

# **The Politics of Language**

**Donald J. Savoie**

**Reflections Paper No. 9**

---

Institute of  
Intergovernmental  
Relations

Queen's University  
Kingston, Ontario  
Canada K7L 3N6

## Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Savoie, Donald J., 1947-

The politics of language

(Reflections, ISSN 0838-4460 ; paper no. 9)

Includes summary in French.

ISBN 0-88911-586-9

1. Language policy - Canada. 2. Canada - English-French relations.  
I. Queen's University Kingston, Ont.). Institute of Intergovernmental  
Relations. II. Title. III. Series: Reflections (Queen's University  
(Kingston, Ont.). Institute of Intergovernmental Relations) ; no. 9.

FC145.L3S29 1991 306.4'4971 C91-094682-5

F1027.S29 1991

## Reflections/Réflexions

*Reflections/Réflexions* is a publications series of the Institute of Intergovernmental Relations. Contributions present the personal thoughts and arguments of their authors on a variety of subjects having to do with federalism and intergovernmental relations. The series is intended to place new ideas into the public forum, where they will be open to challenge and rebuttal.

---

*Reflections/Réflexions* est une collection de l'Institut des relations intergouvernementales. Les articles publiés sont l'oeuvre d'auteurs dont les points de vue ou les thèses abordent divers sujets touchant le fédéralisme et les relations intergouvernementales. Cette collection se propose de livrer à l'opinion publique de nouveaux motifs de réflexion pouvant prêter au débat de fond, voire à la polémique.

# CONTENTS

---

<i>Foreword</i> .....	v
<i>Sommaire</i> .....	vii
<i>Abstract</i> .....	ix
THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT .....	3
QUEBEC .....	7
NEW BRUNSWICK .....	9
ONTARIO .....	10
MANITOBA .....	11
NOVA SCOTIA .....	12
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND .....	12
NEWFOUNDLAND .....	13
SASKATCHEWAN .....	13
ALBERTA .....	14
BRITISH COLUMBIA .....	14
LOOKING BACK .....	15
LOOKING AHEAD .....	19
<i>Notes</i> .....	21

## FOREWORD

---

Language issues are at the heart of Canada's federal system. They have been part of continuing constitutional difficulties over the years and were part of the controversy surrounding the Meech Lake Accord. This brief paper surveys the politics of language in Canada. It provides an essential overview to the debate over language issues — in particular minority language rights and policies — by surveying the progress made by each federal and provincial government over the past 20 years. The paper ends with the author's views that language remains a key part of national unity and that to abandon now the long road of federal commitment to bilingualism would be a mistake.

Dr. Savoie's paper is part of a broader project on contemporary Canadian issues in association with the School of Policy Studies at Queen's University. The Institute is pleased to publish this paper in its *Reflections* series. It will provide a useful companion to the forthcoming proceedings of a conference held at Queen's University in December 1989, entitled "Towards Reconciliation: Official Languages Rights and Policies."

The Institute's *Reflections* series present the personal thoughts and arguments of the authors on a wide range of subjects touching in some way on federalism and intergovernmental relations. It is intended that these papers will place ideas into the public forum from a wide variety of perspectives.

Donald Savoie is the Executive Director of the Canadian Institute for Research on Regional Development at the Université de Moncton, where he also holds the Clément-Cormier Chair in Economic Development. He continues to serve federal and provincial governments in Canada in a variety of capacities. He is the author of a number of books and articles on regional development and public administration in Canada, including *The Politics of Public Spending in Canada*, published in 1990 by the University of Toronto Press.

Douglas M. Brown  
Acting Director  
Institute of Intergovernmental Relations  
June 1991

## SOMMAIRE

---

Un consensus fut établi voilà vingt-cinq ans voulant qu'une politique fédérale ferme en matière de langue soit garante de l'unité nationale. Un certain nombre de mesures ont été appliquées depuis la fin des années '60 pour que soit renforcé le statut de la langue française au Canada. Le gouvernement fédéral et le Nouveau-Brunswick disposent chacun d'une loi sur les langues officielles qui assure l'égalité du français et de l'anglais. Plus récemment, l'Ontario a adopté une loi afin qu'un plus grand nombre de services gouvernementaux offerts par cette province puissent être disponibles en français. Par ailleurs, les minorités linguistiques ont le droit de "recevoir leur instruction" dans leur langue en vertu de l'article 23 de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés.

D'aucuns soutiennent toutefois que la politique linguistique au Canada connaît de sérieux ratés à l'heure actuelle. Certains universitaires et journalistes du Canada anglais vont même jusqu'à affirmer que le bilinguisme est bel et bien moribond au pays d'un océan à l'autre. En outre, d'après des sondages d'opinion publique, une forte majorité de Canadiens anglais sont d'avis que les droits des anglophones ne sont pas adéquatement protégés au Québec tandis qu'à l'opposé, autant de Canadiens-français pensent de même au sujet des francophones hors Québec.

Cet article passe en revue l'application des droits linguistiques ainsi que les efforts déployés au chapitre de l'octroi des services bilingues dans les dix provinces et au niveau fédéral. Le but consiste ici à évaluer les réalisations accomplies dans le domaine des droits des minorités. L'article conclut en abordant certaines questions essentielles touchant l'unité nationale. L'auteur considère enfin que le gouvernement fédéral ne devrait pas confier aux provinces l'ensemble des responsabilités qui lui appartiennent pour l'heure en ce qui a trait à la promotion de la langue et de la culture.

## ABSTRACT

---

Twenty-five years ago there was consensus that a strong national policy on language was key to national unity. A number of measures have been put in place since the late 1960s to strengthen the status of the French language. The federal government and New Brunswick have an official language act that ensures equality of both English and French. Ontario has more recently introduced measures to ensure that more of its government services are available in French and section 23 of the Charter of Rights provides for "access to education" for linguistic minorities.

Many observers, however, now argue that Canada's language policy has not worked. Some English Canadian academics and journalists are increasingly pronouncing bilingualism dead from coast to coast. In addition, public opinion surveys now reveal that a strong majority of English Canadians believe English rights in Quebec are not well protected and a strong majority of French Canadians believe that French language rights are not well protected outside Quebec.

This paper looks at the application of language rights and efforts at providing services in both languages in the ten provinces and at the federal government level. The purpose is to assess what has been accomplished on language minority rights. It concludes with some fundamental questions about national unity and argues that the federal government ought not transfer all responsibilities for promoting language and culture to the provinces.

## THE POLITICS OF LANGUAGE

---

Why, then, do you look at the speck in your brother's eye and pay no attention to the log in your own eye?

