

This is a thematic guide to historical documents, both textual and graphical (photography, art, images of artifacts), available on the Internet. These excerpts are intended to acquaint history and library staff with the types and location of documentary material for curricular use. Suggestions for related activities are also included.

The theme for this issue is ...

QUEST FOR JUSTICE AND UNITY, 1960-82

CONTENTS:

INTRODUCTION

IDEALS - A SOCIETY THAT VALUES JUSTICE

[A Bill of Rights for Canadians \(1960\)](#)

John Diefenbaker

[National Objectives \(1964\)](#)

Lester Pearson

Activity: Pearson lists qualities Canadians should have to foster justice and unity: decency, fairness, generosity etc. Apply these in a role-play of conflicts among different groups in society (such as poor tenants, landlords and city council). Make up two or three situations; consider including alternative outcomes to each situation.

COMPLAINTS - WHEN JUSTICE FALLS SHORT

[Western Canada Secession Last Resort, Says Pederson](#)

Saskatoon Star Phoenix, December 16, 1969

[Lament for Confederation \(1967\)](#)

Chief Dan George (Teswahno)

[“Ex” Won’t Do Anything About Lack of French](#)

The Ottawa Journal, August 27, 1968

[Profiles of Working Class East Indian Women](#)

[A Black Man’s Toronto](#)

[FLQ Manifesto \(1970\)](#)

Activity: Most people in these writings have economic complaints, as well as social ones. Throwing money at them won’t help, but legitimate financial support might. In your job with a foundation, you help change society by identifying people who should receive assistance. Search the writings for what these people would ask for, then brainstorm a list of goals you think they should aim for.

PROGRAMS - LIMITED GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

[Official Languages Bill Introduced in the House of Commons \(1968\)](#)

Pierre Trudeau

[Multiculturalism: Government Response to Volume IV of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism \(1971\)](#)

Pierre Trudeau

[Perspectives and Recommendations on Immigration Policy \(1975\)](#)

The Presbyterian Church in Canada

[Submission on the Green Paper on Immigration \(1975\)](#)

British Columbia Civil Liberties Association

Activity: Government can’t legislate morality, so what can it do to spread justice? Generalize about these and other laws and policies from the Trudeau, Pearson and Diefenbaker governments. Assess the ability of these initiatives to encourage justice (and/or unity, diversity etc.) by placing them in various categories on a chart.

BASIC RULES - RENEWING THE CONSTITUTION

[A Time For Action \(1978\)](#)

Pierre Trudeau

[Proclamation of the Constitution \(1982\)](#)

Pierre Trudeau

INTRODUCTION

Two broad developments came to a head in Canada in the 1960s and '70s. Social awareness arising largely in the Depression, and human-rights consciousness which was a reaction to the horrors of World War II, grew into a widespread demand for justice among a range of minority groups, including francophones, aboriginals, and non-aboriginal people of color. The groups with greater political clout (particularly French Canadians) argued so strongly for social/economic equity (when they weren't threatening separation) that a crisis of national disunity developed. Federal governments in these two decades carried on a quest for justice and unity, passing legislation of varying intent and effect, and culminating in 1982 in the delivery of a reformed constitution with a renewed statement of rights.

In his introduction of the 1960 [Bill of Rights](#), Diefenbaker proclaims basic values for Canadians to foster, both as a nation and as individuals. This and other [dualities in the national character](#) are noted in a Pearson speech on Canada's potential and what Canadians must do to reach it (plus: his list of [qualities needed to maintain unity and justice](#)).

Dualities of discontent, however, show the divisions in the country. [Prairie farmers' frustration](#) leads to mention of Western separation, while Chief Dan George would end the native peoples' [forced alienation](#) by breaking into the dominant culture. The Central Canada Exhibition's [lack of French-language signs](#) makes it into the mainstream press in the brittle relations between francophones and anglophones, where the [second-class citizenship](#) of South Asians rates full coverage in a marginal feminist publication. Surprisingly, a long-time observer of Toronto's Caribbean community notes West Indian immigrants [suffering "distance"](#) from other black Canadians, and the FLQ seems to have a greater [problem with the ruling class](#) than with anglophones per se.

In his government's re-landscaping of society, Trudeau echoes his predecessors in calling on Canadians to make a "conscious choice" of how they want the country to look and feel. [Official bilingualism](#), his high-profile answer to the French-English dilemma, and his [multiculturalism](#) strategy against ethnic discrimination, look toward a society "based on fair play for all" and "a sense of belonging." Yet for all the talk of unity "founded on confidence in one's own individual identity," government can still systematically deny basic rights, as is seen in the criticism [by the Presbyterian Church](#) and [by the BC Civil Liberties Association](#) regarding immigration policy.

Finally, the national will to reinforce justice and unity amid discrimination and dissent is channelled into a resetting of the ground rules in a reformed constitution. In his long [essay on renewing the Federation](#), Trudeau denotes values shared by all Canadians. He argues the necessity to reappraise and update them, but also to integrate them and live up to the practical consequences of that acceptance. Then, at the [proclamation of the 1982 constitution](#), he challenges Canadians to trust and have faith in themselves to build upon the new consensus.

IDEALS - A SOCIETY THAT VALUES JUSTICE

A Bill of Rights for Canadians

John Diefenbaker address (broadcast on CBC's "The Nation's Business")

June 30, 1960

"My fellow Canadians,

Tomorrow is Dominion Day, the ninety-third anniversary of the farsighted decision of our forefathers, taking

their inspiration from the 72nd Psalm, to create here 'a Dominion from Sea to Sea.' On this anniversary, Canadians will renew their faith in our beloved Canada. [...]

All my life I have striven to see Canadians from coast to coast united as 'One Canada' without in any way departing from the historic and constitutional rights of the two great basic races. More and more that dream is coming true. In the spirit of the words of 'O Canada,' it will be my privilege to rise in my place in the House of Commons tomorrow and introduce a Bill of Rights for Canadians. I am sure you will agree with me that the day and the spirit of the day will be highly appropriate for this.

So this evening, on the eve of our great national holiday, I ask you to consider for a few moments with me the reasons why I believe that the introduction of this new Bill represents one more great milestone of the spiritual things of Freedom to make them more secure.

Standing on guard for Canada means many things. We think first perhaps of the great problem of national defence against the threat of aggression from abroad. We must maintain our Defences — protect ourselves against the possibility of attack — and press on for disarmament. [...]

We must vigilantly stand on guard within our own borders for human rights and fundamental freedoms which are our proud heritage. The experiences of many countries whose citizens have flocked to our shores in recent years — and ours too — make it clear that we cannot take for granted the continuance and maintenance of those rights and freedoms. Those who have lived in countries in which human dignity has been denied know how closely the assertion of these rights is linked with the struggle for peace among mankind.

[...]

We are a people deriving our basic institutions from Britain and France, the two nations which have stood in the front line of most of the great battles for human liberty. [...] Our passion for freedom we derive as well from many other countries whose people have written noble pages in the ageless story of freedom.

[...]

[...] In 1952, in introducing a resolution for a Bill of Rights, I said:

The hallmark of freedom is a recognition of the sacred personality of man, and its acceptance decries discrimination on the basis of race or creed or colour. Canadians have a message to give to the world. We are composed of many racial groups, each of which must realize that only by forbearance and mutual respect, only by denial of antagonism or prejudice based on race, or creed, or even surname, can breaches in unity be avoided in our country. National unity in Canada is not only an ideal — it is a necessity — based on ordinary common sense.

There are, of course, those who say that the Bill in its present form does not go far enough — that it should be a constitutional amendment binding on Parliament and the Legislatures. To do this would require the consent of all the provinces, and that is not attainable as yet. This Bill will, however, cover all matters within the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament.

Legislation cannot do everything, but I am sure that few Canadians will deny that this is not only a first step in the right direction, but a very important first step and one that will take its place among the outstanding achievements for the maintenance and preservation of human liberty in Canada. [...]

What will a Canadian Bill of Rights do? It will declare that the following rights and freedoms are in existence and that no Act of the Parliament of Canada, in the past or in the future (subject to the security demands of war), shall be permitted to interfere with them:

- (a) The right of the individual to life, liberty, security of person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law;
- (b) The right of the individual to protection of the law without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex;
- (c) Freedom of religion;
- (d) Freedom of speech;
- (e) Freedom of the press.

It will declare the principle that every individual, whatever his colour, race or religion, shall be free from

discrimination and will have guaranteed equality under the law. [...]

As I said in the House of Commons on past occasions, it will be a contract between the individuals of Canada and the Government of Canada. It will assert the right of the individual and the right of a minority to be protected in the exercise of its rights against the majority. It will above all assure that each of us will have a legal right to be heard in the courts of this country.

It will make Parliament freedom-conscious. It will make Parliament realize that rights are to be preserved. It will make Parliament more cautious in passing laws that would have the effect of interfering with freedom. [...] It will give to Canadians the realization that wherever a Canadian may live, whatever his race, his religion or his colour, the Parliament of Canada will be jealous of his rights and will not infringe upon those rights.

[...]

I want to make it clear that we would favour any measure that would increase or extend the effectiveness of a Canadian Bill of Rights when and if agreement can be reached with all the provinces. We would certainly sympathetically consider the suggestion of making it part of the Constitution when the provinces agree, and will at all times welcome any representations from the provinces in this regard.

For the moment, I believe that you will support the step we have taken and that you will work with us to make it effective, both as individuals and as members of many organizations who are interested in this subject. I recall the opposition that I met with over the many years of my advocacy of this Bill. Its principle appears to have such widespread endorsement today. As one who, time and again, opposed what I considered to be unnecessary encroachments on our freedoms, I can tell you that such encroachments are nowhere in evidence today.

[...]"

