Subsequent reports have built upon the first, with specific areas of focus complementing the update of provincial and territorial data. The 2001 FSL report included a *School Self-Assessment Tool* enabling interested parties, parents, teachers and administrators to discuss and evaluate their school's programs in a constructive manner.

In 2002, the worsening shortage of teachers of French in coming years was brought to the attention of ministries of education, school boards and faculties of education. With the commissioning and dissemination of the Teacher Shortage Study, CPF pointed out the urgent need for concerted action on this issue if the gains made in the last 25 years are to be maintained.

The FSL reports have identified the need for attention, resources, and action in several areas. Among the most urgent problems identified are actual and growing teacher shortages, the need for more and better resources and me-thods that will enable French immersion students encountering difficulties to get the help they need while staying in the program, the need for a totally transparent process of allocating federal funds in support of French second-language learning; and the need to evaluate current teaching methods and curricula and to adopt new ones informed by research.

The voice of CPF has been heard. The federal government's new Official Languages Action Plan responds directly to the issues identified in CPF's annual reports, and sets out both an ambitious objective and the means to achieve it.

Launched by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien in March 2003, a new action plan for official languages, authored by Intergovernmental Affairs minister Stéphane Dion, set a target of doubling the proportion of secondary school gra-duates with a functional knowledge of their second official language by 2013. Currently, 24% of Canadians between 15 and 19 know both languages.

The "Dion Plan" will dedicate $137 million over the next five years to initiatives in four priority areas in second-language education identified by CPF: Improvement of core English and French, a revitalization of immersion, an increase in the number of qualified teachers, and the provision of opportunities for bilingual graduates to put their skills to good use. An annex to the plan lays out an accountability and coordination framework.

Through close and strategic collaboration among the federal, provincial and territorial governments, school districts, researchers, post-secondary institutions, and volunteer organizations including CPF, we believe that the ambitious goal of doubled bilingualism can be realized.

On this 40th anniversary of the Royal Commission of Bilingualism and Biculturalism, we are at a unique point in the development of linguistic duality. CPF takes this opportunity to salute the achievements of the first generation of true Canadian bilinguals, to reflect on the importance of sustained support for French-second-language education programs, and to look forward to a future shared with others who also believe in the importance of access to quality education in both official languages for all Canadian children.

THE FIRST STAGE OF THE MULTICULTURALISM DEBATE

MICHAEL TEMELINI
Dr. Michael Temelini is a Visiting Professor at the Centro di Ricerca in Studi Canadesi (Canadian Studies) at the Università di Genova

ABSTRACT
The author highlights why the policy of multiculturalism was so unconventional by examining the parliamentary debates that preceded the Commission and the recommendations that flowed from it. He suggests that the body of work together promoted a civic humanist meaning of multiculturalism and ethnic conflict resolution

There is a prominent interpretation of multiculturalism which suggests that it is essentially a liberal theory of minority rights. According to this sense of the term, multiculturalism is primarily a principle of procedural justice, and a rule of law. It would be foolish to disavow the importance of this interpretation. The adoption of rules-based guarantees and special recognition, particularly concerning visible minorities and distinct national identities must be seen as a contribution to Canadian civilisation. What concerns me is the extent to which other meanings are screened out when multiculturalism is interpreted exclusively within the juridical vocabulary of minority rights. In fact multiculturalism was originally articulated and defended by Canadians in the language of civic humanism: a good, a moral commitment, and a civic virtue that must be willingly accepted by citizens in a practice of ongoing dialogue. It was subsequent to the articulation of multiculturalism as a good that it was entrenched as a right in the constitution. Understanding the difference between these two political domains, that is the good and the right, will do much to clarify the meaning and significance of multiculturalism in Canada. Recognizing this difference is also crucial to understanding Volume IV of the *Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.*