(Matthew 3:7)

Historian Kenneth McNaught reports that the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was able to "marshal ... facts to reveal the extent of disadvantages experienced by French-speaking Canadians who sought both to advance economically and to retain their language and culture which was seen to be indissolvably linked."<sup>1</sup> The Commission made a series of sweeping recommendations, including the full recognition of French and English as "the official languages of Canada at the federal level with all that such recognition implies about publications, office-holding and staffing of government offices and business management, as well as in the provinces of Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick."<sup>2</sup> McNaught goes on to argue that the recommendations "gained impressively broad acceptance."<sup>3</sup>

A strong policy on language was seen in the 1960s as the key to dealing with the national unity crisis of the time. Then Justice Minister Pierre Trudeau declared that "once francophone-language rights across Canada are constitutionally entrenched, the French-Canadian nation will stretch from coast to coast .... Nobody will be able to say (i.e., in Quebec) — I need more power because I speak for the French-Canadian nation."<sup>4</sup> For Trudeau and for many other Canadians, the most effective way to deal with Quebec nationalism and to ensure Canadian unity was to strengthen the francophone presence outside Quebec. But it would do more than this. French Canadians have long been concerned that their language and culture will have great difficulty surviving the continuing onslaught of the English language. There is a deep sense of insecurity — to paraphrase Jeffrey Simpson — in French Canada whenever it looks south to the United States, looks west or to the world stage where English continues to gain in importance in the global economy. From the late 1960s on, the struggle for survival was no longer restricted to Quebec and French Canadians no longer had to count on Quebec City alone to see their language and cultural aspirations promoted.

This view still has some support in Canada, if recent public opinion surveys can be believed. These report that 51 percent of Canadians believe in "bilingualism for all of Canada" and, at times, 45 percent believe in it "for their

province."<sup>5</sup> Yet, something has gone terribly wrong on the language front. Indeed, language may well be yet another of the "ties that no longer bind us."<sup>6</sup> A slight majority of Canadians may still believe in bilingualism "for all of Canada" but increasing numbers are uneasy about its application — in some instances, so much so that people have openly rebelled against it.

Fearing that Ontario's Bill 8 — the French Language Services Act — would unleash new forces pushing bilingualism at the municipal level, the Sault Ste. Marie city council passed a resolution endorsing English as the city's only official language of business. In a city where there are 3,500 francophones among the 82,000 residents, the move was greeted "with a thunderous ovation in the packed council chamber."<sup>7</sup> Within a few weeks, dozens of small Ontario municipalities adopted similar resolutions. For good measure, the mayor of Sault Ste. Marie recently declared that he may call for a referendum "to prove that it (i.e., the council resolution) reflects the wishes of a majority of voters."<sup>8</sup>

Many observers argue that the move by municipalities in Ontario and the rise of the Reform Party in the west — which opposes bilingualism outside Quebec — can be attributed to an "English-backlash" against Quebec's French-only sign laws.<sup>9</sup> The argument is that language rights and policies have not been applied consistently or, in some instances, fairly. Witness the charge made time and again in many regions of the country that "French is being rammed down people's throats." This may explain why on the one hand public opinion surveys reveal that a slim majority of Canadians support bilingualism even though, on the other hand, we see many hostile positions against it in the west, parts of Ontario and Atlantic Canada.

A public opinion survey in 1989 told us that nearly 70 percent of English Canadians believe English rights in Quebec are "not at all well protected." By contrast, however, 77 percent of French Canadians consider English-language rights in Quebec are either "very well" or "fairly well protected." This difference in perception in itself is disturbing. What is also disturbing is the polarization of opinion on French-language rights outside Quebec. Among anglophone respondents, 81 percent consider French rights to be either very well or fairly well protected and, again, by contrast, 65 percent of francophones think French-language rights are not at all well protected outside Quebec. Canadians, whether anglophones or francophones, have strongly held views on these matters — only 6 to 8 percent of the respondents could not or would not express an opinion.<sup>10</sup>

More recent surveys reveal similar feelings. A survey carried out in the aftermath of the Meech Lake failure reported that "Canada's two solitudes are marked as much by indifference as by hostility (and) a substantial proportion of each of the country's two main language groups believe they are actively disliked by the members of the other group."<sup>11</sup> One reason for the hostility is the perception of how language rights are respected by both sides. The survey



reveals that "in general, francophone respondents said they believe not enough is being done to protect French speakers outside Quebec, while people in other provinces do not think there is sufficient protection within Quebec for the anglophone minority."<sup>12</sup>

The purpose of this paper then is to look at the application of language rights and the efforts at providing services in both official languages in the ten provinces and at the federal government level. It is beyond the scope of this paper to question the appropriateness of Canada's language policy. Others have done so, notably, Kenneth McRoberts, the Western Reform Party and the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada (APEC).<sup>13</sup> This paper examines what has been done with respect to language minority rights across the country and explores briefly how some governments have implemented these rights. The paper does make the case, however, that the federal government ought not transfer all responsibilities for promoting language and culture to the provinces.

## THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Language rights at the federal level date back to the Constitution Act, 1867, which provided for the use of English or French in debates and proceedings of Parliament, in statutes, records and journals of legislature and in criminal and civil proceedings (section 133).

It was not until the 1960s, however, that sustained efforts were made to see French employed in the federal public service. As is well known, the Official Languages Act was passed in 1969. It provided for bilingualism in the public service and federal agencies, authorized bilingual districts and created the Office of Commissioner of Official Languages. Moreover, Parliament adopted in 1973 a resolution reaffirming its support for the Official Languages Act and designating bilingual districts where both official languages are to be the language of work for federal public servants. Bilingual districts, however, were never implemented. Ottawa adopted yet another Official Languages Act in 1988, once again to affirm the federal government's commitment to Canada's both official languages and to encourage the development of official language minorities everywhere in Canada.

Few would deny the federal government's current capacity to serve Canadians in both official languages. When the Official Languages Act was proclaimed in 1969, only about "9 percent of positions required a knowledge of both languages and in reality less than 15 percent of the incumbents of these positions were actually bilingual."<sup>14</sup> Today, 29.4 percent of the positions are bilingual. Important government reports are now always put out in both languages and Canadians generally have little difficulty establishing two-way communications with federal departments and agencies in either language. To

be sure, there have been and continue to be complaints on the level, promptness and quality of service and, occasionally, a breakdown in service is evident. Since these are documented by the commissioner of official languages who reports annually to Parliament, government departments are by and large anxious not to be identified as one of the culprits and so they attempt to serve both language communities well.

But there are problems. Parts of English Canada have voiced strong opposition to the Official Languages Act. For one thing, new political parties, like the Western Reform Party and the Confederation of Regions Party (COR) have pledged to abolish the Act if they are ever elected to power.