<http://www.nelson.com/nelson/school/discovery/cantext/speech2/1960dfna.htm>

SEE:

The Canadian Bill of Rights

<http://www.nelson.com/nelson/school/discovery/cantext/constitu/1960cana.htm>

ALSO SEE:

First Attempt at a Human Rights Charter: The Canadian Bill of Rights

Department of Justice, Ottawa

<http://canada.justice.gc.ca/en/justice2000/84mile.html>

The Birth of Human Rights Codes: The Ontario Human Rights Code (1962)

Department of Justice, Ottawa

<http://canada.justice.gc.ca/en/justice2000/89mile.html>

National Objectives

Lester Pearson

Address to the Empire Club, Toronto, October 15, 1964

"I believe in my country. I honour its past and have faith in its future. I reject the views of those men of little faith and mean spirit who, by their pessimism about our future, diminish our present and betray our past. No country in the world is more envied, and with such good reason, as Canada. No country has a greater destiny ahead of it if we wish to make it so. Other countries would be very happy if they had not only the reality of our present but the promise of our future.

Nothing can prevent us becoming one of the world's great nations except:

- International chaos and the ultimate catastrophe of nuclear war. We have a part — but only a relatively modest part — to play in preventing the tragedy.
- Our own failure to meet the tests and exploit the opportunities that face us: the test of unity and the

opportunity of national growth. This is entirely our own, and no one else's, responsibility.

Canada will not, however, realize its destiny unless we understand the nature of our nation; its origins; its history; its problems; its possibilities. I said at this Club a year ago:

There must be a determination to understand the real nature of Canada and the forces eroding that nature; to recognize the peril of serious internal divisions; to recognize also the competition and challenge of the changing world community and the competitive world marketplace; to realize the opportunities of national strength through unity and the fatal weakness of division and discord.

Geographically we are satisfactorily huge but, in economic and demographic terms, we are merely a long, narrow ribbon clinging to our United States boundary. So we must widen that ribbon by pushing development northward and bringing in the people and the capital which can make that push possible. Yet it must be in essentials a Canadian development under Canadian control.

Insistence on Canadian nationalism must not be allowed to obscure the necessity for cultivating the best possible relations with other countries, especially with the United States and our two Mother Countries, Britain and France. No country depends more on other countries for its prosperity than Canada. The lesson is obvious. You don't bite the hands that are helping to feed you.

We must understand the constitutional and racial structure of our country and the implications of that structure on our political development. Canada is a Federation of Provinces based on two founding peoples, English-speaking and French-speaking, which has subsequently developed as a multiracial society.

Canadian national unity — which is essential — rests on the recognition and the acceptance of this dualism in our origin and of this diversity in our development. This dualism must not be permitted to weaken or destroy us. [...] Inside this entity, however, there is a French-speaking sector which socially, culturally and historically has the nature of a national community, with the Province of Quebec as its heart and centre. This fact must be recognized. So must the fact of national unity, politically and before the world. To maintain such unity should be a primary objective of the Governments and the people of Canada. [...]

To strengthen national unity, the Federal Government and the Governments of the Provinces must use all the means at their disposal. They must in particular endeavour to further and deepen among all citizens, as individuals and as members of associations and communities, the understanding of and support for the principles on which the Canadian Confederation is based.

All Canadians must actively support — as a matter of individual responsibility — policies designed to promote national confidence, national identity, national unity and national purpose; policies which will keep our union strong, our federation healthy and effective and our country one before the world.”

<http://www.nelson.com/nelson/school/discovery/cantext/speech2/1964peem.htm>

ADDITIONAL REFERENCE:

Inauguration of the National Flag of Canada

Lester Pearson, February 15, 1965

“[...]”

May the land over which this new Flag flies remain united in freedom and justice; a land of decent God-fearing people; fair and generous in all its dealings; sensitive, tolerant and compassionate towards all men; industrious, energetic, resolute, wise and just in the giving of security and opportunity equally to all its cultures; and strong in its adherence to those moral principles which are the only sure guide to greatness.

Under this Flag may our youth find new inspiration for loyalty to Canada; for a patriotism based not on any mean or narrow nationalism, but on the deep and equal pride that all Canadians will feel for every part of this good land.

“[...]”

<http://www.nelson.com/nelson/school/discovery/cantext/speech2/1965pefl.htm>

ACTIVITY

Diefenbaker and Pearson are prime ministers during a time when Canada is

- aware of its potential for growth and wealth, and
- aware of society's duty to help and protect even the most unlucky and unwanted, and also
- aware that the nation has lots of problems just staying united.

Diefenbaker argues that Canadian unity depends on people respecting one another, and that respect only comes from recognizing human rights, specifically in a Canadian bill of rights. Pearson outlines the forces that pull national unity in different directions: the urge to give Canadians control over the country's development, along with the need to let foreign financial backers also have a say in the development; the control of society by two major (but unequal) language groups, at the same time that many other cultural and racial groups want a share of prosperity and power. While he knows government has a role in keeping Canada united, he also says it's every individual's responsibility to understand and support the nation's unity, identity and purpose.

It's hard to have unity with justice for everyone when there are so many segments of society wanting different things. Say, for example, that recently arrived black (or aboriginal, or Asian) people renting homes in an old part of the city want their landlords to fix up and repair the rundown houses and apartments they live in; but the landlords, who are children of poor immigrants (or people from poorer parts of Canada, or long-time black/aboriginal/Asian residents), can't do that and still afford the nice houses and middle class lifestyle their parents worked so hard to give them; and the city council, which mostly represents wealthy and upper middle class citizens, is debating a job-creating project that will evict the renters and tear down the old housing so that big business can build a luxury hotel/condo complex (or a casino, or a convention centre). What can be done to treat everyone fairly in this sort of situation? How should we approach such a complicated scenario?

In the "additional reference" just above, Pearson lists the qualities Canadians should have to foster justice and unity: decency, fairness and generosity; sensitivity, tolerance and compassion; energy, firmness and wisdom. Apply these characteristics (and others you think suitable) in a role-play presenting conflicts similar to the example. Make up two or three situations with local, regional or national importance and dramatize them for classmates. Consider including alternative outcomes to each situation (example: the renters get money to make their repairs, or the landlords are forced to make them, or the project goes ahead), and ask your audience which seems to be the most just to the most people in each scenario. Work Pearson's list of qualities into the discussion, as well as the drama — which qualities are relevant? — which conflict with each other?

(Keep in mind the conclusions you come to in this exercise as you read the criticisms and complaints in the next section.)

COMPLAINTS - WHEN JUSTICE FALLS SHORT

Western Canada Secession Last Resort, Says Pederson
Saskatoon Star Phoenix, December 16, 1969

"Secession from the rest of Canada is the last thing in Martin Pederson's mind. But if the federal government refuses to heed the unrest in the west, he will advocate a break of this kind.

Since his statement on this question last week, Mr. Pederson said he has had dozens of phone calls supporting his idea. People [are] offering financial assistance to form a new party, dedicated to bringing pressure to bear so the government will consider the needs of the western people.

'This party would have the ability to speak for all parties on this particular issue,' he said. Mr. Pederson said he did not wish to be the leader of such a party. He was formerly leader of the Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatchewan.

'People are fed up with the lack of response from the federal government to western problems. It is costing us a great deal to belong to Canada. We pay tariffs to protect eastern industry and we pay freight rates to the Atlantic coast while our business could be done at the Pacific coast,' he said.

'The federal government will have to realize that the problem of the western farmer must take precedence over

conferences on the constitution and Quebec interests,' Mr. Pederson said. He said discontent has been growing for at least two years and has shown itself in a concrete form during recent conferences of farming representatives.

He said if the federal government is really trying to help the agricultural situation, credit restrictions should be put on luxury items, instead of interest rates being raised. 'Buying on credit is the farmer's way of life, and he has been severely penalized by what the government is doing to curtail inflation,' Mr. Pederson said. 'The only reason we have a recession and not a depression is because the rest of Canada is still buoyant.'

'Secession from the rest of Canada may have to come,' he said, 'unless the government is prepared to settle the growing unrest in the west.'"

<http://library.usask.ca/sni/stories/pol32d.html>

Lament for Confederation

Chief Dan George (Teswahno)

Empire Stadium, Vancouver, July 1, 1967

"How long have I known you, Oh Canada? A hundred years? Yes, a hundred years. And many many seelanum (lunar months) more. And today, when you celebrate your hundred years, Oh Canada, I am sad for all the Indian people throughout the land.

For I have known you when your forests were mine; when they gave me my meat and my clothing. I have known you in your streams and rivers where your fish flashed and danced in the sun, where the waters said come, come and eat of my abundance. I have known you in the freedom of your winds. And my spirit, like the winds, once roamed your good lands.

But in the long hundred years since the white man came, I have seen my freedom disappear like the salmon going mysteriously out to sea. The white man's strange customs, which I could not understand, pressed down upon me until I could no longer breathe.

When I fought to protect my land and my home, I was called a savage. When I neither understood nor welcomed this way of life, I was called lazy. When I tried to rule my people, I was stripped of my authority. My nation was ignored in your history textbooks — they were little more important in the history of Canada than the buffalo that ranged the plains. I was ridiculed in your plays and motion pictures, and when I drank your fire-water, I got drunk — very, very drunk. And I forgot.

Oh Canada, how can I celebrate with you this Centenary, this hundred years? Shall I thank you for the reserves that are left to me of my beautiful forests? For the canned fish of my rivers? For the loss of my pride and authority, even among my own people? For the lack of my will to fight back? No! I must forget what's past and gone.

Oh God in Heaven! Give me back the courage of the olden Chiefs. Let me wrestle with my surroundings. Let me again, as in the days of old, dominate my environment. Let me humbly accept this new culture and through it rise up and go on.

Oh God! Like the Thunderbird of old I shall rise again out of the sea; I shall grab the instruments of the white man's success — his education, his skills, and with these new tools I shall build my race into the proudest segment of your society.

