

### LANGUAGE RIGHTS AND LANGUAGE POLICY IN CANADA †

Before I enter upon the main burden of my topic, I would like to take this opportunity of saying how happy I am to be addressing this audience in Winnipeg during your centennial year. I have followed your centennial celebrations by means of television and the press, and it has given me occasion to reflect upon the quite unique position Manitoba holds in Canadian history. I envy the excitement of Kelsey and La Verendrye as they debouched upon the vast central plain of North America. A new chapter in the development of Canada started here; a whole new society grew out from here. As in Eastern Canada, the French were the first white men to invade these Indian lands, and showed their remarkable adaptability to Indian ways, but the English authority and settlers soon came south from Hudson's Bay to create in Manitoba the basic dualism of Canadian society. At its creation in 1870, the province had a population in which English and French were nearly equally matched. So it is not surprising that protections for language and separate schools were written into the provincial Constitution — the first written constitution in Canada to be enacted by a Canadian legislature. Being a federal statute it was of course enacted in French as well as English, and both texts are authoritative; even today. Then came the immigration from all parts of Europe and the United States, bringing those *Strangers Within Our Gates* — now among our foremost citizens — of which J. S. Woodsworth wrote so sympathetically. Out of the resulting linguistic confusion grew a demand for one public school system using one language. As Professor Morton has put it in his history of the province, you passed from duality to plurality and, by inevitable paradox, to uniformity. Now uniformity itself (never a very attractive idea!) is giving way before the rising concept of an equal partnership all across Canada between the two founding peoples, which welcomes the contribution of other cultural groups.

During my long teaching of constitutional law, I, of course, had to study the important constitutional cases to which your political movements in Manitoba gave rise from time to time. The names of Barrett and Brophy were familiar to my law students as well as yours, as the consequences of those cases are familiar to all Canadian historians. I have sometimes speculated on the degree to which our history might have been different had we succeeded in abolishing appeals to the Privy Council in 1875 when the Supreme Court of Canada was created, instead of in 1949, for then the unanimous judgment of our highest Court protecting the denominational schools in Manitoba would be the law today, and much of the racial bitterness deriving from that

series of events might have been avoided. The three Protestant judges on the Supreme Court were in agreement with the two Catholic justices in their defence of the separate school rights. But it is the facts of history and not the "ifs" of history with which we must deal, and we Canadians will always, I am sure, find new reasons for disagreeing with one another.

Now we have reached a time in Canada when we are at least as much concerned about the language used in the school as we are about the religious aspect of the school. This represents a very profound change in our outlook, and it has important consequences. Oecumenism has reduced religious tensions but language disputes are ready to hand for those who need to feel angry. Throughout our early history, the principal treaties and statutes touching upon biculturalism referred only to religion; this was true of the treaty of Utrecht 1713, the treaty of Paris 1763, and the Quebec Act of 1784. In these, the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion is promised, but language is not mentioned, though the Quebec Act, in restoring French civil law, must have contemplated the use of the French language. The Union Act of 1840 required all statutes to be in English only, though translation was authorized; this provision was repealed in 1848, but language use was left to the discretion of the legislature. Not until the B.N.A. Act of 1867, and the Manitoba Act of 1870, do we find specific guarantees for dual language use in Canada, and then only in reference to the enactment of statutes, debates in the legislature, and pleadings before the courts. No specific mention of language was included in the sections dealing with schools in the first B.N.A. Act.

Apart from historical and constitutional interests, I have other and more personal associations with Manitoba and in Winnipeg which I should like to acknowledge here. As a young man in Quebec city I think I was hardly aware of the existence of Winnipeg until my father, then Canon F. G. Scott recently returned as Senior Chaplain to the First Canadian Division in World War I, decided during your 1919 general strike that "his boys were in trouble," as he put it, and that he should come here to see if in anyway he could help. He was not motivated by a desire to bring victory either to the Citizens Committee or to the One Big Union, but rather to resume the friendships he had had with officers and men in your regiments with whom he had seen active service. Nevertheless, the authorities apparently decided that his goodwill was more helpful to the strikers than to the forces of law and order, for he was told to leave late one night and had to return to Quebec. He was not the first Scott in your history to attain some notoriety.