The criticism essentially is that the Act denies many English Canadians federal government jobs and that it "rams French down their throats" — a charge that, as noted earlier, has been heard time and again since the late 1960s. An Edmonton-based magazine has bluntly stated "one must speak French to work for the federal government."<sup>15</sup> This concern over jobs is reflected in a recent public opinion survey, which reveals that some 41 percent of English Canadians now think that the federal government should no longer provide services in both languages.<sup>16</sup>

There is, of course, another side to the story. Ottawa insists that one does not have to speak French to work in the federal government. It reports that:

- of the 49,000 federal public servants presently working in the four western provinces, there are but three positions (.006 percent) that require French only;
- knowledge of French and English (i.e., bilingual positions) account for 2.7 percent of the federal public service jobs in western Canada;
- *unilingual* anglophones in western Canada have access to nearly 98 percent of all federal public service jobs available in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia;
- nationally, *unilingual anglophones* are eligible for nearly 80 percent of all positions in the federal public service.<sup>17</sup>

D'Iberville Fortier, the commissioner of official languages, has lately been expressing deep concerns over Ottawa's implementation of the Official Languages Act. He has repeatedly called for the tabling of the new regulations governing the implementation of the 1988 Act and has even threatened to resign unless Ottawa moves more quickly. Indeed, he maintains that the implementation of the Official Languages Act has lost momentum. In his 1990 Annual Report, Mr. Fortier points out that nearly 10,000 incumbents of bilingual positions — or one out of six — are not "linguistically qualified."<sup>18</sup> He also charts the progress of language requirements of positions from 1974 to 1989 (see Table 1 below).

Table 1

<i>Positions</i>	1974	1978	1982	1986	1989
Bilingual	38,164 20.9%	52,300 24.7%	58,360 26.2%	60,042 28.6%	61,741 29.4%
English Essential	110,117 60.2%	128,196 60.5%	133,850 60.2%	1,321,563 58.8%	123,117 58.5%
French Essential	18,533 10.1%	17,260 8.1%	16,599 7.4%	15,636 7.0%	14,021 6.7%
Either/or	15,975 8.7%	14,129 6.7%	13,706 6.2%	12,386 5.5%	11,415 5.4%
TOTAL	182,789	211,885	222,515	223,627	210,294

Source: *Annual Report 1989*, Commission of Official Languages (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1990) p. 53.

Mr. Fortier notes in particular the decline of "French Essential" positions from 1974 to 1989 and wonders if "would there not be more 'French Essential' positions if a service were organized along linguistic lines, if communications from the National Capital Region to Quebec were conducted in French and if more work opportunities were available in that language."<sup>19</sup> He goes on to add that French is underemployed in the National Capital Region, in bilingual regions outside Quebec and "at headquarters of Crown Corporations, even in Montreal."<sup>20</sup>

This is not to suggest that the overall participation of francophones in the federal public service is inadequate. Some 28 percent of federal public servants are francophones. A close look, however, reveals that they make up a large proportion of the administrative support category — that is, secretaries and clerks. They make up 34 percent of this category but only 21.8 percent of the management and 22.5 percent of the scientific and professional categories. Francophones are hardly present at all in senior positions in some key government departments — for example, the deputy minister of Finance and all his assistant deputy ministers are anglophones (see Table 2 below).

**Table 2**  
**Major Sectoral Imbalances in the Public Service**

<i>Employment Category</i>	<i>Anglophones</i>		<i>Francophone</i>		<i>Change in Francophone Participation 1981-89</i>
	<i>Anglophones</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Francophone</i>	<i>%</i>	
Management	3,159	78.2	880	21.8	1.3%
Scientific and Professional	17,407	77.5	5,048	22.5	2.6%
Administrative Support	41,648	66.0	21,476	34.0	2.2%

Source: *Annual Report 1989*, Commission of Official Languages (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1990), p. 53.

The politics of language, however, extends well beyond the direct activities of the federal government. Some of the most impassioned struggles for minority language rights have taken place at the provincial government level. Even the casual observer of Canadian history is probably well aware of the many confrontations over minority language education rights over the years involving francophones outside Quebec and, more recently, anglophones in Quebec.

It is important to note two forces at play when looking at the promotion of minority language rights in the provinces. First, the Official Languages Act passed in 1988 speaks about a federal government commitment that goes beyond simply "preserving." It makes clear Ottawa's commitment to enhance the vitality of the English and French linguistic minority communities, to encourage the full recognition and use of both English and French in society and to assist provincial governments to support the development of English and French minorities and, in particular, to provide opportunities for both communities to be educated in their own language. Second, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which came into force in 1982, provides for minority language education rights where numbers warrant. Section 23 of the Charter provides for "access to education" for linguistic minorities, provided students can meet a number of criteria and the number of children "is sufficient to warrant the provision (of education) to them out of public funds." The section also gives the minority "a right to management and control" of "instructional facilities" and adequate public funding.<sup>21</sup>

All of this is important, particularly for francophones outside Quebec. It will be recalled that at the time the British North America Act was drafted, the emphasis was on protecting educational rights on a denominational basis rather than on language. Francophones outside Quebec later sought educational language rights through the courts, but before article 23 of the Charter came into force they were unsuccessful. In addition, Ontario, through regulations, practically prohibited French-language instruction for many years and New Brunswick, by revoking Regulation 32 in the early 1930s, rendered French-language instruction virtually impossible in most parts of the province.<sup>22</sup> It was because of this background of neglect that the Charter was widely welcomed by francophones outside Quebec. For them, the Charter provided a veritable Canadian "education code" and would put an end to "years of negligence" and, in some instances, "hostility" to French-language education. It is against this backdrop that we look at minority language rights in the ten provinces.

## QUEBEC

Section 133 of the Constitution Act, 1867, which provides for the use of English and French in the Canadian Parliament, in federal statutes, records and journals of the legislature, and in criminal and civil proceedings, also applies in Quebec. It is the *only* province in which it does. As a result, all legislation in Quebec, both laws and regulations, are adopted simultaneously in French and in English. Both versions are official. It is thus possible for a unilingual English-speaking Canadian to be elected to the National Assembly, and to participate fully in the debates and the work of the Assembly. It is the case at the moment with at least one member of the Equality Party.

