

Robert J. MacDonald, *Education, Language Rights and Cultural Survival in Quebec*, A Review Essay

Report of the Commission of Inquiry on the Position of the French Language and on Language Rights in Quebec.

Book I: *The Language of Work: The Position of French in Work and Consumer Activities of Quebecers.*

Book II: *Language Rights.*

Book III: *The Ethnic Groups: Other Ethnic Groups and the Enhancement and Development of French in Quebec.*

Quebec: *The Government of Quebec*, 1973. Editeur Officiel du Québec

Guy Bouthillier et Jean Meynaud, *Le Choc des Langues au Québec 1760-1960*. Montreal: Université de Montréal, 1971.

In a recent article in *The Toronto Star*, it is reported that since Bill 22 was passed last summer, English-speaking Quebecers who used to speak French in public whenever they could, now refuse. "If I'm serving someone and they're French, then I'll speak French. But if I am in a restaurant and paying money, then I expect them to talk in my language." According to the controversial MNA, George Springate, "Both sides have dug in their heels. The bridge was there before. Now it's torn down. It's opened old festering sores."<sup>1</sup> And immigrants are sending their children to "underground" schools so they can learn English and pass the language tests provided for in the Bill.

Bill 22, designed to bring the two language groups in Quebec together, has instead become the object of intense controversy. Though it is the latest attempt by the provincial government to indicate the precise nature of the language relationships in the province, in the short-run it appears to have renewed a controversy which has been going on for over seven years. What angers English-speaking Quebecers is that the Bill, making French the official language of the province and limiting the right of parents to decide the language of instruction, rejects one of the recommendations of the Gendron Commission, that parental right to decide the language of instruction (Bill 63) be maintained for five years until its effect on the demographic equilibrium can be assessed. And anglophones feel that unless one is bilingual or French-speaking, his future in Quebec is limited. Ethnic communities feel the legislation discriminates against them unfairly.

A number of recent publications and studies can assist the specialist and non-specialist alike in understanding the language debate in Quebec. From a long-term historical perspective, the work of Guy Bouthillier and Jean Meynaud, *Le Choc des Langues au Québec 1760-1960* (Montreal, 1971), indicates that the debate is a long-standing one and that French Canadians have fought to maintain their language and culture in the face of English pressure. The collection of articles in the book suggests that the historical battle has been fought on several fronts. Some have been concerned about the quality of French and the need to preserve it against anglicisms.<sup>2</sup> As early as 1792 others complained about the need to speak the language of the minority.<sup>3</sup> During the 1840's, French Canadians fought for the right to speak French in the legislature, while in the early twentieth century the struggle for French schools in Ontario was a central concern. Among the early efforts to make French a viable language in commerce was the so-called Lavergne Law of 1910. In brief, the authors conclude that many of the fears manifested

<sup>1</sup>*The Toronto Star* 6 November 1974.

<sup>2</sup>In 1810 Jacques Viger wrote about this in "Les particularités du français parlé au Canada," pp. 101-105. Bouthillier et Meynard, *Le Choc des Langues au Québec*, pp. 88-92.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 88-89.

by Franco-Québécois today have deep historic roots, and the Franco-Québécois perspective of a minority battling for its cultural survival has had a lasting impact on the province. This perspective, the authors suggest, helps to explain the contemporary actions. In their introductory essay, the authors contend that the relationship between the two language groups will be modified only by a complete transformation of social relations, especially economic relations.<sup>4</sup>

More important for understanding the multitude of factors which constitute the present linguistic equation in Quebec have been the three volumes of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry on the Position of the French Language and on Language Rights in Quebec, as well as the over twenty studies commissioned by the Inquiry. The Commission, more commonly known as the Gendron Commission after its president, Jean-Denis Gendron, was itself the centre of considerable controversy as it laboured for over four years in an attempt to bring recommendations for government policy, leading to linguistic peace. And in the end these various recommendations were the object of bitter attack. However, a number of the findings of the Commission were important. For example, the Commissioners concluded:

Subject only to the strictly "federal" (Dominion-Provincial) divisions of legislative competence established under sections 91 and 92 of the BNA Act, and to the few, very limited constitutional guarantees like Sections 93 and 133 of the BNA Act, the legislature of Quebec has sovereign, plenary lawmaking powers to establish whatever language policy for Quebec it may consider to be desirable in the public interest.<sup>5</sup>