Before I follow the great Chiefs who have gone before us, Oh Canada, I shall see these things come to pass. I shall see our young braves and our chiefs sitting in the houses of law and government, ruling and being ruled by the knowledge and freedoms of our great land.

So shall we shatter the barriers of our isolation. So shall the next hundred years be the greatest in the proud history of our tribes and nations."

<http://www.nelson.com/nelson/school/discovery/cantext/aborigin.htm>

“Ex” Won’t Do Anything About Lack of French
The Ottawa Journal, August 27, 1968

“Nothing will be done this year to change the lack of French-speaking personnel and French language signs at the Central Canada Exhibition, Howie Callaghan, CCE public relations officer says. However, he said the board of directors of the CCEA will ‘look into it in the years ahead, and try their best to make our French-speaking friends feel at home.’

Mr. Callaghan said ‘there is a lack of signs, and we might have done more,’ but he said it’s too late this year for changes. He said the Ex was following the ‘same policy the City of Ottawa follows,’ which means, he said, limited use of French because Ottawa is primarily an English-speaking area.

Monday, Jean Claude Guimond, director of the Hull Jaycees, in a press release said the fair was ‘not just for Ottawa — it’s a regional fair.’ Mr. Guimond said there are ‘some signs in French, but not enough, considering the number of French-speaking people who go there.’ He estimated about 100,000 French Canadians visited the Ex. ‘It’s not too late to do something this year,’ remarked Mr. Guimond.

Public relations representative Mr. Callaghan said there are problems because of firms like Amusement of America, whose American personnel do not speak French. Mr. Callaghan also said that the fair had a few years ago tried a special Grandstand show with French Canadian recording stars, but it was very poorly attended, he said, and had to be discontinued.”

http://collections.ic.gc.ca/superex/english/media/journal/oj_aug27_1968.html

“Profiles of Working Class East Indian Women
Interviewed and translated by Prabha Kholsa
Currents, Winter 1983/84 (Urban Alliance on Race Relations)
This article was first published by Fireweed, the Feminist Quarterly, Spring 1983.

[...]

Three Children Died Last Year

Most of the farm work in British Columbia is concentrated in the Fraser and Okanagan Valleys and is done by immigrant workers. In Greater Vancouver the majority of farm workers are primarily Indian or Chinese. There is also a small percentage of working class whites. Farm work is seasonal, and consequently a large proportion of the workforce is migratory. Some, like the Quebecois workers, travel to the Okanagan Valley every summer to pick fruit. Due to inadequate housing, they usually have to resort to tenting. Many of the farm workers in the Fraser Valley live a great distance away in the interior of British Columbia. They are accommodated in converted sheds or barns. It is estimated that the majority of the 10,000 farm workers in British Columbia are girls and women between the ages of 8 and 70 years old. Kuldip Kaur Bains, who is interviewed below, is sixty-three years old, a grandmother and a worker.

We come down to this farm about March-April, and we live here the whole summer till the end of August, beginning of September. This is the third year we have come to this farm: me, my husband, my daughter-in law and her two children. [...] We live in this barn here that has been converted so that it can now accommodate five families. It’s been divided up into five sections, but as you can see, it’s all rough work with an unfinished plywood ceiling and the walls are bare gyproc. Nothing has been painted or anything. And there aren’t enough light bulbs and there are no windows. We have two bunk beds next to each other with a small table. We keep our clothes and other things under the beds.

In the area outside the bedrooms we have two fridges which we all share and five gas plates — one for each

family. The washrooms are outside around the back, and there is no light there either. There are no showers and we wash ourselves by carrying water in buckets. There are two toilets and two small divided areas where we clean ourselves. We have to make a living, so we just learn to accept these things.

It is very difficult for me to get any other work. I'm old and I don't speak English, so this is the only work I can get. We get up early in the morning, make some breakfast, and lunch to take with us to the fields. We don't come back here until the evening.

The work is hard and backbreaking. But only us Indians do it. Nobody else will. And we get paid so little. For example, if we pick raspberries we get \$2.50 for one flat[....] It takes a lot of picking to fill one flat and towards the end of the season it takes even longer. But we don't get the whole \$2.50, because the farmer deducts money for allowing us to stay here in his barn. So what we get to keep for ourselves is something like \$1 out of every \$2.50.

When we are picking broccoli and cauliflower we use sharp knives and quite often people get hurt. But there is no first aid on the farm and they usually don't take us to hospital unless it's very serious. So most of us carry bandages with us. Many of us have rashes. People say it's from the pesticides we use on the vegetables and fruits, but the farmer is not doing anything about it.

It's also dangerous for our children. Some of the older children work with their parents but the younger ones stay with their mothers in the field. Three children died last year because no one was looking after them. They were just playing by themselves.

Because of all these problems, I joined the Canadian Farmworkers Union. They said that if we are all united we will be able to get better money for our work and also be covered by the Worker's Compensation Board. We don't get many of the benefits that other workers get. After all, aren't we like other people? We do the work like everyone else and we should get these things. How would they eat if we were not doing this work?

Is There a Union Here?

Sudha Patel has lived in Canada for eleven years.

One of my first jobs was at this factory that makes things like paper bags and other paper products. We had many different machines to work with. We made big bags for industrial use and the smaller ones like the ones you get at grocery stores. There were only a few Indians in the factory. Actually, I think there were only two or three of us.

The way the factory was set up was that when we came in the morning, there was a list on the wall indicating which person was assigned to which machine for that day. The machine would be listed with someone's name next to it. And some of the machines were really fast.

Every morning when I would make my way to the machine with my name, the other women who worked there would always tell me, 'No, you can't work at that one. You come and work on this one here.' Everytime, they would move to the fastest one.

I had to work really hard and fast. It was so difficult to keep up the speed of the machine. And I was really tired by the time I got home in the evening. I don't speak English, even though I do understand some, and I never knew who to complain to about the speed of the machine.

So one day I decided that I had had enough of this. I looked at the list and went to the machine which was assigned to me. Again these women told me that I couldn't work on it. But this time I said, 'No, the list said that I was to work on this one, so this is where I am going to stay.'

Well, because of all the noise and confusion the foreman came over and asked what was going on. After he had assessed the situation he said that I had to work on the other machine and not the one with my name on it.

Otherwise I could leave right now. So I left, got my lunch and came home. What was I supposed to do?

The next day I went to apply for unemployment insurance because I didn't know how long it would take me to find another job. But at the UIC office they told me that I couldn't apply for UIC. They told me that there was a union in the plant. And that I shouldn't have walked out, that I should have talked to the union.

I didn't know about the union. I did have a union card, so I guess it's partly my fault. But I didn't know that the

union would do anything about it. They never told me about the union and what it was for. Of course, I guess everybody was in the union but nobody did anything about what had been going on for a long time. And I didn't know who I was supposed to talk to.

I do believe in protecting our rights, but if they don't tell us, how are we supposed to know? I didn't even know the name of the union.

I Want To Learn English

My name is Charanject Dhillon. I was twenty when I came here, five years ago. I had just graduated from the local college in India with a BA. My first four or five months here, I didn't do anything. I missed home a lot, and used to cry every time I received letters from my friends. Then after a while I started realizing that I should get a job or I should start going to school. So I took English classes. I used to go downtown twice a week to Manpower classes. I took the classes for about three months and then started to look for a job.

I only looked for the jobs that didn't require much English, because I didn't speak enough then. I was looking for work in a restaurant, hotel or motel to do cleaning as a chambermaid. Finally I found one. It was for only four hours a day and I was making \$3 an hour. I worked there for a full year, until a friend told me that I should apply for a job at the restaurant where she worked. When you are first here, it is difficult to know where to look for work. Anyway, they finally hired me as a kitchen helper.

I went back to the motel and told the owner that I was going to stop working there because I now had a full-time job. He said, 'Where?' I said, 'In a restaurant.' He said, 'Oh yeah, you'll probably be washing dishes.' You know, that is the attitude they have — that our people only wash dishes. I still remember that. I will always remember that.

I was taking classes all the time then; that's how my English improved. I worked in the kitchen so I didn't have to deal with the customers. It was mostly our people in the kitchen. The waitress and carhops were all white. I always felt like something was going on. For example, when the waitresses have to ask other white people for something, they smile and speak nicely, but when they have to talk to us, they don't smile at all and are very rude. I've noticed that.

I'm now working as a nurse's aide. If I had a choice, I would like a more creative job: even working in the office. I wouldn't do this work if I had a choice. The work is not any better, but it is better paying; we have a union and benefits.

I wish I could continue to learn English, so that I could say what I feel like inside. Right now, I can't. Many times I find myself stuck for words. I want to be good in English so that I can get a good job. Now I know what other women are doing and I know I can do the work, but I think I will have some problems communicating with others. I think the other people think you are dumb if you cannot communicate with them."

<http://collections.ic.gc.ca/magic/mt16.html>

A Black Man's Toronto

Harry Gairey

Polyphony, Summer 1984

Part of this article is from "A Black Man's Toronto, 1914-1980. The Reminiscences of Harry Gairey"
(Multicultural History Society, 1981)

"[...]

In the 1960s with the increased immigration of Blacks into Toronto, it was a tremendous change. You can go anywhere in the city and find Black people. In the early 1920s, you could walk up and down Yonge Street for days and run into only a porter, or some girls out of domestic work shopping around on Thursday, but it was a rare thing. But now if you don't see Blacks, you see Hindus, you see Brown, you see Filipinos, you see Chinese, and that makes it a cosmopolitan city. Before it was only Scottish, Irish, English, or European — it was just that

way....

There is definitely a distance between Black people who have just arrived and those who have been living here for a longer period time. The Black Canadians, those a generation here, still believe that because you are coming up here you are coming to take away their jobs. But there is an abundance of assets that the West Indians bring in here that helps the Black Canadians and vice versa. We must try not to force anything, try to cooperate and discuss things if there is a problem, which I believe there is....

