

# Canada Down

## *The Case for Dumping Quebec*

**J. G. (Joe) Houlden, B.A., CD, Captain (Retired)**

### **About the Author**

Joe Houlden spent most of his working years in the Royal Canadian Air Force/Canadian Forces as a pilot. Now, he is a freelance writer who has been quoted by such notables as Diane Francis and Peter Worthington.

Houlden has concluded that Canada is on the path to failure as a country. In his opinion, the blame can be laid squarely at the feet of unprincipled “Francophanatics” at home and abroad whose plan has been to dominate the country.

He retains some hope, albeit faint, that Canada can be saved and has penned this essay to point the way.

### **Contents**

About the Author.....	1	Distinct Society.....	14
Introduction.....	1	Some Other Opinions.....	16
History for Anglos.....	2	Conclusion.....	17
The Wheel.....	3	Epilogue.....	18
The Wheel Derailed.....	3	<b>Appendix A</b> - Significant Dates.....	19
Official Bilingualism.....	6	<b>Appendix B</b> - United Nations Decision.....	20
The Commissioner.....	7	<b>Appendix C</b> - Canadians for Language	
The Next Act.....	8	Fairness v. City of Ottawa.....	22
French Immersion.....	9	Supplementary Reading List.....	23
Tidbits.....	10	Endnotes.....	24
Trudeau.....	12		

### **Introduction**

Recently, my Greek-Canadian barber and I were discussing the state of the Canadian nation. Although we disagreed on the timing, we agreed that, if things were to continue the way they were, Canada was bound to break up eventually. There are more than a few Canadians who think like Charlie and I.

At the root of the discontent is the racist, parochial, self-absorbed Province of Quebec, a problem child that has preoccupied the family far too long. It is reasonable to assume that the rest of Canada will wake up some day and start to act in its own interest. When it does, its first step must be to demand that the country be governed by a set of first principles common to one and all.

I am convinced that the best possible set of first principles has already been invented. I am also convinced that a series of traitorous federal governments, Liberal and Conservative, have deliberately chosen to violate those principles not only to appease Quebec but also to advance French power coast to coast.

What follows is my analysis of the problem and my proposed solution. Those who remain unconvinced are referred to the Supplementary Reading List.

*Joe Houlden, 2005*

## History for Anglos

One result of the age of European exploration was a world-wide rivalry between England and France. English and French Canada are still fighting it out, and English Canada is on the verge of defeat, its symbols virtually gone, its principles under siege. The situation must be reversed before English Canada is reduced to nothing more than a historical curiosity and its positive voice is lost to the world.

A major theme in the history of western civilization has been the struggle to proclaim the inherent dignity of the individual and fundamental human rights for all. These ideals were initially advanced mainly by Judeo-Christian religious thought and Greco-Roman-British secular thought. Today, the principles underlining those ideals find expression in the United Nations International Bill of Human Rights.

Whatever faults may be attributed to English Canada, it was increasingly articulating and promoting those principles. Indeed, it was a Canadian who drafted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a forerunner and now part of the aforementioned Bill. Unfortunately, the process was derailed by French Canada being yet again aroused by its perverse intelligentsia and by the perpetually cranky France.

During the American Revolution, French Canada had realized that it would still be a minority in any new America and opted for the shelter of the Quebec Act under the British flag. It did so largely because the preferred markets in Europe would remain open to a British colony, but also because the British had been generous conquerors.

Eventually, though, the kitchen culture of French Canada, particularly Quebec, was touted as being oppressed and only able to blossom by diminishing English Canada, symbols and all. Admittedly, some of the symbols were set aside owing to the natural process of moving from colony to autonomous nation. Most were, however, displaced deliberately with the avowed purpose of enhancing national unity – a strategy so unsuited to the purpose as to arouse suspicion.

Unfortunately, English Canada has been despicably faithless to its heritage at every turn, paying billions to prop up a separatist Quebec, allowing French to be rammed down its throat while its federal government defends Quebec's language legislation in the international arena and turns all federal institutions into job farms for francophones.

For the uninitiated, the following are some of the things that clearly violate the cited principles: the concept of two founding races, the Official Languages Act, the Charter, the Parliamentary Resolution defining Quebec as a distinct society, multiculturalism, and Quebec's language legislation.

There is no question that English Canada's principles have been repeatedly assaulted to placate Quebec, more likely to establish French dominance. ("French power exists in Canada because there are people like you . . . who are ready to fight so that it will exist, not merely here at home . . . but nation-wide." – Chrétien speech to Liberals, Quebec City, March 31, 1984. "French power will exist forever. Quebec is strong and can decide who is going to govern, and more importantly, how this country will be governed." – Trudeau, July 6, 1984).

If the idea of French power destroying the heritage, the identity, the principles of English Canada doesn't bother the reader, perhaps the following will. French power in Quebec was achieved by a xenophobic, tribal, ungrateful group through bombings, kidnappings, murder, internationally-denounced language legislation and the persecution of its minorities, the latter two with the active support of a federal structure likewise in the business of advancing French power.

English Canada has sacrificed too much. It is virtually a dispossessed and colonized nation and can not long survive the combined assault of Quebec and its own fifth column of obsequious quislings. English Canada must reassert itself. It must declare and implement its own priorities, regardless of the consequences.

For a list of significant dates related to Canada's language war, see Appendix A.

## The Wheel

The wheel has been invented. It is the United Nations International Bill of Human Rights<sup>1</sup> All United Nations members promise to promote and protect the human rights proclaimed therein.

John Humphrey, a Canadian, was on the committee headed by Eleanor Roosevelt that prepared the first draft of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It was adopted by the United Nations in 1948 and was later incorporated into the larger Bill.

In 1988, reviewing the progress towards universal human rights on the Declaration's fortieth anniversary, Mr. Humphrey said in part:

“The late Eleanor Roosevelt . . . called it the Magna Carta of mankind . . . One of the reasons for the historic importance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is indeed its recognition of the existence of economic, social and cultural rights . . .

“The Declaration has also had a strong impact on national law all over the world. Not only are the principles enunciated by it in national legislation, sometimes verbatim, but they have also influenced the jurisprudence of national courts.” – *John Humphrey, 1988*

It is particularly noteworthy that Article 2 of the Declaration and Article 2 of the later International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights both censure discrimination based on language.

It is also to be noted that neither the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms nor the Canadian Human Rights Act list language as a prohibited ground of discrimination.<sup>2</sup>

Whether the United Nations Bill is binding on all states is debatable, but one thing is for sure - it carries a lot of moral suasion. In that sense, it is a significant guideline – there is to be no discrimination based on language.

## The Wheel Derailed

“At the federal level, the two languages must have absolute equality . . . notably in the civil service and the armed forces . . . This concept of equality must also be put into effect by management and by the courts . . . Such reforms must certainly be incorporated into constitutional law . . .” – *Pierre Trudeau, 1965*

Note that Trudeau wrote those fateful words in 1965. He became Prime Minister in 1968. The Official Languages Act was passed in 1969. By 1972, it was becoming evident what the Act was really all about and that it was a wholesale violation of the United Nations International Bill of Human Rights.

“Dateline: National Defence Headquarters, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K2  
17 October, 1972

“CANADIANS FORCES PROMOTION SYSTEM - BILINGUAL AND BICULTURAL GOALS

“The purpose of this letter is to provide you with information concerning the CF promotion system in relation to bilingual and bicultural goals in the CF. These goals are or should be well known; however, there is evident concern in the forces about promotion as it pertains to the problem of cultural imbalances.

“In accordance with Government policy, DND is taking steps to achieve francophone representation that approximates the national average in all occupation areas and at all rank levels. We are committed to redress the present imbalances within 15 years, showing continued progress toward that goal each year until the situation is corrected. Equitable representation at the higher rank levels in 15 years' time can only be achieved if there is an adequate promotion flow of francophone personnel through the lower ranks in the early years of the programme. While the francophone promotion flow is essential, it must be achieved in a way that is fair and appears to be fair to anglophone and francophone personnel alike. There must be no stigma attached to any promotion and this can be assured only if there is a general awareness that promotion is still based on merit rather than cultural background.

“Where practicable, some increase in francophone representation at each rank level is required by the end of each promotion year in those classifications and trades where francophone shortages presently occur.

The increases both last year and this year have been small in many classifications and trades. In a few instances there has been no increase, but overall progress has been made. Undoubtedly, as the francophone base broadens, the rate of progress will improve to allow successful completion of the programme within the allotted time frame . . . .

“The point of most concern is probably the fact that some deviations from the strict order of merit lists have occurred in the past and may be necessary in the future. The very limited number of these deviations, the fact that those so bypassed have been and will continue to be protected and promoted, and the overriding consideration of the need to achieve the goals set us, should make it obvious that we are carrying out the necessary practical actions and yet preserving the integrity of our system. I firmly believe we are taking the best possible course of action available. . . .

