. We recommend that all personnel who wish to serve in the French-language sector receive, where necessary, professional training in French before being posted to that sector.
36. We recommend a) that, where necessary to staff the different positions in the French-language sector of Mobile Command, qualified personnel who can exercise their duties in French be rapidly promoted; and b) that the authorized rank and promotion quotas be adjusted so as to make this possible.
37. We recommend the progressive establishment of French-language units at Canadian Forces Headquarters and in commands other than Mobile Command.
38. We recommend that Training and Mobile Command make available to the French-language sector instructors qualified to teach in the French language, as well as French-language manuals, texts, and teaching aids; and that, when required, they call upon French-language technical and technological institutions and universities in Canada and abroad.
39. We recommend that recruits and previously trained personnel who intend to join the French-language sector not be required to take English courses unless and until their professional development so requires.
40. We recommend that the existing Royal Military College at Kingston continue to be an English-language institution,

and that the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean become a French-language, degree-granting institution with analogous curricula; and that there be a strong emphasis on the teaching of French at the Royal Military College at Kingston and on the teaching of English at the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean in order to develop bilingual proficiency among future officers.

41. We recommend that a Canadian Forces language bureau be established as a fifth branch at Canadian Forces Headquarters, and that it be made responsible for the planning, implementation, and co-ordination of the organizational measures needed to guarantee the realization of our recommendations within the Canadian Forces.
42. We recommend that in the private sector in Quebec, governments and industry adopt the objective that French become the principal language of work at all levels, and that in pursuit of this objective the following principles be accepted: a) that French be the principal language of work in the major work institutions of the province; b) that, consequently, the majority of work units in such firms that until now have used English as the principal language of work in middle and upper levels become French-language units; and that such firms designate all management and senior positions as posts that require bilingual incumbents; c) that the majority of smaller or specialized firms should use French as their language of work, but that there should be a place for firms where the language of work is English, as there should be a place anywhere in Canada for such firms where the language of work is French; and d) that the main language of work in activities related to operations outside the province remain the choice of the enterprise.
43. We recommend that in the private sector throughout Canada, the Canadian head offices of firms with extensive markets or facilities inside Quebec develop appropriate bilingual capacities, including French-language units and bilingual senior executives.

44. We recommend that the government of Quebec establish a task force to consist of representatives of government, industry, the universities, and the major labour unions with the following general terms of reference: a) to launch discussions with the major companies in the province concerning the current state of bilingualism and biculturalism in their organizations and the means of developing institutional bilingualism more fully; b) to design an overall plan for establishing French as the principal language of work in Quebec and to set a timetable for this process; c) to initiate discussions with the federal government and with the governments of New Brunswick and Ontario, to discover areas of potential co-operation in implementing the plan; and d) to make recommendations to the provincial government for the achievement of the goal and for the establishment of permanent machinery of co-ordination.
45. We recommend that the government of New Brunswick establish a task force charged with suggesting steps to be taken in education, in the provincial public service, and in the private sector so that French can become a language of work like English, bearing in mind the economic and social conditions in the province.
46. We recommend that the government of Ontario establish a task force charged with preparing a programme of action with the objective of ensuring the progressive introduction of French as a language of work in enterprises in bilingual districts, on the basis of a co-operative and concerted effort by government and industry.
47. We recommend that the firms at issue in Recommendations 42 and 43 make an explicit policy commitment to establish institutional bilingualism in their operations; and that they immediately designate certain units within their head offices and their operations in Quebec, and in bilingual districts, as future French-language units and designate those executive and senior positions that in the near future will require bilingual incumbents.

48. We recommend that, immediately after designating French-language units in their organizations, the firms also designate a substantial number of professional technical, and managerial positions as French-language posts.
49. We recommend that the firms make every effort to interest Francophone students on business careers, by providing full information in career opportunities to the appropriate officials in French-language educational institutions and by sending recruiting teams to these institutions both within and outside Quebec.
50. We recommend that the firms make their internal training programmes fully available in the French language for their Francophone employees.
51. We recommend that, where internal training programmes are presently unavailable in French, the firms consult with French-language institutions of higher education in Canada and elsewhere about the possibilities of providing the needed programmes.
52. We recommend that the firm seek to equalize the opportunities for job transfers for their Francophone employees, while at the same time taking steps to minimize the difficulties that these transfers entail.
53. We recommend that all material relevant to the promotion process and the preparation for it be made fully available in French.
54. We recommend that all Francophone candidates have the option of expressing themselves in their own language in all oral and written examinations and interviews, and that the examiners take into account the difficulties that the candidate may have had to face during his previous work experience as a result of the obligation to work in a second language.
55. We recommend that where firms designate positions as bilingual posts they take steps to ensure that the required

level of competence in French and English is clearly defined and that they use this factor as a criterion in promotions to these positions.

56. We recommend that all information relevant to federal government contracts and other services to private enterprise, including technical specifications and documents, be made available simultaneously in French and English, and that in all official relations among federal government personnel, business firms, and unions, appropriate action be taken to ensure that the French language is fully used in the appropriate circumstances.
57. We recommend that, as a matter of policy, the federal agencies concerned make available to private firms all the data arising from developments in translation services, bilingual lexicons, and language training that may be of assistance to the firms in their transformation process.

# BOOK 4: THE CULTURAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS

## Introduction

It would be presumptuous for us to try to study all the questions raised by the existence in Canada of "other ethnic groups," that is those whose ethnic origin is neither French nor British, in a single volume. Rather, we shall concentrate on examining the part played by these groups in the country's history and the contribution they make to Canadian life.

We are aware of the difficulty of this task. It is not easy – if possible – to distinguish clearly between an individual's cultural contribution resulting from his membership in a cultural group and his contribution resulting from deliberate integration with one of the two official linguistic communities. An individual's activity is often doubly motivated – by a desire to retain the cultural heritage of his forebears and a desire to feel that he is participating in the development of his adopted country. Should we interpret "the contribution made by the other ethnic groups" to mean the sum of the individual contributions, or the acceptance by Canadians as a whole of certain cultural characteristics that belong to a particular group? These are some of the basic questions, to which we cannot claim to have found final answers.

Rather than yield to facile generalizations, we have chosen to cast our Book within the perspective of our terms of reference, and have studied the cultural contribution made by the other cultural groups by examining the patterns of their integration, as groups or individuals, into the life of the country.

The terms of reference instructed the Commission "to recom-

mend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races, taking into account the contribution made by the other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada and the measures that should be taken to safeguard that contribution". The Commission was further directed "to report on the role of public and private organizations, including the mass-communications media, in promoting bilingualism, better cultural relations and a more widespread appreciation of the basically bicultural character of the country and of the subsequent contribution made by the other cultures." The two passages in italics call attention to the key terms of our mandate concerning the "other ethnic groups."

It will be noted immediately that while the terms of reference deal with questions of those of ethnic origin other than British or French, they do so in relation to the basic problem of bilingualism and biculturalism, from which they are inseparable, and in the context of the coexistence of the Francophone and Anglophone communities. Also, the terms of reference do not call for an exhaustive study of the position of those of non-British, non-French origin, but rather an examination of the way they have taken their place within the two societies that have provided Canada's social structures and institutions. We will look at their contribution to Canadian life, and especially to the enrichment that results from the meeting of a number of languages and cultures. This contribution is seen, within the Canadian reality, in the active participation of those whose mother tongue is neither French nor English in various facets of community life. The resulting exchange of values – particularly those relating to language and culture – is beneficial to the country provided that it is carried out in a spirit of understanding and with a view to mutual enrichment.

Canada, like the United States, is a country of heavy immigration and can be called an "open" country. Its demographic make-up therefore differs from that of older European countries – such as Spain, Germany, or Poland – where one generation succeeds another with no substantial change as a result of waves of immigrants.

Canada, a vast territory inhabited in the beginning by Indians



and Eskimos, was first colonized by the French, beginning early in the 17th century, and then by the British. Late in this century, immigrants of different ethnic origins began to arrive; variations in the later flow of immigrants almost always depended on political and economic conditions. The first Germans arrived towards the end of the 17th century. One of the first Jews to come to Canada was Aaron Hart, who settled in Montreal in 1759. In the last half of the 18th century, among other immigrants, two Poles whose names were to become familiar came to Canada: Dominique Barcz around 1750 (his name was later spelled "Bartzsch" and "Debartzch") and Auguste-François Globenski in 1776. After 1870, the Danes, Dutch, Icelanders and others made their way to the prairies in ever-increasing numbers. In 1891, Wasyl Eleniak and Iwan Pylypiw symbolically initiated Ukrainian immigration to Canada. Even these few examples demonstrate that Canada's population of non-British, non-French origin, often termed "New Canadians," has a long history.

Immigration continues today with far-reaching effects on the two main linguistic communities, and the population of Canada is still undergoing changes whose future extent it is impossible to foresee with any certainty. It is highly desirable that newcomers to Canada receive full and clear information about their new country. It is not enough to assure an immigrant work and material comfort; he must also be made aware of certain fundamental principles that will bear upon his citizenship in his adopted country. In particular, he should know that Canada recognizes two official languages and that it possesses two predominant cultures that have produced two societies—Francophone and Anglophone—which form two distinct communities within an overall Canadian context.

On the other hand, being Francophone or Anglophone does not necessarily mean that one is of French or British origin. Immigrants, whatever their ethnic or national origin or their mother tongue, have the right and are at liberty to integrate with either of the two societies. Those of French and British origin—who have the definite advantage of having colonized Canada—share with all Canadians the rights and obligations arising from the fundamental duality of Canada, as it should be, in the name

of equality and the democratic spirit. The process of integration, which contributes to the development of the two societies, should therefore be guided by three conditions: the good of the individual, the good of the society he chooses, and the good of the country as a whole.

Integration, in the broad sense, does not imply the loss of an individual's identity and original characteristics or of his original language and culture. Man is a thinking and sensitive being; severing him from his roots could destroy an aspect of his personality and deprive society of some of the values he can bring to it. Integration is not synonymous with assimilation. Assimilation implies almost total absorption into another linguistic and cultural group. An assimilated individual gives up his cultural identity, and may even go as far as to change his name. Both integration and assimilation occur in Canada, and the individual must be free to choose whichever process suits him, but it seems to us that those of other than French or British origin clearly prefer integration.