[...]"

<http://collections.ic.gc.ca/magic/mt70.html>

FLQ Manifesto

“Issued by the Front de Liberation du Quebec; read over CBC/Radio-Canada on Oct. 8, 1970 as a condition for the release of kidnapped British trade official James Cross

“The people in the Front de Liberation du Quebec are neither Messiahs nor modern-day Robin Hoods. They are a group of Quebec workers who have decided to do everything they can to assure that the people of Quebec take their destiny into their own hands, once and for all.

The Front de Liberation du Quebec wants total independence for Quebecers; it wants to see them united in a free society, a society purged for good of its gang of rapacious sharks, the big bosses who dish out patronage and their henchmen, who have turned Quebec into a private preserve of cheap labour and unscrupulous exploitation.

The Front de Liberation du Quebec is not an aggressive movement, but a response to the aggression organized by high finance through its puppets, the federal and provincial governments (the Brinks farce, Bill 69, the electoral map, the so-called “social progress” tax, the Power Corporation, medical insurance — for the doctors, the guys at Lapalme...)

The Front de Liberation du Quebec finances itself through voluntary taxes levied on the enterprises that exploit the workers (banks, finance companies, etc....).

The money powers of the status quo, the majority of the traditional tutors of our people, have obtained from the voters the reaction they hoped for, a step backwards rather than the changes we have worked for as never before, the changes we will continue to work for.

- Rene Levesque, April 29, 1970

Once we believed it worthwhile to channel our energy and our impatience, in the apt words of Rene Levesque, into the Parti Quebecois, but the Liberal victory shows that what is called democracy in Quebec has always been, and still is, nothing but the “democracy” of the rich. In this sense the victory of the Liberal party is in fact nothing but the victory of the Simard-Cotroni election-fixers. Consequently, we wash our hands of the British parliamentary system; the Front de Liberation du Quebec will never let itself be distracted by the electoral crumbs that the Anglo-Saxon capitalists toss into the Quebec barnyard every four years. Many Quebecers have realized the truth and are ready to take action. In the coming year Bourassa is going to get what’s coming to him: 100,000 revolutionary workers, armed and organized!

[...]

Yes, there are reasons for the Liberal victory. Yes, there are reasons for poverty, unemployment, slums[...] Yes, there are reasons, the guys who work for Lord know them, and so do the fishermen of the Gash, the workers on the North Shore; the miners who work for Iron Ore, for Quebec Cartier Mining, for Noranda know these reasons too. The honest workingmen at Cabano, the guys they tried to screw still one more time, they know lots of reasons.

Yes, there are reasons why you, Mr. Tremblay of Panet Street and you, Mr. Cloutier who work in construction in St. Jerome, can’t afford “Golden Vessels” with all the jazzy music and the sharp decor, like Drapeau the

QUEST FOR JUSTICE AND UNITY, 1960-82

aristocrat, the guy who was so concerned about slums that he had coloured billboards stuck up in front of them so that the rich tourists couldn't see us in our misery.

Yes, Madame Lemay of St. Hyacinthe, there are reasons why you can't afford a little junket to Florida like the rotten judges and members of Parliament who travel on our money. The good workers at Vickers and at Davie Shipbuilding, the ones who were given no reason for being thrown out, know these reasons; so do the guys at Murdochville that were smashed only because they wanted to form a union, and whom the rotten judges forced to pay over two million dollars because they had wanted to exercise this elementary right. The guys of Murdochville are familiar with this justice; they know lots of reasons. Yes, there are reasons why you, Mr. Lachance of St. Marguerite Street, go drowning your despair, your bitterness and your rage in Molson's horse piss. And you, the Lachance boy, with your marijuana cigarettes...

Yes, there are reasons why you, the welfare cases, are kept from generation to generation on public assistance. There are lots of reasons, the workers for Domtar at Windsor and East Angus know them; the workers for Squibb and Ayers, for the Quebec Liquor Commission and for Seven-up and for Victoria Precision, and the blue collar workers of Laval and of Montreal and the guys at Lapalme know lots of reasons.

The workers at Dupont of Canada know some reasons too, even if they will soon be able to express them only in English (thus assimilated, they will swell the number of New Quebeckers, the immigrants who are the darlings of Bill 69).

These reasons ought to have been understood by the policemen of Montreal, the system's muscle; they ought to have realized that we live in a terrorized society, because without their force and their violence, everything fell apart on October 7.

We've had enough of a Canadian federalism which penalizes the dairy farmers of Quebec to satisfy the requirements of the Anglo-Saxons of the Commonwealth[...] Canadian federalism pursues a reckless import policy, thereby throwing out of work the people who earn low wages in the textile and shoe industries, the most downtrodden people in Quebec, and all to line the pockets of a handful of filthy "money-makers" in Cadillacs. We are fed up with a federalism which classes the Quebec nation among the ethnic minorities of Canada. We, and more and more Quebeckers too, have had it with a government of pussy-footers who perform a hundred and one tricks to charm the American millionaires, begging them to come and invest in Quebec, the Beautiful Province where thousands of square miles of forests full of game and of lakes full of fish are the exclusive property of these all-powerful lords of the twentieth century. We are sick of a government in the hands of a hypocrite like Bourassa who depends on Brinks armoured trucks, an authentic symbol of the foreign occupation of Quebec, to keep the poor Quebec "natives" fearful of that poverty and unemployment to which we are so accustomed.

We are fed up with the taxes we pay that Ottawa's agent in Quebec would give to the English-speaking bosses as an "incentive" for them to speak French, to negotiate in French. Repeat after me: "Cheap labour is *main d'oeuvre à bon marché* in French."

We have had enough of promises of work and of prosperity, when in fact we will always be the diligent servants and bootlickers of the big shots, as long as there is a Westmount, a Town of Mount Royal, a Hampstead, an Outremont, all these veritable fortresses of the high finance of St. James Street and Wall Street; we will be slaves until Quebeckers, all of us, have used every means, including dynamite and guns, to drive out these big bosses of the economy and of politics, who will stoop to any action however base, the better to screw us.

We live in a society of terrorized slaves, terrorized by the big bosses, Steinberg, Clark, Bronfman, Smith, Neopole, Timmins, Geoffrion, J.L. Levesque, Hershorn, Thompson, Nesbitt, Desmarais, Kierans (next to these, Remi Popol the Nightstick, Drapeau the Dog, the Simards' Simple Simon and Trudeau the Pansy are peanuts!). We are terrorized by the Roman Capitalist Church, though this is less and less true today (who owns the square where the Stock Exchange was built?); terrorized by the payments owing to Household Finance, by the advertising of the grand masters of consumption, Eaton's, Simpson's, Morgan's, Steinberg's, General Motors — terrorized by those exclusive clubs of science and culture, the universities, and by their boss-directors Gaudry and Dorais, and by the vice-boss Robert Shaw.

There are more and more of us who know and suffer under this terrorist society, and the day is coming when all the Westmounts of Quebec will disappear from the map.

Workers in industry, in mines and in the forests! Workers in the service industries, teachers, students and unemployed! Take what belongs to you, your jobs, your determination and your freedom. And you, the workers at General Electric, you make your factories run; you are the only ones able to produce; without you, General Electric is nothing!

Workers of Quebec, begin from this day forward to take back what is yours; take yourselves what belongs to you. Only you know your factories, your machines, your hotels, your universities, your unions; do not wait for some organization to produce a miracle.

Make your revolution yourselves in your neighbourhoods, in your places of work. If you don't do it yourselves, other usurpers, technocrats or someone else, will replace the handful of cigar-smokers we know today and everything will have to be done all over again. Only you are capable of building a free society.

We must struggle not individually but together till victory is obtained, with every means at our disposal, like the Patriots of 1837-1838 (those whom Our Holy Mother Church hastened to excommunicate, the better to sell out to British interests).

In the four corners of Quebec, may those who have been disdainfully called lousy Frenchmen and alcoholics begin a vigorous battle against those who have muzzled liberty and justice; may they put out of commission all the professional holdup artists and swindlers: bankers, businessmen, judges and corrupt political wheeler-dealers....

We are Quebec workers and we are prepared to go all the way. With the help of the entire population, we want to replace this society of slaves by a free society, operating by itself and for itself, a society open on the world. Our struggle can only be victorious. A people that has awakened cannot long be kept in misery and contempt.

Long live Free Quebec!

Long live our comrades the political prisoners!

Long live the Quebec Revolution!

Long live the Front de Liberation du Quebec!

Source: 'The FLQ Manifesto,' Marcel Rioux, Quebec in Question (1971), tr. James Boake"

<http://www.nelson.com/nelson/school/discovery/cantext/modpolit/1970flqm.htm>

ACTIVITY

These writings show the range of discontent in Canada in the 1960s and '70s, from the exasperation of Western farmers to the violence of the FLQ. French-English disagreements had the highest profile nationally, but regional differences and racial discrimination were also reported in the news. Perhaps it seemed that everything that described Canada — an ancient native tradition, joined by two founding cultures and later, immigrants from many lands, all tying various regions together across a continent — everything characteristic of Canadian society and history, was a source of grievance and strife.

We could say that this “goes with the territory” when such a variety of peoples, histories and experiences live together in a society that is subject to racism, elitism, sexism and other prejudices. Yet even if we expect it, there is no excuse for ignoring social conflict, or the “-isms” that so often feed it. However, there are other ways of looking at problems that might offer possibilities for solutions.