Though section 133 ensures a degree of bilingualism in Quebec, the provincial government has put in place a number of measures that have played havoc with minority language rights. It will be recalled that the Quebec National Assembly adopted Bill 22 in 1974, making French the official language of the province. It also imposed some language tests for those wishing education in a language other than French. The National Assembly adopted Bill 101 in 1977, once again making French the only official language in Quebec and adding further restrictions to the use of English. In 1983, however, Quebec amended its language charter and "recognized the contribution of English-language institutions." It abolished some language tests and relaxed conditions for education in English for children from other provinces. Then, in 1988, Quebec adopted Bill 178, requiring "public signs and posters and commercial advertising, outside ... (to) be solely in French ... notwithstanding the provision ... of the Constitution Act, 1982." The bill also gave "market predominance" to French for interior signs.<sup>23</sup>

The reaction against Bill 178 on the part of English Quebec and English Canada was swift. Three of the four English-speaking ministers in the Bourassa government resigned over the issue. The bill was also widely condemned in Ottawa and in the other nine provinces. Indeed, many observers argue that the collapse of the Meech Lake agreement was due in large part to the Quebec "sign laws." Quebec's English-speaking minority has a further grievance against its provincial government, in that only 1 percent of provincial public servants are anglophones, although they constitute over 10 percent of Quebec's population.

The Quebec government argues that the "sign law" has overshadowed the many efforts it has made to secure more benefits for its English-speaking minority. Both plaintiffs and defendants may use either French or English in all civil cases. Judges may hand down decisions in either language. The same holds true for criminal cases. Moreover, the Quebec Charter of Rights and Freedoms (chapter C-12) guarantees certain judicial rights. Section 28 of the Charter states that "every person arrested or detained has a right to be promptly informed, in a language he understands, of the grounds of his arrest or detention."<sup>24</sup> In addition, section 36 of the Quebec Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees that "every accused person has a right to be assisted free of charge by an interpreter if he does not understand the language used at the hearing."<sup>25</sup> This right applies in all criminal cases where a crown attorney brings a charge.

Quebec can also argue that it offers anglophones a complete state-funded education from kindergarten to all levels and disciplines at the university level. Children whose parents are Canadian citizens and who themselves studied in English at the primary level in Canada are admissible to either French or English schools. There are currently 306 English elementary and secondary schools out of a total of 2,550 schools and some 10.4 percent of Quebec's student population attend English schools. This proportion reflects very well the linguistic distribution of the population of Quebec.

Of the seven universities in Quebec, three — Bishop's, Concordia and McGill — are English-language institutions. In 1986, some 43,230 degrees were granted by Quebec universities and 23.3 percent of these were granted by the three English universities. At the Master's level, 31.2 percent of the graduates came from the English universities, while 38.6 percent of the PhDs did so. In the field of pure sciences, 36.2 percent of all degrees and 37.9 percent of all PhDs were granted by the English universities. In applied sciences, the overall figure is 30.3 percent of all degrees and 48.2 percent of all PhDs. In human sciences, 24.7 percent of all degrees were earned at the English universities and 35.5 percent of all PhDs. In administration, the three English institutions granted 21.6 percent of all degrees.<sup>26</sup>

The Quebec government also passed Bill 142 in 1986, providing every English-speaking person in the province a right to receive health care and social services in the English language. In addition, Quebec signed in May 1989 a

\$1.1 million agreement with the federal government to strengthen health and social services to its English-speaking minority.<sup>27</sup> All in all, there are 79 establishments in Quebec, including hospitals, nursing homes and social service centres, that are required by law to make their services available in English.

## NEW BRUNSWICK

No other province has made more progress in language rights during the past 25 years than has New Brunswick. To be sure, the province had considerable catching up to do. In fact, until the mid-1960s, the push for minority language rights in government services and the courts was being heard but hardly listened to. The focus for Acadians was on securing education rights. And even here the progress was slow. For example, in the 1940s former Premier Louis Robichaud had to leave his home in Kent county to attend a private school run by the Roman Catholic clergy to complete high school in his mother tongue. Though Kent county is predominantly French-speaking (about 80 percent Acadian), local high schools taught only in English.<sup>28</sup> I, myself, could not attend a French-language high school in Moncton in the mid-1960s because there were none, and I, too, had to attend a privately run school to have access to a French language education. At the time, Acadians made up one-third of the city's population, which was about 70,000. There is now plenty of evidence to suggest that until the 1960s, the strategy of the Government of New Brunswick was to assimilate Acadians as quickly as possible to the English-speaking community. The fact that it failed is due in large part to the Roman Catholic clergy and to the relatively insular existence of the Acadian population.

Things, however, began to change quickly with the arrival of Louis Robichaud to power in 1960. He completely overhauled the province's education system, established the Université de Moncton and passed New Brunswick's Official Languages Act. Acadians now have full educational services from grade one to the graduate level in several disciplines at the Université de Moncton. The progress was such that when the Charter of Rights and Freedom was enacted in 1982, it had virtually no impact on the New Brunswick education system.

As is well known, New Brunswick is the only officially bilingual province in the country. The proceedings of the legislature are presented in both official languages. One can plead a case in the courts in either French or English and the public can communicate with any institution or agency of the provincial government in either language. All official provincial documents are published in both English and French and all have equal standing before the courts.

Though there is still a constant stream of complaints from francophones about the level, quality and the speed of government services in French, they are now legally available in both languages. Moreover, francophones have been

able to secure a good number of positions in the New Brunswick public service. Their participation — 32.7 percent — is now roughly equal to their percentage of the population — 33.5 percent. Still, francophones are seriously under-represented in several employment categories — notably at the management level and they are hardly represented in the key departments of Finance, Commerce and Technology, and Management Board. In addition, precious few francophones are able to work in their mother tongue in the provincial capital. The language of work remains English.

There has been of late increasing concern in New Brunswick over the rise of COR, which is opposed to official bilingualism. Premier McKenna recently acknowledged these concerns in a major address on English-French relations when he observed, "There have been factors within New Brunswick which have created concerns and apprehensions in our Province."<sup>29</sup> He went on, however, to pledge his full support for the province's Official Languages Act.

## ONTARIO

The Ontario government passed the French Language Services Act (Bill 8) on 19 November 1989.<sup>30</sup> It sought to define the linguistic rights of 500,000 Franco-Ontarians and the legal status of the French language in Ontario. The Act stopped short of making Ontario bilingual. It did, however, give French an official status in the courts and in education. It also gave the right to individuals to use French in the debates of the Legislative Assembly and the right to receive services in French from the head offices of government departments and agencies in local offices in some 22 designated areas. To implement the new policy, the government designated 5,000 of the 87,000 provincial public service positions to deliver French-language services.