I want to illustrate the difference between rights and the good, and highlight why the policy of multiculturalism was so unconventional, by surveying the House of Commons debates that led to the setting up of Canada's *Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*, as well as the recommendations of its Volume IV, the subject of which was "the contribution by other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada and the measures that should be taken to safeguard that contribution." It is a remarkable fact that many commentators on multiculturalism do not even mention these debates nor the *Royal Commission* itself. And yet the very first stage of the debate on multicultura-

lism occurred during these parliamentary debates and Commission hearings. The Commission launched a groundbreaking pan-Canadian conversation that effectively redefined Canada's national identity. These debates and discussions and the *Final Report*, which was submitted in 1969 and accepted as official policy on October 8, 1971, should be seen as the birthplace of multiculturalism. What we find in these debates and discussions is not a juridical vocabulary but the recognition that understanding other cultures would lead to the enrichment and flourishing of Canada.

Created by an order in Council on July 19, 1963 the *Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism* was a response to a widespread belief among public servants and Canadians in general that the country was experiencing, in the words of co-Chairman André Laurendeau, "a state of emergency – an emergency that can jeopardize the very existence of Canada." Laurendeau, (who made these remarks at the Preliminary Hearing, November 7 and 8, 1963) was referring to a series of events that effectively called into question the stability and integrity of Canadian federalism: A renewed resurgent Québec nationalism; the emergence of a growing popular secessionist movement; and the actions of the extreme terrorist wing of the nationalist movement. In the face of these complex challenges Canadians reacted in ways which were, as Kenneth McNaught has so aptly observed, "both indigenous and distinctive." (*Penguin History of Canada*, 1988, p. 307)

What was indigenous was that in the midst of this climate of fear and uncertainty, Canadians looked for a variety of non-violent solutions in the form of dialogue, self examination, and understanding. What was distinctive was that while Canada faced "the greatest crisis of its history" (as quoted in the "Preliminary Report," *Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*, Ottawa, February 1, 1965) Canadians recognized that the conventional practices of constitutionalism and federalism could not exclusively reconcile the conflict between the "founding races," or what we now call ethnocultural or ethnic groups. In fact both francophone and anglophone Canadians alike reacted to these events first by calling into question such conventions and then by adopting a remarkable spirit of good will and a genuine willingness and to negotiate and engage in dialogue. This willingness to negotiate was first articulated in a series of remarkable debates that took place in the federal House of Commons. A number of Members of Parliament launched a campaign between the Fall of 1962 and the spring 1963 to set up a royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism. Prime Minister J.G. Diefenbaker carefully rejected such proposals. One aspect of the debate had to do with "respecting the rights of one another." But a number of Parliamentarians also stressed the importance of "a full understanding" and "a perfect understanding" between anglophones and francophones. One notable intervention was that of the leader of the opposition, Lester B. Pearson, on December 17, 1962. Pearson expressed concern about the "serious crisis of national unity" and then gave a passionate defence of confederation, which he described as "the rejection not only of political and economic annexation of the United States, but also of the American melting pot concept of national unity." Instead, Pearson saw confederation as,

> ...an understanding or a setttlement between the two founding races of Canada made on the basis of an acceptable and equal partnership. That settlement provided that national political unity would be achieved and maintained without the imposition of racial, cultural or linguistic uniformity.

Throughout his speech, Pearson frequently employed this vocabulary, characterizing confederation as an "understanding" between two different founding Canadian "races" and he referred to the national unity crisis as a breakdown in this understanding. He described the crisis as a difference of interpretation, as a "misunderstanding" as "difficulties in relations" and "a difference over the meaning of confederation." To solve this crisis of meaning and understanding Pearson did not propose constitutional negotiations and he did not appeal to a language of rights. Instead he called for dialogue. He called for "a deep, responsible and understanding examination of basic situations" by means of a "review" of the "bicultural and bilingual situation in our country" in which there could be "every opportunity and every encouragement for Canadians, individually or in their associations, and organizations, to express their ideas on this situation."

The idea that the crisis required self-expression, and "a climate of mutual understanding and full cooperation" and not just rights, was a sentiment articulated by a number of Members of Parliament that day. Perhaps it was Stanley Knowles who articulated most clearly this distinction:

> We...support wholeheartedly the proposition that every effort must be made to establish mutual respect and equality between the two great races that brought this country into being. We feel that it is not only a matter of according rights and adjusting certain grievances that have grown up, but that it will add to the richness of life in this country if we can further the binational, bicultural and biethnical heritage which is already ours.