It was this finding which allowed the Bourassa government constitutionally to proceed with Bill 22. More significant for educational purposes was the view that Section 93 of the BNA Act entrenched only religious rights in education, and that any "acquired" or customary rights for parental choice of language had no "juridical significance" in Canada and therefore in Quebec.<sup>6</sup> In addition to these legal and constitutional questions, the Gendron Commission clearly outlines two of the important factors in the language dispute in Quebec—the dominance of the English-language in the Quebec economy, especially at the managerial levels<sup>7</sup> and, what is the pivotal group within the province, the ethnic groups who occupy a middle ground between the francophones and the anglophones.<sup>8</sup> The several studies published by the Commission also pinpoint other factors in the equation, including demographic projections and the teaching of second languages.

In addition to these published works, a number of theses also throw light on the question. John Parisella's "Pressure Group Politics: A Case Study of the Saint-Léonard School Crisis" (unpublished M.A., McGill, 1971), is basically a study of the rôle played by pressure groups in the development of the controversy, the so-called match that touched off the explosion across the province. An important contribution made by the study is the relationships between the various and often miniscule pressure groups which emerged during the debate. The ethnic community, as suggested, has been one of the focal points of the debate. For that reason, Paul Cappon's "Conflit entre les Néo-Québécois et les Francophones de

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 10.

<sup>5</sup>Gendron Commission, *Report: Language Rights*, vol. II, Québec: L'Éditeur Officiel du Québec, 1973, pp. 69-70.

<sup>6</sup>Gendron Commission, *Language Rights*, pp. 48-50.

<sup>7</sup>Gendron Commission, *Language of Work*, vol. I, Québec: L'Éditeur Officiel du Québec, 1973.

<sup>8</sup>Gendron Commission, *Report: The Ethnic Groups*, vol. III, Québec: L'Éditeur Officiel du Québec, 1973.

Montreal" (unpublished Doctorat, Paris, 1971), examines the ethnic relations which exist in Montreal. Cappon used an invaluable method of gaining his information: he brought together members of the various communities in Montreal, and observed their discussions of the language debate, including the frustration felt by the ethnic groups when it was insisted the conversations be in French. In this way, Cappon sought to bring out the tensions between the ethnic communities and the French Canadians, tensions which he felt were basically economic in origin. Finally, the study of Pierre Fournier, "A Political Analysis of School Reorganization in Montreal." (unpublished M.A., McGill, 1971)., investigates an often neglected aspect of the language debate: specifically he examines the question of the proposed rationalization of school administration on Montreal Island, and the perceived effect it would have on Anglo-Protestant educational autonomy.

A number of other books or studies could be cited; but most are in the nature of polemic rather than specifically scholarly contributions to the understanding of the debate.<sup>9</sup> More detached views can be found in a number of small articles.<sup>10</sup> In brief, what studies have been available tend to be fragmentary, and as yet no single work has attempted to deal with the educational debate and all its manifestations.

In order for the non-Quebecer (and even Québécois) to understand the contemporary situation, one must examine the historic development of the two language groups in Quebec. It must be recognized that language division and demands for language rights have been part of Quebec's political and educational history since the Cession in 1763. Bouthillier and Meynaud outline this very well. For example, they suggest that when the Quebec Act of 1774 recognized French law, it implicitly recognized the French language, since it would be illogical not to recognize the language in which those legal principles were written.<sup>11</sup> A further step in the demands for recognition of the French language occurred in 1792 when Jean-Antoine Panet was elected speaker of the Assembly, defeating partisans of assimilation, and in the process securing the right of French to be used in the Assembly debates.<sup>12</sup> The fight was repeated during the 1840's when the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada were united, as a result of Lord Durham's recommendations. In the articles selected for the book throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a familiar theme of speakers and writers alike was the intolerable position which English, the language of the minority, had in the province. Equally prominent is the theme that this predominance of English invaded the speech of the French Canadian, and thus corrupted the language and thought.