The Ontario government has also made important strides in improving French-language educational opportunities and facilities in the province since 1917, when French-language education was prohibited. Initially, at least, the provincial government sought to respond to the provisions contained in section 23 of the Charter recognizing the right to French-language education. It has since gone beyond section 23 by ignoring the "where numbers warrant" condition. In addition, there are now two French-language school boards — one in Toronto and the other in Ottawa-Carleton — thus, ensuring that management and control belong to francophones.

Ontario has also sought to strengthen its capacity to provide health and social services to its francophone minority. Much like Quebec, Ontario has designated a number of institutions, 48 in all, to offer services in both languages. The Ontario government has also announced new measures to encourage young francophones to make a career in health care and social services, so as to improve services to the francophone community.



Ontario's efforts in promoting French-language services, however, do not extend to the municipal level. In contrast, Quebec, through Bill 101 (section 113), allows for municipal governments to offer services in both English and French. Some 100 Quebec municipalities have announced their intention to do so. In Ontario, 31 municipalities have declared themselves bilingual, while another 41 have said that they are "unilingual" English.

## MANITOBA

Article 23 of the Manitoba Act, 1870, provided essentially for the same language requirements that article 133 of the Canada Constitution Act, 1867 did for the Canadian Parliament and Quebec. Manitoba, however, cast aside this obligation as early as 1890. In 1984, it will be recalled, a court challenge forced Manitoba to respect its constitutional obligation to the French language.

It was only in 1989 and 1990, however, that the Manitoba government made some commitments to provide services in both French and English.<sup>31</sup> However, no law has been passed in support of these services. Simply stated, it is government policy "where numbers warrant" and "whenever possible." This policy applies to correspondence between government departments and individuals, to some government forms and public notices and some public documents.

There was also very little attempt made to provide French-language education for Manitoba francophones until the 1960s. In 1967, an amendment was made to the Schools Act authorizing French-language instruction during "at least half of the school day." As elsewhere, section 23 of the Charter holds important implications for minority education rights in Manitoba. As in most of the provinces, however, the burden of proof to secure French-language education for the francophone children now lies with the parents, since provincial governments — particularly those in western Canada — have largely ignored section 23 of the Charter. It is only court challenges that have led to change. Francophone parents must go to court, provide proof that their rights have not been respected — and then see their provincial governments challenge them in court. In addition, the Manitoba Court of Appeal ruled on 6 February 1990 that francophones do not have any right of "management." That is, instruction can be given in French, but how the schools are managed, which children may attend, and decisions as to whether francophones should attend the same schools as anglophones are left to the school boards, and not to separate "francophone" boards. The Supreme Court of Canada, however, recently ruled on this issue in the Mahé case and declared that francophones have a right to "management." Still, although the road has been long, there is no denying that progress is being made in Manitoba. There are now 18

first-language French or French-immersion schools in Manitoba, attended by about 4,000 students.

## NOVA SCOTIA

There are no legal provisions in Nova Scotia to ensure that both English and French can be employed in the debates and proceedings of the legislature, or in the courts for civil proceedings.<sup>32</sup> In addition, the Nova Scotia government has no law in place offering services to its Acadian minority in French. The government has, however, signed an agreement with Ottawa to secure federal funding to improve French language services. In communities with large francophone populations, some medical care and social services are available in French. Similarly, though there are no provisions to accommodate court cases in French, there are only two francophone judges capable of hearing criminal cases in French.

Although Nova Scotia's Acadians experienced strong opposition — if not outright hostility — in their efforts to develop French language schools for much of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and, indeed, well into our own, the struggle has not been without results. The 1981 Nova Scotia Education Act now provides for "Acadian schools." These are designed to "contribute to the maintenance and a better knowledge of the French language and the Acadian culture in the province [and also] to help Acadians take full advantage of their language rights."<sup>33</sup> Still, the Act provides for the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the advice of the Minister of Education and the school boards the authority to designate "Acadian" schools. It thus gives the government an important discretionary power in the provision of French-language education.

## PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Prince Edward Island also has no provision in place to ensure that residents may receive provincial government services in English or French, or that both languages can be employed in the debates and proceedings of the legislature, in statutes and other legal records and in the courts. The government, however, has recently established an office responsible for implementing better French-language services.

The struggle for education rights on the part of Island Acadians has been long and, at times, painful. In 1861, Acadians were told that, to qualify for funding, 18 students were necessary. The English majority only required ten students. Acadians also saw the use of French books banned because they were "considered too religious." It was not until 1980 that the educational rights of francophones on Prince Edward Island were formally recognized. The Island government amended the School Act to ensure that it now meets the

requirements of section 23 of the Charter. There are now two francophone schools on the Island and they provide all their courses in French, except second-language English courses.<sup>34</sup>

## NEWFOUNDLAND

The French language has no official status in Newfoundland in the legislature, in government services or in the courts. There is also no government policy on minority language rights. Two government positions only are designated bilingual. This is not to suggest, however, that the incumbents can actually function in both English and French.

The Newfoundland School Act was amended in 1982 to include a general statement in support of the right of francophones to receive instruction in their own language. For all practical purposes, however, nothing has changed. The *Comité de parents de Terre-Neuve* took the matter to the courts in June 1988. The *Comité* argued, among other things, that there are some 2,360 children below the age of 19 in the province who have at least one parent whose mother tongue is French. The government of Newfoundland and the St. John's School Board argued that "the number of children did not warrant them receiving instruction in French."<sup>35</sup> The matter is still before the courts.

## SASKATCHEWAN

The Saskatchewan Act (1905, article 16) called on the province to respect the provisions contained in the Northwest Territories Act. This would, among other things, ensure that both English and French would enjoy official status in the legislature, before the courts and in official government documents. The Supreme Court declared in 1988 that both English and French (i.e., the *Mercure* case) enjoyed official status in Saskatchewan as well as in Alberta, because the same provisions were established for that province in 1905. The court ruled, however, that both provincial governments could modify these provisions unilaterally.

The government of Saskatchewan moved quickly. It passed a bill declaring English as the province's only official language. The bill, however, did provide for the use of French in the legislature, before a limited number of selected courts and the translation into French of certain laws. There is no provision for French-language services in health care and social services or in municipal services.

Saskatchewan, at first, allowed for French-language instruction in grade one (in 1920), then, not at all (1925) and, later, for one hour a day (1953-57). It has, however, guaranteed access to French-language instruction since 1978. Faced with a court challenge in light of section 23 of the Charter, the Saskatchewan

government asked for an independent assessment of the situation. Former Public Service Commission Chairman Edgar Gallant submitted his report in August 1989. It contained recommendations designed to meet the requirements of minority language rights in education under the Charter. The report makes a number of recommendations, including the right of management in education for francophones.<sup>36</sup> The government reports that it accepts the recommendations "in principle." Since the collapse of the Meech Lake Accord, the government appears less certain about implementing the report.