“A most important factor, separate from but related to the cultural imbalance, is the shortage of bilingual persons in the CF. A greater opportunity for a challenging career and for advancement is available to those who are bilingual, and that is as it should be in a bilingual country. We must, therefore, ensure that unilingual personnel are encouraged to learn the second language, particularly those with obvious career potential. . . .

*“Signed, D.S. Boyle - Rear-Admiral for Chief of the Defence Staff”*

When the substance of the foregoing letter was made known to the troops, nobody was fooled by the statement that promotion was “still based on merit rather than cultural background.”

In the end, the Canadian Forces introduced two successive fifteen-year plans: 1972 – 1987 and 1987 – 2002. The first plan prescribed the phony promotions described in the letter. The second plan dropped the phony promotions, but decreed that, henceforth, promotions to the more senior levels were normally to be restricted to bilingual members. The Anglophone-Francophone cultural balance was to be maintained as well. That is where the policy rests today.

Integration and unification have often been legitimately cited as having harmed the Forces, but they were structural not cultural factors. Trudeau’s Official Languages Act of 1969 institutionalized cultural discrimination in the Canadian Forces and, indeed, throughout the land, based on race and language. The moral decline of Canada had begun.

Although they generally kept their own counsel, many career managers of the day were upset with being told to “adjust” the legitimate merit lists. Some let it be known that finding a Francophone to promote all too often meant having to go a long way down the promotion list. As a result, many of the Francophones promoted during that era were belittled as “28-percenters,” a sad situation, but after all, the very essence of any military – confidence in the leadership – had been destroyed.<sup>3</sup>

In 1985, with the assistance of J. Carlisle Hanson, Q.C., I filed a complaint about the Forces’ promotion policy with the United Nations Human Rights Committee in Geneva. The Committee found the complaint inadmissible because I had not shown that I was a victim of the policy. See Appendix B.

Clearly, the Committee erred in not concluding that a member of a group discriminated against is himself being discriminated against. Be that as it may, there were victims. There always had to be a tail end Charlie who didn’t get promoted at all.

In 1988, when language had become a factor in promotions,<sup>4</sup> I wrote to the Minister of National Defence. I suggested that a procedure be established whereby promotions could be tracked to determine how many of those members who were promoted would not have been had language ability not been a factor in their scores. The point was to determine whether the best at their trade were being promoted.

Lieutenant-General D.N. Kinsman, then Assistant Deputy Minister (Personnel), responded, stating that he could “find no reasons that would justify the implementation” of my suggestion. Apparently, Kinsman could not grasp the idea that a military that marches on its tongue is bound to trip occasionally.

At this point, it is worth citing two items that were available to the leadership of the Forces during the first fifteen-year plan: Article, Politics and Culture, Canadian Defence Quarterly, Vol. II, No. 4, Spring 1982, and Report 76-4, Francophone Military Career Participation in Canada: A Preliminary Report, Canadian Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit, September 1976.

The article indicated and the report implied that barriers that might have caused under-representation of Francophones in the Canadian Forces were overwhelmingly from within the Francophone population itself and not systemic.

**Both items clearly indicated that neither quotas nor any sort of affirmative action program aimed at Francophones could be justified on the ground that the “system” had been or was at fault.**

I have dwelled on the Canadian Forces because it is the area I know best; it was, however, hardly the only federal institution affected.

“There are numerous regular members in this Division who do not meet the linguistic profile of the position they occupy and do not possess the required language learning aptitude to qualify for full-time language training. It is felt that these members may wish to relocate to another division where bilingualism is not such a critical issue.”

*Memorandum from Staffing and Personnel, RCMP,  
“A” Division<sup>5</sup> to members – November 24, 1981*

“Since there is still an urgent need to recruit F.O.L. (F)<sup>6</sup>/Bilingual applicants, I urge you all, members and public servants, to make a special effort towards the Force’s bilingual recruiting program. There is a significant F.O.L.(F)/Bilingual mass in the National Capital region and many outlying areas within the Division, thus the potential certainly exists to recruit that segment of our population.”

*Memorandum from R.M. Shorey, C.O., “A” Division  
to All Employees, “A” Division – November 27, 1981*

Although several members of the RCMP protested to the Commissioner of Official Languages that the bilingualism policy threatened the careers of unilingual Anglophones, they got nowhere. Many Anglophones were forced to accept postings elsewhere, which unnecessarily uprooted families and engendered a lot of bitter feelings. What took place in “A” Division was nothing more nor less than ethnic cleansing.

“Apparently, the PSC has cleared EMR to hire, directly, only “exceptional” francophone candidates. From now on, all French-speaking candidates should be considered exceptional and, therefore, subject to clear-track hiring.”

*Memorandum to EPAS Management Committee  
from Mary Glen – October 6, 1981*

“A copy of a Government of Canada directive, issued by the Associate Deputy Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, has just come into my hands. The subject of this directive is the establishment of a ‘Francobank’.

“This establishment of a ‘Francobank’ ... is designated to provide special efforts and resources for recruitment of Francophones ... .

“There has been no Parliamentary debate or approval to establish ‘Francobank’ ... . Therefore, I am obliged to ... call for a full scale Parliamentary debate this Fall on the Liberal Government’s changes and additions to their bilingual policies.”

*Press Release, Dan McKenzie, M.P., September 1, 1982<sup>7</sup>*

“The federal Energy Department has been accused of discrimination in setting up a \$7-million training pool called ‘francobank’ to recruit francophones and pay them \$25,000 a year while they await permanent jobs....

“The Energy Department’s francobank aims to increase the proportion of francophones in the scientific and professional category from 9.3 percent to 27.5 percent – more in the line with the national proportion – by 1988.

“Under the plan, which began last February and was explained in an Aug. 14 memo by A.E.Collin, Associate deputy minister of energy, there will be room in the pool for 30 francophone recruits a year. They will be paid \$25,000 and ‘be exposed to departmental programs (research)’ until permanent jobs become available either in the department or elsewhere in the public service. The memo also predicts most will find jobs within a year.

“It also urges managers to use ‘creativity, imagination and innovation’ in finding ways to absorb the recruits....Including recruiting expenses, the cost of the program is estimated to be \$1.05 million a year....

“The expert on the program in Lalonde’s office was out of town and other officials in the department, the source of several controversial leaks in the last year, said they aren’t allowed to discuss it. ‘I have a wife and a family to support,’ said one official.”

*Victoria Times – Colonist, September 3, 1982.*

As difficult as it may be to believe, high-ranking officials were to repeatedly deny that affirmative action was taking place.

## **Official Bilingualism**

“Language legislation is utterly insane and is designed to encourage bigotry. There is no precedent anywhere for unity being enhanced through a policy of two official languages.”

*Peter, Worthington, Financial Post, July 1988*

Unofficial estimates of the cost of official bilingualism range into billions of dollars per year.

“For the federal government, it is just part of the cost of doing business.”

*Victor C. Goldbloom, Commissioner of Official Languages, 1996*

The Official Languages Act was sold as a matter of fairness, simply a matter of providing bilingual services where there was a significant demand. That was propaganda worthy of Goebbels. It is still the mantra of the naive and of a variety of self-serving souls.

The truth is that the Official Languages Act amounts to an ethnocentric affirmative action program clearly intended to recruit and promote French-Canadians. It is founded on three insidious articles of faith.

The first article of faith is the so-called “right” to be served in one’s own official language. Riding on its coat-tails are the “right” to work in one’s own language and the “right” to be likewise supervised. The upshot is a pyramid of bilingualism clearly more advantageous to French-Canadians, because they have more opportunity to become bilingual.

The second article of faith is that Anglophones and Francophones must be represented in all federal institutions. Essentially, it is a fail-safe mechanism should the first article prove inadequate to the task of ensuring a French-Canadian presence. It is articulated at Section 39 of the Official Languages Act.

In practice, Section 39 requires all federal institutions to have a workforce ratio of Anglophones to Francophones based on the latest census. Thus were spawned, in the 1970s, the well-documented programs to recruit and promote Francophones.

As early as 1982, one Professor Bayefsky had written: “In fact, what is almost totally forgotten in this country is that, for at least the past decade, we have witnessed in Canada the greatest affirmative action program of all, and that is the recruitment of Francophone Canadians into the federal public service.”<sup>8</sup>

The third article of faith is the device of personal, rather than territorial, bilingualism. Initially, official bilingualism was to apply only in regions prescribed by government policy, but the concept was quietly abandoned along the way. Personal bilingualism allows the government to expand the bilingual services throughout the country on virtually any pretext. English Canada has been the main target; this article of faith is akin to block-busting.

Officialdom denies that the Official Languages Act amounts to affirmative action. Incredibly, the bureaucrats have resorted to the cute technicality that affirmative action involved “quotas” and the Act generates only “targets.” They claim that the first involves hard numbers, the second simply goals.