In a speech that passionately outlined the prevailing moral commitment, Lionel Chevrier called for "self-examination" and a "spiritual retreat" aimed at mutual understanding. Chevrier remarked: "we must learn, on both sides, not only to remain ourselves and better to live our own culture, but also to become a little like the other, and to participate more actively in the culture of the other." The aim and expectation was that with this exercise, "we shall then become better citizens, and we shall form a richer and more united nation."

There were two related disagreements that arose during these parliamentary debates. First, there was a disagreement about the vocabulary in which to characterize the political situation. But this was not just a linguistic dispute because the disagreement was also a substantive political debate in which Canada's prevailing constitutional conventions were being questioned. Prime Minister Diefenbaker did not go on record as agreeing with the Official Opposition that Canada's crisis of national unity was a crisis of understanding. Consequently, in response to these calls for a royal commission, he stalled and redefined the problem along customary terms by proposing the more conventional Canadian practices of ethnic conflict resolution, namely constitutional

negotiations and the convening of a federal-provincial conference. The opposition certainly did not completely renounce these conventional practices, and many attempted to justify the royal commission as a complementary approach. But federalism and constitutional negotiations were rejected as a first option on the grounds that Canada was not facing a constitutional crisis, but a crisis of understanding, which could not be exclusively dissolved by federal-provincial negotiations. The parliamentarians justified their demands partly on the claim that federal-provincial and French-English relations were "unsettled and unsatisfactory," as T.C. Douglas remarked on December 18, 1962. Douglas in fact called for a "new approach" to federalism, but he also argued that "the task we face as a country must be understood by all our people and this requires much more intensive thought and study." For this reason he promoted the idea of a royal commission as "a thorough study of our experience of Canadian federalism" and a mechanism for "a careful rethinking of the relations between the two nations."

The dispute was settled when the government was defeated on February 5, 1963 on a general non-confidence motion and with the election of the Pearson government in the April 1963 federal election. In its Speech from the Throne on May 16, the new government announced "the character and strength of our nation are drawn from the diverse cultures of people who came from many lands" and that "the greater Canada that is in our power to make will be built not on uniformity but on continuing diversity, and particularly on the basic partnership of English speaking and French speaking people." To ensure that "the partnership shall be truly equal" the new government announced that it would establish a Royal Commission "to study...how the fundamentally bicultural character of Canada may best be ensured and the contribution of other cultures recognized." During the debate on the Speech from the Throne, one Member of Parliament, S. Perry, suggested on May 23 that without "the recognition of the stimulating contribution of other cultures, this nation cannot flourish as it should." And following the announcement of the terms of reference and personnel of the *Royal Commission* on July 22 there was widespread support declared on the grounds that it could lead to "greater understanding, co-operation and spirit of unity." Still, Members of the Progressive Conservative Party, now the Official Opposition, expressed doubts that day concerning the Commission's utility and Diefenbaker continued to insist that no "effective action" could be taken "until there has been agreement between the dominion government and the provincial governments on the question of the amendment of the constitution..."

What these public debates reveal is that there were at least two contested approaches to address resurgent ethnic and national conflict. There were on the one hand, those who sought a solution exclusively in constitutionalism and federalism. Against this position there were those who promoted the idea that cross cultural understanding was something that could be achieved in dialogue and conversation. The view that prevailed was the latter. What these debates also reveal is that Canadian parliamentarians were trying to articulate what Charles Taylor calls "the good" – something marked out as higher by a qualitative distinction, something considered valuable or worthy. In his *Sources of the Self*, Taylor claims that the good is always primary to the right, "not in that it offers a more basic reason... but in that the good is what, in its articulation, gives the point of the rules which define this right." (p. 89). Whatever other meanings the term has since acquired, in Canada (perhaps the first liberal democracy to adopt such a policy) multiculturalism was first embraced as a virtue term, a strongly valued good, as a way of life that must be willingly accepted by citizens engaged in an ongoing practice of dialogue. In fact there is striking historical evidence to support this claim. In Canada multicultural rights actually followed the articulation of multiculturalism as a good. Therefore it is precisely the case that this articulation gave the point of the rules that define minority or group rights.