Since economic, social and linguistic factors all play a part, the Francophone community, being economically weaker than the Anglophone, cannot easily attract immigrants. This is evident in Montreal and elsewhere in Canada. Because of this imbalance between the two societies, most members of non-British, non-French groups gravitate almost instinctively to the Anglophone side. The repercussions of this are felt in many fields, some of which lie within provincial jurisdiction, particularly in social and educational spheres. We caution readers against forming the impression, in reading this Book, that the Francophone group is on an equal footing with the Anglophone; in fact its position is inferior in all sectors in Canada, and in a number of sectors in Quebec.

The process of integration goes hand in hand with what anthropologists call "acculturation." Anyone who chooses Canada as his adopted country adopts a new style of life, a particular kind of existence. This phenomenon is easily visible in the immigrant's experience in the work world, in his social contacts with other people, in the schools, where children acquire a major part of their preparation for life, and in all his contact with other

citizens and public institutions. In office and factory, train and plane, in court and Parliament, the process of acculturation can be seen, despite the obstacles facing an individual as he becomes acquainted with his new environment, in which he is exposed to so many influences. Acculturation is the process of adaptation to the environment in which an individual is compelled to live as he adjusts his behavior to that of the community.

Acculturation is inevitable in a multi-ethnic country like Canada, and the two main societies themselves are open to its influence. The integration of immigrants into the life of the country, with the help of its institutions, is surely the road to their self-fulfilment. But in this process of adopting fully the Canadian way of life, sharing its advantages and disadvantages, those whose origin is neither French nor British do not have to cast off or hide their own culture. It may happen that in their determination to express their desire to live fully in this mode, their culture may conflict with the customs of their adopted society. But Canadian society, open and modern, should be able to integrate heterogeneous elements into a harmonious system, to achieve "unity in diversity."

What counts most in our concept of an "ethnic group" is not one's ethnic origin or even one's mother tongue, but one's sense of belonging to a group, and the group's collective will to exist. Ethnic origin, be it French, British, German, Italian or any other category implies only biological affiliation and ancestry; an individual's loyalty to a group should, as we have said before, depend far more on his personal identification with it. To stress ethnic origin as a basic principle for shaping society would create closed groups based on accidents of birth. An "ethnic group" is consequently much more than a statistic based on one's ethnic origin, much more than the total number of individuals of the same origin – it is a force which draws its vitality from its members' feeling of belonging to the group.

In Canada, where some 30 ethnic origin categories are identified by the 1961 census, the position of the various cultural groups is far from clear; in fact it is very complex, especially if we are attempting an objective study of their will to exist. Some groups draw together and develop, while others break up and

disperse – for example, many Canadians of German and Dutch cultural groups. On the other hand, a Canadian of Ukrainian origin whose family has been in Canada for three generations and who no longer speaks his ancestral language, or of Jewish origin who speaks neither Yiddish or Hebrew, may participate with great enthusiasm in the activities of his respective cultural group. Measuring the vitality of any cultural group by taking as a criterion the individual's sense of belonging to a particular culture is as difficult as determining the extent of the group's integration with one of the two societies.

There are a number of cultural groups in Canada with a clear sense of identity. They want, without in any way undermining national unity, to maintain their own linguistic and cultural heritage. They have their own associations, clubs, parishes, and religious organizations; they maintain their own schools and express their collective views through their own press. Some have formed highly active organizations – for example, the Canadian Jewish Congress and the Canadian Polish Congress. These organizations act as spokesmen for the group, may use the group's ancestral language, and create, as far as possible, a climate propitious to the maintenance of the group's own culture. To deny their existence would be to shut one's eyes to the Canadian reality. The fear that their growth might foreshadow the "balkanization" of Canada perhaps had some foundation 50 years ago. Today such a thing is out of the question. Although the last great wave of immigration to Canada was fairly recent, only 1 per cent of the Canadian population speaks neither English nor French.

Nothing should prevent those of other than French or British ethnic origin from keeping their attachment to their original culture once they have been integrated into Canadian life. This should be encouraged, for society as a whole can only benefit from it. However, to those Canadians of the Anglophone and Francophone societies who consider such affiliation only a pleasant manifestation of traditional folklore (which, for example, lends a touch of quaintness to the celebration of Christmas or Easter), we wish to say that this concept is quite out of touch with reality. A person's original culture affects him deeply, and often over several generations; there are deep personal attach-

ments no one can explain, customs firmly rooted in a man's being. What happens to those who have left their mother country and adopted another? Having arrived in Canada, they can appreciate more keenly all they had to leave behind in their country of origin. On contact with new values and new customs, their cultural heritage assumes greater value in their eyes. That heritage is composed of a variety of ideas, feelings, and artistic expressions, and folklore is only one aspect of it.

Among those of non-British, non-French origin, some accept official bilingualism without hesitation but categorically reject biculturalism. They consider Canada to be a country that is officially bilingual but fundamentally multi-cultural. It is clear that we must not overlook Canada's cultural diversity, always keeping in mind that there are two dominant cultures, the French and British. It is in this perspective that we shall study the contribution of various other cultures to the life of the country.

Culture and the language that serves as its vehicle cannot be dissociated. Language allows for self-expression and communication according to one's own logic. The vitality of the different languages spoken in Canada, other than French or English, varies from one cultural group to another, and even within these groups, many people speak their ancestral language poorly or not at all. On the whole, however, those who care about their cultural heritage also care about their ancestral language. Here again, the phenomenon of cultural identification and a feeling of belonging are firmly rooted.

The presence in Canada of many people whose language and culture are distinctive by reason of their birth or ancestry represents an inestimable enrichment that Canadians can not afford to lose. The dominant cultures can only profit from the influence of these other cultures. Linguistic variety is unquestionably an advantage, and its beneficial effects on the country are priceless. We have constantly declared our desire to see all Canadians associating in a climate of equality, whether they belong to the Francophone or Anglophone society. Members of "other ethnic groups," which we prefer to call cultural groups, must enjoy these same advantages and meet the same restrictions. Integra-

tion, with respect for both the spirit of democracy and the most deep-rooted human values, can engender healthy diversity within a harmonious and dynamic whole.

Finally, the presence of the other cultural groups in Canada is something for which all Canadians should be thankful. Their members must always enjoy the right – a basic human one – to safeguard their languages and cultures. The exercise of this right requires an extra effort on their part, for which their fellow Canadians owe them a debt of gratitude. Their presence facilitates communications between Canada and the rest of the world. Their cultural values find expression not only in popular traditions but also in arts and letters. In our opinion, these values are far more than ethnic differences; we consider them an integral part of the national wealth.

### *Part 1: Immigration*

The arrival in Canada of people drawn from a wide variety of ethnic origins can be followed through four distinct phases. The first of these lasted until approximately 1901. In that year the immigration policy of Sir Clifford Sifton (who became Minister of the Interior in 1896 and was determined to see the Canadian West settled) showed its results in the sharply rising census figures. This second phase, which lasted from 1901 until the outbreak of World War I, saw the greatest flow of people into Canada that the country has ever experienced. This influx was halted abruptly by the war, and the level of immigration only began to rise again in the early 1920's. This third phase was in turn halted by the Depression; immigration lapsed until a fourth phase began after World War II and has continued since then. Each of these four phases attracted different types of immigrants to the country. Thus, over the years the ethnic background, class, and educational levels of the newcomers have differed widely, as have the geographic areas in which they chose to settle.

Substantial immigration to Canada resumed soon after the end of World War II. A wider variety of ethnic origin categories, social classes, and occupations were included in this final phase, which has also continued longer than either of the earlier phases

before and after World War I. The ethnic origins most strongly represented among the new arrivals since 1945 – other than British – are Italian, German, Dutch, Polish and Jewish; those of British origin constituted one-third of the total.

During this same period, Canada has become increasingly urban and industrial, and the vast majority of these immigrants have settled in towns and cities. A substantial number have gone to Montreal, but Toronto has become the immigrant metropolis of Canada. In 1961, nearly 42 per cent of the residents of Toronto and one-third of the residents of the Toronto metropolitan area were not born in Canada. Twenty-nine per cent of the city's residents and 22 per cent of those in the metropolitan area had immigrated between 1946 and 1961.

Those of other ethnic origins are not equally dispersed across Canada. The Atlantic Provinces and Quebec (except Montreal) have remained largely British or French. Residents of other ethnic origins make up 47 per cent of the population of the Prairie Provinces, 34 per cent of that of British Columbia, and 29 per cent of Ontario. All five of these provinces also have a high proportion of residents born outside Canada. The range is from 16 per cent in Saskatchewan to 26 per cent in British Columbia, as compared with 7 per cent in Quebec and even less in the Atlantic Provinces.

In the 1961 census nearly one quarter of the population reported their ethnic origin as other than British, French or Indian and Eskimo. A large proportion of these are in fact Canadian-born. Seventy-seven per cent of those of Ukrainian origin and 73 per cent of those of German, Russian and Scandinavian origin were born in Canada.

## *Part 2: Economic, Political and Social Problems*

### The Economic Structure

Economic factors have always been a primary regulator of the number and kind of people who have come to Canada, of the

regions and types of community to which they have gone, and of their later movements. At the same time, these newcomers vitally affected the economy by swelling the labour force, by adding to the country's pool of skills and experience, and by providing additional consumers. Today, those of ethnic origin other than British or French play a substantial and essential role in Canada's economic structure. In spite of the number who are recent immigrants, they do not constitute a lower stratum in the economy which could be considered particularly vulnerable to technological changes of economic recessions, but are distributed throughout all occupation and income levels.

Ethnic origin obviously affects the individual's position in the economic structure, not only those of British or French origin but for all the peoples of Canada. However, so little research has been done on Canadians of ethnic origin other than British or French, that it is difficult to be precise about the factors involved in their different economic positions. Some factors are obviously important; these include patterns of settlement, time of arrival, immigrant and ethnic occupations, ethnic values, the incidence of discrimination and exploitation, and the problems created by language barriers.