For those who deny that Section 39 is effectively affirmative action, the question is this: At what point was it determined that Anglophones needed legislation to ensure their employment in federal institutions? Moreover, the Commissioner of Official Languages’ own statistics reveal that the whole program is out of control. The majority of federal institutions are over-staffed with Francophones. Obviously, such a transformation cannot be attributed to any natural process.

Just as they deny that the Act amounts to affirmative action, officials usually deny that French-Canadians are its focus. For example, Max Yalden, when Chief of the Canadian Human Rights Commission, obfuscated the obvious by stating that Francophones can be Haitian, Belgian or Swiss in origin, not just French. True, but pettifoggery at its best. Conversely, Mr. D’Iberville Fortier, when he was Commissioner of Official Languages, flatly stated that language policies were an attempt to help French-Canadian minorities.

The official Languages Act provides for social engineering of the first order. It is a racist document, intended from the outset to ensure a French-Canadian presence at all levels in all federal institutions. The Act is a scourge on Canadian society. It arouses suspicion about even the most valid appointments of Anglophones and Francophones alike. It breeds resentment and, in the end, incompetence. The Act should never have seen the light of day.

It is particularly noteworthy that the Official Languages Act, Parts 1 to 5, have primacy over any other Act of Parliament except the Canadian Human Rights Act (see Section 82 of the Official Languages Act). Thus, the Official Languages Act has to be taken into account in everything the federal bureaucracy undertakes.

It is also noteworthy that France, despite having several domestic dialects and languages (Provençal, Breton, German, Corsican, Catalan, Basque, Flemish and French), has declared the language of the majority of its population, namely French, to be its national language.

## **The Commissioner**

### **Open Letter to the Commissioner of Official Languages, Dyane Adam.<sup>9</sup>**

Dear Dyane:

Now that you have sailed through Canada’s superficial process for such appointments and familiarized yourself with the territory, I think it is an appropriate time to give you some guidance on your new role as Commissioner of Official languages. By way of background, let me start with Trudeau, because there begins the tainted history of the Official Languages Act, which you must understand so that you can deny it.

As it is clear from his writings, that pseudo-intellectual pamphleteer had mistakenly attributed French Canada’s underdog status not only to its self-inflicted wounds but also to Anglo oppression. To redress the latter, he sought French power. The quickest way to power is not to earn it, of course, but to usurp it. Thus is explained Trudeau’s Official Languages Act, which elevated French to a prerequisite for any federal office of consequence and set the stage for the virtual conscription of French-Canadians into all federal institutions. (You are advised to use the blander term for French-Canadian, namely, Francophone. The truth tends to rankle the higher-ups.)

.../

Incredibly, Trudeau has claimed that his purpose was to show French-Canadians that they could do it too. Nice try, but no cigar! As French-Canadians were recruited and promoted, Anglophones were everywhere dispossessed. Surely, he was not unaware of the consequences of his Government's legislation and policies. That those early years saw the Trudeau Government deliberately sacrifice the principles of equal opportunity and merit is a given. Clearly, the purpose was to create a critical mass of French-Canadians in all federal institutions to establish and maintain French power. And that's Trudeau in a nutshell.

The important thing for you to understand is that the goal of creating a critical mass of French-Canadians has been achieved and your duty is to simply maintain or increase it. Keep your own hands clean; use proxies. For example, Treasury Board has a plethora of policies to that end. Should French-Canadian numbers not meet or, as under your predecessor, exceed expectations, simply blame the Board. It understands the game and will, in turn, harass the recalcitrant parties in your stead.

There are all sorts of other proxies you can use. The Parliamentary Committee on Official Languages would be a good place to start. Its members understand the game and can be counted on to crucify dissident Anglophones who appear in front of them. For propaganda purposes, various French-Canadian cultural groups, Canadian Parents for French, even France, can be very helpful.

Along that line, you should continue your USEFUL LINKS page on the Internet; it lists all manner of domestic and international pro-French organizations. The idea, of course, is to facilitate their collaboration so they can better advance the cause.

If you play your cards right and advance French power, you will be amply rewarded. Like your predecessors, you will have lost your credibility, but gained the confidence of the Government. Thereafter, as a trusted agent, you will be able to call the shots and head the Canadian Human Rights Commission or the Canadian Radio and Television Commission or whatever and eventually retire with a superb pension.

Moreover, and this is the icing on the cake, you will be able to bask in the honours that are sure to be bestowed on you by a grateful Francophonie and Elysée Palace.

The foregoing should be enough to get you started, except for a final note of caution. Once you have read this letter, burn it. The last thing you need is for the truth to come out, lest it awaken our lethargic media or incite otherwise unaware Anglophones, which is most of them.

Good luck, *Joe Houlden*<sup>9</sup>

## **The Next Act**

The rot continues. While billions of dollars are transferred to Quebec in the form of equalization payments, federal grants, subsidies, permanent loans, art exhibits and the like, the response of English-speaking Canadians is to stick their kids in French immersion.

While English-speaking Quebecers are being fined for having signs with English writ too large, while the expulsion of Anglophones from Quebec proceeds apace, while billions are being spent to create block-busting, phony Francophone enclaves from coast to coast ... French immersion. While the juggernaut of French power rolls over the country... more French immersion.

The propulsive agent for a lot of this nonsense is, of course, the Official Languages Act. Except for a few feisty groups, English-speaking Canadians seem to have been taken in by the government propaganda that official bilingualism is a sacred cow. They should open their minds.

Over the years, several books have been published that have signalled that there is a scheme afoot to Frenchify Canada. Various observers have also noted the federal campaign abroad to reduce Canada's participation in the anglosphere and emphasize its links to the francosphere.

Those books and many articles have traced the development of French power and its many negative effects on English-speaking Canadians. For example, Trudeau's version of official bilingualism and its entrenchment in

his Charter; the debasement of our Commonwealth ties; the strengthening of our ties to La Francophonie; France's support of Quebec separatists; and, the collaboration of self-seeking Anglophone quislings have all been exposed.

Now, however, we have something that tops them all – definitive proof that there is a blueprint for the Frenchification of Canada. The details can be found in the shocking official federal document: The Next Act: New Momentum for Canada's Linguistic Duality, subtitled The Action Plan for Official Languages.

Just how shocking is that document: Well, for example, Section 3-1-1 bemoans the fact that “an increasing number of young Francophones are marrying Anglophones and starting families with them.” Shades of Nuremberg!<sup>10</sup>

The Next Act provides definitive proof of a well-funded, massive infrastructure that will reduce English-speaking Canadians to second-class citizens.

It is now extremely naive to believe the propaganda that official bilingualism is simply about bilingual services to the public, or that it is intended to safeguard Francophone culture in the North American sea of Anglophones, or to secure national unity. Now, it is absolutely certain that official bilingualism is a cover for the Frenchification of Canada.

As the document makes abundantly clear, more and more English-speaking Canadians are about to join the ranks of those already harmed by the racist, power-grabbing scheme that is increasingly infecting this country in the guise of language fairness, national unity and other such Pecksniffian rubbish.

One way or another, sooner or later, ALL English-speaking Canadians are going to feel the pain ... unless ...

## French Immersion

“Since 1968, when Louisiana declared itself bilingual, the French government has spent millions of dollars in the state to promote its language. Additional aid for Louisiana's ‘French renaissance’ has come from Belgium and Quebec....

‘The French government has made us a priority,’ asserts Philippe Gustin, director of the CODOFIL, the Council for the Development of French in Louisiana. ‘We are a window through which they can keep good relations with the United States, in the same way that they are using Quebec in Canada....’

At least 50,000 elementary students in Louisiana study French, many of them instructed by teachers from France, Belgium and Quebec. Their salaries are paid, in part, by their nations of origin.”

*The Charlotte Observer, May 8, 1983.*

“Bilingualism is unthinkable for Quebec.” – *Robert Bourassa, 1988*

On October 13 – 16, 1973, Keith Spicer, Canada's first Commissioner of Official Languages, convened a Parents Conference on French Language and Exchange Opportunities financed by the Department of the Secretary of State. Two groups attended – Canadian Parents for French, then in its embryo stage, and the Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers (CAIT). A joint working agreement was formed between those two organizations.

Canadian Parents for French was formed from the top down - first a national executive and subsequently provincial and local groups, all with federal funding. Its mandate involved actively lobbying school boards, trustees and the Federal and Provincial governments, seeking priority for French Immersion for Anglophones. The organization has received millions of dollars from the Government of Canada.

“A variety of misconceptions have been spawned concerning the status of French immersion in Canada. One of the most disturbing trends is the degree to which parents have been duped by promotional propaganda and the misuse of immersion enrolment statistics.