The Members of Parliament believed that cross cultural understanding was neither a form of compensation nor exclusively a right. Rather, it was seen in more substantive terms as an admirable way of life, as something indispensable for the enrichment of the polity. They justified their support for a royal commission and pleaded for cross cultural understanding on the grounds that it would strengthen the bonds of civic solidarity. In this respect, there is nothing new about what Kymlicka calls the "new front in the multiculturalism wars." Even at its genesis, multiculturalism was defended as a civic virtue that would ensure rather than corrode or undermine or destabilize "long-term political unity and social stability." (Kymlicka, *Contemporary Political Philosophy*, p. 365-368.)

Aristotle is often cited as a source of this domain of ethical thinking. In his celebrated *Nichomachean Ethics*, he defined the good as that which "makes life something desirable and in no way deficient." (I,vii) Following the establishment of the Commission, this sense of the good was articulated by Co-Chairman André Laurendeau at the Preliminary Hearing, November 7 and 8, 1963. He justified the purpose of the inquiry as follows:

> The equal partnership, l'égalité culturelle: this is not a notion that compels recognition by itself, even in deference to the most profound studies. For such an idea to flourish it must have the voluntary support of the people in a free society. And that is why the discussions between the Commission and the public will have to be continuous, intimate and free... Aristotle wrote that friendship is the soul of the city. Today social sciences affirm that a nation exists where you find a collective "wish to live" among its members. Basically the two ideas are the same, and give our task some singularly profound perspectives.

Laurendeau went on the define the Commission inquiry as a "dialogue." And indeed one of the remarkable aspects of the Commission is that it was really the first time that a Royal Commission undertook public hearings, rather than simply seeking expert opinions. This dialogical approach and Laurendeau's explicit citation of Aristotle is striking evidence of the point I am making here. Aristotle claimed that the good is an aspect of *phronesis*. It does not come from a rule or a theory, but by training, by good habits from an early age, and by a practice of dialogue with others. "It is not enough to know about goodness" Aristotle explains

in the *Nichomachean Ethics*, "we must endeavour to possess it and use it, or adopt any other means to become good ourselves." (X,ix) Indeed, the goal of political inquiry is "not to know what goodness is, but how to become good."(II,ii) And this purpose is at the heart of these early parliamentary debates on multiculturalism, and might in fact be considered as the leitmotif of the *Royal Commission* itself, including Volume IV, from which the official policy was born. The aim of the *Royal Commission*, as Laurendeau explained in the preliminary hearing, was not theoretical knowledge. Rather it was an effort to convince Canadian citizens to talk to each other and to voluntarily change their practices, to create a new political society based on mutual understanding. Laurendeau was speaking to the quality of political life and the degree to which it embodied common deliberation. The end sought was not necessarily minority rights but a certain quality of "discussions between the Commission and the public." Indeed, it was out of these discussions that Canadian citizens themselves democratically agreed upon a new civic self-interpretation. In the hearings that took place many of the groups appearing before the *Royal Commission* rejected the dualist image of Canada suggested of the terms of reference. Some participants wanted to replace dualism with a unitary concept of citizenship. On the other hand the idea of dualism aroused fears among many established ethnic groups who rejected it on other grounds. If Canada should be described by its ethnocultural composition, then the appropriate term is not biculturalism, they argued. Consequently, it was in its *Preliminary Report* submitted February 1, 1965, that the Commissioners announced the birth of multiculturalism as follows:

> "What image of Canada would do justice to the presence of these varied ethnic groups? This question preoccupied western participants especially, and the answer they often gave was "multiculturalism", or more elaborately, "the Canadian mosaic"... They asked: if two cultures are accepted, why not many? Why should Canada not be a Country in which a multitude of cultural groups live side by side and yet distinct from one another, all contributing to a richly varied society? Certainly, it was stated, the mosaic idea was infinitely preferable to the "melting pot." (page 51)