Most if not all of the voices heard in the writings above have an economic complaint, as well as social ones. The Western secessionist says it's “costing us a great deal to belong to Canada.” The East Indian farm worker objects that “what we get to keep for ourselves is something like \$1 out of every \$2.50 [we earn],” while the nurse's aide says “I wouldn't do this work if I had a choice. The work is not any better, but it is better paying[....]” The aboriginal chief wants to “grab the instruments of the white man's success.” The black immigrant to Canada has found that “Black

Canadians, those a generation here, still believe that because you are coming up here you are coming to take away their jobs.” And the FLQ member seems most upset that francophone Quebecers are exploited as cheap labor. Money seems to be a common element in the situations.

Yet throwing money at the indignities all these people suffer wouldn't remove the problems. However, you know that serious financial support, for the people and/or for those working legitimately to improve their situations, can help clear their paths to justice. You help make this happen in your job at the billion-dollar Social Justice Foundation. You work for change in society by identifying people who should receive the foundation's assistance. That's money to allow them to reduce or eliminate the disadvantages keeping them from the level of security and opportunity that Canadians of the mainstream culture enjoy. Your assignment is to work with the people you heard from in the writings above, to see what they need that the foundation can give them and how the aid should be provided.

Your bosses always emphasize that you don't give money to improve on people's problems, but to eliminate them. So as you look over the cases in your assignment, you know **not** to fund a nicer barn for the farm workers to stay in, nor to move the aboriginal people to a river with more salmon. Instead, you discuss with them what would make a practical, permanent improvement in their lives. Look through their writings for hints of what they would ask for, then brainstorm a list of goals you think they should aim for. Which goals are practical? — are the East Indian farm workers ready to operate their own farm? — could the aboriginal people start their own college to acquire the instruments of success? Go through your list and eliminate the ideas that are too ambitious to work and the ones that try only to make bad conditions nicer. Settle on proposals that the people you're working with will find useful **and** that will advance your foundation's purpose: social justice.

(As you read the government programs in the next section, think about which would fit the foundation's criteria for practical, permanent, social justice goals.)

PROGRAMS - LIMITED GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Official Languages Bill Introduced

Pierre Trudeau

House of Commons, October 17, 1968

“Mr. Speaker:

Many of the bills which are placed before members of this House are concerned with a specific problem, or a single occupation, or one region of the country. The Official Languages Bill is a reflection of the nature of this country as a whole, and of a conscious choice we are making about our future.

Canada is an immense and an exciting country, but it is not an easy country to know. Even under modern conditions, it is a long and expensive trip from St. John's to Vancouver, or from Windsor to Inuvik. The great differences of geography, history and economics within our country have produced a rich diversity of temperament, viewpoint and culture.

This is easy to state, and it has been repeated in hundreds of patriotic speeches; but without the direct experience which has not been available to most Canadians, it is difficult to appreciate it fully.

The most important example of this diversity is undoubtedly the existence of the two major language groups, both of which are strong enough in numbers and in material and intellectual resources to resist the forces of assimilation. In the past this underlying reality of our country has not been adequately reflected in many of our public institutions.

Much of our political theory and tradition has been inherited from the major countries of Western Europe. It happens that the majority of these countries are relatively homogenous in language and culture. It has been practical for many of them to operate on the principle: one state, one language. For Canadian descendants of West Europeans this has often appeared to be the normal situation[....]

Looked at from a contemporary world viewpoint, it is the apparently homogenous states of Western Europe which are the exception. Many Eastern European, Asian and African states contain within a single political unit a

great variety of languages, religions and cultures. In many of them this diversity is reflected in a federal system of government and in two or more official languages. In the past, multicultural states have often resulted from conquest or colonialism. In the modern world many are based on a conscious appreciation of the facts of history, geography and economics. In Canada, a country blessed with more prosperity and political stability than most, we are making our choices methodically and democratically.

In all parts of the country, within both language groups, there are those who call for uniformity. It will be simpler and cheaper, they argue. In the case of the French minority, isolation is prescribed as necessary for survival. We must never underestimate the strength or the durability of these appeals to profound human emotions.

Surely these arguments are based on fear, on a narrow view of human nature, and on a defeatist appraisal of our capacity to adapt our society and its institutions to the demands of its citizens. Those who argue for separation, in whatever form, are prisoners of past injustice, blind to the possibilities of the future.

We have rejected this view of our country. We believe in two official languages and in a pluralist society not merely as a political necessity but as an enrichment. We want to live in a country in which French Canadians can choose to live among English Canadians and English Canadians can choose to live among French Canadians without abandoning their cultural heritage.

[...] French Canada can survive not by turning in on itself but by reaching out to claim its full share of every aspect of Canadian life. English Canada should not attempt to crush or expect to absorb French Canada. All Canadians should capitalize on the advantages of living in a country which has learned to speak in two great world languages. Such a country will be able to make full use of the skills and energy of all its citizens. Such a country will be more interesting, more stimulating and in many ways richer than it has ever been. Such a country will be much better equipped to play a useful role in the world of today and tomorrow.

How can we realize these aspirations? We believe that this bill is one step in that direction. It is not the first step, and to place it in context, I will mention some others which have been taken since the appointment of the Royal Commission [on Bilingualism and Biculturalism] under Mr. Dunton and Mr. Laurendeau in 1963.

A program of language training for federal public servants was started in 1964 and has since been greatly expanded to develop proficiency in both languages in those centres where it is required. The government recognizes that its objectives in this field cannot be accomplished overnight[...] Nevertheless, substantial progress has been made.

About 5000 hours of language training per day are now available for public servants. I am happy to note that a number of members of this House have been taking advantage of these facilities. [...] The Government intends to expand the language training resources further over the next four years on a scale sufficient to meet the objectives announced[...] There is no easy way to competence in a second language, but in three and a half years, enough such competence has been acquired by many senior officials to permit both English- and French-speaking participants in conferences and committees to use their mother tongue, confident that they will be understood. [...]

[T]he Constitutional Conference held in February of this year[...]reached the following consensus on language rights:

1. French-speaking Canadians outside of Quebec should have the same rights as English-speaking Canadians in Quebec.
2. Each government should take the necessary actions in this field as speedily as possible, in ways most appropriate to its jurisdiction and without diminishing existing rights recognized by law or usage.
3. The Conference established a special committee to examine the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism[...]

Today's resolution describes the Official Languages Bill, which will provide for the implementation of the Royal Commission's recommendations that lie within the jurisdiction of Parliament. [...] It sets out for the first time the language rights of citizens in their dealings with Parliament, with the federal government and with federal institutions, and the duties of those institutions toward the citizen in matters of language. We do not claim that

this bill will take care of all of Canada's needs in respect of French and English or other languages. It is important to point out some of the areas to which it does not apply.

It does not, of course, amend the constitution. I have often stated my belief that such amendment is necessary to guarantee the fundamental language rights of our citizens.

It does not affect provincial jurisdiction over the administration of justice or any other matter within provincial jurisdiction. [...]

It does not regulate the internal operations of the government. Other statutes and policy statements deal with such matters as communications between one government employee and another and bilingualism as a factor in employment.”

<http://www.nelson.com/nelson/school/discovery/cantext/speech2/1968trol.htm>

Multiculturalism: Government Response to Volume IV of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism

Pierre Trudeau

House of Commons, October 8, 1971

“Right Hon. P.E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):

Mr. Speaker, I am happy this morning to be able to reveal to the House that the government has accepted all those recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism which are contained in Volume IV of its reports directed to federal departments and agencies. Hon. members will recall that the subject of this volume is ‘the contribution by other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada and the measures that should be taken to safeguard that contribution.’

Volume IV examined the whole question of cultural and ethnic pluralism in this country and the status of our various cultures and languages, an area of study given all too little attention in the past by scholars.

It was the view of the royal commission, shared by the government and I am sure by all Canadians, that there cannot be one cultural policy for Canadians of British and French origin, another for the original peoples and yet a third for all others. For although there are two official languages, there is no official culture, nor does any ethnic group take precedence over any other. No citizen or group of citizens is other than Canadian, and all should be treated fairly.

The royal commission was guided by the belief that adherence to one's ethnic group is influenced not so much by one's origin or mother tongue as by one's sense of belonging to the group, and by what the commission calls the group's ‘collective will to exist.’ The government shares this belief.

The individual's freedom would be hampered if he were locked for life within a particular cultural compartment by the accident of birth or language. It is vital therefore that every Canadian, whatever his ethnic origin, be given a chance to learn at least one of the two languages in which his country conducts its official business and its politics.

A policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework commends itself to the government as the most suitable means of assuring the cultural freedom of Canadians. Such a policy should help break down discriminatory attitudes and cultural jealousies. National unity, if it is to mean anything in the deeply personal sense, must be founded on confidence in one's own individual identity; out of this can grow respect for that of others and a willingness to share ideas, attitudes and assumptions. A vigorous policy of multiculturalism will help create this initial confidence. It can form the base of a society which is based on fair play for all.

The government will support and encourage the various cultures and ethnic groups that give structure and vitality to our society. They will be encouraged to share their cultural expression and values with other Canadians and so contribute to a richer life for us all.

In the past, substantial public support has been given largely to the arts and cultural institutions of

English-speaking Canada. More recently, and largely with the help of the royal commission's earlier recommendations in Volumes I to III, there has been a conscious effort on the government's part to correct any bias against the French language and culture. In the last few months the government has taken steps to provide funds to support cultural educational centres for native people. The policy I am announcing today accepts the contention of the other cultural communities that they too are essential elements in Canada and deserve government assistance in order to contribute to regional and national life in ways that derive from their heritage, yet are distinctively Canadian.

[...]

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize the view of the government that a policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework is basically the conscious support of individual freedom of choice. We are free to be ourselves. But this cannot be left to chance. It must be fostered and pursued actively. If freedom of choice is in danger for some ethnic groups, it is in danger for all. It is the policy of this government to eliminate any such danger and to 'safeguard' this freedom.

[...]"