The archetype of the knitting of members of different cultural groups into a modern industrial economic structure is the experience of the 12 million immigrants who entered the United States from south, central, and eastern Europe between 1880 and 1914. Most of them were uprooted peasants who settled in the country's urban centres and entered the economic system at the bottom as unskilled, non-unionized labour; they tended to push into better jobs the earlier immigrants who had now acquired some knowledge of the English language and some understanding of American society. If they found opportunities in the legitimate structure – and opportunities were abundant in the developing economy – they rose through education and initiative into business and the professions. If they did not find such opportunities, some climbed by means of organized crime and legitimized their position later. Some, of course, stayed at or near the bottom, often ignored by believers in the "American dream."

This pattern does not apply to all cultural groups in the



United States (for example, the Germans and Scandinavians who settled in the Great Plains and political refugees of various eras). It is even less true in Canada for four reasons. First, Canada's early development was so slow that some groups entered not in a flood but a trickle. Second, this country had land for those who wanted it long after the frontier in the United States was closed. Third, by the time agriculture was losing its expansionist force here, many of the new immigrants were sophisticated urban residents who arrived with education and skills. Fourth, no sizeable cultural group in Canada has stopped receiving substantial additions of immigrants long enough ago for it to have completed a life-cycle as an immigrant group. The diversity in the occupational distributions of the ethnic origin categories listed in the 1961 census reflects all these factors.

The pattern of settlement in Canada has to a large extent been governed by the time at which immigrants arrived in the country. Until the beginning of the 20th century, immigrants tended to come from rural backgrounds and to establish themselves on the land; later arrivals tended to come from cities and to settle in Canada's urban centres. According to the 1961 census, those born in Canada had a lower proportion of urban residents than immigrants in every sizable origin category. The immigrants who have come since the end of World War II have an even higher proportion of urban residents than immigrants who arrived earlier. The pattern of settlement has also been influenced by the fact that different areas of the country have been developed at different times and new immigrants tend to go to whichever section is expanding when they arrive.

Region has a strong influence on income in Canada, with low average incomes in the Atlantic Provinces and Quebec (outside metropolitan Montreal), higher incomes in Montreal and the prairies, and highest incomes in Ontario and British Columbia. It has been noted elsewhere that it is probable that the economic dominance of Ontario and the western provinces and of the non-French component of the labour force is attributable in good part to the tendency of immigrants to affiliate with the Anglophone rather than the Francophone community, and to the heavy flow of immigrants to Ontario. The fact that Ukrainians

are still concentrated heavily in the prairies thus affects their income level. Yet it is certainly possible not to prosper in regions with high income levels. Most Italians have settled in high income regions, but have not shared in the general prosperity because of their lack of skills and education or the fact that they are recent arrivals.

Some immigrants have been recruited and admitted to Canada for specific, and usually lower-level occupations. The occupations that new arrivals enter, but later try to avoid, are generally those which require little or no skill, have low wage levels, and make few linguistic demands (for example, certain jobs in construction, mining, logging, the needle trades, the restaurant industry and domestic service). If an ethnic-origin category has a considerable foreign-born component, it will tend to be overrepresented in the occupations associated with entrance status. The high representation of Italian men among labourers in construction, of Italian, Portuguese, and Greek women in the needle trades, and of Italian, Portuguese, and Negro women in domestic service are all examples of entrance status. Other immigrants have passed through these occupations at varying speeds, depending on their background and the range of other opportunities open to them. For example, Japanese women shunned domestic service after World War II because of their unhappy memories of working in households in British Columbia, and their discovery that they could obtain light factory work. Until World War II the Japanese seemed to be stuck in entrance-status occupations, but this situation has since changed dramatically.

Paradoxically, a number of professions and skilled occupations of relatively high status have been filled largely by immigrants, particularly since World War II. Among them are some medical and scientific fields, drafting, architecture, and electronics. Native-born Canadians seem to have avoided these occupations, or have been unable to get the training required for them, or else have emigrated to the United States after receiving training.

Little research has been done in Canada on what has enabled some groups to rise faster and further in the economic hierarchy than others, but it seems likely that cultural characteristics have a considerable influence on the diversity in economic status among

different groups. Ethnic identity often affects behavior and values that influence occupational choices, work habits, and spending, saving and investment practices.

There is a significant relationship between economic behavior and certain religions. What evidence there is indicates that this relationship between religion and income also applies in Canada. For example, John Porter found by examining the 1951 census tracts of Halifax, Ottawa-Hull, Windsor, and Winnipeg that higher incomes were related to Protestantism and lower incomes to Catholicism, and that French origin could not explain the whole disadvantage of Catholicism.

Religion affects economic position in another way because of its relation to education. Occupation and income levels are closely related to educational levels. While access to schools and ability to pay for education dictate the educational level of a cultural group to some extent, so does the value set on learning or on particular types of education. These values are in turn related not only to religion, but also to class position and other factors.

Cultural differences also appear to influence economic advancement in other ways. Since there is little information about these factors we can only suggest what may be important. For example, in the modern Canadian economy geographical mobility seems to be positively correlated with social mobility. Members of some cultural groups are more reluctant to move than others. Cultural factors, such as how important familial and extra-familial relationships are, how distinct the group's wants are, and what their goals are, all exert some influence on the individual's willingness to move. Risk-taking seems to be another cultural variable, and one crucial to economic attainment in the modern world. Jews appear to accept the risks of expansion and speculation, while members of certain other groups appear reluctant to take the chances involved in expanding a small but secure enterprise into a larger one.

Another cultural characteristic which influences economic status is the value placed upon property ownership. Italians place great importance on owning their homes, and members of Italian families perform almost incredible feats of saving in order to

purchase a house and pay off the mortgage. It appears that the less the acculturation of Italians in Edmonton, the more likely they were to own property in Canada. Kosa found that the Hungarians he studied in Toronto also valued owning property, but usually bought rooming houses or boarding houses which provided income in return for the part-time labour of members of the family. When their income levels improved they bought single-family dwellings.

Discrimination is sometimes considered the most important factor leading to differences in the economic positions of different cultural groups. However, it is difficult to discuss the influence of discrimination except as a residual factor, for three reasons. First, it is difficult to prove. In Canada discrimination has rarely been directly expressed in laws or by-laws, although it has sometimes been indirectly expressed in general laws that have had a severe impact on particular cultural groups. Several of its more overt forms are now proscribed by law. This has not resulted in the disappearance of discrimination, but has made it assume more covert forms. Second, discrimination is difficult to measure even when its existence seems beyond dispute. Prejudice may be measured, but while prejudice and discrimination are related they do not always coincide. Prejudiced attitudes do not always lead to discriminatory behavior, and discriminatory behavior is sometimes practised by the unprejudiced. Segregation can also be measured, but segregation and discrimination do not always coincide either. Third, the economic effects of discrimination are not the same for all groups. Discrimination seems to spur some groups on to outstanding achievement, while it limits the economic advancement of others.

One reason that there has been little discriminatory legislation in Canada has been the discriminatory nature of our immigration policy. While British subjects and Americans have been preferred, and Asians and Negroes have been restricted, in fact sometimes almost excluded. These policies have been justified on various grounds, such as maintaining the ethnic balance in the population or prohibiting the entry of persons unable to adapt to the Canadian climate. Such policies have become increasingly hard to defend as Canadians have become more sensitive to

human rights, and there have been a number of recent declarations that discrimination on racial or ethnic lines will be eradicated—for example, the White Paper on Immigration which was tabled in the House of Commons in October 1966.

Lack of fluency in at least one of the official languages in Canada is obviously a barrier to participation in Canadian life, and one which is often first felt in the economic sphere. Since Canada received immigrants from many countries where neither English nor French is the language of daily life, they are inevitably handicapped by this lack; and it is essential that we attempt to minimize this handicap by making available facilities for learning the official languages of the country. Such facilities should be available both to young people in conjunction with their education and to adults in conjunction with their work.

## The Political Process

Canadians of ethnic origin other than British or French have contributed to Canadian political life in a variety of capacities: as voters, as members of interest groups and political parties, and as participants in governmental institutions and in the public service. In all these capacities, their cultural backgrounds have helped to shape and develop their points of view. Their contribution has been significant, although in some instances it has been limited by their lack of conviction that they have a role to play in the political process, or by the prejudice and discrimination of others.

There is no easy way to assess the political activities and achievements of Canadians of any specific ethnic origin or cultural identity. The assumptions underlying our political system are individualist and rationalist. They disregard such matters as background, emotional ties, or group activities. Political scientists have come to recognize the gulf between theory and practice, but in Canada they have just begun to explore the significance of the ethnic factor in the political process. As a result, what little statistical data there is, is often unreliable.

Members of certain cultural groups have been more eager than others to obtain naturalization. This has not always been because

of a desire to vote; in many instances it has been in order to obtain title to land, or the right to sponsor relatives as immigrants. Interest in exercising the right to vote has probably been greatest in areas where a particular cultural group has been concentrated, and where members of that group have therefore felt that their votes would carry some weight and would not be submerged by those of voters whose viewpoints were very different. A recent study concluded that a desire to participate in Canadian political life was second only to a desire for a sense of belonging permanently to Canada among the reasons given by immigrants for wanting to become Canadian citizens.

Canadians of ethnic origin other than British or French have steadily increased their degree of participation and representation in Canadian politics, particularly since World War II. Those of some cultural groups have done so to a much greater extent than others in proportion to the size of their group. This can be attributed to a number of factors including time of arrival, level of education, and the relative concentration or dispersal of the group's population. Also important are such cultural factors as ethnic self-consciousness, the degree of intensity of group nationalism, and the desire for group self-assertion. Certain cultural groups have shown determination and persistence in their search for political participation and recognition; others have not.

The more vocal groups tend to demand proportional representation in various government institutions. For example, their spokesmen have asked that they be given a proportion of the appointments to the Senate, the Cabinet, or the Supreme Court equal to their proportion in the population. We do not favour such representation and, even if we did favour it in principle, we should still be faced with the fact that there is no effective way of determining either the size and strength of a cultural constituency or the qualifications of a particular individual to represent it.

This is as true if the other cultural groups are taken together as it is if the groups are considered separately. The non-British, non-French cultural groups are too diverse in background and characteristics to constitute an effective "third force." We urge that the members of all groups be welcomed into the Anglophone and Francophone communities, and that they participate

fully in the political sphere from within one of these communities.

We insist that ethnic origin or cultural distinctions should be ignored wherever specific group interests are not involved. Merit and competence should be the only basis for appointment to government posts, within the context of the two official languages as we have recommended in previous books of our Report.