Later when I returned from Oxford in the 1920's, Winnipeg again

began to loom in my life. I came under the influence of several great Canadians who have emerged from this city, notably John W. Dafoe, E. J. Tarr and others who were so prominent in the founding of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, and in defining a new form of Canadian nationalism which led inevitably to our independent status in world politics. It was then too, that I first met and began to appreciate the stature of J. S. Woodsworth, who perhaps more than any other Canadian helped me to clarify my ideas about the kind of democratic Canada we should seek to build and the kind of political instrument that would most contribute to the attainment of our ideals. These are still living memories which I deeply cherish.

I realize that in choosing as my topic for this lecture "Language Rights and Language Policy in Canada," I am opening up a subject on which there are many strong feelings. This at least, means that, to use a current term, the subject is "relevant." Of course the whole question of constitutional revision is also relevant, but we have made already far more positive decisions with respect to changes in the use of the two official languages than we have in regard to the future distribution of legislative jurisdiction between Ottawa and the provinces. I feel on much more solid ground in talking about the language question than about the constitutional question, because I can discuss actualities rather than possibilities. Moreover the language issue gives me an opportunity to say something about the work of the B. and B. Commission, now at last drawing to an uneventful close. To borrow from T. S. Eliot, it began with a bang, and is ending with a whimper. But I think you will agree that because of its work, Canada will never be quite the same again.

Canadians often question the utility of Royal Commissions, and our Commission and its cost stimulated more criticism. Let me just give you a few of the facts. We were given a mandate which, on examination, required us to do an amount of work that I think could legitimately have been assigned to seven or eight separate Royal Commissions. How do you operate the armed forces in a bilingual country? Canada is a member of NATO where English and French are the two working languages, as they are at the United Nations. A whole Royal Commission could have been devoting its time to this military problem. How do you change the imbalance in the use of the two official languages in the Federal Civil Service and Crown Corporations? This is another vastly difficult subject, of crucial importance. What is the situation regarding the teaching of English and French in the various provincial school systems? This rated an entire volume of our studies. Did it not rate a separate Commission? How do the modern media of communication, such as the newspapers, film,

radio and television affect the development of bilingualism and biculturalism? Here again we have a question of major importance. What is the role of the "Other Ethnic Groups" in Canadian society, many of whom are conscious of their language and culture and wish to preserve them? Some 24% of the Canadian population falls in this category. And of particular importance in Quebec, but of growing importance elsewhere, is the question of the proper relationship between private business enterprises and the cultural environment in which they are placed. Even where there is no language problem, we can be and are, deeply concerned about the foreign ownership of essential Canadian resources; this foreign ownership looks more dangerous in Quebec where to the ownership is added a dominant use of English at the top levels of industrial government. A career use of French becomes less and less possible as the young Quebec rises in business and finance.

One Royal Commission, our Royal Commission, was handed this whole package of problems. You must forgive us if we took much time and spent — was it much money? Whenever we had a twinge of conscience, and even Royal Commissioners do have a conscience, we remembered the aircraft carrier *Bonaventure*. It will be discovered that the greater part of our expenditure went on research. This was an essential activity because we were inquiring for the first time into a maze of problems on which there were no reliable statistics. One of the beneficial side effects of our work will be that a very large number of experts, both inside and outside the universities, and both French and English speaking, were brought to put their minds to these vital questions. These men and women, now better informed, are part of our whole educational structure.

So much by way of an introduction. To prove that I was not unaware of the unpopularity, particularly in the early days of our work, of much that we were doing, I wrote this little verse about it:

How doth the busy B. and B.  
Enlarge each whining hour,  
By hearing griefs from sea to sea  
And turning sweet to sour.