"The Federal Response

Appendix to Hansard, October 8, 1971

The government accepts and endorses the recommendations and spirit of Book IV of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. [...] The government regards [Canada's cultural diversity] as a heritage to treasure and believes that Canada would be the poorer if we adopted assimilation programs forcing our citizens to forsake and forget the cultures they have brought to us.

[...]

The government, while responding positively to the commission's recommendations, wishes to go beyond them to the spirit of Book IV to ensure that Canada's cultural diversity continues.

Cultural diversity throughout the world is being eroded by the impact of industrial technology, mass communications and urbanization. Many writers have discussed this as the creation of a mass society — in which mass-produced culture and entertainment and large impersonal institutions threaten to denature and depersonalize man. One of man's basic needs is a sense of belonging, and a good deal of contemporary social unrest — in all age groups — exists because this need has not been met.

Ethnic groups are certainly not the only way in which this need for belonging can be met, but they have been an important one in Canadian society. Ethnic pluralism can help us overcome or prevent the homogenization and depersonalization of mass society. Vibrant ethnic groups can give Canadians of the second, third and subsequent generations a feeling that they are connected with tradition and with human experience in various parts of the world and different periods of time.

Two misconceptions often arise when cultural diversity is discussed:

(a) Cultural Identity and National Allegiance

The sense of identity developed by each citizen as a unique individual is distinct from his national allegiance. There is no reason to suppose that a citizen who identifies himself with pride as a Chinese-Canadian, who is deeply involved in the cultural activities of the Chinese community in Canada, will be less loyal or concerned with Canadian matters than a citizen of Scottish origin who takes part in a bagpipe band or highland dancing group. Cultural identity is not the same thing as allegiance to a country. [...] Ethnic groups often provide people with a sense of belonging which can make them better able to cope with the rest of society than they would as isolated individuals. Ethnic loyalties need not, and usually do not, detract from wider loyalties to community and country.

Canadian identity will not be undermined by multiculturalism. Indeed, we believe that cultural pluralism is the very essence of Canadian identity. [...] To say we have two official languages is not to say we have two official cultures, and no particular culture is more 'official' than another. A policy of multiculturalism must be a policy

for all Canadians.

(b) Language and Culture

[...] The very name of the royal commission whose recommendations we now seek to implement tends to indicate that bilingualism and biculturalism are indivisible. But biculturalism does not properly describe our society; multiculturalism is more accurate. The Official Languages Act designated two languages, English and French, as the official languages of Canada for the purposes of all the institutions of the Parliament and government of Canada; no reference was made to cultures, and this act does not impinge on the role of all languages as instruments of the various Canadian cultures. Nor on the other hand should the recognition of the cultural value of many languages weaken the position of Canada's two official languages. Their use by all of the citizens of Canada will continue to be promoted and encouraged.

The government is concerned with preserving human rights, developing Canadian identity, strengthening citizenship participation, reinforcing Canadian unity and encouraging cultural diversification within a bilingual framework. These objectives can best be served through a policy of multiculturalism composed of four main elements:

1. The government of Canada will support all of Canada's cultures and will seek to assist, resources permitting, the development of those cultural groups which have demonstrated a desire and effort to continue to develop, a capacity to grow and contribute to Canada, as well as a clear need for assistance. The special role of the government will be to support and encourage those cultures and cultural groups which Canadians wish to preserve.

[...]

However, the government cannot and should not take upon itself the responsibility for the continued viability of all ethnic groups. The objective of our policy is the cultural survival and development of ethnic groups to the degree that a given group exhibits a desire for this. Government aid to cultural groups must proceed on the basis of aid to self-effort. And in our concern for the preservation of ethnic group identity, we should not forget that individuals in a democracy may choose not to be concerned about maintaining a strong sense of their ethnic identity.

2. The Government will assist members of all cultural groups to overcome cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society. The law can and will protect individuals from overt discrimination but there are more subtle barriers to entry into our society. A sense of not belonging, or a feeling of inferiority, whatever its cause, cannot be legislated out of existence. Programs outlined in this document have been designed to foster confidence in one's individual cultural identity and in one's rightful place in Canadian life. Histories, films and museum exhibits showing the great contributions of Canada's various cultural groups will help achieve this objective. But we must emphasize that every Canadian must help eliminate discrimination. Every Canadian must help contribute to the sense of national acceptance and belonging.

3. The Government will promote creative encounters and interchange among all Canadian cultural groups in the interest of national unity. As Canadians become more sensitive to their own ethnic identity and to the richness of our country, we will become more involved with one another and develop a greater acceptance of differences and a greater pride in our heritage. Cultural and intellectual creativity in almost all societies has been fostered by the interaction and creative relationship of different ethnic groups within that society. Government aid to multicultural centres, to specific projects of ethnic groups, and to displays of the performing and visual arts as well as the programs already mentioned, will promote cultural exchange. The Government has made it very clear that it does not plan on aiding individual groups to cut themselves off from the rest of society. The programs are designed to encourage cultural groups to share their heritage with all other Canadians and with other countries, and to make us all aware of our cultural diversity.

4. The Government will continue to assist immigrants to acquire at least one of Canada's official languages in order to[...]adjust to Canadian life and to participate fully in the economic and social life of Canada."

Perspectives and Recommendations on Immigration Policy (1975)
The Presbyterian Church in Canada

“[...]

The Government of Canada issued a Green Paper on Immigration Policy, inviting public discussion and comment. The executive committees of the [Presbyterian Church's] Boards of World Mission and Congregational Life submitted a brief to the Joint Parliamentary Committee [on Immigration Policy,] and the [Church's] 101st General Assembly (1975) gave its endorsement. [T]wo sections, the Summary of Perspectives and the Summary of Recommendations, are printed here.

Summary of Perspectives

1. We believe that all human beings are valuable persons and that any attempt to measure the value of human life in economic or educational terms provides an opportunity for a display of injustice, prejudice, arrogance and racism.
2. We believe that a multicultural and multiracial nation offers an interesting and desirable environment for personal and societal growth.
3. We believe that government immigration policy should establish and uphold moral principles that lead the Canadian people into a growing awareness of social and moral responsibility.
4. We believe that because we live in an interdependent global society, our immigration policy will have a far-reaching impact on the world.

Summary of Recommendations

1. That Manpower and Immigration be separated, creating two departments, and that a Department of Immigration co-ordinate its responsibilities with those of several other departments, Manpower being one.
2. That the point system, or whatever system used, should not be weighted in favour of immigrants with higher education.
3. That in granting landed immigrant status, neither consideration of race nor the country of origin be a restrictive factor.
4. The establishment of a refugee or asylum category so that a refugee remains free to choose either to remain in Canada or go elsewhere after a prescribed period of time, and that in the case of political refugees the decision to grant admission be based on humanitarian grounds.

[...]

6. That immigration officers serving abroad receive training:
 - (a) To give them knowledge and understanding of the culture and country where they will be working.
 - (b) To help them communicate a sensitive understanding of the aspirations of applicants for landed immigrant status.
 - (c) To help them present a realistic picture of life and opportunities in Canada.
7. That officers in Canada receive orientation about cultural differences to help them be sensitive to the state of mind and feelings of new arrivals.
8. The granting of temporary entry permits to persons whose status on arrival requires clarification in order to avoid injustice caused by misunderstanding.

[...]

10. (a) That the needs of all immigrants, not just those in the labour force, be carefully considered and more adequate services designed to help with orientation and adjustment.
- (b) That government give more financial and consultative support to community organizations involved in immigrant services. That the federal government encourage and support financially the creation of a national coordinating body for services to immigrants.

(c) That Departments of Education and other public institutions be encouraged to provide more educational material and programs to [immigrants.]

[...]

13. That a study be made of migrant workers from a humanitarian point of view and that adequate legislation be enacted providing guidelines relating to the rights and responsibilities of both workers and employers.

[...]"

<http://www.presbycan.ca/documents/socialaction/i1.htm> (Scroll down to "IMMIGRATION")

Submission on the Green Paper on Immigration
British Columbia Civil Liberties Association
May 1975

Covering letter:

"Mr. R. R. Tait, Chairman
Canadian Immigration and Population Study
Department of Manpower and Immigration
Ottawa, Ontario

Dear Mr. Tait:

The British Columbia Civil Liberties Association would like to express its grave concern about certain aspects of the recent federal Green Paper on immigration and to communicate this concern to the members of the Special Joint Committee on Immigration Policy.

A detailed commentary on the Green Paper from the BCCLA is attached[.... T]his Association's major concerns are opposition to any quota system based on race, creed, nationality, religion, sex or class; and insistence upon inclusion of adequate due process safeguards in the mechanisms adopted under any new Immigration Act.

Respectfully yours,
Dave Robertson
President

BCCLA comments

[Our comments deal] not with the broad and essentially political question of how many immigrants Canada should seek, but with the criteria by which those immigrants will be measured and with the processes by which immigrant selection, exclusion and deportation will take place. Speaking in very broad generalities, our brief [sent to you last year] proposed the following:

1. Our Immigration Act should continue to be non-discriminatory in terms of race, creed, nationality, religion, sex, class or the like classifications.
2. There should be no discretion to refuse admission to Canada of a person fully complying with the Act and the regulations in force for the time being. This is equivalent to saying that a qualified applicant has a 'right' to be granted permanent resident status.
3. [J]ust as no person in Canada can be deported without a hearing, no person should be refused a visa on the basis of allegations he or she has not had an adequate chance to dispute.
4. Applicants should be permitted access to 'guidelines' and interpretive materials an immigration officer may use to determine compliance or non-compliance with the Act and regulations. In short, all criteria to be applied should be available to those affected.
5. Appeal procedures should exist to correct any error in law, so that difficult or obscure Immigration Act provisions will be applied consistently, and no field-level immigration officer can take unto him or herself the

power to ignore even clear provisions.