## Social Patterns

Immigrants are under immediate and direct pressure to adjust to the economic, political and legal structures of the country to which they immigrate. But there are some areas (such as family life, religious belief and practice, and social and cultural associations) where society exerts less pressure and permits a wider variety of behavior. As a result, immigrants may continue to follow traditional patterns in these areas. Society at large has tended to accept and even encourage this retention, but even so life in Canada has inevitably brought changes in the social patterns of all cultural groups, even the most isolated and self-sufficient.

Many of Canada's immigrants came from societies in which kinship ties were very important, and where families were often linked into networks which would assist the young men of the families to emigrate. Once established in the new land, they were in turn expected to help their kinsmen to follow them.

Since the 1920's, and especially since 1945, the role of the larger kinship network, as against the conjugal family, has been diminishing in Canadian society and it will probably continue to do so. This change is due to industrialization, urbanization, and increased mobility. These factors are reinforced by the increased proportion of urban, middle-class immigrants and a government policy of selecting immigrants on the basis of skills, education, and training.

Some immigrants married before coming to Canada, and either brought their wives and children with them or sent for

them within a few years. Others left fiancées behind and later sent for them. Still others settled near members of their own cultural groups, and so tended to meet and marry members of their own cultural group in Canada. Ethnic endogamy (marriage within the cultural group) was highest among the immigrants whose lives and migration were inextricably linked with kinship.

The conditions required for perpetuating the old kinship systems did not exist in Canada, and the rise of a new generation often brought drastic changes. In any differentiated society there are differences and conflicts between generations; in an immigrant group, these tend to be increased. The transmission of a way of life depends upon acceptance of a total system of institutions and such a system can only rarely be transmitted intact to a new land. This transfer is most complete for such sects as the Mennonites and Hutterites, and the generational conflicts are therefore least severe within these groups.

To the degree that the transfer of the traditional system is incomplete, the etiquette or ritual that governs relations between generations in the family and the community breaks down. The young may still be taught approved forms of behavior by their parents, relatives, and other members of their cultural group; but their neighbourhood, school and church may not reinforce this teaching.

The experience of the Japanese cultural group illustrates the effects of generational differences. Whereas in Japan the schools reinforced the training given at home, helping the children "to chart their course properly through the rigid ceremony of everyday behavior," Canadian public schools did not fulfill this function. In fact, they did just the reverse by stressing the values of democratic individualism, "which ill accorded with the authoritarian collectivism of the community." Thus the Nisei did not fit easily into the Japanese community. The discriminatory attitude of society as a whole, which failed to recognize "the Canadian orientation of the majority of the Nisei and directed its hostility to all Japanese, irrespective of place of birth," added to the problem. "Unable to prove they were 'good Canadians,' the Nisei were forced back into dependence upon the ethnic community and this made the cultural conflict more obvious."

The second generation of those of Ukranian origin offer an



example of generational changes in which a particular immigrant occupation played a part. Young girls would often go into domestic service in the cities and thus come into contact "with new ways of living, new social relationships, a new language—in short, a new world." Some of the girls would marry within the families for whom they worked, and were quickly almost completely assimilated. Many of them returning to visit their families, would find their parent's modes of dress, language, food, and general way of life "uncouth and even 'foreign.'" The parents would then reproach their children for having "forsaken the old ways."

The relationships between religion and ethnic identity and religion and ethnic origin are complicated. Some religions, for example Judaism, are explicitly ethnic. Christianity is not, although some Christian denominations are. Some cultural groups are almost entirely of one religious affiliation, others are spread among many different faiths. Within every cultural group there are people who practise no religion, although they may profess one to a census-taker, but who adhere to the ethic of the religion they inherited but have abandoned.

Many cultural groups shared a single religious affiliation when they first came to Canada. The Italians were almost all Roman Catholics; the Scandinavians, Lutherans; the Japanese, Buddhists; the Ukrainians, either Greek Orthodox or Greek Catholic. The Jewish group in Canada was less divided than in the United States; few *Sephardim* or liberal German Jews came to Canada. For the Germans and Dutch, who were of many different religious affiliations, religion was not an important part of their ethnic identity.

Many problems confronted immigrants in setting up their religious organizations. Some religions are much less portable than others. The Doukhobors, Mennonites, and Hutterites had little difficulty maintaining their forms of worship on the Canadian prairies, and Jews could secure their religious accoutrements; at least in the cities. Those of other faiths were often less fortunate, particularly if they were dependent upon a highly trained priesthood. Often they did not bring priests with them to Canada and had little money to pay priests for their services here.

In cases where a suitable priest was secured, he frequently

found that his position was undermined by several factors. The experiences of the laity in setting up a congregation and in seeking out a priest frequently made them more independent than they had been at home and less willing to accept the priest's sacerdotal role.

The burden of setting up a religious organization and financing religious services, buildings for worship, and religious objects often presented further difficulties. In the homeland, the financial burden of upkeep was widely shared, especially in the established churches. Immigrants, already under financial stress, found the financial demands of their religion onerous, especially when they compared them to the costs of religions that rejected conventional church architecture and appointments.

The relationship between religion and education is close. In Canada the school one attends, the quality of instruction, the choice of programmes and subjects, and the availability of higher education are all related to the major religious division between Catholics and non-Catholics, as well as the main language division between Anglophones and Francophones. Ethnic background is also an important factor.

The average level of education attained by the population has been rising over the last 80 years, both in Canada and abroad. In addition, Canadian immigration policy, which before World War II tended to give preference to agricultural immigrants and those willing to enter domestic service, has now been altered to give preference to those with education and training. The level of education among immigrants has therefore tended to be high since 1945, except among immigrants who are sponsored and need not meet these requirements.

The immigrant population taken as a whole has a lower educational level than the Canadian-born population, but it also has more members with university training. When the immigrant population is classified according to the time of arrival, those who came before 1931 predominate among those with little education; those who came after 1945 include a high proportion with university-training. Some of these immigrants have obtained or completed their education in Canada. The high proportion of

recent immigrants who have settled in urban areas is also related to the high proportion with university training.

Many immigrants had little experience with voluntary associations when they arrived in Canada. The family, the kin group, and the church had provided their social structures in their homelands. Settlers in rural areas established few voluntary associations, but immigrants in towns or cities tended to organize associations, either to fill old wants or to meet new needs created by migration. Many of these voluntary associations were sponsored by the churches; some in turn became sponsors of part-time schools.

Ethnic associations are set up to meet those wants that people share with their ethnic fellows but not with the community at large. They are of many types: mutual-aid or benefit associations designed to give assistance in crises such as unemployment, illness, accident, or death; philanthropic or social welfare associations through which the more successful and established members of the group may assist the less successful newcomers; associations with political aims, either in the homeland or in the new country; social and recreational associations; occupational and professional associations; research institutes and learned societies; women's groups; youth groups and coordinating bodies.

Different types of ethnic associations have usually been characteristic at different periods, because of the different types of immigrants who came in each period and the different state of developments of the Canadian communities in which they settled. Mutual-benefit associations emerged first. Faced with few resources in a frontier society, immigrants banded together to provide the kind of help that the family or kin group had provided in their homeland. Sometimes these mutual-aid societies became the forerunners of flourishing businesses. Often they were short-lived because their members prospered and had no further need of them, because those who were entrusted with the funds lacked experience, acumen, or honesty, or because economic depressions prevented members from paying their dues while at the same time multiplying the number of claimants for benefits. Those that endured were often responsible for social

and ceremonial occasions as well as for material aid. In recent years there has been a decline in mutual-benefit associations for at least three reasons: the greater sophistication of many immigrants, the increased economic opportunities in an expanding country, and the growth of public welfare measures. In addition, credit unions established by earlier arrivals have been of considerable financial assistance to newcomers, meeting some of the needs originally filled by mutual-benefit associations.

Generally, it appears that the more an ethnic group finds its origin a handicap, the more likely it is to form a strong structure of ethnic associations. Thus members of the German cultural group, with a long tradition in Canada and close cultural affinities with the British, do not have as many associations that are exclusively German as do other cultural groups. The Dutch, also well established and sharing a northern European culture with the British, have had difficulty in maintaining and developing an associational structure.

The fact that there were few exclusively German associations could well be related not only to the general lack of barriers between those of German and British ethnic origin, but also to hostility towards the German language and culture during and after the two world wars. This provided a strong reason for taking advantage of the ease with which people of German origin could disappear into the population at large. Faced with similar hostility, members of the Japanese community in Toronto after World War II were reluctant to build up an ethnic association structure such as had existed in Vancouver in the 1930's, because of the resulting visibility of the Japanese cultural group.

A sense of ethnic identity and participation in ethnic associations are positively correlated in many instances. The correlation is not perfect, however, and this is of particular significance for recent immigrants. The tendency of immigrants to form colonies or ghettos has been diminishing as new immigrants have become less exclusive and more sophisticated. These same factors have probably decreased interest in ethnic associations. This may not necessarily indicate that new immigrants have become less eager to maintain their cultural heritage, but only that they wish to maintain it by other means. However, participation in ethnic

associations is not purely segregating in its effects. Associations provide opportunities for their members to learn from one another the facts of Canadian life. This is of particular importance for immigrants whose communication with other Canadians is hampered by language and cultural barriers.

### *Part 3: The Maintenance of Language and Culture*

#### Language Transfer Patterns

In Canada, the retention rate of ancestral languages varies substantially from one cultural group to another, from generation to generation, and from province to province. The vitality of non-official languages is determined by a host of influences and modified by factors peculiar to particular ethnic origin categories. Differences exist even within the same groups residing in different regions of the country. As a result, linguistic integration is a complex process; there are no rules that can be applied to all languages or that explain all the reasons behind the maintenance of one's mother tongue. However, there are discernible factors that appear to influence the rate of linguistic and cultural assimilation. Three of the most important are the degree of cultural distinctiveness of a cultural group, percentages of foreign-born and Canadian-born, and rural-urban settlement patterns.