<sup>9</sup>Henry Egretaude, *L'Affaire Saint-Léonard*, Montréal: La Société d'Éducation, 1970; Marcel Rioux, *Quebec in Question*, Toronto: James Jewis and Samuel, 1971; François-Albert Angers, *Les Droits du Français au Québec*, Montréal: Editions du Jour, 1971; Gérard Dagenais, *Pour Un Québec Français*, Montréal: Editions du Jour, 1973; Raymond Barbeau, *Le Québec Bientôt Unilingue?*, Montréal: Les Editions de l'Homme, 1965; Jean Marcel, *Le Joul de Troie*, Montréal: Editions du Jour, 1973; Association Québécoise des Professeurs du Français, *Le Livre Noir*, Montréal: Editions du Jour, 1970; Léandre Bergeron, *The History of Quebec: A Patriote's Handbook*, Toronto: New Canada Publications, 1971; Guiseppe Turi, *Une Culture Appelée Québécoise*, Montréal: Edition de l'Homme, 1971; and Reggie Chartrand, *La Dernière Bataille*, Montréal: Parti-Pris, 1972.

<sup>10</sup>Avigdore Farine, "La Politique de la Langue et l'Engseignement du Québec", *Canadian and International Education*, vol. 1, no. 1, June 1973, pp. 42-50; Roger Magnuson, "Education and Society in Quebec in the 1970's", *Journal of Educational Thought*, Vol. 7, No. 2, August 1973, pp. 94-104; Richard Arès, "Autour du Bill 85; Langues parlées par les Néo-Québécois à Montréal"; *Relations*, no. 337, avril 1969, pp. 102-105; Richard Arès, "L'Ecole de Demain — Le Bill 62 et la Confessionnalité", *Relations*, no. 345, janvier 1970, pp. 6-8.

<sup>11</sup>Bouthillier et Meynaud, *Le Choc des Langues au Québec*, p. 80.

As Oscar Dunn remarked, "Notre ennemi n'est pas le patois, c'est l'anglais . . ." <sup>12</sup>

However, in the selection of texts for the work, the authors have relied heavily on articles written by the traditional elite, such as Monseigneur Louis-François Lafleche, Edmond de Nevers, Laurent-Olivier David, Thomas Chapais, and Lionel Groulx, or journalists, especially polemicists such as Jules Tardivel, Dostaler O'Leary, Esdras Minville, Arthur Buies and Leon Lorrain. It is true that individuals such as Jean-Baptiste Meilleur (one-time superintendent of schools), Pierre-Joseph-Olivier Chaveau (one-time Premier), Olivar Asselin, Henry Bourassa (founder of *Le Devoir*), Maurice Duplessis (former Premier) and Andre Laurendeau (former editor of *Le Devoir*) are cited. But while the articles indicate an historic discontent among the educated and politically sensitive, there is little evidence to suggest that the concerns stated in the articles became the concerns of *la plupart des Québécois*. That is, the collection of documents, while it illustrates an anxiety over cultural survival, does not necessarily indicate a popular anxiety over cultural survival. In contemporary terms, however, Québécois as a whole share the anxiety over this survival. In addition, the debate presented in the collection is essentially one-sided: that is, basically only those positions arguing that the culture was in danger from English predominance and inroads are presented, while little of the counter debate is mentioned. Consequently, one gets the impression that the articles are selected basically to present this one position of the authors. Nonetheless, the book does provide valuable insight into the history of the current debate.

In addition to this historic debate, a number of additional factors emerged and merged during the decade of the sixties. These include the bifurcation of the Quebec school system, the decline of the Church and the emergence of the State as the predominant force in the protection of the Quebec culture, the predominance of Anglo-American industries and technology in the Quebec economy, and the new demographic trends (the decline of the Franco-Québécois birth rate coupled with the tendency of immigrants to opt for the English-language school system).

Since the publication of Hugh MacLennan's *Two Solitudes*, the term has been a cliché, albeit an apt cliché, to explain the wide gulf which exists between the anglophone and francophone communities in Quebec. The two solitudes exist to the extent that in the current debate, French speakers think primarily of the future of French in Quebec as the last bastion of French on the continent, while English speakers indicate their prime concern over the future of English, the language of the continent, in Quebec. Studies of the Gendron Commission indicate the extent to which each group lives unto itself, especially in the newspaper, television, radio and entertainment preferences. <sup>13</sup> Perhaps, the fact that each group basically receives its information on the language debate from its own indigenous news sources helps to explain why the language debate often seems a dialogue of the deaf. <sup>14</sup>

Another factor contributing to these two solitudes has been the development of a dual confessional and dual language educational system in the province. <sup>15</sup> Since

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 182.