6. Refugee identification should cease to be tied to the hopelessly inadequate UN Convention, and realistic regulations for identifying and processing refugees should be substituted.
7. In many respects, especially involving 'security' matters, the new Act should be rewritten to conform fully with the spirit of Canada's Bill of Rights.
8. The current blunt weapon of deportation, with its subsequent ban on further applications through normal channels, should be discarded whenever the reason for refusing admission is 'curable' (e.g., lack of money, lack of a visa, temporary medical conditions, etc.).
9. The present ban on persons convicted of or admitting to 'crimes of moral turpitude' should be extensively modified, so that a specified period of good behaviour would entitle a person to apply for permanent resident status.
10. Certain grounds of prohibition should be altogether eliminated, e.g., homosexuality, and epilepsy (unless constituting a serious medical condition).

We have eagerly reviewed the Green Paper for the reception given to these basic concepts, as well as a host of more detailed suggestions. Some comfort is afforded by this passage from page 70 of Part I:

The Inquiry

This is a crucial aspect of Canada's enforcement procedures. It is at the inquiry that officials under the law determine the legitimacy, when this is in doubt, of any individual's claim to be allowed to enter or to remain in Canada. Since it is the inquiry process that may result in orders of deportation, it is imperative that procedures at this point be conducted with scrupulous regard to impartiality, objectivity, individual liberties and the rights persons in Canada enjoy under the Bill of Rights. The same considerations apply to immigration procedures with respect to arrest and detention.

However, the Act should be further re-written to provide procedures that are fully consistent with the Canadian Bill of Rights[....] The great debate on the ultimate aims of Canadian immigration policy must not be conducted on so lofty a plane that no provision is made for fair and impartial mechanisms to carry out the policy ultimately adopted.

But if we are disappointed that important safeguards of due process are not explicitly dealt with in the Green Paper, we are aghast that one of the policy options[...] is a nation-by-nation quota system. We had assumed that it was hardly necessary to go on record as opposing discrimination in our immigration policy on the basis of race, creed, nationality, religion, sex or class.

The concept of setting quotas to cater to Canada's 'demographic policy' is one that appals us, belonging as it does to a past history of consciously racist immigration policy. We cannot express too strongly our opposition to any form of national, regional or racial quotas, whatever arguments there may be in favour of a quarterly or annual global quota."

<http://www.bccla.org/positions/admin/75greenpaper.html>

ACTIVITY

Sometimes when government tries to make society more just, it fails. Government can do only so much to change people's attitudes to each other. It is not as good at getting people to act more justly as it is at punishing them when they act not justly enough. As Trudeau said about his multiculturalism program:

The law can and will protect individuals from overt discrimination, but there are more subtle barriers to entry into our society. A sense of not belonging, or a feeling of inferiority, whatever its cause, cannot be legislated out of existence. [W]e must emphasize that every Canadian must help eliminate discrimination. Every Canadian must help contribute to the sense of national acceptance and belonging.

New government programs and policies can at times do little to change things for the better, and can even make conditions worse for the people who need help. Critics find that federal government initiatives can:

- make cosmetic changes where real, effective change is needed;

QUEST FOR JUSTICE AND UNITY, 1960-82

- try to do too much, causing confusion and conflicts;
- try to make changes that the provinces don't agree on, in areas that the provinces control;
- be restrictive, and even unfair, where more openness is needed;
- assume Canadians are ready to "do the right thing," when they are not.

If government can't legislate morality, what can it do to strengthen and spread justice? Work toward an answer by generalizing about Ottawa's efforts in this period. Using what you've read here and elsewhere, make a comparative analysis of federal laws and policies from the Trudeau, Pearson and Diefenbaker governments.

Assess the ability of these initiatives to encourage justice (and/or unity, diversity etc.) by placing them in various categories on a chart. Create categories based on what lawmakers have said (e.g., Diefenbaker: "[this is] a first step in the right direction"), what critics have said (e.g., Presbyterians: "[government] should establish and uphold moral principles that lead the Canadian people"), and whatever beliefs and opinions have come out of your class discussion.

Some sample assessment categories for judging effectiveness:

Good Start - needs a broader target or wider support

Moral Leadership - more useful as an example than as a result-getter

Light Weight - does too little

Big Stick - hurts as many as it helps

Make up your own categories for government initiatives, and draw conclusions about their usefulness in combatting injustice and strengthening unity. For instance, the program to make parliamentarians and civil servants bilingual might be only a "good start" because merely speaking the other group's language won't make people as aware of that group's goals and problems as, say, living among them for two years would. By analyzing government actions this way, you won't necessarily come any closer to solving problems than government does, but you'll be clearer on what you believe to be important Canadian values and better able to criticize the methods used to reinforce those values.

(Keep these beliefs and criticisms in mind as you read Trudeau's ideas for constitutional reform in the next section.)

BASIC RULES - RENEWING THE CONSTITUTION

A Time For Action (1978)

Pierre Trudeau

"Chapter II - Affirmation of the Canadian Identity

[...]

The renewal of the Federation does not by any means require some basic change in the character of the Canadian people. In order to bring it about, we need only be ourselves — but more consistently and more faithfully than in the past. In a word, the current crisis of confidence is a crisis of our maturing. It will make us an adult nation, more sure and more aware of what we are and of what we can become. By no means must we renounce our national personality, our regional characteristics or our distinctive cultural traits, whoever we are or wherever we live in Canada. On the contrary, we must assert the Canadian identity, establish once and for all what this identity consists of, and express it more vigorously through our actions, both individual and collective.

[...]

The Canadian Model

[W]ith the passage of time and the required adaptation to distinctive realities, [our] values have acquired specific Canadian characteristics. These values motivate our behaviour as individuals and determine our personality as a country. They govern the relationships among the different groups in Canada and determine the character of our social institutions. They define the form of our government and prescribe the rules governing our political institutions. They shape our aspirations, forge our ideals and provide direction for our future. In short, these values determine what we may legitimately call, without undue pride but also without false modesty, the Canadian model. This synthesis of Canadian values is not fixed or unchangeable and hopefully will never be so.

Canada is not a closed or rigid society — quite the contrary, the dynamism which it draws from its openness and diversity, as well as its continuing development and progress, bring a perpetual process of renewal to the Canadian People.

There are times when our value system changes almost imperceptibly as a result of the trimming, pruning and grafting spontaneously practised on it by Canadians. But there are other times when the Canadian model must be updated in a more explicit way, through conscious and persistent efforts. We have now entered such a period of deliberate reappraisal, comparable in many ways to the troubled times in the last century which preceded Confederation.

Values We Must Share

The renewal of the Federation requires first of all that we become aware of the values which we need to share, regardless of the community to which we belong or the region where we live. [...] With our tendency to emphasize our distinctive characteristics as members of one linguistic community or another, or inhabitants of one region or another, we must often be reminded by foreigners how much we have in common. We are all too prone to reduce culture to language or ethnic origin and, consequently, to underestimate the cultural values which we share.

[...]

We[...]share a great number of social and economic values. Our spirit is North American. We all believe in the pre-eminence and fundamental freedoms of the individual citizen, in equal opportunity for all, in democratic values and respect for the rule of law. Canadians also believe in the dynamics of individual enterprise, in the effective use of government institutions to serve our collective development, and in the sharing of the country's wealth and income among individuals and regions. New and constant efforts are needed to achieve a better integration of these values in Canadian society, and the renewal of the Federation provides an opportunity to make further progress in this direction. We may be of different minds as to the means to be used, but we have no difficulty in agreeing on overall goals since a national consensus truly exists in these areas.

However, other values must also be enshrined in our national consensus. They concern language equality, cultural diversity, the dignity of our native peoples and the self-development of our various regions. The current crisis demands that we make the efforts necessary to entrench these values and to accept their practical consequences.

Basically, all that is required of us in this connection is to accept that what we ask for ourselves be extended to others. We all assert our right to speak the official language which is ours by birth or by choice, and to deal with government institutions in that language. We all insist on our right to preserve our cultural heritage and to seek the assistance of governments in doing so. We all wish to see our regions develop in their own way, and expect to be able to choose, with those among our fellow Canadians who are closest to us, the lifestyle which we prefer.

The renewal of the Federation must lead to the recognition by each of us that all other Canadians have, in these areas, aspirations similar to our own. In the name of the diversity which we call upon to justify our own enjoyment of individual and collective freedoms, we must accept that these freedoms be extended to all other Canadians and that they be given the means to exercise these liberties.

We must go a little further: not only to accept that other Canadians and their communities are different from our own and want to stay that way; but also to respect them for what they are. There can be no place in a renewed Canada for arrogant, domineering or contemptuous attitudes toward this or that community. Friendship, solidarity and respect among our different communities are essential values of the Canadian identity. Dedication to these values will enable us to achieve much more than the mere survival to which our more pessimistic thinkers would limit us; we will be able to grow, to develop, to fulfill our great potential.

Values We Are Free to Choose

Once these values have been well integrated into the national consensus, we will at last be able to devote ourselves, serenely and without compunction, to the cultivation of Canadian diversity. Each community, for its

own betterment and to some extent for the good of others, will be able to develop its language and its culture and its regional characteristics, whatever these may be. In all other respects we will be able to choose the values that shape our attitudes, our aspirations and our lifestyles, and to resist in all good conscience pressures from those who would impose on us, in the name of unity, a sterile and pointless uniformity.

[...] Uniformity would make Canada totally uninteresting, and eventually deprive the country of its *raison d'être*. Northrop Frye, the well-known Canadian critic, has perhaps expressed the essential difference between uniformity and unity better than anyone:

Uniformity, where everyone “belongs,” uses the same clichés, thinks alike and behaves alike, produces a society which seems comfortable at first but is totally lacking in human dignity. Real unity tolerates dissent and rejoices in variety of outlook and tradition, recognizes that it is Man’s destiny to unite and not divide, and understands that creating proletariats and scapegoats and second-class citizens is a mean and contemptible activity. Unity, so understood, is the extra dimension that raises the sense of belonging into genuine human life.