While other socio-economic factors may have an impact of their own, as a general rule, the greater the cultural difference between an immigrant group and its receiving society, the slower its rate of integration. This difference can be based on linguistic, religious, or social factors. For example, immigrants speaking a Germanic or Romance language find it easier to adopt English or French than those whose language has no cultural base in North America. Often they also find a warmer welcome here than do those whose culture seems more alien to Canadian society. There are also some groups, such as the Jewish, whose

culture is based on factors other than language. Even if the ancestral language continues to occupy an important position in the group's cultural activities, those who have abandoned the use of their mother tongue may not have abandoned their cultural identity and aspirations. Customs and patterns of interaction may persist in a cultural group even when considerable linguistic assimilation has taken place.

It is apparent that the larger the percentage of foreign-born in a cultural group, the more likely it is that the group will use its ancestral language and maintain its cultural identity. Canadian-born children and the grandchildren of immigrants are less likely to consider themselves members of a specific cultural group or to report its language as their mother tongue.

Rural isolation and traditionalism tend to perpetuate older ways of life much more effectively than do urban industrial societies. This same factor influences the level of retention of ancestral languages, which have always been more strongly entrenched in rural than in urban areas. Groups that are strongly urban are generally characterized by lessened support of their original languages.

It is extremely difficult to forecast future language retention rates on the basis of past language retention patterns. A new factor has been added to the various determinants in the last few years; television may exert an overwhelming influence on linguistic assimilation.

## Education

Schools are the formal means by which a society transmits its knowledge, skills, languages and culture from one generation to the next. Canada's public school systems are primarily concerned with the transmission of knowledge that is essential to all citizens, including knowledge about Canadian institutions, the traditions and circumstances that have shaped them, and the two official languages. Since those of British and French ethnic origin are the main groups in Canada, it is appropriate that the British and French cultures dominate in the public schools. But public

heritage. They help to nurture love of beauty and respect for artists and scholars, and to further development in arts and letters. The arts and letters of the other cultural groups are also a source of variety in outlook, ideas, and talent. Finally, support for the arts, letters, and crafts of its people affirms our pride in Canada's diversity.

An important part of Canadian support for the arts and letters of its peoples must be the preservation of the history in which these arts find their cultural base. The history of those of origin other than British and French in Canada is unfortunately little known.

## Recommendations

1. We recommend that any provinces that have not yet enacted fair employment practices, fair accommodation practices, or housing legislation prohibiting discrimination because of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry, or place of origin, do so; and that this legislation be made binding upon the Crown and its agencies. We further recommend that all provinces make provision for full-time administrators of their human rights legislation.
2. We recommend that the same conditions for citizenship, the right to vote, and to stand for election to public office be accorded to all immigrants, with no regard to their country of origin.
3. We recommend that the teaching of languages other than English and French, and cultural subjects related to them, be incorporated as options in the public elementary school programme, where there is sufficient demand for such classes.
4. We recommend that special instruction in the appropriate official language be provided for children who enter the public school system with an inadequate knowledge of that language; that provincial authorities specify the terms and conditions of financial assistance for such special instruction;

and that the federal authorities assist the provinces in mutually acceptable ways through grants for the additional cost incurred.

5. We recommend that more advanced instruction and a wider range of options in languages other than English and French, and in cultural subjects related to them, be provided in public high schools, where there is sufficient demand for such classes.
6. We recommend that Canadian universities broaden their practices in giving standing or credits for studies in modern languages other than French and English both for admission and for degrees.
7. We recommend that Canadian universities expand their studies in the fields of the humanities and the social sciences relating to particular areas other than those related to the English and French languages.
8. We recommend that the CRTC remove restrictions on private broadcasting in languages other than English and French, except those restrictions necessary to meet the administrative and legal responsibilities of the licensees and those that also apply to English- and French-language programmes.
9. We recommend that the CBC recognize the place of languages other than English and French in Canadian life and that the CBC remove its proscription on the use of other languages in broadcasting.
10. We recommend that the CRTC undertake studies in the field of broadcasting in other languages to determine the best means by which radio and television can contribute to the maintenance of languages and cultures and that the CBC participate in these studies. We further recommend that these studies include pilot projects on either AM or FM radio in both Montreal and Toronto.
11. We recommend that research be undertaken through the CRTC concerning the nature and effects of the portrayal of



other cultural groups on both publicly- and privately-owned English- and French-language radio and television stations.

12. We recommend that the National Film Board undertake to publicize the fact that it produces prints of many of its films in languages other than English and French, particularly in regions where there are concentrations of persons who speak languages other than English and French. In addition, we recommend that the voluntary associations of cultural groups stimulate interest among their groups in the use of these films.
13. We recommend that the National Film Board continue and develop the production of films that inform Canadians about one another, including films about the contribution and problems of both individuals and groups of ethnic origin other than British and French, and that the National Film Board receive the financial support it requires in order to produce such films.
14. We recommend that the appropriate federal, provincial, and municipal agencies receive the financial means they require to maintain and extend their support to cultural and research organizations whose objectives are to foster the arts and letters of cultural groups other than the British and French.
15. We recommend that the administrative costs of the Canadian Folk Arts Council or a similar body be provided for out of public funds through the Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State.
16. We recommend that the National Museum of Man be given adequate space and facilities and provided with sufficient funds to carry out its projects regarding the history, social organizations, and folk arts of cultural groups other than the British and French.

# BOOK 5: THE FEDERAL CAPITAL

## The Capital City

In thinking about the federal capital, we have tried first of all to see the issues in broad perspective. We have looked not only at the Canadian situation in some detail, but also in a more general way at the problems and solutions that have been developed for the capitals of other countries. Such an approach has enabled us to visualize more clearly the role that the federal capital should play in Canadian life – a role that has two quite distinct aspects.

First, a capital is a symbol of the country as a whole. It should express, in the best way possible, the values of the country as a whole, its way of life, its cultural richness and diversity, its social outlook, its aspirations for the future. This symbolism has both an internal and an external dimension. Citizens from across the country who visit their capital should find in it a fuller understanding of their country's traditions and a pride in personal identification with it. Similarly, visitors from other countries should be able just as readily to find tangible expression of the values of a country with which they may be unfamiliar.

In the second place, and on a more practical plane, a capital is a legislative and administrative meeting place for legislators from every constituency in the country; it must offer a suitable environment for these activities. Most modern states place considerable stress upon offering career opportunities in the public service of the country on equitable terms to all its citizens. To the extent that the capital is an uncongenial or disadvantageous place to work for any sector of the population, such an aim is frustrated. Moreover, many private citizens visit the capital to deal with government, and they too must be able to do so without undue

inconvenience. In short, it is important that a capital offer a satisfactory working environment within which the business of government may be conducted; to the extent that it does not, the result will be a loss of efficiency and morale.

It is hardly surprising that questions concerning the capital arose from our earliest public meetings in 1963.

The formal briefs contain a wealth of observations and perceptions about the capital. Much testimony suggests that the language and culture of English-speaking Canada predominate there; that English is the sole official language; that a Francophone resident or visitor from Quebec cannot feel "at home" there; that the federal capital is like a foreign territory to a substantial sector of the Canadian population. As illustrations of this predominance of English, various briefs mention the refusal of Ottawa City Council to permit traffic signs in French; the predominance of English signs on federal public buildings; the difficulties of obtaining service in French in the shops; and the obstacles to testifying in French in local courts. Though the picture may have to be shaded or qualified after closer study, this is the image of the capital that emerges from the briefs presented to us, and it is a picture shared by Francophone and Anglophone Canadians.

That such an image should be held by substantial numbers of Canadians has important consequences for the federal government. Our terms of reference ask us "to make recommendations designed to ensure the bilingual and basically bicultural character of the federal administration." To the extent that the atmosphere of the capital impedes the recruitment of adequate numbers of Francophone public servants from Quebec, or induces them to leave the federal Public Service prematurely, or promotes their Anglicization and estrangement from their original cultural background - to that extent the capital fails to fulfil its role as the seat of the federal government.

We are concerned about the apparent effects of the provincial boundary on the formation of attitudes. In accordance with our terms of reference, we have taken as our basic principle the development of a capital based on an equal partnership of Francophones and Anglophones. Yet we cannot see the basis for

doing this in a setting where half the Francophone population feels alienated and physically cut off from the centre of federal government activity in the capital and the other half lives as an underprivileged linguistic minority in conditions where equality has for generations been manifestly absent.

This is our perception of the present situation of the capital. In formulating proposals for reform we shall constantly bear in mind that two quite distinct major problems are involved. First, the predominantly Francophone Quebec sector must attain a position of full participation in the area's role as federal capital. This perspective in no way denies the need for independent socio-economic development of the Quebec sector, through whatever measures the federal, provincial, or municipal levels of government may undertake separately or together; it merely underlines our concern with the relation of the Quebec sector to the capital region. Second, the Francophone minority in the Ontario sector must attain a position of equality with its Anglophone fellow citizens. Both problems must find a solution if a meaningful equal partnership is to develop in the capital area.

## Equal Partnership

In earlier volumes of this Report, we have discussed at some length our interpretation of the notion of equal partnership in different settings. In our view, the principle can be looked at separately in relation to linguistic régimes, educational structures, the work world, mass media, the arts and letters, and so on. But it must also be looked at somewhat differently in different jurisdictions; that is to say, its meaning at the federal level may be different from its meaning at the provincial or local level, and even different from one area to another within the same province.

In every province either French or English predominates. This is a matter not of law but of demographic and social structure. Some may deplore this absence of equality at the provincial level, but it is part of the Canadian reality.

In the context of Canada today, therefore, it is difficult to

think of any sizable territory that may be considered, both in a juridical and a sociological sense, to be in a state of equilibrium in terms of the official languages. We think it important that such a territory should exist with respect to the federal capital. For if the capital of a bilingual country is to command the respect and loyalty of its citizens of both official languages, it should not reflect the dominance of one language over the other.

Some will ask if it is possible in the circumstances for Canada to have a bilingual capital. No one can answer this question with certainty. But we are going to propose that a serious attempt be made to develop a bilingual capital, and all our recommendations concerning the capital have been formulated with that aim in view.

In this respect the federal capital is like the federal government itself: it should be regarded as the property of neither Franco-phone nor Anglophone Canadians but as the product of the fruitful collaboration of both, as a symbol of the things they have in common.