Apparently, many Canadians believed that we should have let sleeping dogs lie. "We had no problem here till you came" was a frequent observation we met on our travels; we usually found that the problem was very deep and had not been faced realistically. It is true that some enquiries can stir up trouble that perhaps in the course of time would die away, but the kind of problem facing Canada when we were appointed, and the problem that still faces it, and which we must learn to live with and adapt to, is not of that sort. History and demography have committed us to a course from which there is no turning

back. Even so extreme a solution as the independence of Quebec would not in fact dispose of the problem. An independent Quebec would start with over a million English speaking people, a very large minority for a new country of six million. There would also be a million francophones in the other provinces, mostly in Ontario and New Brunswick. Their claims to recognition could not be ignored by English Canada without violating established rights. I know there are some nationalists in Quebec who would like to have a unilingual French State, as there are many anglophones (I trust this new word we coined is winning general acceptance) who would like to see an all English Canada, but these are extremes of opinion which we must tolerate but cannot realistically endorse.

Let me now give some of the facts which our studies brought to light and which are basic to any thinking about language rights and policy for Canada. We are dealing not just with a Canadian problem, but with a world wide problem in its Canadian application. Linguists tell us there are 2,500 identifiable languages in the world, and there are only 130 countries to put them in. Some people, indeed many people, are going to have a language problem. Language being an essential part of a culture, and the love of one's culture being natural to men who live in a cultural group, language use is seen by most people as an essential part of their individuality and personal freedom. Our terms of reference made it clear that we were to assume some degree of bilingualism in Canada, and were to recommend ways in which the Canadian Confederation could develop on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding peoples, but we also had to take into account the contribution made by the other ethnic groups. We have only two official languages in Canada, French and English, and to have recommended three or more official languages would have been beyond our mandate — besides an exercise in futility.

Given the world wide dimensions of our problem, the experience of other bilingual states became extremely relevant. We made an intensive study of four countries with comparable situations, namely Belgium, Switzerland, Finland and South Africa. We might, of course, have visited all these countries, following the examples of many other Royal Commissions that feel a need to look at situations in other parts of the world before making a report, but we chose instead to have experts write about them and tell us what they found. Here at least we were not extravagant.

What are some of the significant things we learned from these studies? First, I would say, we learned that every country that has a language problem, attempts to solve it in its own way. There are no universal rules, except perhaps the rule that language rights must be

respected if you wish to have domestic peace. We also learned that there are two kinds of bilingualism which must be distinguished. These may be called territorial bilingualism and personal bilingualism. Territorial bilingualism means that the country with two languages divides itself into regions within each of which only one language is officially used. Language is tied to the land, as it were. For example in Belgium, with some minor exceptions, everything north of a line across the country is Flemish, and everything south of it is French; there is a mixed area around Brussels where the two are officially recognized. Personal bilingualism means that each individual may use his own language wherever he happens to be in his country for all official acts. Most countries use some combination of the two forms of bilingualism: Territorial bilingualism is thus attached to a defined territory while personal bilingualism travels with the person. In our recommendations we drew upon both these principles for our proposed solutions.

We found it necessary to make another distinction. A bilingual person, of course, is one who can speak any two languages, but for our purposes, because of our terms of reference, we confined the term to those who can speak English and French. I won't trouble you with the distinctions that must be made in the degrees of bilingualism; these are hard to measure but very important. If you can speak and understand another language when it is spoken to you, you have a very simple but useful bilingualism; if you can also read it and write it you have complete bilingualism. Often it is quite sufficient for a person to be able to talk the language and to understand it when it is spoken.

Institutional bilingualism is another kind of concept. Here the institution — let us say Federal Post Office or the Canadian National Railways — is bilingual if it can provide services to the public in both languages, even though the great majority of its employees may speak only one language. To satisfy the reasonable requirements of personal bilingualism, so that a French speaking person getting off at a railway station in Vancouver can have his needs met, it is only necessary that in the station there be a wicket or a place where he can get the information he needs in his own language. A very few bilingual people are sufficient to staff such a service, and then we can say the institution is bilingual.

We noted another fact about these countries, which is certainly true of Canada. In a bilingual country you will find large blocks of people who only speak one language. In Quebec, according to the 1961 census, 61% of the population could not speak English. Other figures suggest 75% are unilingual. Right now Quebec is predominantly unilingual. So is English Canada where even fewer are bilingual. This situation is not going to change very fast: the widespread notion that

our Commission expects everyone to learn two languages, however desirable this may be, is wrong. Official bilingualism in a province does not force the minority to become bilingual, as the example of Quebec amply proves. If everybody spoke both languages equally well, there would really be little need in trying to make any special rules.