“Proponents of immersion and groups whose vested interests depend upon the numbers of students created false impressions of the enrolment in immersion. The number of immersion students, reportedly 312,000, represents only a small portion of the total 5,160,000 English program students in Canada. This amounts to a mere six percent of the overall student population. For this elite group, Canada has propagated a billion-dollar industry including everything from a federally funded lobby group – Canadian Parents for French – for promotion and preservation of immersion to the militant immersion special interest group CAIT and its charities.”

*Lori Nash, The Ottawa Citizen, December 18, 1997*

Relatively recently, I filed a complaint with the Commissioner of Official Languages that the workforce of the House of Commons was roughly 65% Francophone, 35% Anglophone, the reverse of what it should be. The response was that, although the House was working on it, correcting the percentages would take time. One reason – difficulty finding bilingual Anglophones in its main recruiting area, the National Capital Region, a region drowning in French Immersion classes.<sup>11</sup>

“After 12 years of successful French education, with marks around the 90s, all it took was a five-minute telephone interview to determine that [my daughter’s] French was not good enough [to be a page in the House of Commons] . . . . It’s time to pack up and head west or south – someplace where our best is good enough.”

*Barry Lee, letter, The Ottawa Citizen, March 1, 2005*

## **Tidbits**

“Each one hopes that, if he feeds the crocodile enough, the crocodile will eat him last.”

*Winston Churchill*

“Canadian politicians have spent the last four decades stripping this country of its British heritage in a vain attempt to construct an artificial national identity . . . .”

*The Ottawa Citizen, January 22, 2001*

In 1931, by the Statute of Westminster, the British Empire became the British Commonwealth of Nations and, in 1949, the Commonwealth of Nations (the Commonwealth).

Canada celebrated Commonwealth Day 1999, the Commonwealth’s fiftieth anniversary, in a number of ways, most notably with a statement in the House of Commons. There was also a reception of Commonwealth High Commissioners, a press release, a dinner hosted by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and an inter-faith service. In short, on an important occasion, Canada’s main heritage was celebrated by a small elite who consumed and prayed somewhere in the recesses of Ottawa.

On March 17 that same year, Diane Marleau, then the Minister Responsible for La Francophonie, placed a notice in *The Ottawa Citizen*, and probably elsewhere, announcing “an exceptionally important event: the Journée internationale de la Francophonie on March 18.” The notice did not mention the Franco-Canadian exhibition train touring Canada coast to coast at the time, but it did point to the Francophone Summit (Moncton, 3 – 5 September) as being “an excellent opportunity to showcase to the world Canada’s many Francophone communities.”

“Don’t be embarrassed if you didn’t know that Monday is Commonwealth Day. The federal government doesn’t seem to remember either . . . . In recent years, Foreign Affairs has slashed the number of diplomats in its Commonwealth section, while greatly expanding La Francophonie’s unit . . . .”

*The Ottawa Citizen, March 8, 2003*

“Canada’s basic contribution to the commonwealth is a relatively piddling \$30 million which is \$20 million less than the federal government spends on la Francophonie, an affiliation of francophone and pseudo-francophone nations with a fraction of the Commonwealth’s potential clout.”

*The Ottawa Citizen, March 13, 2005*

Why all this attention devoted to the Journée Internationale de la Francophonie compared to Commonwealth Day?

“Quebec uses la Francophonie to establish its international identity.”

*Stephen Clarkson, University of Toronto political scientist, The Ottawa Citizen, March 13, 2005*

“Everything we undertake and everything we are doing to make Canada a French state is part of a venture I have shared for many years with a number of people.”

*Serge Joyal, Secretary of State, 1982<sup>12</sup>*

“Canada is going to be a French-speaking nation coast to coast.”

*Leo Cadieux, Ambassador to France,  
speaking to the French National Assembly, 1973*

The official languages of the Pan-American Games are English and Spanish. When held in Winnipeg in 1999, Canada insisted that French be equally included.

In 2001, at the opening ceremonies of the Games of the Francophonie in Ottawa-Hull, Governor General Adrienne Clarkson and Heritage Minister Sheila Copps were roundly booed for uttering a few words in English.

In 2003, a Mr. McLeary of Shawville, Quebec, was ticketed for a minor violation of Quebec’s language law. Because he refused to pay the fine, Quebec authorities announced that they would seize and auction off sufficient of his personal property to pay the amount owing. The wheels were put in motion to do so.

In the end, the combined effect of an Ottawa radio talk show, the preparations of Alliance Quebec to attend the auction, bid on the property and return it to its owner, and the knowledge that other groups would be bussing in from Ottawa, caused the authorities to discover an administrative error and cancel the auction. Regardless, the planned BBQ went well, and then everyone went home.

I had on file a letter from Stéphane Dion wherein he had answered my concerns regarding the plight of the Anglophone minority in Quebec by writing that, in his opinion, Bill 101 “is a valid piece of legislation which balances the rights of individuals with the province’s unique linguistic, cultural and historical situation.” I faxed Mr. Dion. Citing his letter, I asked him whether he thought an appropriate balance was struck on the “rights of individuals” side of the equation in the McLeary situation. Mr. Dion replied in a letter dated November 6, 2003, thusly: “I have not changed my view in this matter.”

In 1993 the United Nations Human Rights Committee agreed that Quebec’s language legislation (Bill 178) violated the rights of one Gordon McIntyre. The Quebec National Assembly passed Bill 86 to replace Bill 178. Bill 86 allows English on signs, but with many restrictions. In 2003, Bill 86 was challenged before the United Nations Human Rights Committee (The Lyon and The Wallrus case – results TBA).

On May 9, 2001, the City of Ottawa passed a by-law to adopt a new bilingualism policy. The policy opens with a Declaration of Principle stating that “The City of Ottawa recognizes both official languages as having the same rights, status and privileges.” The text belies that statement. The policy discards any pretense of hiring on merit. Moreover, it is overwhelmingly concerned with things French. For example, it establishes a French Language Services Advisory Committee, but not an English or even a bilingual one. “French” is used seventeen times, “English” is used three times; “Francophone” is used four times, “Anglophone” not at all. Overall, the policy so closely parallels the Official Languages Act that they are one and the same.

When presented with a number of examples of the policy's pro-French bias, Dyane Adam, the Commissioner of Official Languages, stated: "I do not believe that the policy is discriminatory."

On October 5, 2004, the group Canadians for Language Fairness filed an Application in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice to challenge the legality of the City of Ottawa's bilingualism by-law and policy – results TBA. See Appendix C.

In 2004, the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages released its study that evaluated the bilingual services provided by businesses that lease premises from the federal government in the National Capital Region (NCC) (Ottawa-Gatineau).<sup>13</sup> It stated in part:

"In keeping with the Government of Canada's commitment under Part VII of the OLA to foster the recognition and use of English and French within Canada, owners of federal lands and property, such as the NCC and PWGSC, have included language requirements in their leases with commercial tenants in the NCR. While they have the authority, as well as the obligation, under Part VII of the OLA to include such language clauses in leases, the NCC and PWGSC also have to ensure that they take into account provincial regulations regarding language used on commercial signage in implementing such clauses. We have to bear in mind that legislative authority regarding commercial signage rests with provincial governments. We have therefore taken into account the applicable legislation in this case, namely the Quebec *Charter of the French Language*. According to the Charter, the use of languages other than French is allowed as long as French predominates. By enforcing language clauses contained in their commercial leases, the NCC and PWGSC are abiding by the constitutional principle of advancement toward the equality of status for English and French and the constitutional principles pertaining to the sharing of legislative authority by Parliament and the provincial legislatures."

In plain English, the commissioner of Official Languages unilaterally declared that Quebec's language legislation trumps Canada's Official Languages Act.

In 2005, the Council of Clarence-Rockland, Ontario, passed a by-law requiring all future commercial signage to be bilingual. In the following weeks, elected officials required police protection and there was a string of bomb threats at City Hall.

(Interestingly, one of the few reported convictions under section 281.2 of the Criminal Code involved messages directed against Francophones in the Windsor area. The case was reversed on appeal, however, since the accused, Francophones themselves, were found not to have propagated their messages wilfully but rather, as agents provocateurs, to further the Francophone cause.)

## Trudeau

"Pearson prepared the 1969 Official Languages Act, and Trudeau passed it. He did so by defining the two-centuries-old English-French argument as a challenge of equal dignity. Official languages became the core for concentric circles of rights: first, the rights of the two founding groups of modern Canada ("bilingualism"); then the rights of all ethnocultural groups ("multiculturalism"); finally, the rights of individual Canadians (his Charter of Rights and Freedoms). Trudeau's intellectual rigour pulled all this together into a Canada where everyone could feel respected, where no one was second-class . . . .

"... Largely to deflect criticism of the Official Languages Act as an alleged put-down of unofficial languages, Trudeau launched a program of multicultural grants. Bluntly put, this was initially a "sop to the ethnics." But it worked so well that it later became a strategic imperative with its own unstoppable budgets and lobbies. To square the circle, the government invented the slogan of "official bilingualism in a multicultural society."