<sup>13</sup>Sorecom, *Les Mass Média, l'Attachement à sa Langue et les Modèles linguistiques au Québec en 1971*, Etude réalisée pour la Commission Gendron, Quebec: Editeur Officiel du Québec, 1973.

<sup>14</sup>The French primarily read French newspapers and magazines, and listen to or watch French radio and television. Similarly the English utilise their own language services.

<sup>15</sup>G. Emmett Carter, *The Catholic Public Schools of Quebec*, Toronto; W.J. Gage, 1957; Louis-Philippe Audet, *Histoire de l'Enseignement au Québec*, Montreal: Holt, Rinehart et Winston, 1971, 2 tomes.

the French and Roman Catholic rejection in 1801 of a proposed centralized and unified educational system (on the fear that it would lead to Anglican and hence English dominance), the educational history of the two basic groups in Quebec has been different. The Confederation debates formalized the existence of two autonomous Protestant (English) and Roman Catholic (French) school systems. With the rise of Irish immigration in the mid-nineteenth century, the English Roman Catholic section grew, especially in the big cities. This section became virtually autonomous, so that until recently there were in effect three systems. After 1964 when the Ministry of Education was created, language became the effective difference between the French Roman Catholic and the Anglo-Protestant and Anglo-Catholic systems. The virtual autonomy of the English systems within the provincial system had assured a different philosophy of education and a different cultural content. Thus it could be argued that autonomous school systems led to the development of autonomous cultures within the province.

Historically the Quebec representatives in the Confederation debates had insisted on provincial autonomy over education, in an effort to ensure cultural control and protection for the French-speaking minority in Canada. Since the Roman Catholic Church was the pre-eminent agent providing education, this provincial autonomy meant that French Canada sought to protect her culture through a distinct religious philosophy and a distinct language. Religion and language were the two factors which characterized that culture, though the articles presented in Bouthillier and Meynaud give little indication of the rôle of the Church. But since the Second World War, and especially since the late fifties, Quebec has witnessed a decline in the influence of the Roman Catholic Church in the province. In institutional terms, schools and the medical care delivery system have become secularized. In practical terms, a study by the Archdiocese of Montreal reveals that during the decade of the sixties, regular church attendance declined from 60 to 30 per cent, and among the youth 15 to 34, the attendance has plummeted to 12 per cent.<sup>16</sup> Roger Magnuson has argued that with the decline of the religious factor in French Canada what distinguishes Quebec more and more from the rest of Canada and North America is language.<sup>17</sup>

The institution which has replaced the Church as the guardian of the faith, so to speak, has been the provincial government. It was because of the need to modernize and reform the educational system that the Lesage government established the Parent Commission, reformed educational structures in the so-called Grand Charter of 1961, and created the Ministry of Education in 1964.<sup>18</sup> These measures were designed to permit Quebec (and hence French Canada) to play a more meaningful rôle in contemporary society. Similarly, through agencies such as L'Hydro-Québec, La Société de Financement Général, and La Société Québécoise d'Exploitation Minière (SOQUEM), the Quebec government has strengthened her rôle in the economy of the province. And it is significant that the Gendron Commission's recommendations put the onus on the government to improve the position of French. Related to the new thrust of the State in determining the rôle which Quebec will play in contemporary affairs is the new direction of French Canadian or Franco-Québécois nationalism. While French-Canadian nationalism has always been a factor in Quebec and hence Canadian society, historically it has been a nationalism which emphasized the need to isolate French Canada from the rest of the continent.

<sup>16</sup>Le Devoir 26 novembre 1973.

<sup>17</sup>Roger Magnuson, "Education and Society in Quebec in the 1970's", pp. 94-97.

<sup>18</sup>Audet, *Histoire de l'Enseignement au Québec*, tome 2, pp. 388-90; Audet, *Bilan de la Réforme Scolaire au Québec*, Montreal: Presse de l'Université de Montréal, 1969, p. 20.