South Africa is a country where the majority of the white population is already bilingual, and in consequence they are able to adopt such rules as having a department of Government speak English for one month and Afrikaans the next month, — something we could not do. They publish their statutes in the two languages, but only one of them is authoritative and the bills are assented to alternately in English and Afrikaans. They thus avoid the problem of interpretation when there is a difference between the two versions. We have to struggle with that problem in Canada, because our two versions are equally authoritative, and this is now true of the judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada which appear in parallel columns in the two languages. I am sure lawyers in English Canada have been somewhat startled to discover that from now on, the statutes of Canada and the Supreme Court judgments are printed in both languages in the same volume. Formerly the statutes were all bound in an English volume and separately in a French volume, so it was easy for the practising lawyer in Victoria, B.C., perhaps violently opposed to bilingualism, to forget that Canada was already a bilingual country in certain essential respects, even in British Columbia. Now he sees on his desk the language that has produced the great masterpieces of French literature.

Finland was a country that we found particularly interesting and from which we borrowed one of our basic ideas, namely the "bilingual districts" — special areas within which a defined language régime would be established for federal, provincial and local governments. Finland used to be part of Sweden and was for long governed by Swedes; now it is independent and the Swedes make up about 7% only of the population. Yet their language rights are generously protected. The commune is the unit of local government, and it is recognized as officially bilingual if it includes in its territory a linguistic minority of at least 10% or 5,000 persons. And Finns may use either language in their dealings with governmental authorities anywhere. Finland thus uses a combination of the territorial principle, the bilingual communes, and the personality principle, the right of the individual, even outside the commune, to choose the language of communication with governments.

Belgium is another, and not very happy, bilingual country. But here the territorial principle is rigidly applied, except for the area around Brussels and some small exceptions on the border. Everything

north of the dividing line, as I have said, is Flemish, everything south is French. With one million anglophones in Quebec, and one million francophones outside, this kind of solution would be wholly unsuitable to Canada. There is no place where the dividing line can be fairly drawn: certainly not at the boundary of Quebec — Switzerland showed us another example of a combination of the territorial and personality principles: the cantons are mostly unilingual for schools and local administrative services, while federal services are given in the individual's language no matter where he lives. South Africa, in its use of Afrikaans and English, showed further variations: no overall territorial principle is applied because bilingualism is widespread and the two communities are interspersed. Members of the official language groups are fully integrated with the public service and can work in their own language, while each child has a right to education in his mother tongue wherever the numbers warrant it.

It is interesting to note that of the four countries we specially studied only one — Switzerland — is a federal state. South Africa's "provinces" do not possess coordinate powers as do the Canadian provinces. Biculturalism and bilingualism can be well safeguarded in a country that has a single central government. Decentralisation in the form of federalism may be helpful, but does not appear to be essential.

These are some of the ways in which four countries with language problems similar to Canada's have attempted to apply the principle of equal partnership. From each there was some lesson to be learned. But each found its own solutions and there was no uniform pattern of law or custom. So too it would have to be in Canada: our special Canadian conditions would require special Canadian arrangements. What those conditions were, how Canadians lived and worked and felt in an environment already bilingual and bicultural to a considerable degree, was what we sought to discover through our massive research programme. Volume I of our Report lists 146 studies prepared for our use, and there were innumerable other documents made available to us, of which the 1961 census was of first importance. It was on the basis of this mountain of evidence that we sought to make our recommendations achieve "the greatest equality with the least impracticality." There are 14 such recommendations dealing with the official languages, 46 relating to education, 57 regarding the work world, both for the federal administration and the private sector, 16 for the other ethnic groups, and 17 for the federal capital district — 150 in all for the volumes already published.