[...]

The Means of Discovery

To [learn about our differences and how to live with them,] we have means incomparably more powerful and more efficient than those which were available to earlier generations of Canadians. These include the airplane, the railways, the automobile, our education system, newspapers and periodicals, books, radios, television and films — in fact, everything that conveys human beings, their thoughts, their impressions and their hopes. [...] But no government will ever be able to establish and develop the Canadian identity by way of legislation.

Governments can help, support and facilitate the discoveries of Canadians; but this important dimension of the Federation’s renewal can only be accomplished by the Canadian people. In a democracy, it is up to the people to decide where they will travel and what they will read, watch or listen to. Thus it is up to Canadians to discover the similarities which bind us together and the differences from which spring our diversity and which we can agree to preserve together.

Chapter III - The Principles of Renewal

[...]

Justice Demands Full Respect for the Dignity and Rights of Native Peoples

In the past we have not duly recognized the contribution of the country’s first inhabitants, the Indian and Inuit peoples, to Canada’s development. The settlement and development of lands which they were the first to occupy have often been carried out at their expense. More than any other group in Canada, the native peoples have suffered indignities and have not had the respect of their fellow citizens. Programs of support have often produced a state of dependence that eroded self-reliance.

For years the Indians and Inuit have been demanding recognition of particular rights and of their proper place within Canadian society. They realize that they should be able to preserve their culture and their way of life in accordance with the same principle of diversity that the other Canadian communities invoke.

The renewal of the Federation must foster cooperation among Indians, Inuit and other Canadians in order that the descendants of those who first occupied this country might make their contribution, with equal rights and opportunities, to the strengthening of national unity, so that they too are recognized as founders of the future Canada.

The Full Development of the Two Linguistic Majorities

The renewal of the Federation must guarantee the linguistic equality of its two major communities, the English-speaking and the French-speaking, and assure that Canadian institutions exist to help each group to prosper.

[...]

Neither of the two linguistic communities could impose its will upon the other or try to subordinate the other

without causing the Federation to fall apart. This political reality requires that all Canadians, regardless of their official language, develop mutual respect and understanding and an open and friendly attitude toward each other.

This reality certainly does not mean that most citizens have to become bilingual. However, it does mean that the equality of our two official languages must be recognized and guaranteed, and that the practical implications of this equality must be accepted. It means that the establishment of language equality within federal institutions must be completed and that, wherever numbers justify, provincial services must be administered to minorities in their official language. It should finally lead the institutions of the private sector to recognize that it is useful and even necessary in many parts of the country to operate in both official languages.

The Enhancement of the Mosaic of Cultures

The renewal of the Federation must lead to respect for cultural diversity and for the right of every citizen, regardless of ethnic origin, to equal opportunity. Every cultural community should be able to rely on the goodwill of governments in preserving its own cultural heritage and in discovering and appreciating those of other communities.

[...]

With the sheer weight of their numbers, it is natural that the French and British cultures occupy a major place in Canada. But there is no question of having only one or two official cultures; Canadian society must promote cultural diversity, clearly and explicitly.

[...]

Our French and British traditions have not been weakened by the multicultural character of our society. On the contrary, by good fortune this increasing diversity has helped to reduce the old rivalry between them. They have also been invaluablely enriched and revitalized in all fields — from the arts and sciences to economics and politics. Our two principal cultures will in no way be diminished by the determination of new communities to preserve their own cultural heritage.

[...]

The Self-development of Regions

The renewal of the Federation must, in all fields, promote the self-development of regions by avoiding excessive centralization. Canada has always been, and still is today, a country of regions. Our geography dictates this and the people demand it. The federal structure of our system of government has made it possible for regional identities to develop and determine the nature and operations of social institutions[....]

[Yet further decentralization is needed, and] can be achieved through a more functional distribution of powers between the federal government and the provincial governments. A renewed commitment to reduce regional disparities is also required if all regions, and not only the more affluent, are to have the ability to develop in their own way and preserve their particular lifestyles and cultural traditions.

[...]

Promoting National Solidarity

The renewal of the Federation must extend and strengthen solidarity between citizens of all regions and communities. [...] The freedom and self-development of individual citizens, regions or communities can only be realized to their fullest extent with the occasional support of others.

[...]

Our history is full of instances where national solidarity has been crucial and economically beneficial for all regions in turn. Confederation, by accelerating economic development in Quebec, stemmed the tide of French-speaking emigration to the United States. Quebec, by supporting financially through the federal tax system the construction of our transcontinental railways, made possible the settlement and development of the West.

Ontario until recently bore most of the burden of inter-provincial equalization and thus financially assisted the

improvement of public services in the less affluent provinces; but Ontario was in a position to do this because other regions had earlier consented to tariff protection in order to stimulate the growth of manufacturing industries.

We are all aware that British Columbia and Alberta carried part of the cost of equalization as soon as their economies became buoyant enough for them to do so. [...] We are also aware that the oil-producing provinces of the West have agreed to spread the increase in the price of domestic oil over several years, so as to minimize disruption of other regional economies. They agreed all the more readily to this since earlier policies, again based on national solidarity, spurred the exploitation of their oil resources.

Solidarity is therefore essential for the unity of the country and must be strengthened. It must also be extended to areas other than the economy and public finance, such as language and culture.

[...]

Strengthening Canada as a United Country to Serve All Canadians

[...]

The unity of Canada must transcend the identification Canadians have with provinces, regions and linguistic or other differences. But for Canada to be deserving of the transcendent loyalty that such unity involves, there must be a sense that it does serve, as a country, the vital needs of all its citizens and communities. Each must feel that Canada, and the federal Parliament and government acting on his or her behalf, are the best guarantors of the security, progress and fulfilment that derive from the common action of free citizens in a democratic country. It is toward such a Canada — united and strong — and such a sense on the part of all Canadians that our efforts must be directed in the renewal of our Federation

Conclusion

[...]

Nothing worth having in this life comes easily. The creation and development of Canada has been no exception. So many people of differing cultures and languages and local traditions, living on a land which beggars the imagination by its extent and its variety! So many tendencies, all so reasonable, to go our different ways! Yet so much to be gained by building one 'house' for all, with many 'mansions' to serve our special differences! So much to be gained by understanding and respecting each other's ways, while sharing each other's burdens, in this Canada of ours!

It is clear that we have not yet found that ideal balance that will make it possible for all Canadians to enjoy full pride and satisfaction in belonging and contributing to the larger whole, while continuing to enjoy the fulfilment which comes from their belonging to the French- or the English-speaking communities, or to particular groups, provinces or regions of Canada. We are however now engaged in the search for that balance, in the search for renewal, more intensively than in all our history. Canadians can be confident that their search will be successful.

[...]"

<http://www.solon.org/Constitutions/Canada/English/Proposals/tfa.htm> (Scroll past "Prologue" to "Table of Contents")

Proclamation of the Constitution

Pierre Trudeau, April 17, 1982

"[...]

The Canadian ideal which we have tried to live with varying degrees of success and failure for a hundred years is really an act of defiance against the history of mankind. Had this country been founded upon a less noble vision, or had our forefathers surrendered to the difficulties of building this nation, Canada would have been torn apart long ago. It should not surprise us therefore that even now we sometimes feel the pull of those old reflexes of mutual fear and distrust:

- Fear of becoming vulnerable by opening one's arms to other Canadians who speak a different language or live in a different culture.
- Fear of becoming poorer by agreeing to share one's resources and wealth with fellow citizens living in regions less favoured by nature.

[...] We know that justice and generosity can flourish only in an atmosphere of trust. For if individuals and minorities do not feel protected against the possibility of the tyranny of the majority, if French-speaking Canadians or native peoples or new Canadians do not feel they will be treated with justice, it is useless to ask them to open their hearts and minds to their fellow Canadians.

[...]

The Constitution which is being proclaimed today goes a long way toward removing the reasons for the fears of which I have spoken. We now have a Charter which defines the kind of country in which we wish to live, and guarantees the basic rights and freedoms which each of us shall enjoy as a citizen of Canada.

It reinforces the protection offered to French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec, and to English-speaking Canadians in Quebec. It recognizes our multicultural character. It upholds the equality of women, and the rights of disabled persons. [...] It offers a way to meet the legitimate demands of our native peoples. [...]

[...]

It must however be recognized that no Constitution, no Charter of Rights and Freedoms, no sharing of powers can be a substitute for the willingness to share the risks and grandeur of the Canadian adventure. Without that collective act of the will, our Constitution would be a dead letter, and our country would wither away.

It is true that our will to live together has sometimes appeared to be in deep hibernation; but it is there nevertheless, alive and tenacious in the hearts of Canadians of every province and territory. I wish simply that the bringing home of our Constitution marks the end of a long winter, the breaking up of the ice-jams and the beginning of a new spring. For what we are celebrating today is not so much the completion of our task, but the renewal of our hope — not so much an ending, but a fresh beginning.

Let us celebrate the renewal and patriation of our Constitution; but let us put our faith, first and foremost, in the people of Canada who will breathe life into it.

[...]”

<http://www.nelson.com/nelson/school/discovery/cantext/speech3/1982trco.htm>

This compilation created by Russ Chamberlayne (russc@freespace.net). No credit, copyright or responsibility is assumed for the quoted text.

The compilation itself, INTRODUCTION text and the ACTIVITY texts are all copyright © Russ Chamberlayne, 2002. All rights reserved. This copyright-protected textual material may be used only by subscribing institutions and their staffs and students for educational purposes only, and may not be resold or otherwise transferred. Please include this copyright notice in any storage of this compilation.

Your comments and questions are welcome. Please send along the name and e-mail address of anyone you think would be interested in subscribing to this publication.