- Keith Spicer, *The Ottawa Citizen*, October 21, 2000

Subsequent to his death, the media's portrayal of the life and legacy of former Prime Minister Trudeau left me wondering when his resurrection would take place. My assessment of the man: not a philosopher-king, but a dilettante; not a humanitarian but a tribalist. In short, the reality does not match the myth.

How many Canadians have read and understood Trudeau's book, *Federalism and the French Canadians*, published in 1968? Not many, I suspect, or more of us would realize that Trudeau not only had a plan but also that he pulled it off. Trudeau dedicated the book "to the progress of French Canadians." He set out therein the plan for actualizing such progress, a plan that was to result in the wholesale abandonment of the principles of equal opportunity and merit.

Failure to recognize the cited book as Trudeau's *Mein Kampf* and years of propaganda have resulted in the Trudeau myth – an uncritical praising of his courage, his intellect, his official bilingualism and his Charter. I don't buy any of it.

Courage! Likewise travelled, anyone would experience a world wherein minorities are often oppressed. Likewise relieved of having to earn a living, virtually anyone would be moved to courageously try to do something about it. The trick would be in directing one's efforts to everyman, to the individual rather than to a particular group. Purporting to be a champion of individual rights, Trudeau's abiding concern was group rights, a particular group – French Canadians. That was not courage; that was racism.

Intellect! While trained in law, hence trained to marshal eloquent arguments, his reputed intellect often amounted to little more than a capacity for repartee – the kind of repartee commonly iterated by those likewise steeped in academe, traveled, and habitually attendant at interesting tables. Over-reliance on 'reductio ad absurdum' and making a show of one's fleeting experience with other cultures amounts to dilettantism, not genius. Moreover, just how does a superior intellect, for five full adult years, accept Quebec's argument of the day that WWII was a foreign war in which French Canada should not participate?

Official bilingualism! An artificial construct imposed on an unsuspecting country. Bilingual service was the slogan; advancement of French-Canadians was the reality.

Most Canadians are still totally unaware of the plethora of policies and programs dictated by the Trudeau Government that were designed to recruit and promote French-Canadians *en masse* in all federal institutions. Officialdom still denies that was affirmative action.

Perhaps the ordinary citizen could be forgiven for believing that some form of preferential treatment was afoot. He might also be forgiven for concluding that the whole concept, officially dubbed "equitable participation," was and is racist to the core.

The Charter! Trudeau himself allowed that a few rights were thrown in only to "broaden the debate." Translation: he wanted to entrench French as an official language, thereby constitutionally underpinning the Official languages Act and effectively preventing any future Parliament from toying with it. Including rights and freedoms helped the medicine go down.

What rights did the Charter give Canadians that they didn't have before? What about Keith Spicer's repeated assertion that entrenching multiculturalism in the Constitution was only a "sop to the ethnics" to get them to buy into official bilingualism. Why does the Charter have nineteen sub-sections dealing with official languages, all of which are protected from the notwithstanding clause?

Clearly, Trudeau was seeking French power. His battles with the likes of the FLQ and Levesque buttress the point. Why settle for a ghettoized Quebec when he could deliver Canada through a language revolution.

Trudeau confirmed as much on July 6, 1984: "French power will exist forever. Quebec is strong and can decide who is going to govern and more importantly, how this country will be governed." He had pulled off his vision so clearly delineated in his earlier essays.

Given the evidence – what Trudeau himself wrote and said and the effects of his legislation, policies and programs, of which he could not have been unaware – I can only conclude that he was not the alpha and the omega that the myth makers would have us believe. In the long run, I suspect that history will record that Trudeau was a bright, haunted tribalist who simply never understood that the *maudits anglais* had it right.

## Distinct Society

My article as it appeared in *The Ottawa Citizen*, December 11, 1996, follows. It was written when I still had some faith that Canada could include Quebec.

“To entrench distinct society status for Quebec in the Canadian Constitution is to deny the democratic principles that are the heritage of the rest of Canada. Enough is enough; let’s get a few things straight.

“A major theme in the history of western civilization is the struggle to proclaim the inherent dignity of the individual and the value of fundamental human rights. It is not beyond the pale to assert that those ideals were historically advanced mainly by Judeo-Christian religious thought and Greco-Roman-British secular thought.

“Today, the democratic principles underpinning those ideals find expression in the United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

“English Canada has inherited these principles and generally takes them very seriously. If, at times, English Canada is inclined to be somewhat ornery, it is simply because it is so intellectually and viscerally primed to decry any violation of its inherited principles.

“Thus it opposes such half-baked ideas and programs as multiculturalism (glorifying ethnicity), two founding races (implied superiority), employment equity (reverse discrimination), official bilingualism (affirmative action) and distinct society (the constitutional entrenchment of a group as particularly noteworthy). Simply put, English Canada is in tune with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which is egalitarian in nature.

“Unfortunately, as Canadian history has unfolded, English Canada’s values have been assaulted almost as much as its symbols. The symbols are largely gone, partly owing to the natural process of moving from colony to autonomous nation.

“In the main, though, the Sisyphean strategy of placating an increasingly nationalistic Quebec has been the propulsive agent behind the assault on both the symbols and the values of English Canada. The values have not yet disappeared, but they surely will unless English Canada takes steps to re-assert them. In that regard, English Canada has only one option – a new Canadian Constitution.

“A new Canadian Constitution would, of course, state that Canada is indivisible. Its main feature, though, would be Article 1, a direct repeat of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. If that declaration is good enough for the members of the United Nations in all their political, economic and social diversity, it is surely good enough for Canada. As long as the remaining articles in no way violated Article 1, the rest would be a matter of relatively minor mechanics.

“Such a new constitution would have several advantages. First and foremost, it would clearly lay out the rest of Canada’s vision of the world as it wishes it to be. Moreover, it would divest us of the constitution Acts of 1867 (BNA Act) and 1982 (essentially the Charter of Rights and Freedoms).

“The former has had its day and is now an outdated gentlemen’s agreement between English and French central-Canadian power elites; the second, with its notwithstanding clause and its 19 sub-sections about language, amounts to nothing more than a language decree.

“If a modern constitution is intended to express the highest ideals of man, then the Canadian Constitution falls short; it is simply a parochial business plan. It may hint at a vision, but it fails to secure one. Indeed, in that it sets up competing groups (English, French and ethnics), it promotes a jaundiced view of the world. Canada needs a modern Constitution.

“A plain word to francophone Quebecers. Your central message is clear – you wish to survive as an ethnic group complete with your own language and your own *moeurs et manières*. The debate continues as to the best way for you to accomplish that, or whether it is even possible.

“Although it is fair to say that your successes have often had to be clawed out of the rest of Canada, it is also fair to say that you have not done badly within Canada. Be that as it may, a lot of what you have achieved has been at the expense of English Canada’s principles.

“Already in English Canada, there is a sizeable faction that believes that its best intentions have been abused.

“Frankly, there are those who believe you have become a domestic burden (transfer payments) and an international embarrassment (United Nations censure) that isn’t worth the candle.

“Quebec being entrenched in the Canadian Constitution as a distinct society is simply the last straw.

“French Quebec should take a long, hard look at Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which says: ‘In those states in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, profess and practise their own religion, or to use their own language’.

“Article 27 is generous, but finite. As such, it fits the mood of many in English Canada, and is likely to be included in a new Canadian Constitution.

“Clearly, English Canada is becoming more and more intolerant of its values being chewed up for the sake of national unity, and distinct society is its line in the sand. When it musters the wherewithal to reassert its values in a new Canadian Constitution, it will do so with or without Quebec.

“Quebec’s options will then narrow to two: either it will live under something akin to Article 27, or it will be partitioned and sent on its way and a new Republic of Canada created.”

Time and again, Canada’s francophanatics have tried to have Quebec declared a distinct society – Meech, Charlottetown, Calgary. They were repeatedly rebuffed; it happened anyhow. My article as it appeared in the October-November 2004 issue of *Dialogue Magazine*:

“No Virginia, the concept of Quebec as a distinct society didn’t die with Meech and Charlottetown. Who told you that? Indeed, the idea is alive and well throughout the land.

“One day you will learn about former Chief Justice Brian Dickson, who once said that the courts were already taking into account Quebec’s role in protecting and promoting its distinctive francophone culture, so entrenching either accord wouldn’t have made a big difference in that regard.

“You will also learn that, although it didn’t make it into the constitution, the concept did make it later as a Parliamentary Resolution, which is the next best thing, because the courts must pay attention to such resolutions.

“I’ll get a copy of the resolution (*Hansard*, Nov. 29, 1995 – Government Orders) and put it in your stocking for Christmas. Some day, you will be able to read it on your computer, too.