It may be objected that to serve the public in both French and English requires bilingualism on the part of the person who provides that service. This is of course true, up to a certain point, and we have explored some of the implications of this point elsewhere. A policeman on point duty, or a tourist guide, or a cashier at a cinema, may well have to be bilingual if he is to perform his job effectively. But where several persons are associated in providing the same service, such as sales personnel in a department store, or municipal clerks in a large department, then clearly not all of them need be individually bilingual in order to provide effective service to the public in both languages. In our judgement, those situations where full fluency in French and English is needed will form a relatively modest proportion of the work world. On the other hand, our research on the capital area has suggested that there may be many bilingual individuals at work in situations where their language skills are seldom if ever used.

We have developed a general principle as to how equal partnership might be conceived in the federal capital. We have talked of the whole range of facilities used by the public in the complex-

ities of daily life, while recognizing that only a certain number of them lie directly in the public sector. In terms of implementation, the most immediate reforms could undoubtedly be carried out within the public sector. Yet two further observations may be made. First, we should not underestimate the force of example in the public sector as an influence on behavior in the private sector. It is difficult to imagine that, in a capital where all public services in the broadest sense were fully and freely available in both languages, the private sector would be radically different. Second, selected services in the private sector could be brought within the reach of public policy by a variety of means: linguistic legislation, agreements and contracts between governments and private organizations, and so on.

Our general principle, in any case, is clear. It is time to restate it in the form of a general recommendation. Accordingly we recommend for the present federal capital and areas to be designated as part thereof, that the French and English languages have full equality of status; and that the full range of services and facilities provided to the public be available in both languages throughout the area. This is, indeed, more than a recommendation to governments: it is an invitation to the private sector as well. If we have phrased it more positively and more comprehensively than our recommendations for other parts of Canada, it is because we are dealing with a capital, and behind that capital stands the reality of a bilingual Canada.

## The Role of the Federal Government

The existence of the Ontario-Quebec boundary has profoundly influenced the relations between the two provincial sectors of the capital area, but there is one level of government that has some jurisdiction over both sectors – the federal authority.

We have noted earlier that federal activity to date in the capital area could be grouped around four broad areas of concern: the acquisition and maintenance of public buildings, whether as owner or tenant; the planning, development, and embellishment of the capital in keeping with its significance to Canada as a whole; the development of various cultural and

museum facilities appropriate to Canada's capital; and an emerging concern with the linguistic image offered by the capital area.

Federal policies – or, in some situations, the lack of a federal policy – concerning the development of the capital area have played an inescapable part in the development of different conditions of life for Francophones and Anglophones in the capital area. There is a striking imbalance between the Quebec and Ontario sectors. This has been intensified by siting the overwhelming majority of federal government buildings on the Ontario side, including all major cultural and museum facilities as well as transportation terminals. It has been intensified by the distribution of federal grants to municipalities, which has given the Ontario sector an overwhelming – and apparently still increasing – proportion of federal payments. There is a similar imbalance in development expenditures by the N.C.C. though here it has more often been the purpose rather than the amount of the expenditure that has been felt inappropriate by residents of the Quebec sector.

The achievement of conditions of equal partnership within each sector is perhaps less obviously a federal responsibility. Yet we have noted that the federal government, the largest “taxpayer” in the area, has made no public representations to municipalities respecting language use, even in the city of Ottawa where it contributes at least 40 per cent of the tax revenue from commercial-industrial-federal property. The department of Public Works, as responsible for federal buildings, has had a relatively passive policy on language use even in matters fully under federal control.

In brief, the relevant federal agencies have paid insufficient attention to the requirements of equal partnership in the capital. They have only begun to develop policies that will assert the federal role in the face of the very strong influence of the provincial and municipal institutional framework on the patterns of language use. We think it is essential that federal policy continue to develop on this question.

The capital area should continue to evolve a vigorous and efficient system of provincial and local government but, on the

broad issue of equal partnership between Francophones and Anglophones, we should place the interests and perspectives of Canada as a whole on a par with local considerations. We may note that many other issues, such as zoning and height regulations in downtown Ottawa, pollution control of the Ottawa River, and problems of urban planning and development generally, also involve difficulties in drawing a proper boundary between federal and provincial or local interests and responsibilities. But we need not discuss topics of this kind here except to the extent that they affect our own theme.

Our real concern remains the question of equal partnership between Francophones and Anglophones, and how it may be achieved in the capital. In our view, the need for a greater federal initiative is clear. Therefore, we recommend that the federal government assume a direct, positive role in promoting equal partnership in all its aspects between Francophones and Anglophones in the present federal capital and in areas to be designated as part thereof.

Much more than formal linguistic rights is involved. Indeed, the practical problems of achieving equal partnership in the capital focus upon two major issues: removal of certain basic inequities between the Quebec and Ontario sectors; and achievement in each sector, but particularly in the Ontario sector, of equal rights and facilities by the official-language minority.

In calling for a régime of complete equality in the capital area, we are fully conscious of the magnitude of the change proposed. It will require co-operation and understanding among the authorities concerned and understanding among the public involved.

Also, while certain far-reaching changes in attitudes will be required, the possibility of basic institutional reforms must also be considered. We are convinced that present attitudes concerning the capital are closely associated with present institutional arrangements and that therefore it is essential to consider altering the institutional framework rather than trying to change patterns of thought while institutions remain the same.

Over the long term, the changes that will occur are large and difficult ones; they cannot be accomplished all at once. There



must be a process of interaction, in which institutional reforms will tend to produce more open attitudes; and these in turn will pave the way for establishing a regime of full equality.

## Recommendations

1. We recommend, for the present federal capital and areas to be designated as part thereof, that the French and English languages have full equality of status, and that the full range of services and facilities provided to the public be available in both languages throughout the area.
2. We recommend that the federal government assume a direct, positive role in promoting equal partnership in all its aspects between Francophones and Anglophones in the present federal capital and in areas to be designated as part thereof.
3. We recommend that all external and internal signs on all buildings under the control of the department of Public Works in the capital area be made bilingual within two years.
4. We recommend that all rental contracts for federally leased buildings or parts of buildings in the capital area have a clause containing appropriate provisions for language use on the part of the lessor and his employees or agents, including bilingual internal and external signs on the building itself and provision of services in French and English by elevator operators, commissionaires, and other personnel in contact with the public or with public servants.
5. We recommend that federal grants-in-aid (including National Capital Commission grants) to municipal or provincial public works projects in the capital area be given subject to an undertaking that appropriate recognition of the two official languages be observed on the project when completed.

6. We recommend that, in all activities of federal agencies in the capital area, services in French be freely and publicly offered on the same basis as services in English, and not merely be made available exceptionally or on request.
7. We recommend that Ontario and Quebec accept in principle that all provincial services provided in their respective sectors of the federal capital and all services provided by the provincial capitals to residents in the federal capital area be available in French or English at the option of the individual citizen, and that this linguistic provision become a right guaranteed by provincial statute.
8. We recommend that the full range of municipal services be provided in French and English in the capital area and that this be guaranteed by provincial statute.
9. We recommend that the full range of regional government services be provided in French and English in the capital area and that this be guaranteed by provincial statute.
10. We recommend that immediate provisions be made by the province of Ontario to extend the use of the French language in the courts that sit in the Ontario sector of the federal capital area.
11. We recommend that all French-language elementary schools in Carleton county be placed under the jurisdiction of the Ottawa Roman Catholic Separate School Board.
12. We recommend that all French-language secondary schools in Carleton county be placed under the jurisdiction of the present Ottawa Board of Education.
13. We recommend that the province of Ontario and the local school boards concerned examine the possibilities of offering educational opportunities where instruction is given in the second language in the federal capital area, without

religious and financial restrictions upon those parents wishing to have their children educated in the other official language.

14. We recommend that the Canadian Radio and Television Commission, in granting future licences and renewing licences presently held, give priority to the principle of linguistic equality in the federal capital area.
15. We recommend that the question of convenient access to transportation and communication services for the various parts of the capital area be given greater consideration in the future by the federal government and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.
16. We recommend that any future planning for investment in federally owned or leased buildings in the capital area include a programme specifically aimed at correcting the present imbalance between the Ontario and Quebec sectors.
17. We recommend that the federal government and the provinces of Quebec and Ontario establish a specific advisory Tripartite Agency to be charged with the responsibility for detailing co-ordination of the programme we have outlined for the federal capital area.

# BOOK 6: VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS

## Equal Partnership

Voluntary organizations exist in Canada in great numbers and in a wide variety of forms, and they cannot be categorized in such a way as to permit us to draw precise conclusions and make recommendations in the usual style of Royal Commission reports. But this does not diminish their importance as social institutions influencing the political situation and the decisions Canadians will take in respect to future cultural relations.

Since satisfactory relations between Canada's two language groups can be achieved only when conditions of equality prevail between them, and since voluntary associations often affect the occupational, personal, and civic competence of their members, it follows that if the Canadian Confederation is to be developed on "the basis of an equal partnership," the benefits Canadians derive from belonging to voluntary associations must be roughly equal between Francophones and Anglophones. If members of each cultural group are to benefit to a like degree from belonging to an organization such as a voluntary association, the costs in terms of time, effort, and money must be broadly comparable and cannot consistently favour one of the two language groups:

Voluntary associations are, by definition, private organizations catering to an enormous variety of interests of their members. In a free society they must be allowed to function with a very high degree of freedom. Under these conditions it is particularly important that their members and leaders realize that the policies and actions of their associations nevertheless vitally affect the society of which they are a part. More specifically, in Canada they should be aware of the fact that unequal opportunities for

participating in their associations directly affect the relations between the members of the country's two official-language groups as well as their relative status. If both are to have the potential to contribute to and participate fully in the life of Canada, they must be able to develop their respective talents and skills to a comparable degree, and to gain from the same experiences; unequal access to the benefits offered by voluntary associations prevents them from doing so.

In the area of voluntary associations, equal partnership can develop only when each of the two linguistic groups has an equal opportunity to develop freely the associational structures suitable to its own society, and to participate with equal benefit in whatever joint activities are undertaken. We are therefore interested in exploring how they do and can contribute to the development and flourishing of each of Canada's two communities and their role in establishing adequate relations between them.

These two objectives, while linked, are by no means automatically attained by policies which may further either one. For instance, if all Francophone members of a given association learn English, this may promote better communications, and thus in one sense better relations among its members. But, if a special burden is imposed on only one of the cultural groups, it would certainly not bring about an equal partnership. The minimal condition under which this could be achieved would require that members of both language groups invest some of their resources in learning the other's language or that each bear an equal share of the burden of not being able to operate in it.