## ALBERTA

As is the case with Saskatchewan, the Alberta Act (1905) sought to give French legal status before the legislature, the courts and in official government documents. Alberta also enacted a law in 1988 dealing with the fallout of the Supreme Court decision (i.e., the *Mercure* case) giving French official status and made English the province's only official language. Alberta, however, went further than Saskatchewan. The Alberta legislation gave legal status to all laws adopted in English — past and future — and declared that there is no need for government publications to be in both English and French. The legislation does allow the use of French in the legislature and in "oral" communications before certain courts. There is no policy on providing government services, including health care and social services, in the French language.

In the education field, French was "tolerated" to some extent until 1952. That year, school teaching became unilingually English. Things improved somewhat in the 1960s and 1970s, when it became possible to establish French-language education programs. A new law was passed in late 1988 which declared that individuals now have constitutional rights to education in French in line with section 23 of the Charter. Franco-Albertans, however, have found the legislation lacking.<sup>37</sup> For one thing, the right to education is conditional on a "sufficient numbers" clause. The cost of establishing new schools is also identified as a factor before a decision can be taken. In addition, the francophone community went to court for a ruling regarding the right to manage and control a French-language school system (i.e., the *Mahé* case). Some parents in St. Paul also went to the Court of Appeal in September 1988 to secure a French-language program for their area.

## BRITISH COLUMBIA

The British Columbia case is straightforward. French enjoys no legal status in the legislature, in the courts, in government services, in government publications, or in municipal services.

The British Columbia position on education was also straightforward for a long time — schooling was in English only. It was only in 1979 that the province agreed to establish a French-language primary school program. The program was expanded in 1982 to the secondary level. At the moment, a specific government policy — found in Policy Circular 39 (1987) — guides francophone education in the province. The circular states that the province wishes to preserve the francophone culture by respecting provisions found in the Charter.<sup>38</sup> It states, however, that education rights for francophones can be secured at the elementary level only when the equivalent of ten students can be grouped and when parents request it. At the secondary level, the number is set at 15 students. The policy prescribes that the education of the linguistic minority must be given in separate facilities.

The francophone community in British Columbia has complained time and again about the lack of a proper legal status for minority language rights in education and about the insufficient number of courses actually given in French in the French-language education program. The *Fédération des Franco-Colombiens* recently launched legal action against the government to show that the provincial School Act is incomplete, particularly in its dealing with section 23 of the Charter, and that there are enough children to justify more instruction in French. There are also serious concerns over the “homogeneity of instruction.” The provincial Ministry of Education reports that the percentage of instruction in French is as follow:

<i>Grade</i>	<i>% of instruction in French</i>
Kindergarten-2	100 %
3-7	80 - 90 %
8-10	30 - 50 %
11-12	12 - 25 %

Francophones argue that grade 8 to grade 12 can hardly be described as “homogeneous instruction.” Indeed, they argue that French-immersion programs offer a higher percentage of instruction in French.<sup>39</sup>

## LOOKING BACK

A few years before Canada adopted its first Official Languages Act and in the midst of a difficult soul-searching period for Canadians on English-French relations, Senator Eugene Forsey urged English-speaking Canadians to “try to

understand the position of French Canada as a tiny island of people who speak French in a vast North American sea of people who speak English, and an island upon which the sea beats incessantly and thunderously. We should try to imagine what it would be like if *we* were the island and *they* were the sea. Might we not be asking for wider rights and guarantees?"<sup>40</sup> Looking back, 25 years later, we can see that important progress has been made in some areas. One only has to compare New Brunswick in 1960 with New Brunswick in 1990 to see substantial progress. Has it been enough? No. Have English Canadians responded to Forsey's call for a greater understanding of the position of French Canada? Not totally.

How can we assess the response of English Canada? There are a number of ways. As noted earlier, a slim majority of Canadians do favour bilingualism. A closer look, however, reveals that it is in Quebec where one finds the strongest support for having two official languages in Canada. A slight majority of western Canadians (56 percent) feel that "Canada would be better off with just one official language."<sup>41</sup> The leader of the Reform Party has stated that, in his vision of a new Canada, his party would delegate to Quebec "the legal and financial responsibility for preserving the French fact in Quebec."<sup>42</sup> He sees no need to deal with the issue of the French fact outside Quebec. Presumably, the sea would be allowed to beat incessantly until francophones outside Quebec would be assimilated and the "French problem" done away with. Slight majorities in both Ontario (53 percent) and Atlantic Canada (57 percent) feel that having two official languages makes Canada a better place.

This paper's brief survey of minority language rights and government services for linguistic minorities in the federal government and the ten provinces reveals that only the federal government, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario have made sustained efforts — although even here anglophones are still not participating fully in senior positions in key government departments in Quebec and francophones elsewhere. The language of work for public servants remains largely English and the commissioner of official languages reports a possible "early sign of bilingualism burn-out."<sup>43</sup> He asks "Have recent linguistic events driven many of our normally tolerant citizens to rethink their support, or worse, to abandon a long-cherished national dream?"<sup>44</sup>

Our survey reveals that the Charter of Rights, more than any other factor, has helped give new education opportunities for francophones outside Quebec in their own language. Even then, however, francophones have had to turn to the courts to secure these rights, particularly in the management of their schools.

Much has been said in English Canada about Quebec's language laws, particularly about Bill 178 — the sign law. Yet this survey reveals that the anglophone minority in Quebec has had and continues to enjoy minority language rights and access to government services that francophones in the other provinces, with the exception of New Brunswick, do not have. But that

only tells part of the story. English Canadians in Quebec have a long and rich history and have been able to build solid institutions, especially in education and in the media. It is only since the 1960s that francophones outside Quebec have been able to secure the most basic of language and education rights.

The reaction of English Canada to Quebec language laws has baffled many French Canadians. Kenneth McRoberts writes about the "hoary notion of collective rights that so offends English Canadian political culture."<sup>45</sup> How can English Canadians find collective rights so offensive when Canadian history is rife with examples in nine provinces of laws prohibiting the use of French in the classroom and elsewhere? The French Canadians look to history and see the banning of French textbooks in public schools and of French-language instruction in those provinces with large French-speaking minorities — Ontario and New Brunswick — for a number of years. They look today at Alberta and Saskatchewan where provincial governments have recently made English their only official language. They also look to many municipalities in Ontario that have done the same thing. They know that the political, economic and demographic circumstances in North America strongly favour the English language and culture. They likely find a contradiction in the attitude of many English Canadians towards minority rights. They likely consider it unfair for English Canada to say now that with the Charter everyone should be playing on a level playing field. The field had never been level for francophones outside Quebec for some 120 years and is still not level today in several provinces.