I have been surveying the earliest debates on multiculturalism in which the concept was articulated as a virtue and a good in the civic humanist sense of an ability that shapes our character, in the sense that it makes us "become better citizens", and in the sense that it adds "to the richness of life in this country." To see multiculturalism as a good rather than a right is to recognize that achieving cross cultural understanding and avoiding ethnocentricity are of higher worth, are valuable and necessary civic achievements. If this argument is correct, it may help explain why educational associations most vigilantly defend multiculturalism. The focus on education might also help us understand how to properly address the challenges posed in a multicultural society. If Canada offers any lessons, it is simply that engendering cross cultural understanding is, to reiterate the words of Stanley Knowles, "not only a matter of according rights and adjusting certain grievances." Rather, it is, also a philosophy of education, by which I mean an approach that trains us to be good, that teaches us to value what is both similar and different in others, that teaches us to see differently. Multiculturalism is in fact, a modern version of the classical humanist tradition of *studia humanitatis* an approach that seeks to create the *vir perfectus*, an excellent human being. In the humanist tradition, the common good is seen in civic and moral terms and education was defended and promoted as a benefit to the city, or the republic. It was necessary in order to live civilly and honestly (*viver civil et honesto*).

The idea that multiculturalism is a good, something that needs to be cultivated, or what civic humanists call a moral virtue, that it enriches the polity, that it is a necessary feature of civilised society, is clearly articulated in these parliamentary debates, and indeed throughout all the submissions and hearings, and official documents of the *Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism* and in its Final Report, which was submitted to the Governor General in Council on October 23, 1969, which declared that "The presence in Canada of many people whose language and culture are distinctive by reason of their birth or ancestry represents an inestimable enrichment that Canadians can not afford to lose." Evidence can also be found in the sixteen recommendations of Volume IV. The Commission not only advocated human rights legislation, but educational mea-sures to promulgate the newly understood good. The Commission recommended that the teaching of languages other than English and French, and cultural subjects related to them "be incorporated as options in elementary and high school"; that universities "broaden their practices in giving standing or credits for studies in modern languages other than French and English both for admission and degrees." Illustrating even more clearly the connection between multiculturalism and the civic humanist perspective, the Commission also recommended that Canadian universities "expand studies in the fields of the humanities and the social sciences related to particular areas other than those related to the English and French languages." Recommendations were also made to remove restrictions in public and private broadcasting, and even "to foster the arts and letters of cultural groups" other than the British and the French. Indeed, these recommendations follow quite dramatically the advice offered by the civic humanist tradition. These recommendations suggest that it is not enough to know that Canada is multicultural; rather, Canadians had to learn how to *become* multicultural, since otherwise, as Aristotle correctly adds, this knowledge "would be useless." (Nichomachean Ethics II,ii)

On October 8, 1971, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau announced in the House of Commons that his government accepted the recommendations of the Final Report of the *Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*, which were contained in Volume IV. The new policy he announced was "multiculturalism within a bilingual framework." When Trudeau stood in the House of Commons that day a remarkable transformation had already taken place in Canada. The debate about multiculturalism changed Canada in at least two important respects. First, it changed the way Canadians talked about and related to each other as an immigrant society. Second, Canadians, and the Québecois particularly, stopped seeing their 'national' identities exclusively in terms of the French-English dichotomy.

What began as a call to understand the difficulties in our linguistic and cultural duality resulted in the recognition that Canada is a diversity of cultures. What's interesting, is that this self-identification and understanding came from dialogue, not from a theory. Moreover, this new identity was defended as a strongly valued good, a term of excellence, as something that enriched us as Canadians, an indispensable condition of our existence. It was in 1982, thirteen years after the release of the *Final Report* and eleven years after the adoption of the policy, that multiculturalism was entrenched in the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. And it was in 1988 that multicuturalism was guaranteed as a federal law. To paraphrase Taylor, articulating the good of multicultura-lism was primary to entrenching multicultural rights, because articulating the good gave the point of the rules which define this right. This meaning of multiculturalism is screened out of Kymlicka's picture.