([http://www.parl.gc.ca/english/hansard/previous/267\\_95-11-29/267GO1E.html](http://www.parl.gc.ca/english/hansard/previous/267_95-11-29/267GO1E.html)).

“Eventually, you may even be allowed to read what other people had to say about the state protecting and promoting a particular culture. For example: ‘The state is a means to an end. Its end lies in the preservation and advancement of a community of physically and psychologically homogeneous creatures.’ (*Mein Kampf*, Vol. 2, Chapter 2).

“But that’s another story. For the moment, rest assured, Virginia, that the universe is turning as it should.”

“We rely on the leadership in this country to rise above public opinion.”

*Jean Charest, as quoted in The Ottawa Citizen, May 22, 1998*

## Some Other Opinions

The following extracts from *Dialogue Magazine* will serve to illustrate that there are other unhappy campers coast to coast in this Canada.

*Dr. Marguerite E. Ritchie, C.M., Q.C., President of the Human Rights Institute of Canada, doesn't pull her punches:*

“Canadians now see the further sellout of Canada. All Federal parties are engaged in a race to help Quebec become sovereign in everything but name. Members of Parliament cannot protest. They cannot take independent positions on anything that affects Quebec or bilingualism. They do as they are told.

“Not one of the political parties deserves to be there. This is not a free Parliament.

“Prime Minister Martin relies on Quebec separatists and sovereignists. He is elected from Quebec, and looks to Quebec for support. His Government is responsible for the compulsory bilingualism that is enforced on English-speaking Canada, while he is silent about Quebec and its language laws.

“In 1995 Prime Minister Chrétien passed a Resolution through Parliament that recognized Quebec as a distinct society within Canada, binding Parliament and the Government of Canada. Prime Minister Martin has reinforced it by publicly recognizing Quebec as a Distinct Society with which he can make separate deals on health or anything else.

“That makes nonsense out of any pretense that Canada is a single country.

“And Quebec is on its way to independence. Prime Minister Chrétien established the Francophonie at our expense, and took Premiers of Quebec and New Brunswick to the meetings. Now Quebec premier Charest and the Prime Minister of France will be on a trade mission to Mexico, meeting Mexican President Vicente Fox, to benefit Quebec and France.

“Now Quebec is seeking an administrative arrangement with the Federal Government to give Quebec a more prominent role in several international forums. So Quebec will gain greater control over the people within the province. Canadians will be further divided.

“Quebec is a French racist state but it is defended by our Prime Ministers. Now the Martin Government has told foreign Governments to end any recognition of the Queen in dealing with Canada. By contrast, Prime Minister Martin has recognized Quebec acting with France, without regard to Canadian interests, while also able to make deals with the Federal Government that apply to no other Province. Our taxes promote Quebec's power.

“None of the political parties speaks about the complaints to the United Nations against Quebec or the estimated 600,000 – 700,000 mainly English-speaking Quebecers who fled from that Province because of the forced language, the language police, and the harassment. That was the greatest mass migration in Canadian history. No political party will mention it.

“What can we do?

“We can take our future as a country into our own hands. We must not wait while we are plundered further by Governments concerned with handing over our money to Quebec.

“The only Province with the wealth and potential interest to make a difference is Alberta. It has repeatedly protested its exclusion from national policies. It should stop funding the Federal Government. It could declare itself independent. That would start a major shift throughout Canada to throw Quebec out of Canada and to have a Federal Government elected from the rest of Canada.” [*Dec 04-Jan 05 issue, Dialogue*]

*R. Catt of Nanaimo, B.C., agrees with Dr. Ritchie:*

“... after attending a Conservative party meeting, it is clear that both the Liberals and Conservatives are fully committed to bilingualism and have no intention of changing that course. So, apart from establishing a Western Canadian Party, we are likely to become a French nation.”

So does *Kenneth T. Tellis of Mississauga, Ontario*:

“Whatever happens now will be based upon the idea that Quebec rules Canada and not otherwise. Thus, we must work harder to separate and create a republican nation out of Western Canada. Need I say more?”

And *William E. Lee of Qualicum, B.C.* seems to have made up his mind:

“Well, I, too, have had enough. Enough appeasement by successive federal governments of so-called French Canadian nationalists who are, in fact, traitors to their country.

“For nearly 10 years, these governments – dominated, if not led, by French Canadians – have explored the furthest limits of English-speaking Canadians’ generosity and patience . . . . They have poured billions and billions of dollars directly and indirectly into the pockets of individual Quebecers. They have eradicated our historical monuments and customs and rewritten our history. They have given the country a new name; a new flag, symbolic of nothing but the Liberal Party, . . . and a new constitution, in which our British common law heritage has been replaced by one on the French model with a Charter which stresses group rights and where an appointed court, rather than an elected Parliament, is the final arbiter of our freedoms.

“They have given us language laws which impose the French language on all federal institutions throughout the country, while suppressing the English language in towns founded, developed and (until recently) populated by English speakers – Sherbrooke, Lennoxville and, yes, even Montreal.

“I therefore find myself in wholehearted agreement with Ian Hunter, professor emeritus of law from the University of Western Ontario, who wrote in the *BC Report* of December 18, 2000, that, for Western Canada, ‘The way forward is the way out.’

“I would simply add the proviso that the sooner the better.”

**And, finally, this historical footnote:**

“We are sick of the French Canadians with the patriotic blabber and their conspiracies against our treasure, and peace of what, without them, might be a united Canada! With Quebec holding the balance of power, Canada isn’t safe for a moment! The Constitution, or the British North America Act, which is our alleged Constitution, must be altered as to deprive these venal politicians of their powers or else Confederation will have to go! As far as we are concerned, and we are concerned about the good of Canada as anyone else, Quebec could go out of Confederation tomorrow and we would not shed a tear – except for joy. If Ontario were a trifle more loyal to herself, she would not stand for Quebec’s monkey business another moment!”

*Editorial, Toronto Evening News, 1885*

## Conclusion

For years, the rest of Canada has been under assault by an Official Languages Act and by an unprincipled, racist Quebec that have done it serious financial and moral injury.

It bears repeating that Quebec is an insatiable domestic burden, an unrepentant international embarrassment, has in its midst a xenophobic, tribal, ungrateful gang that will not rest until Quebec secedes from Canada; that the rest of Canada has poured billions of dollars into Quebec and diluted its principles in a generous but fruitless effort to accommodate the tribe; and that its reward has been bombings, kidnappings, murders, a constant stream of bilge and the persecution of Quebec minorities.

Obviously, the universe is not turning as it should, and the rest of Canada has every right to be mad as hell. Just as obviously, unless the rest of Canada wants more of the same, there is only one solution – to send a partitioned Quebec on its merry way and to get on with trying to build a new, ethical and officially unilingual – English nation, regardless of the consequences.

# Epilogue

## Dateline 2075

Looking back, the break-up of Canada was much less troublesome and worked out generally better than the naysayers had predicted.

In 2025, Canada was divided into two countries. The province of Quebec was partitioned and, along with northern New Brunswick and a small slice of northern Ontario, became the Republic of Quebec. The rest of Canada became the Republic of Canada.

Once Quebec had quit the Dominion, though, the piecemeal disintegration of the new Republic of Canada was inevitable. The Maritime Provinces were the first to go, in short order, they joined the U.S.A., geographical proximity and kinship with New England winning the day. What remained – the North and Ontario through to British Columbia – the last “Canada” – collapsed when Ontario decided to join the U.S.A. for reasons of economic self-interest.

Today, in 2075, after undergoing considerable turmoil, Quebec is doing reasonably well, perhaps overly dependent on an opportunistic France, and Canada, except for its northern territories that went their own way, has been successfully integrated into the U.S.A. in the form of several new States.

Canada’s disappearance from the world map was only briefly lamented; the event was overtaken by two serious questions. First, what would be the consequences of America’s now unfettered access to the former Republic of Canada’s vast resources? Second, what lesson was there for countries that wanted to remain intact? The first question is ongoing; historians have reached a consensus on the second.

The consensus amounts to this: The United Nations International Bill of Human Rights lists and harmonizes the rights of individuals and groups with the interests of the state and provides legitimate avenues for redress. It is intended to minimize disharmony, to subsume issues before they become problems. Any country that wishes to remain intact, particularly a heterogeneous one such as Canada was, must ensure that democratic principles akin to those in the cited Bill prevail in its domain. Canada failed to do so.

For reasons that are now clear, Canada deliberately ignored the fact that it was a signatory to the cited Bill and did not follow its prescription. The line it took with French Canada, with which it had become preoccupied, was replete with violations of the Bill and caused existing tensions to reach the breaking point.

The most blatant violations were engendered by Canada’s Official Languages Act and its companion piece, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It is now generally agreed that the purpose of both instruments was to advance French Canada. Clearly, both gave Francophones an exaggerated influence in Canadian affairs.