Royal Commissions create a stir when they are appointed and when they report, but all too often the effect is short-lived. It is hardly to be expected that all of our proposals will be widely known, but the



basic ideas and the philosophy behind them should be kept before the public if there is to be a meaningful change in our national habits. Many important steps – more perhaps than is generally realized – have already been taken to give effect to some of our recommendations, at least in the making of new laws, like the official languages acts of the federal and New Brunswick governments, and the amended school acts in Ontario, New Brunswick and, most recently, Manitoba. For the first time in Canadian history the four contiguous provinces between Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan, where the minority questions are most acute, are applying the principle of the complete dual school system in the official language chosen by the parents.

However, to change the feelings and outlook of people is a more difficult matter than to change their laws. We cannot legislate love, but at least we can by legislation lessen the causes of hate. Since our objective was an effective equal partnership between French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians, our very first recommendation was that this equality should be recognized by proclaiming French and English as the official languages in the Federal Parliament, courts and administration, and also in the provinces of New Brunswick, where the French constitutes 35% of the population, and Ontario, where though only 7% they make a global mass of about 600,000 people. We also laid down the principle that any other province where the official language minority reaches 10% should make the same declaration. We made no similar recommendation for Manitoba partly because the law of 1890 purporting to make the province unilingual has never been tested in the courts and might turn out to be unconstitutional, and partly because the francophones there do not reach the 10% we adopted as a general rule for all provinces nor constitute a sufficiently large global mass (there were 61,000 in 1961) to meet this other criterion.

Certain corollaries inescapably flow from this general principle. Federal services should be made available in either of the official languages in all parts of the country. This is the personality principle, and since the enactment of The Federal Official Languages Act in 1969 and the appointment of the Official Languages Commissioner in Ottawa—a sort of language Ombudsman—is on its way to being realized. This by itself, though much, is only part of the problem. It does not touch the inside working of the federal services. Here we took as the ideal that no Canadian should be handicapped in his career as a servant of the federal government or its Crown Corporations by reason of his having English or French as his mother tongue. Our proposed solution was the creation of work units, appropriately placed at all levels of administration, where French could be as normal a language of work as English is at the present moment. The difficulties in the application

of this principle should not blind us to its practicability and great utility; only thus will we be able to make full use of French talent and capacity in the federal civil service.

Making the federal government services bilingual is not enough: the provinces and municipalities, the Commission felt, should play their part. Where the official language minorities actually live in sizeable groups, there should be found in Canada as in Finland, a complete range of provincial and municipal as well as federal services in the two languages. This is where the territorial principle applies. All provinces should respect this obligation, and not only the officially bilingual ones. The services would include of course public education given in the official language chosen by the parents. Hence the Commission proposal for the creation of bilingual districts — selected areas in which at least 10% of the population uses the second official language.

To locate these bilingual districts the Commission could use only the federal census districts, of which there were 273 in the 1961 census. It was found that all but two provinces — British Columbia and Newfoundland — had such districts meeting the 10% test. This makes the French minorities outside Quebec quite unlike all other language minorities, which are not so dispersed across the country, and on this ground alone, quite apart from the obvious historical differences, could not expect to be placed on the same constitutional footing as the French. Our recommendation was that bilingual districts be established throughout Canada, their exact limits to be defined by negotiation between the federal and provincial government concerned. Such negotiations have already begun. In Quebec the need is less pressing as the English minority has its own schools, and receive bilingual services already from the provincial government and in municipalities where it is most concentrated. Yet Quebec too should accept the rule.

One area requiring particular attention was the city of Ottawa and the whole federal capital district. The hitherto purely English character of Canada's capital is an anomaly that must be ended if the concept of equal partnership is to be given real as well as symbolic meaning. Most countries composed of more than one cultural community have had difficulty determining the location and character of the capital, and here again we found a variety of solutions. South Africa divides its capital functionally; the legislature meets in Cape Town, the administrative capital is Pretoria, and Blomfontein is the seat of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court. Bern is mostly unilingual German despite Switzerland's multilingual constitution. In the old United Province of Canada before Confederation the Capital perambulated between Kingston, Montreal, Toronto and Quebec. Ottawa was then chosen as the most acceptable compromise. There it obviously

must remain, though the "Federal District" extends far beyond the single city of Ottawa into Quebec, and some federal administrative offices are now situated in Hull. Our Commission set out in Book V the detailed recommendations designed to make the whole area reflect the new concept of a bilingual and bicultural federal state.