On the other hand, practices designed to bring about a more equal participation (for example, the preparation of an organization's documents in both languages) may be distasteful to one group because it could lead to a general increase in membership fees. This might create hostility and so result in the deterioration of cultural relations.

In voluntary associations, as elsewhere, the two objectives of harmony and equality are inseparable, although not always realizable through the same methods. During much of this country's history, many English-speaking Canadians believed that so long as an amicable rapport existed between Francophones and Anglophones, wherever and whenever they had contact with

each other, the relationship between them was satisfactory. Harmony, rather than equality, was held to be the desirable keystone of the relationship. And for a long time such harmony was thought to be broadly attainable without equality. The central feature of the crisis to which we referred in our Preliminary Report is precisely that large and influential numbers of Francophones, as well as Anglophones familiar with the problems of our cultural relations, no longer can accept harmony as the main characteristic of the partnership. Equality has become more important and is one of the conditions which must be met if harmony is to prevail.

The far-reaching changes necessary for the attainment of equality can probably not be brought about without the respective understanding by Francophones and Anglophones of each other's position and needs. This awareness of the other group's requirements and the willingness to act on it cannot materialize without both maintaining a sympathetic interest in each other's affairs. Clearly, understanding will be more likely to grow and develop to the degree that Francophones and Anglophones seize the opportunities offered by their co-existence in Canada to work together on mutually acceptable projects or for mutually acceptable ends. For that reason, the ultimate rewards of membership in voluntary associations for both Francophones and Anglophones will probably be greater when they can unite in joint association. In order for such association to yield its full benefit, however, both groups must be uninhibited and be equally free to express their cultural particularities. In the long run, cultural relations will be satisfactory only if the two official-language groups have equal access to the opportunities and responsibilities offered by Canada, and if the relations between them are sufficiently harmonious to make both wish to make the effort towards successful co-operation.

## Language and Culture

Virtually all Canadian associations serving the two official-language groups have in recent years recognized that both in their aims and methods they had in the past failed to respond

adequately to Canada's duality. As a result, most have been going through the difficult process of redefining their purposes and of finding more acceptable ways of conducting their business.

The manner in which a voluntary association adjusts to the new conditions depends to a very great extent on the general climate in which it copes with the requirements of its dual membership. Associations have reflected the political state of the country with respect to the relations between the two linguistic groups. The way in which they have approached their often newly-perceived "language" and "cultural" problems has depended in large part on the degree to which their leaders have been emotionally or otherwise involved in the current dialogue.

Some people feel that the language one speaks has no bearing on most of the activities carried out in voluntary associations – how one plays a game of hockey, for example, or how one decides the most effective way of opposing the taxation of co-operatives. But we are concerned not only with two linguistic groups but also with two cultures. And culture, as "a way of being, thinking, and feeling," influences what an individual considers important, and how he can best achieve these goals. Cultural differences can quite easily lead to differences in the priorities that members of each group assign to various aspects of the programme and also to the manner in which they feel the activities should be pursued.

A representative of the Dominion Drama Festival was explicit on this point when discussing with the Commission his organization's problems in securing competent adjudicators:

Mr. Melanson: We have had a great many difficulties . . . in finding people who are competent in both traditions and techniques of the theatre to adjudicate our Festivals . . .

Two months ago I asked one person in French theatre if he would be interested in judging one of our competitions and he said, "I would very much like to . . . I feel I speak English very well, but I am not bicultural enough."

The awareness of this aspect of cultural difference underlay a statement made by a leading member of the Association des médecins de la langue française du Canada when he once described

the purpose of his association as "to encourage the development of medicine according to the genius of our (*i.e.*, French Canadian) civilization and culture, and according to our own intellectual aptitudes and characteristics."

Because of the importance of cultural – as distinct from linguistic – differences, associations seeking to serve both of Canada's main cultural groups are likely to be effective in promoting equal partnership only if decisions about virtually all activities, including the dissemination of information, are made with the full and free participation of both Francophones and Anglophones.

If the two official-language groups do not participate equally in the activities of voluntary associations, they cannot benefit equally from their membership. They not only derive unequal rewards from the efforts put into belonging but they also have unequal access to the indirect benefits of associational experience. As a consequence, inequalities may develop or be perpetuated between the two linguistic groups in their respective occupational and recreational capabilities, in their mental health, and in their capacities as citizens.

There is a further serious consequence to this situation: because of the operation of a somewhat circular process, the lower the participation of one linguistic group, the less likelihood there is that members of that group will wish to participate in the future. If members of a group do not play an active role in an association, they will have little influence over the programme, personnel, and activities. The failure of the members of one group at a given point in time to play a full role in their association is almost certain to affect the usefulness of the association for members of the same group at some future date. Since it is much more difficult for a group to gain influence than to abdicate it, the process of opting out may have long-term consequences which can be corrected only with the greatest difficulty.

## Structure

In deciding what particular structure would best serve its interest, a voluntary association confronts dilemmas similar to those which



challenge Canadian federalism: what is the appropriate degree of centralization and decentralization and, more particularly, what should be the formal relations between Francophones and Anglophones? A graphic description of the very practical way in which these problems present themselves to many Canadian associations was put before the Commission by the brief of the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants:

Like other Canadian organizations operating on a national scale, we are faced with a division of function and responsibility between the Canadian and provincial Institutes. In theory this is not an easy distinction to make in a precise and clear-cut manner, but in practice we have found that a reasonably workable division of fields can be made. For example: The education of our students must by its very nature be a provincial matter in order that it may fit in with the pattern of the educational system extant in Canada. Nevertheless we have been successful in so co-ordinating the examinations on a national scale that each of the provincial Institutes has for many years now accepted and adopted the one set of examinations as its standard of qualification. You can appreciate the importance of this to a profession in contributing to a uniform standard of competence throughout the country.

Research in its every phase is easy to classify as a nationwide project, because of the very heavy cost of research and the advantages that can come from pooling of talent and resources.

On the other hand, the supervision of professional conduct of members is a matter that can be handled most effectively at the provincial level.

Practice has resulted in the work of the national body being of two sorts. In certain areas it takes direct responsibility – for example, in research – while in other areas it provides a meeting ground for the provincial Institutes to consider matters which are essentially provincial in nature, but where there are advantages to pooling the experience of the different provincial Institutes.

Members of the two official-language groups in voluntary asso-

ciations have frequently tried to establish structures and adopt procedures equally satisfactory to both, and their discussions have often paralleled debates in Canada about revisions of the British North America Act. In both cases the discussion revolves around the same themes: "special status", Quebec being a province like no other, the need to protect the Francophone minorities in the other provinces, the advantages of the central government having extensive powers so that common standards of well-being can be created, or the exigencies of majority government. Many Francophones, restive under arrangements which they saw as restrictive and inadequate, have urged that what they take to be the spirit underlying the B.N.A. Act – the desire to create a partnership between Francophones and Anglophones – has to be refused into their voluntary association.

It is not inappropriate that the arguments taken from the constitutional field should have been applied to voluntary associations. The latter in a sense mirror Canada's political community; however, since their scope of activity is smaller, the problems they face are less complex, and since they are private, the options open to them are greater. At the same time, the success with which they cope with Canada's duality is one of the conditions determining whether a satisfactory solution to current political and constitutional problems can be found.

Among Canada's voluntary associations there are many organizational forms. Associations may be formed by direct individual membership or organized into branches; they encompass the component parts directly or through intermediary tiers at the provincial or regional level. They may be highly centralized or loosely strung together. Associations may be grouped according to the degree to and the form in which they unite or segregate Francophone and Anglophone members. One extreme type consists of a mixed, unitary Canada-wide body, composed of individual members from both linguistic groups and giving no recognition in its formal structure to their cultural duality. At the other extreme there is the type of association in which members of the two cultural groups belong to two unilingual sections linked to one another in only a most tenuous way. This particular arrangement may in fact take the form of two quite distinct

organizations, each serving its own linguistically defined constituency. The Canadian Economics Association, composed of individual members from both linguistic groups interested in the academic study of economics, is an example of the first type. The Boy Scouts of Canada and l'Association des scouts catholiques du Canada, which are two independent bodies linked by slender organizational ties, exemplify the other.

These two types of associations represent extremes in that they display certain characteristics in an undiluted form. In the unitary common type of organization there is no structural provision for the separation of Francophone and Anglophone members, whereas in the parallel type of organization there is express provision for serving the two linguistic groups separately. However, in between these two types there is a very complex range of associational structures which combine some characteristics of each model. The parallel unilingual type may take at least two forms: completely separate bodies (the Co-operative Union of Canada and the Conseil canadien de la cooperation are an example) and two associations maintaining very modest ties (the scouts). At the other pole there are many more possibilities ranging from a monolithic, displaying varying degrees of decentralization. These are, of course, not strictly unitary but their membership is mixed. Under some of the more decentralized forms there are occasionally sections which are totally or almost totally Francophone, although the association as a whole may be predominantly Anglophone. A parallel may be drawn between these French-language sections and the unilingual units we recommend for the federal Public Service.

In most mixed Canadian associations, most members normally speak and write in English; most of the activities are carried out in English; publications, agendas, meetings, minutes, and reports are in English; and the language of administration is English. We noted in our discussion of structural forms that some associations have sections in which some or all of these things are done in French; this may affect parts of the organization, but in pan-Canadian activities and concerns, English almost certainly predominates. Often decisions at the country-wide level are the most

important ones and have a pronounced effect on all parts of the organization. Furthermore, Francophones may find themselves in places or associations where no French-language sections exist; so they must function in English if they wish to, or must, join a given association.

Many associations provide written material for the purpose of implementing their educational, recreational or utilitarian aims. If Francophones do not understand this literature, or if they must make a greater effort to understand it, their benefits from belonging to the association are reduced. Even for those who are well-acquainted with the second language, it is usually more time-consuming or tiring to use it and it is also easy to miss the full meaning and nuance of what they read. This, of course, applies equally to spoken communications: lectures, study-sessions, meetings, conferences, informal get-togethers.