True, English Canadians can point to the "where numbers warrant" clause to argue that it is not always feasible to protect minority language rights. After all, they maintain, there are about 800,000 English Canadians in Quebec and, for example, only 60,000 French-speaking Albertans. A typical French-Canadian response is to dismiss this argument out of hand. For them, a right exists or it does not. If English Canadians find "collective rights" hoary, they should honour the imperative of individual rights without regard to numbers. They will also say that the reason there are now so few francophones outside Quebec is the result of years of neglect, if not hostility, to the French fact. One does not, after all, assist in a minority group fight to hold back the incessant sea by pointing to numbers. We also ought not forget that there are still today about one million francophones living outside Quebec.

Indeed, a French Canadian will likely argue that if any group has justification for restricting individual rights, it is Quebec, and not the other provinces. After all, it is the French language that is threatened in North America, not English. Pressures to assimilate are strong and they have been well documented, even by some English Canadians.<sup>46</sup> The pressures were fueled for a long time by deliberate government policy and more recently by the modern economy and urbanization. Kenneth McRoberts argues that the pressures are indeed strong and though the children of "francophones can get a complete education in

French, the language of work, at least in the private sector (i.e., outside Quebec), is English."<sup>47</sup> He adds that assimilationist rates are particularly high in urban areas and notes that in Saskatchewan the 1981 census showed that "people of French origin who speak French at home make up 29 percent of the population in the farming areas and 26 percent in other rural regions, but only 12 percent in Saskatoon and 9 percent in Regina."<sup>48</sup> The conclusion is that as the process of urbanization continues, French Canadians will be increasingly assimilated.

To English Canadians this may well mean that, since the assimilation of French Canadians outside Quebec is "inevitable," governments should give up and scrap any attempts or policies they may have to promote the French language and culture outside Quebec. French Canadians are likely to have a diametrically-opposed reaction and conclude that the dangers of assimilation are so great that every effort should be made to secure the French language and culture in Quebec and promote them outside Quebec.

It is hardly possible to overstate the insecurity French Canadians face with respect to their language and culture. While some English Canadians are concerned by the pervasive American influence on our television and movie screens, for example, they do not lose much sleep over the prospect of complete assimilation. French Canadians do constantly. They have seen their population steadily decline, particularly in the four western provinces, as a percentage of the total population. They are constantly reminded that the future for the French fact in North America will be extremely difficult. Radio Canada, for example, ran a program in 1989 called *Disparaître* which was designed to warn Quebecers that because of a declining birth rate, the immigration of non-francophones and the assimilation to anglophone communities, traditional French-speaking families could disappear.

Though French Canadians have not totally succeeded in resisting assimilation in several provinces, they have been fairly successful in Quebec. Their position has strengthened vis-à-vis new residents, for example. People whose mother tongue is neither English nor French are increasingly enrolling in French-language instruction. They now account for 34 percent of enrollment at French-language junior colleges, up from 14 percent in 1980.<sup>49</sup> By some accounts, Bill 101, which imposed restrictions on English-language education for children without at least one parent who studied in English in Canada has worked and is helping in the French fact in North America. For French Canadians, initiatives like Bills 101 and 178 are thus considered necessary to their survival. Michel Tremblay, the well-known Quebec playwright, explains: "We had to invent new laws to protect French, and we did it. We didn't do it because we are stupid, mad or Nazi, but because the danger of losing French always exists."<sup>50</sup>

Certainly one can appreciate why Quebecers would want to "invent new laws" to protect French. Many English Canadian academics and journalists are



increasingly pronouncing bilingualism and biculturalism dead from coast to coast.<sup>51</sup> The commissioner of official languages speaks about bilingualism burn out. Yet, it is evident that bilingualism in the federal public service has not been as demanding on English-speaking public servants as was believed. In addition, when Quebecers look at minority language rights at the provincial level, they very often see *Deux Poids — Deux Mesures*, or one standard for Quebec and another for the other nine provinces. One hears that the angry reaction to the Quebec sign laws on the part of English Canadians resulted in large part from their deeply felt commitment to individual rights or because "English Canadians take individual rights to heart."<sup>52</sup> French Canadians have great difficulty seeing evidence of this commitment when it comes to their own situation and their own history. Indeed, it appears that English Canadians are quick to cry foul when they see minority rights in Quebec under siege, but not when the rights of francophones outside Quebec are at stake. In short, francophones see more rhetoric than substance in English Canada's selective invocation of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

#### LOOKING AHEAD

Many English-speaking Canadians are likely to tell Quebecers that there is no such thing as an English Canada or an English Canadian position when asked "what does English Canada want?" English Canada, the argument goes, is much too fragmented to be able to define a position on many issues. I have also made this point of late.<sup>53</sup> The economic interests of Canada's regions, for example, are far too diverse to expect that nine provinces and the federal government could agree on many things, let alone on an "English Canada" position.

It seems to me, however, that the question "what does English Canada want?" is legitimate when it comes to language. There are not many choices. English Canada can say that it has no interest in preserving the French fact and that promoting the French language should be left to Quebec. Conversely, it can say that the French fact gives Canada its character and its distinctiveness. This option would mean taking to heart Eugene Forsey's plea about understanding "the position of French Canada as a tiny island" trying to survive the tremendous assimilation pressures. In brief, English Canada would become partners in protecting French Canada against the "incessant and thunderous" sea.

The first option obviously entails far reaching implications. Gordon Robertson pointed to them when he recently observed that unless French-speaking Canadians "can believe in future that their wish to remain French ... is respected and welcomed. If [we] do not succeed — and if French-speaking Canadians cannot feel wanted here — the Canada we know and love cannot survive."<sup>54</sup> The point is that English Canada cannot have it both ways — it cannot have a united Canada while leaving the promotion of the French fact to Quebec alone.

Those who would deny special status to Quebec as they did in the Meech Lake debate and who also argue that bilingualism has failed and has only served to shove French down the throats of English Canadians are surely putting Quebec between a rock and a hard place. They may wish to gamble that in the end Quebec will never want to pay the economic price of sovereignty. Even if the gamble paid off, Canada would still lose. We would see Quebec turning more and more inward, and looking to the rest of Canada only for short term and very specific economic advantages. We would also see more and more "laws" to protect the French fact. In time, the country would become far more fragmented and bitter than it is at the moment and perhaps we would see the regions fly off in different directions.