Another important federal agency examined by the Commission was the armed forces. These employ roughly one-quarter of all federal government personnel, and should obviously be subject to the same general principles of language use with suitable adaptation, which were applied to other branches of the public service. The Royal 22nd Regiment – the Vandoos – have already shown the possibility and efficiency of this kind of "work unit," and there has been a steady development of bilingual practice within the services in recent years. The story is told in Volume III as part of the description of the federal administration.

The armed forces are a significant area of the total work world to which the Commission's recommendations are directed. By far the most important part of this world, however, from the point of view of the numbers employed, is the private sector – the world of private business. This was dealt with in the third part of Volume III.

It is not too difficult, though difficult enough, to develop new procedures and practices within governments which give effect to the officially bilingual character of the country. It is more difficult to work out and give effect to such procedures and practices within the field of private business, because here there are literally thousands of employers each enjoying the freedom of private enterprise. If language is a human right, then private individuals should presumably be able to associate together for business purposes and carry on that business in the language of their choice. This is of course a right being exercised in all parts of Canada, given the heterogenous composition of this population. There are, for example, Chinese newspapers being published, where one may assume that the editors and other employees speak Chinese to one another in their daily work. A Ukrainian in Winnipeg told the Commission he might spend a week practising his profession, meeting clients and friends, and scarcely speak a word of English. There is no reason why such forms of work using any language should not be allowed to grow and to flourish in their own way and at their own pace.

If we are to encourage the contribution of the "other ethnic groups," such forms of private enterprise should be welcomed as well as merely permitted. In business enterprises, there will almost inevitably be a distinction made between the language of internal management and that used in external communication with the public. An Italian restaurant in Montreal will use English or French with the great majority

of its customers, whereas the chefs and waitresses may only speak Italian to one another. But it would be undemocratic to prohibit by law an Italian restaurant from speaking only Italian to its customers, and no Canadian should feel insulted if he is not dealt with in either French or English in a private undertaking. The customer's choice will soon determine the size and extent of such a business.

Complications arise when the business run in one language begins to engage large numbers of employees who use English or French, and carries on business in a large way with governments and other enterprises. A bilingual country ought not to impose any impediment upon successful advancement in a chosen career because the mother-tongue of the employee is one or other of the official languages. This means that in Quebec large business enterprises, which at present are mostly owned and managed by anglophones, ought to permit the French speaking employee to rise in the business to the top posts without being handicapped by the fact that his normal tongue is French. At the present moment he is so handicapped, unless he is exceptionally bilingual, whenever English is the working language. This is particularly true in the upper echelons of business. The English-speaking Quebecer is similarly handicapped if he chooses a career in the public administration of Quebec and cannot speak fluent French.

It was to meet this problem, which is also found in government enterprises, that the Commission proposed the creation of language units within the private corporate structure similar to those recommended for government enterprises. What this means is that the daily activities of these work situations ought to be so arranged that some of the work can be carried on in the second language, though of course it is essential that there be bilingual individuals at these top levels who can communicate with other work units. A man may thus spend almost his whole day working in the language he knows best and in which he is most efficient. For the private sector of Quebec the Commission recommended as the objective that French must become "the principal language of work at all levels," and specified certain steps to be taken to reach this objective, including a change over from English to French as the main language of work units in the middle and upper brackets of major work institutions.

I was obliged to differ with my colleagues on the Commission of this wording, not because I was opposed to the idea that French must become the principal language of work in Quebec, for I believe that to be the case, but because in the formulation of its recommendation the Commission did not, it seemed to me, sufficiently distinguish between the types of business to which this principle would apply. Business activities today are carried on in so many different kinds of institu-

tions, with so many varieties of internal and external relationships, that it is impossible to impose a uniform rule on everyone.