Even the sporadic attempts by *La Ligue d'Action Nationale* (in the period following the First World War) failed to relate this nationalism to contemporary industrial society. The myths of religion, family, and rural values remained. But since the Second World War, the Franco-Québécois have been much more aggressive in their nationalism, whether in the form of demands for greater autonomy within Canada even to the extent of demanding an international presence or in the form of actual independence as demanded by the Parti-Québécois. What is significant about this new attitude is that, unlike during the period of which Bouthillier speaks, this new nationalism is related to mass movements, rather than being articulated by the traditional élite. That is, the language question in Quebec is related to the future of Quebec's (Franco-Québécois) identity, an identity which has embraced the values of industrial-urban society.<sup>19</sup>

In the post-war period, furthermore, several new factors entered the equation of cultural survival. While historically Anglo-Quebecers have been economically more secure than Franco-Québécois, and while anglophones have tended to dominate the economy of the province, only since the Second World War has this predominance clashed with the growing aspirations of French Canadians. It was during the sixties that the full extent of this inequality became known. A number of briefs to the Gendron Commission cited the findings of the federal Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism to the effect that of fourteen ethnic groups in Quebec, French-Canadian average yearly income was greater than only two—the Italians and the Native groups.<sup>20</sup> Economic grievances were predominant in French-Canadian briefs to the Gendron Commission and to Parliamentary Commissions. That these grievances had some basis is confirmed by the studies of the Gendron Commission. In a survey of head offices in Montreal, two English speakers were hired to every French speaker: and, while French speakers earned 35% of salaries under \$10,000, they filled only 15% of positions where the salary was above \$22,000.<sup>21</sup> Surveys throughout the province indicate that "low levels of income and education coincide with the predominance of the French language. The middle levels are associated with bilingualism at work and at the highest levels of income and education, forces favor the use of English."<sup>22</sup> Related to this economic grievance has been the reluctance of Anglo-Quebecers to learn the French language. On the other hand the predominance of English as a language of internal communication (as distinct from a language of external business communication) has led to a refusal by many young Québécois to learn English as a second language, ostensibly because to do so would put them in a colonial position.<sup>23</sup>

Another aspect of the economic question relates to the technological revolution which has affected contemporary civilization. In order for Quebec to become economically competitive in North America and to raise her standard of living, she along with other Canadian provinces, has imported a great deal of modern technology. Since overwhelmingly this technology has been of American origin, technological terms and concepts tend also to be American. As a consequence, a great many English words have crept into the French used in Quebec. For the purist, and there are many who also espouse French unilingualism, this invasion of anglicisms threatens not only to corrupt the language but to anglicize the thought

<sup>19</sup>Bouthillier et Meynaud, *Le Choc des Langues au Québec*, p. 17.

<sup>20</sup>Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Book III: *The Work World*, Ottawa: The Queen's Printer, 1969, p. 23.

<sup>21</sup>Gendron Commission, *The Language of Work*, p. 119.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 77.

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 199.

of Québécois.<sup>24</sup> For others, the technological invasion by English presents one more obstacle to overcome to make French a viable language of work at lower levels of production.<sup>25</sup> It was partly this realization that led the creation of the Office de la Langue Française whose function was to create technological lexicons in French. And it was this realization which led the Gendron Commission to recommend not only that the Government and the private sector encourage a greater use of French terminology by labourers and foremen, but that the development of a French technical and scientific language be accelerated.<sup>26</sup> Nonetheless, this technological invasion raised the question of the future rôle of French in Quebec's economy.<sup>27</sup>