At the same time that Francophones were being favoured, Quebec was continuously angling to become a sovereign state. Eventually, the contradiction galled the rest of Canada sufficiently to set the stage for Quebec’s virtually uncontested departure, which, as the record shows, was aided and abetted by a self-serving France.

The lesson, then, for countries that want to remain intact is straightforward and, paradoxically, nicely formulated at Article 3 of the French Constitution:

“National sovereignty belongs to the people . . . . No section of the people, nor any individual, may attribute to themselves or himself the exercise thereof.”

The message is made absolutely clear at Article 2: “France is . . . indivisible.”

In short, the right of France to endure must necessarily trump the contrariness of any individual or group.<sup>14</sup>

What to do, then, with minority groups?

Part of the United Nations’ Bill, the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, addresses the matter of minority rights at its Article 27:

“In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practise their own religion, or to use their own language.”

Article 27 means that Alsatians, for example, are free to speak German among themselves. It does not mean that France must make German an official language of the French state or that a percentage of France's public servants must be citizens whose mother tongue is German. Unfortunately, Canada entrenched both ideas in law to promote its French-speaking minority, thereby undermining two main principles of democracy – equal opportunity and merit. The results were predictable.

In the end, it seems things worked out rather well for Canada. Be that as it may, that former nation has given a valuable lesson to other nations that wish to remain intact. They must heed the United Nations International Bill of Human Rights and ensure that their own constitutions, laws and systems of governance reflect the egalitarian principles proclaimed therein, principles that best serve humanity in all its political, economic and social diversity.

## Appendix A - Significant Dates

**1867** – Confederation: British North America Act provides for use of English or French in debates and both languages in records and journals of Parliament and the Quebec legislature; either language in any court of Canada or Quebec.

**1869** – Red River settlers led by Louis Riel call for equality of English and French in the legislature, courts and public records and bilingual judges in Manitoba courts. The following year, the *Manitoba Act* is passed, providing for the use of both languages.

**1897** – In Manitoba, English and another language for instruction are permitted in “bilingual schools” where ten or more students speak a language other than English.

**1916** – English is made the sole language of instruction in Manitoba schools.

**1955** – French instruction permitted in designated Manitoba schools in Grades 4 – 12.

**1963** – Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, co-chaired by André Laurendeau and Davidson Dunton, is set up.

**1969** – Official Languages Act provides for bilingualism in the public service and federal agencies, authorizes bilingual districts and creates the office of Commissioner of Official Languages.

**1969 – 1979** – Federal inquiry into safety aspects of bilingual air traffic control in Quebec supports the use of French in small airports in Quebec. Federal Court upholds the use of English in air traffic control stations in Quebec. Final report of inquiry commission in 1979 calls for bilingual air traffic control services in all parts of Quebec. The federal government accepts the recommendations.

**1973** – Parliamentary resolution reaffirms Official Languages Act principles; bilingual districts are designated where both official languages are to be the languages of work for federal public servants.

**1974** – Quebec national Assembly adopts Bill 22, making French the official language of the province (public administration, professions, labor, business and education); language tests are required for language of instruction other than French.

**1975** – Bilingual services extended to Ontario courts.

**1977** – Quebec passes Charter of the French Language (Bill 101): French becomes the official language of Quebec. Federal bilingual districts are abandoned.

**1978** – Quebec Superior Court rules province's Charter chapter on language of legislation and courts is unconstitutional. Ruling is upheld the next year by the Supreme Court of Canada.

**1979** – Manitoba Court of Appeal rules the 1890 language act unconstitutional. Supreme court of Canada upholds the decision.

**1980** – Patriation resolution tabled including Charter of Rights containing guarantees for the two official languages and minority language educational rights. All provinces except Quebec agree. Manitoba legislature establishes English and French as official languages in the province.

**1982** – Canadian Parliament adopts Constitution Act. Quebec Superior Court declares the language of instruction section of Charter of French Language invalid under the Canadian Constitution. Same court rules French-only signs violate freedom of expression guarantee in Quebec Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms.

**1983** – Manitoba government proposes to establish official character of English and French, to translate a specific number of statues and recognize the right of Franco-Manitobans to government services in French, causing public uproar. Parliament passes a resolution supporting the move, but the adjournment of the Manitoba legislature kills the measure. Quebec amends its language charter recognizing the contribution of English-language institutions, abolishing some language tests, and relaxing conditions for English instruction for children from other provinces.

**1984** – Supreme Court of Canada rules that parents educated in English in Canada can send their children to English schools in Quebec. Ontario Court of appeal recognizes the right of all Franco-Ontarians to education in their language.

**1985** – The Supreme court of Canada declares invalid all Manitoba statutes and regulations in English-only. Out-of-court settlement allows series of deadlines, up to December 31, 1990, for translation of all documents.

**1986** – Ontario government guarantees certain services in French.

**1987** – Meech Lake constitutional accord struck between prime minister and provincial premiers to recognize Quebec as a “distinct society” and the role of the Quebec legislature to “preserve and promote” the distinct entity.

**1988** – Supreme Court of Canada upholds 1982 ruling against French-only signs. Quebec adopts Bill 178 requiring French-only signs outside businesses and bilingual signage inside with French predominating. A new official languages bill is passed affirming the government’s commitment to encourage development of official language minorities.

**1989** – McIntyre appeals to Human Rights Committee in Geneva about bill 178.

**1990** – Sault Ste Marie passes English-only resolution.

**1993** – Human Rights Committee agrees that Bill 178 violates McIntyre’s rights.

**1993** – Quebec national Assembly passes Bill 86 to replace 178. Allows English on signs but with many remaining restrictions.

**2003** – “The Lyon and the Wallrus” case submitted to Geneva. Results TBA.

**2004** – Canadians For Language Fairness challenge the legality of the City of Ottawa’s language by-law and policy in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice. Results TBA.

## **Appendix B**

### **Decision of the United Nations’ Human Rights Committee under the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights – Twenty-fourth Session – concerning Communication No. 187/1985**

**Submitted by: J.H.**

**Alleged victims: (In general, English-speaking members of the Canadian Armed Forces)**

**State party concerned: Canada**

**Date of communication: 1 February, 1985**

The Human Rights Committee, established under article 28 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, meeting on 12 April 1985, adopts the following:

#### **Decision on inadmissibility**

1. The author of the communication dated 1 February 1985 is J.H., a Canadian national and retired member of the Canadian Armed Forces, living in Ontario, Canada. He alleges that promotion policies in the Canadian Armed Forces are discriminatory and constitute a violation by Canada of article 2(1) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
- 2.1 It is alleged that Administrative Order 11-6 (1972) of the Canadian Armed Forces, which provides for

an increased percentage of officers and soldiers of French mother tongue, has resulted in discrimination on the basis of language, tantamount to a form of racial discrimination, since English- and French-speaking persons in Canada are of two different ethnic origins. It is alleged that persons of French mother tongue are preferred for promotion within all ranks of the armed forces, to the corresponding disadvantage of persons of English mother tongue.

- 2.2 In last 1978, shortly before his retirement in April 1979, the author, who is of English mother tongue, began his endeavours to point out what he considered to be the linguistic and racial discrimination being practiced in the promotion policy of the Canadian Armed Forces. He wrote letters to several opposition members of Parliament and to two successive Ministers of National Defence. In June 1980 he filed a complaint with the Canadian Human Rights Commission (a statutory body created by federal legislation to administer the Canadian Human Rights Act).
- 2.3 In 1984, a new administrative order was promulgated (2-15 of 29 June 1984), under which “mother tongue” was no longer to be used to determine the participation ratio of English- and French-speaking members of the Canadian Armed Forces. The reference to “mother tongue” was replaced by “first official language.” The author submits that the change was intended to answer the criticism of the prevailing promotion policy. He asserts, however, that the change was only cosmetic and that the same promotion policy continues to be applied today and that the only difference is the manner in which the English and French language and origin are defined.
- 2.4 As a result of the reworded promotion policy, the Canadian Human Rights Commission felt that there were no longer any grounds for potential ethnic or racial discrimination and informed the author that it would not make a decision in the complaint brought by him. J.H. points out in this connection that there is no legislation in Canada prohibiting discrimination on the basis of language (neither the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, part of the Canadian Constitution, nor the Canadian Human Rights Act includes linguistic discrimination as a prohibited practice). He further submits that the conclusion of the Canadian Human Rights Commission to the effect that there was no discrimination is not a “decision” on which an appeal to the courts could be made. He finally mentions that further correspondence with Members of Parliament and other persons in positions of authority have produced no results.
- 2.5 There is no specific indication in the communication that the author has himself been adversely affected by the policy which he complains about. He requests that his complaint be examined and that the Government of Canada be advised “that it is actually discriminating against English-speaking Canadians in implementing its incentive programmes to assist French-speaking Canadians.”
2. Before considering any claims contained in a communication, the Human Rights Committee shall, in accordance with rule 87 of its provisional rules of procedure, decide whether or not it is admissible under the Optional Protocol to the Covenant.
- 4.1 The committee notes that articles 1 and 2 of the optional protocol require that the author of a communication must himself claim, in a substantiated manner, that he is or has been a victim of a violation by the State partly concerned of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant. It is not the task of the Human Rights Committee, acting under the Optional Protocol, to review *in abstracto* national legislation or practices as to their compliance with obligations imposed by the Covenant.
- 4.2 The author of the present communication has not put forward any facts to indicate that he has himself been a victim of discrimination in violation of the provisions of the Covenant. An allegation to the effect that past or present promotion policies are generally to the detriment of English-speaking members of the Canadian Armed Forces is not sufficient in this respect. The committee, accordingly, concludes that the author has not shown that he has a claim under article 2 of the optional protocol.