The Commission recognized this fact insofar as it sought to distinguish between "major work institutions" and "smaller or specialized firms," and in recommending that "the main language of work in activities related to operations outside the province remain the choice of the enterprise." But its stipulation that French should be the principal language of work "at all levels" in all the major work institutions in the Province seemed to me quite unrealistic in the light of corporate enterprise today, which may be nation-wide or world-wide. A company may have a head office and only one plant in Quebec, with ten elsewhere; obviously at the topmost levels in the head office English will have to be the principal language used.

It would still be true to say of some enterprise, however, that French was their "principal language of work" if, as in the case of the pulp and paper industry, the majority of the work force was French Canadian and were speaking French daily on the job. The amount of French spoken per day in such an industry is far greater than the amount of English used. The statement often heard, that no French-Canadian can get a job in Quebec unless he speaks English, is much more incorrect than correct; 61% of the Quebec population cannot speak English at all, yet presumably are not all unemployed, and the prevalence of English is confined to the far less numerous though more influential posts in the middle and upper management brackets. It is here, at the top of the industrial pyramid, that the language problem presses. It is here that the inequality exists and where some solution must be found.

Many people believe that "private business," because it is private, should control its "in-door management" in any way which the owners determine. I have suggested that this idea is valid for smaller businesses and that, not only in bilingual districts, the choice of the business language should be the free choice of the owners. But it is unrealistic to apply this principle to the so-called private businesses that are in fact large industrial undertakings employing thousands of people and offering important careers to the young men and women coming out of the schools and universities. These businesses affect the public interest so widely that they can no longer be called private. They are a form of government exercising powers delegated to them in their corporate charters by the state, and the principles of language use which we would apply to a government must apply to them.

As a method of approaching the whole problem of the language of work in Quebec, the Commission made a very practical recommendation. It is quoted here in full:

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 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. (1310)

Unfortunately, this approach has not yet been accepted. Instead there is another commission called the Gendron Commission studying the same questions on which the B & B Commission reported. Its composition is unfortunate. Neither the English business community nor the Quebec trade unions are represented, and the only anglophone, though a distinguished professor, was not a native Canadian, and had lived only two years in Quebec when appointed. Whatever the recommendations of the Gendron Commission may be, and no doubt its research will throw more light on the problem, there will inevitably arise questions as to the authority with which it speaks.

Canadians must approach the language question with two special qualities: realism and goodwill. Realism means accepting facts. French-Canada is a fact, and English-Canada is a fact. The English minority in Quebec now numbers one million; the French minorities outside Quebec also number about one million. If Canadian federalism is to survive, it must accept biligualism sensibly applied, in Quebec as well as in Canada as a whole. It is *one* of the essential conditions of our survival. It is not the only one, for economic benefits must come to all Canadians from our association. We must believe we are worthwhile as a nation. But it must be a bilingual nation.

We must also have goodwill. We must see the plus as well as the minus, the great advantages as well as the difficulties. To accept bilingualism means a greater respect for human rights, a greater domestic tranquility, and, above all, the development within our country of the richness and creative ability that have made England and France two of the great centers of western civilization. That it will give Canada a national identity unique in the Americas goes without saying.

Quebec is painfully making up its mind as to what should be its political relations with its neighbours. So is English Canada, though its more secure position and difference of temperament make it more content to accept minor adjustments in the status quo. Will an independent Quebec provide a safe haven within which an uncontaminated French culture may flourish, or will this not be a fortress state driven

in upon itself, cut off from its growing minorities outside, and doomed to the tensions and antagonism which such a situation tends to create? Will English Canada move toward some form of special status for Quebec which will still leave a viable federalism? This is the position as the B & B Commission ends its labours. We did not attempt the task of proposing basic constitutional reforms because it was doubtful if we were appointed for that purpose, we had not embarked upon the necessary background research, and we would have been entering an area in which other more specialised official committees were already at work. But my experience convinced me that an equal partnership between the two cultural communities in Canada was a workable concept, and one which would help Canada make a distinctive contribution to world history and world peace. Whether Canadians will accept the idea and bring it steadily into being is their decision. I for one have faith that they will accept the great challenge rather than fall back into obsolete forms of the nation state.

FRANK REGINALD SCOTT, Q.C.\*

---

† The Sixth Annual Manitoba Law School Foundation Lecture.  
\* Of McGill University.