Finally demography has played a critical rôle in the emergence of linguistic tensions in the sixties. Historically French Canadians have seen Canadian immigration policy as fulfilling Durham's recommendation to anglicize the French Canadian. Immigration was perceived as deliberately designed to strengthen the English element and to overwhelm the French element. Certainly in view of the fact that federal policy encouraged immigration from the British Isles and the fact that in other provinces, immigrants opted overwhelmingly for English, French Canadian perceptions were valid. However, in Quebec, data reveals that during the thirties, the French sector of the Commission d'Ecoles Catholiques de Montreal attracted about half the Roman Catholic immigrants, particularly the large Italian community.<sup>28</sup> However, since the Second World War, immigrant children increasingly went to the English sector. This trend was more significant since Protestant children, until recently, had no choice but to go to English schools. Consequently, by the sixties, up to 90% of immigrant children were found in English-language schools. This led many Québécois to argue that immigrants were being anglicized by the ability and practice of choosing English schools.<sup>29</sup> The Gendron Commission pointed out however that many New Canadians demanded bilingual schooling, many sent their children to French-language universities, and for the Italians at least, intermarriage was far more likely to be with French Canadians than British Canadian.<sup>30</sup> Despite the oversimplification that English schools led to anglicization, and the fact that the Gendron Commission revealed the immigrants' collective will to survive as distinct ethnic communities,<sup>31</sup> French unilateralists demanded measures to compel immigrants to attend French schools.

Among the reasons for this tendency of immigrants to attend English schools was social and economic advancement.<sup>32</sup> That is, the English language had much more prestige and was more essential than French in social and economic advancement. In his doctoral dissertation, Paul Cappon suggests that among the people he observed and consequently among Néo-Québécois, the primary and hence only significant factor in determining the choice of English schools was economic.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>24</sup>The theme was echoed by Tardivel in 1880, and the Association catholique de la jeunesse canadienne française in 1924.

<sup>25</sup>Gendron Commission, *Language of Work*, p. 125.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 294.

<sup>27</sup>This point was raised during a television interview with Guy Saint-Pierre, Minister of Industry, in the spring of 1974.

<sup>28</sup>CECM, *Mémoire sur le Bill 28, Annexe B; Comité Interministériel sur L'Enseignement des Langues aux Néo-Canadiens, Rapport*, pp. 9ff.

<sup>29</sup>*Journal des Debats* 4 février 1969, pp. 427, 444. The recent federal green paper on Immigration recognises Quebec's anxieties and the need to increase francophone immigration.

<sup>30</sup>Gendron Commission, *The Ethnic Groups*, pp. 73-4.

<sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 325-38.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 104.

<sup>33</sup>Cappon, *Conflit Entre les Néo-Québécois et les francophones à Montreal*, p. 2.

However, one might question the extent to which the people Cappon observed were representative of the various ethnic groups from which they were drawn. Moreover, Cappon's thesis does not leave much room for the fact that traditionally French Canadians were rather cool towards immigrants for religious or ideological reasons, and that even now three out of four French Canadians associate the immigrant with unemployment and poor housing<sup>34</sup> Moreover, many immigrants would have preferred to send their children to French schools, but either because of confessional factors, better education in English schools or traditional French-Canadian reluctance to accept immigrants, the children were sent to English schools. Thus to say immigrants chose English schools for purely economic reasons or that attendance at English schools means anglicization and rejection of French is an oversimplification.

Couple with this perceived drift of immigrants to anglicization was the precipitous decline in the birth rate in Quebec. Historically Quebec had a high birth rate, reaching a peak in the twentieth century of 37.6 per thousand during 1921,<sup>35</sup> Even in 1955 the French Canadian birth rate was over 32 per thousand. However beginning in 1958, the rate declined rapidly. By 1962 the rate was slightly above the Canadian average of 25.3, but by 1968 the figure was 17. Latest figures indicate the Quebec rate is below the Canadian average.<sup>36</sup> Since the birth rate of immigrants' is higher than the French Canadian rate, the decline has even more catastrophic implications. Demographic projections<sup>37</sup> have led many Québécois to suggest that by the end of the century the French Canadian proportion of the population will have dropped to two-thirds of the Quebec population, and in Montreal to one-half. There are other more optimistic projections. Nonetheless, the falling birth rate has led to demands for a population policy to maintain the current proportion of French speakers in the province.<sup>38</sup> This idea is linked to demands that immigrants attend French schools. It may be that recent raising of family allowances in Quebec may help increase the birth rate.

The combination of the economic and technological predominance of English and of the demographic tendency of the French proportion of the population to decline (itself a combination of immigration and birth rate trends) has put in doubt the future of the French Canadian or Franco-Québécois culture. That is, economic realities question the viability of the language beyond the home or in entertainment, while demographic realities questioned the continued French predominance in the *château fort* of Quebec. The French fact in Quebec was in doubt—it was a question of survival.