The Human Rights Committee therefore *decides*:

**The communication is inadmissible.**

## Appendix C

### Canadians for Language Fairness v. City of Ottawa

#### Application

The Application is for:

1. A Declaration that said By-Law and Bilingualism Policy are illegal and *ultra vires* the City of Ottawa;
2. An Order striking down By-Law No. 2001-170 of the City of Ottawa and the Bilingualism Policy adopted by the City of Ottawa on May 9, 2001 pursuant to Section 52(1) of the *Constitution Act* as being of no force or effect as it is in contravention of the guarantee of freedom of expression pursuant to Section 2(b) of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*;
3. The costs of this Application on a substantial indemnity scale plus Goods and Services Tax;
4. Such further and other Order as to this Honourable court may seem just.

The Grounds for the Application and the Material Facts Giving Rise to the Constitutional Question are as Follows:

1. The Province of Ontario has legislated provisions for various designated municipalities within the province of Ontario concerning the use of the English and French languages within the municipality which is set forth in the *French Language Services Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c.F.32 as amended.
2. Section 14 of the *French Language Services Act* empowers designated municipalities, of which the City of Ottawa is one, to pass a by-law with respect to the administration of the municipality being conducted in both English and French and that all or specified municipal services be made available in both languages.
3. In purported exercise of the authority granted by the Province of Ontario, the City of Ottawa passed By-law 2001-170, and therein referred to a Bilingualism Policy (“Policy”) adopted by Council with respect to bilingualism in the City of Ottawa.
4. There is no jurisdiction granted by the Province to the City to promulgate such a Policy. The promulgation of the Policy is not authorized or is in excess of the powers granted in the enabling legislation and, moreover, is in itself unreasonable, unfair, discriminatory and vague and uncertain in its application.
5. Moreover, the By-law unlawfully adopts the extraneous substantive Policy which “may be amended from time to time” which is without lawful authority and a delegation not permitted by the enabling legislation.
6. The provisions of the By-law and Policy are contrary to the right of freedom of expression as guaranteed by Section 2(b) of the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*
7. Rules 1.04, 14.05, 38 and 39 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*.
8. Such further and other grounds and material facts as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.

The Following is the Legal Basis for the Constitutional Question and Application:

1. The Policy, under the guise of attempting to provide for provision of bilingual service for its citizens, has mandated a bilingualism policy which discriminates against current and prospective City of Ottawa employees and is in violation of the guarantee of freedom of expression as guaranteed by Section 2(b) of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

2. The violation of the freedom of expression guarantee by the City of Ottawa contained within the By-law and Bilingualism Policy is not a reasonable limit that can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.
3. The By-law and Policy are void and illegal in that the City of Ottawa has acted without jurisdiction or in excess of its jurisdiction to enact the By-law and Policy thereunder by legislating on matters strictly reserved for the Legislature.
4. The Policy is unreasonable, unfair and discriminatory and is unauthorized by the enabling legislation and vague and uncertain in its application.
5. Such further and other bases as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.

The Following Documentary Evidence will be used at the hearing of the Application:

1. The Affidavit of \_\_\_\_, a ratepayer, and member of Canadians for Language Fairness;
2. Such further and other documentary evidence as counsel may advise and this Honourable court may permit.

*Dated at Ottawa this 5<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2004.  
Law Offices of J. Arthur Cogan, Q.C., Barrister*

## **Supplementary Reading List**

### **Background Documents**

The United Nations International Bill of Human Rights  
 The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms  
 The Canadian Human Rights Act  
 The Official Languages Act  
 The Next Act: New Momentum for Canada's Linguistic Duality, 2003

### **Literature (by year of publication)**

Trudeau, Pierre Elliott. *Federalism and the French Canadians*. Macmillan of Canada, 1968.  
 Andrew, J.V., *Bilingual Today, French Tomorrow*. BMG Publishing Limited, 1977.  
 Brimelow, Peter. *The Patriot Game*. Key Porter Books Limited, 1986.  
 Andrew, J.V. *Enough!* Andrew Books, 1988.  
 King, Maurice J. *The First Step*. (The Gordon McIntyre Case) Southwest Quebec Publishing, 1993  
 Kirk, Russell. *American's British Culture*. Transaction Publishers, 1993  
 Reid, Scott. *Lament for a Notion*. Arsenal Pulp Press, 1993  
 Armstrong, Joe C.W. *Farewell the Peaceful Kingdom*. Stoddart Publishing Co. Limited, 1995.  
 McDonald, Kenneth. *The Monstrous Trick*. APEC Books Ltd., Toronto, 1998.  
 Boshier, J.F. *The Gaullist Attack on Canada 1967 – 1997*. McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.  
 Scowen, Reed. *Time to say Goodbye*. McClelland and Stewart Inc., 1999.

## Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup> Not reproduced here, but available in virtually any library.

<sup>2</sup> The Canadian Human Rights Commission will accept a complaint on the ground of language, but only if it can be linked to ethnic origin, one of its listed grounds. In fact, language was deliberately left out of the Canadian Human Rights Act because it was thought that the Official Languages Act covered the territory. See Senate Debates, June 14, 1977, pp.891-892.

<sup>3</sup> The percentage referred to the percentage of Francophones (persons whose mother tongue was French) that the Forces had to achieve at all rank levels at the time. Today it is 25 percent.

<sup>4</sup> The language factor accounts for five percent of a member's annual score.

<sup>5</sup> "A" Division is responsible for federal policing in northern and eastern Ontario and the Outaouais region of Quebec.

<sup>6</sup> F.O.L (F) stands for: First Official Language (French)

<sup>7</sup> Dan McKenzie was variously reviled as a dinosaur, anti-French and anti-Quebec, terms not unknown to those who criticize official bilingualism.

<sup>8</sup> *The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Commentary*, The Carswell Company Ltd., Toronto, 1982, p.434.

<sup>9</sup> Joe Houlden, *Dialogue Magazine*, February 2000.

<sup>10</sup> *The Next Act* laments the assimilation of Francophones into Anglophone communities; indeed, billions of dollars have already been poured into preventing it. In 2004, despite there still being English-speaking students on New Brunswick's remote Miscou Island, the last English elementary school at Miscou Harbour will close in the fall of 2005. Most of the students now attend French-language schools. Neither heritage Canada nor the Commissioner of Official Languages has lifted a finger to prevent the assimilation of that Anglophone community.

<sup>11</sup> The majority of federal institutions exceed their quota of Francophones. For years, the percentage of Francophone employees in the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages itself has hovered around 70 percent.

<sup>12</sup> Serge Joyal was a cabinet minister and Secretary of State under Trudeau. Appointed a Liberal Senator by Jean Chrétien in 1997, he is now preoccupied with buying portraits of dead French kings to hang in the halls of Parliament.

<sup>13</sup> *For Rent – In Search of Bilingual Services from Businesses in NCR Federal Buildings*.

<sup>14</sup> In 1998, the Supreme Court of Canada declared on the question of Quebec's separating that the other provinces and the federal government would have no basis to deny the right of the government of Quebec to pursue secession.

\* \* \*

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN SELF-PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR -  
AND CIRCULATED AS A PAID INSERT IN THE AUGUST-SEPTEMBER 2005 ISSUE OF DIALOGUE MAGAZINE.  
THE VIEWS EXPRESSED ARE THOSE OF THE AUTHOR AND COPYRIGHT BELONGS TO THE AUTHOR.

EXTRA COPIES CAN BE ORDERED FROM DIALOGUE MAGAZINE, WHILE SUPPLIES LAST.

Send \$10.00, with your name & address (cost includes GST & postage)

To: Dialogue Magazine

6227 Groveland Dr., Nanaimo, B.C. V9V 1B1

Tel: (250) 758-9877; Fax: (250) 758-9855

E-mail: [dialogue@dialogue.ca](mailto:dialogue@dialogue.ca); [www.dialogue.ca](http://www.dialogue.ca)