Conclusion

My argument here has been that the parliamentary debates establishing the *Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*, as well as the discussions and recommendations of Commission promoted a civic humanist meaning of multiculturalism and ethnic conflict resolution. What the *Royal Commission* teaches us is that multiculturalism is not in essence a juridical or procedural commitment, but primarily a substantive moral commitment about what constitutes a good life, which we and others ought to strive for. Multiculturalism is not a just a rules-based approach. It is not simply a corollary of, or exclusively captured by, the language of minority- or "group-differentiated" rights. Regardless of the position one holds on the debate on rights, whether individual or collective, multiculturalism is not simply a principle of justice. The juridical or law-centred paradigm is an important aspect of the meaning of multiculturalism. But multiculturalism cannot be fully or properly understood if it is reduced to this idiom. Rather, multiculturalism must also be understood as a strongly valued good, and a civic virtue, by which I mean, an ongoing ability that is acquired in dialogue with others, and something that needs to be cultivated and learned. In this sense, whether the other culture is in the minority or majority is irrelevant. Because the aim is not a correct theory or principle of procedural justice, or compensation. Rather, multiculturalism is a continuing conversation, a practice of genuine cross cultural understanding. Multiculturalism on this view is not exclusively a procedure for according special powers or rights to national minorities and fair terms of integration to ethnic groups. Multiculturalism is a way of understanding others in which we *become* multicultural. If our aim is indeed cross cultural understanding, then this meaning of multiculturalism must be taken seriously. To see that multiculturalism is about virtues as well as rights means that 'national unity' must be based on something more than a constitution that guarantees the equality of all its citizens. It must be based on an ongoing dialogue and what Aristotle called in his Nichomachean Ethics "a right training for goodness from an early age."

RÉFLEXIONS SUR LES DIFFÉRENTES LÉGISLATIONS LINGUISTIQUES CANADIENNES

JOSEPH-G. TURI
Joseph-G. Turi, avocat et professeur, est Secrétaire général de l'Académie internationale de droit linguistique

RÉSUMÉ
Les conflits linguistiques au Canada ont éventuellement amené l'état à intervenir de façon considérable en matière de politique linguistique. Conséquemment, le bilinguisme officiel progresse à la vitesse des législations linguistiques qui se multiplient rapidement au pays actuellement. Ces disposition juridico-linguistiques canadiennes demeurent néanmoins insuffisantes notamment pour préserver les droits des Canadiens allophones.

Le problème des langues a toujours été important au Canada, tant au niveau central qu'au niveau local, parti-culièrement depuis 1867. Le Canada est depuis ses origines modernes, du point de vue constitutionnel, un pays fédéral officiellement bilingue au niveau central et au niveau des provinces du Québec et du Manitoba, conformément aux dispositions de l'article 133 de la Loi constitutionnelle de 1867 et de l'article 23 de la Loi du Manitoba de 1970. Ces articles édictent que le français et l'anglais sont les langues officielles du Fédéral, du Québec et du Manitoba, dans les domaines législatifs et judiciaires de leur compétence. Le bilinguisme officiel-constitutionnel est également prescrit pour le Nouveau-Brunswick, en vertu des articles 16 à 22 de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés, de 1982 (articles qui s'appliquent également au Fédéral).

Toutefois, le Canada, formé d'un État fédéral, de dix États membres, les provinces, et de trois territoires, tout en restant et en devenant davantage officiellement bilingue, est devenu une société multiculturelle. Ce n'est plus la même réalité sous-jacente de la Commission Laurendeau-Dunton! La population actuelle du pays est de quelque 30 millions d'habitants. Grosso modo, le 58 % est d'origine « anglophone » (établi surtout dans les huit provinces anglophones du pays), le 23 % est d'origine « francophone » (établi surtout dans la province francophone du Québec, dans la province franco-anglaise du Nouveau-Brunswick et au nord de l'Ontario), le 18 % est d'origine « allophone » (établi un peu partout au pays et ayant