The second option is also not without implications. It means English Canada committing itself to promoting French. It means that English Canada would have to look at demographic trends not as a reason for abandoning the French language and culture but as a reason for intensifying its efforts to promote them. It also means provincial governments would have to take the lead in securing French-language education facilities for its francophone population rather than sitting back and waiting for parents to go to court to have section 23 of the Charter interpreted. This is not to suggest for a moment that the federal government should transfer responsibilities for promoting language and culture to the provinces. Some students of Canadian federalism, notably Richard Simeon and Robert Young have put that option forward recently in the *Globe and Mail* and elsewhere as a way out of our national unity crisis. This option would constitute a backward step, certainly from the perspective of a francophone living outside Quebec. Those who promote this view are not clear on why they do so other than as a means to appease Quebec nationalists and those in English Canada who have been rankled by Ottawa's policy on bilingualism. If the objective remains to give the French language and culture every chance of surviving in North America then it makes little sense. Indeed, it is difficult to understand how Quebec nationalists can view the work of federal policies and such federal institutions as Radio Canada as having in any way hindered the development of the French language. The opposite is, of course, true. For Ottawa to let go of its power to promote language and culture would be seen as the federal government simply washing its hands of what may be to some a thorny issue, but which is to others a fundamental tenet of the Canadian identity. It only takes a moment's reflection to recognize that such a move would be tantamount to gutting efforts at promoting French outside Quebec. Ontario could well continue for a time to push ahead with its recent attempt to provide more French language services largely because it has the financial clout to do so. Things would be different in other provinces. Even in my home province of New Brunswick, which is often held up as a model of working bilingualism, one is hard pressed to find more than a handful of initiatives promoting the

province's official languages policy over the past 20 years that saw the light of day without direct federal encouragement and financial support. In many instances, it was the federal government that first came up with the idea. Premier Hatfield was particularly *adroit* at selling measures to promote French to New Brunswickers by arguing that the measures would be largely financed by federal funds and that if New Brunswick did not take up federal funding available then it would go elsewhere.

In short, the position of French Canada on language is clear — it will not give up and it will continue to struggle against strong odds that the French fact can survive in North America. A French-speaking Quebec and an English only rest-of-Canada may work for a few years, but it is unlikely that the country could survive over the long term. English Canada now needs to make its position clear. What *does* English Canada want?

#### NOTES

1. Kenneth McNaught, *Canada* (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1976), p. 308.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 308-9.
4. Quoted in "French From Coast to Coast," *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 21 March 1990, p. A7.
5. Geoffrey Stevens, "Bilingualism: Demographic Trends Threaten a Rough Ride," in *The Toronto Star*, 20 May 1990, p. B3.
6. The phrase was coined by Richard French. See "Ties that no longer bind," *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 4 August 1990, p. D1.
7. "Defiant Soo Ponders Language Referendum," *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 12 November 1990, p. A4.
8. *Ibid.*
9. See, among many others, "In Search of a Nation's Heart," *Maclean's* (Toronto), 11 June 1990, pp. 13-34.
10. "PM Dismisses Support for Independent Quebec," *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 21 July 1989, p. A4.
11. The "Globe and Mail-CBC News Poll," *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 9 July 1990, p. A5.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Kenneth McRoberts, "Making Canada Bilingual: Illusions and Delusions of French Language Policy," in David P. Shugarman and Reg Whitaker (eds.), *Federalism and Political Community* (Peterborough: Broadview Press, 1989), p. 141-72.

14. Commissioner of Official Languages, *Annual Report 1989* (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1990), p. 52.
15. See *Alberta Report* (Edmonton), February 1988, (a special issue on bilingualism).
16. The "Globe and Mail-CBC News Poll," p. A5.
17. Government of Canada, *A Response to the Editor, Alberta Report*, 9 February 1988, prepared by the Treasury Board Secretariat and signed by all federal Cabinet ministers from western Canada.
18. Commissioner of Official Languages, *Annual Report*, p. 54.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
21. See *The 90s Decade: Consolidation Period* (Ottawa: La Fédération des Francophones Hors-Québec), 1990.
22. Hugh Thorburn, *Politics in New Brunswick* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), chapter 2.
23. Commissioner of Official Languages, *Annual Report*, p. 198.
24. Quebec, "Facts and Figures on the English-Speaking Community in Quebec," ministère des Affaires internationales, Direction des Communications, December 1988, p. 8.
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
27. Canada, Secretary of State, *Canada-Quebec Agreement on Access to Health and Social Services* (Ottawa), 24 May 1989.
28. See, for example, Richard Wilbur, *The Rise of French New Brunswick* (Halifax: Formac Publishing Co. Ltd., 1989), p. 189.
29. "Our Two Linguistic Communities: Full Partners in Progress: A Statement by Premier Frank McKenna," Premier of New Brunswick, Government of New Brunswick, 10 August 1989, p. 3.
30. See, among others, "Ontario Language Law a Symbol of Success for Minority," *The Gazette* (Montreal), 5 July 1989, p. 1.
31. See, among others, Jean-Pierre Proulx, "Deux minorités, deux mesures," *Le Devoir* (Montreal), 5 to 8 March 1990.
32. See "État des minorités linguistiques au Canada," rapport préparé par le Service de la Recherche de la Fédération des Francophones Hors-Québec (Ottawa), 14 May 1990, pp. 7-9.
33. Quoted in *The 90s Decade*, p. 43.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

36. See "État des minorités linguistiques au Canada," rapport préparé par le Service de la Recherche de la Fédération des Francophones Hors-Québec (Ottawa), 14 May 1990, p. 22.
37. See *The 90s Decade*, p. 80.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 93.
40. Eugene Forsey, *A Life on the Fringe: The Memoires of Eugene Forsey* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 187.
41. "Opinions Unlike the Others," *Maclean's* (Toronto), 1 January 1990, p. 20.
42. "One Blueprint For a New Canada — An Essay," *The Ottawa Citizen* (Ottawa), 24 November 1990, p. B7.
43. Commissioner of Official Languages, *Annual Report*, p. 3.
44. *Ibid.*
45. See "Saving the Nation," *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 29 March 1990, p. A7.
46. See "Declining Pressence," *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 26 March 1990, p. A7.
47. *Ibid.*
48. *Ibid.*
49. See "Bill 101 Working," says *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 26 June 2990, p. A3.
50. Quoted in "I write for me and Montreal," *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 17 November 1990, p. C3.
51. See, for example, Philip Resnick, "A New Canada-Quebec Union?" *Globe and Mail* (Toronto) 22 June 1990, p. A21.
52. *Ibid.*
53. See Donald J. Savoie, "Post-Meech — An Atlantic Perspective," (forthcoming).
54. Gordon Robertson, Notes for Convocation Address, Carleton University; Spring Convocation 1990, p. 5.