## Conclusion

In our Preliminary Report and the subsequent volumes, one point of view is repeated again and again. Canadians must accept that "if Canada is to continue to exist, there must be a true partnership, and that partnership must be worked out as between equals." The idea of partnership requires that there is contact between the groups, that they undertake certain tasks together, and that they interact and mutually influence one another. This interaction between different kinds of people and different kinds of culture is potentially a promising human experience.

The coming together of people belonging to different cultures has had the effect of unleashing energies and resources which have enriched mankind. Under conditions of equality, the interaction of cultural groups is generally fruitful. When two such groups inter-react under appropriate viewpoints on the world around them and they bring more than one cultural tradition to bear on matters of mutual concern. When both groups have to explain their ideas and actions, they are forced to make a critical self-examination and thus they may come to understand them-

selves better. Moreover, because of rivalry between them, each will make greater efforts than they might otherwise do. Segregated, the groups are not as inclined to creative initiatives.

In Canada at the present time, the two main linguistic groups are assessing the means by which they may draw the greatest possible benefit from joint participation in the affairs of the country and at the same time allow equal opportunity for the full and free development of each community. A parallel may be drawn between problems in the functioning of voluntary organizations and political problems in Canada. The attitudes that voluntary associations take towards the problem of finding a satisfactory basis for the creative interaction of the two communities have far-reaching consequences, both because of the example they afford, and because of the influence they exert on their members, the general public, and, in particular, politicians. Ultimately, the arrangements made between two linguistic groups in the private and public sectors are certain to be affected by the country's voluntary organizations.

If in their voluntary associations, economic enterprises, and artistic and intellectual concerns, Canadians become increasingly segregated into respective ghettos, they will find it more difficult to collaborate at the political level. A massive and large-scale split of voluntary associations into separate unilingual organizations, if unaccompanied by determined efforts to maintain close and meaningful contact, is likely to lead to a growing alienation of the two groups. Political collaboration tends to be easier in those areas where there are highly varied and criss-crossing ties of other non-political kinds. Certainly, voluntary associations that facilitate interaction of Canada's two cultures in recreational, education, occupational, and other pursuits contribute to the working-out of political solutions.

Voluntary associations are private organizations. Therefore, in a country that treasures its freedom, voluntary associations must be allowed to carry out their affairs without interference by the state, except when their activities have public implications or when they assume certain duties on behalf of the state, as in the case of licensing members of a profession. For this reason, and because they are so numerous and varied, we have not, in

contrast to our practice in other books of this Report, formulated any recommendations for them. In our opinion, a careful reading of the various points raised and the illustrations provided will make the members of voluntary associations more sensitive to the linguistic and cultural expression of voluntary action, and will help them to identify problems and seek solutions. In this light, generalized recommendations would be presumptuous.

Some people may realize that the aims of their organization, as formally laid down in its constitution, largely reflect the interests of Anglophone members of another generation and that they could not be fully implemented today without alienating the Francophone members. Or they might suddenly perceive that Francophone members seldom participate in the process of arranging their association's programme, and that the programme does not answer their aspirations. Finally, they may become aware of the important role played by the senior permanent staff.

In many associations the relations between Francophone and Anglophone members could be improved. We have discussed various aspects touching on these relations and many of the means that associations have used in dealing with the difficulties they present.

All associations aiming to play their full part in helping Canadians to realize and profit from their country's cultural duality must accept certain basic requirements. In the first place, voluntary associations need to be "culturally aware" and sensitive to the consequences of their activities on relations between the two linguistic groups. Leaders of associations should regularly examine their procedures and activities from a cultural point of view - what one might term a "cultural relations yardstick". In speaking of this subject in Book II we said: "The aim here is to make Canadians so conscious of our cultural duality that they will be accustomed to think of cultural partnership as one of the factors to be weighed when decisions are made."

Second, voluntary associations should make equal status for the two official languages a fundamental principle. The inability to use French in the procedures and activities of most common associations has been a major stumbling-block to equal participa-

tion. In recent years, some organizations have made determined efforts to overcome this obstacle. Satisfactory communication between the two groups implies the following: adequate translation services, bilingual officers and staff, and simultaneous interpretation. The last, because of the problems associated with it, has as yet been rarely used. If centres in which simultaneous translation equipment is installed could be made available to major pan-Canadian associations, and if portable equipment could be rented at a low cost, it would help to facilitate communication at conferences and conventions. Discussions to this end might be held between the major pan-Canadian associations and the Citizenship branch of the department of Secretary of State, which is already engaged in programmes aiding these associations to promote cultural understanding. Provincial governments, too, should be willing to assist in such an undertaking. Governments have recognized the importance of voluntary associations by providing them with aids designed to make them function more effectively. There are other departments of the federal government and all provincial governments which support voluntary associations in a variety of projects. We think it appropriate and in the country's interest that associations should receive increased assistance in this area.

Further, in order to assure equal opportunity in common associations, the vital areas to be scrutinized are participation in decision-making, representation, and communication.

More particularly, for parallel associations, we wish to stress the vital importance of keeping communications lines open. It may happen that, for valid reasons, the Francophone minority may decide to set up a separate organization. While this may perhaps provide more satisfactory service to their respective members, there is, on the other hand, a danger of isolationism for the two parallel associations. Without links between the two groups, there may be a risk of impoverishment: the associations may lose the mutual benefit of their successful initiatives and Canada may not share in their common experiences and aspirations. Today the trend is clearly away from highly integrated and centralized organizational forms to much more loosely linked structures. Modified structures must be devised which combine a

high degree of decentralization with close co-operation between the cultural communities. Both sides should respond jointly to common challenges and consider goals and activities that enrich them individually and collectively.

Finally, each organization must devise its own methods to assure satisfactory relations between the two cultural groups. There is no blanket formula for this. The adjustments we consider necessary will demand resourcefulness, flexibility, and sustained effort if equality is to be achieved. There is no single sure way of obtaining success, and the effectiveness of a given measure may become known only after it has been tried. Members of associations should be prepared to display imagination and creativity and to know when it is necessary to depart from established practices.

The changes suggested will require a radical reorganization of many voluntary associations. This reform is essential to improving relations between the two groups, but it assumes a strong motivation. Effective motivation cannot be stimulated by mere goodwill. The desire for reform must be based on both an intellectually perceived and an emotionally felt sense of its necessity. Voluntary associations have an essential role to play as agents of change and as examples of the will of Canadians to live a life in common.



# APPENDIX

## The Terms of Reference

P.C. 1963-1106

Certified to be a true copy of a Minute of a Meeting of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 19th July, 1963.

The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Right Honourable L. B. Pearson, the Prime Minister, advise that

André Laurendeau, Montreal, P.Q.  
Davidson Dunton, Ottawa, Ont.  
Rev. Clément Cormier, Moncton, N.B.  
Royce Frith, Toronto, Ont.  
Jean-Louis Gagnon, Montreal, P.Q.  
Mrs. Stanley Laing, Calgary, Alta.  
Jean Marchand, <sup>1</sup> Quebec City, P.Q.  
Jaroslav Bodhan Rudnyckyj, Winnipeg, Man.  
Frank Scott, Montreal, P.Q.  
Paul Wyczynski, Ottawa, Ont.

be appointed Commissioners under Part I of the Inquiries Act to inquire into and report upon the existing state of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada and to recommend what steps

<sup>1</sup> Jean Marchand's resignation from the Commission was accepted on September 21, 1965. On November 22 of that year Paul Lacoste, formerly one of the Co-Secretaries of the Commission, was appointed to fill the vacancy created by Mr. Marchand's resignation. On May 1, 1966, Prof. Gilles Lalonde of the University of Montreal was appointed Co-Secretary.

should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races, taking into account the contribution made by the other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada and the measures that should be taken to safeguard that contribution; and in particular

1. to report upon the situation and practice of bilingualism within all branches and agencies of the federal administration – including Crown corporations – and in their communications with the public and to make recommendations designed to ensure the bilingual and basically bicultural character of the federal administration;

2. to report on the role of public and private organizations, including the mass communications media, in promoting bilingualism, better cultural relations and a more widespread appreciation of the basically bicultural character of our country and of the subsequent contribution made by the other cultures; and to recommend what should be done to improve that role; and

3. having regard to the fact that constitutional jurisdiction over education is vested in the provinces, to discuss with the provincial governments the opportunities available to Canadians to learn the English and French languages and to recommend what could be done to enable Canadians to become bilingual.

The Committee further advise:

- (a) that the Commissioners be authorized to exercise all the powers conferred upon them by section 11 of the Inquiries Act and be assisted to the fullest extent by Government departments and agencies;
- (b) that the Commissioners adopt such procedures and methods as they may from time to time deem expedient for the proper conduct of the inquiry and sit at such times and at such places as they may decide from time to time;
- (c) that the Commissioners be authorized to engage the services of such counsel, staff and technical advisers as they may require at rates of remuneration and reimbursement to be approved by the Treasury Board;

- (d) that the Commissioners report to the Governor in Council with all reasonable despatch, and file with the Dominion Archivist the papers and records of the Commission as soon as reasonably may be after the conclusion of the inquiry;
- (e) that André Laurendeau and Davidson Dunton be co-Chairmen of the Commission and André Laurendeau be Chief Executive Officer thereof.

R. G. . ROBERTSON  
Clerk of the Privy Council

## **Bilingualism & Biculturalism**

An abridged version of the Royal Commission Report.

### **Hugh R. Innis**

The Royal Commission Report on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was an urgent measure, designed to explore the most crucial aspect of Canada's divided culture. What emerged was one of the most important documents in recent Canadian history. The Commission members, "eye witnesses on the Canadian condition," gave a cross-country report on the greatest issue in our history—and offered solutions. The report was published over a period of years, in six volumes. Here, Hugh Innis preserves the depth, clarity and insight of the original, drawing on the report's own words. This one volume offers a brief, compact picture of Canada's language problems in education, employment, and ethnic sub-cultures. It prescribes new roles for teaching, working, and living in Canada, and includes a comprehensive concept of Ottawa as national capital. *Bilingualism and Biculturalism* offers a one-volume version of one of the landmarks in our government's history, and in our culture as a whole.

Hugh R. Innis, scholar, historian, and editor, is Associate Registrar and Assistant to the Dean of Arts at Ryerson Polytechnical Institute.

**McClelland and Stewart Limited**

0-7710-4308-2