One of the conclusions of the Gendron Commission was that the critical area was Montreal where economic, linguistic and demographic tensions were greatest.<sup>39</sup> Montreal was the economic and commercial hub of the province, while it was in Montreal that anglophones and ethnic populations concentrated. Outside the

<sup>34</sup>Gendron, *The Ethnic Groups*, p. 76.

<sup>35</sup>Le Conseil de la Vie Française en Amérique, *La Crise de la Natalité au Québec*, Les Editions Ferland, 1968, p. 8.

<sup>36</sup>Gendron Commission, *The Ethnic Groups*, p. 169; Hubert Charbonneau et Robert Maheu, *Les Aspects démographiques de la question linguistique*, Québec: 1973, pp. 155ff

<sup>37</sup>Hubert Charbonneau, Jacques Henripin, et Jacques Légaré, "L'Avenir Démographiques des Francophones au Québec et a Montréal, en l'absence de politiques adéquates", *Revue de la Géographie de Montréal*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 199-202.

<sup>38</sup>"Le Peuplement et l'Immigration", *Action Nationale*, vol 57, nov-déc. 1967, pp. 291-318. Some even wanted a repatriation of French Canadians from Northern New England and Ontario.

<sup>39</sup>Gendron Commission, *The Language of Work*, p. 15.

metropolitan area, the issue of language rights was of secondary importance. It was no accident then that the debate over language rights in education began in the Montreal area.

During the early years of the sixties, Anglo-Quebecers had been uneasy, partly because the creation of the Ministry of Education in 1964 appeared to end their effective autonomy in education, and partly because the Franco-Québécois had increasingly insisted on the use of their language in public. On the other hand, the Franco-Québécois were increasingly resentful of the inferior place that their language seemed to enjoy in the province. But Saint-Léonard became the spark that ignited the public conflict which has continued until this day. *L'Affaire Saint-Léonard* embodied many of the factors which were more evident on a provincial scale.

Saint-Léonard is a suburb in the northeast of Montreal Island, which had seen a rapid growth in population since the late 1950s. Along with this population growth had come a demographic shift. Although the city still retained its predominantly French character, a large non-French, largely Néo-Québécois element made up over 40% of the population. The most notable segment of this non-French element was the Italian community, which is well-organized throughout the Montreal area.<sup>40</sup> Moreover, this Italian element competed with French Canadians in the construction industry and economically was just below the French Canadian in average annual income. Furthermore, this Italian element was accused of betraying their cultural allies, the French, by sending their children to bilingual or English classes.

The immediate spark was a resolution on 20 November 1967 to phase out the bilingual classes of the Saint-Léonard School Commission. Though the bilingual (French-English) classes had originally been set up to enable the Néo-Québécois students to become bilingual in French and English, and also to accommodate them more to the French milieu, by 1967 the policy seemed to have failed. Most bilingual students opted for English secondary schools and many complained that the children never learned French properly. The policy envisaged by the November 1967 resolution was one of French-only schools. This seemed to strike at the historic parental right to determine the type of education their children received, or so it seemed to the non-francophone parents.

By March 1968, two opposing groups emerged. On the one hand there was the St. Leonard Parents Association, largely non-francophone in composition, which advocated restoration of the bilingual classes; on the other hand there was the *Mouvement Pour l'Intégration Scolaire*, francophone in composition, which advocated French unilingualism throughout the province. The emergence of pressure groups permitted existing tensions to surface. In school elections on 10 June 1968, each group presented its slate of candidates in an effort to gain control of the Commission and to establish its particular policy on the language of instruction. The aftermath of the bitter campaign was the election of two MIS candidates, Jean Girard and Raymond Langlois, who with Jacques Duchesne (whose seat was not up for election) controlled the Commission. As a result of this victory and apparent support in a referendum, on 27 June 1968, the three men succeeded in getting the Commission to pass a resolution to phase out bilingual classes beginning in September 1968.

The establishment of a unilingual French policy led to bitter resistance by the St. Leonard Parents Association. The confusion of election day and the manner in

---

<sup>40</sup>Jeremy Bossevain, *The Italians of Montreal, Social Adjustment in a Plural Society*, Studies of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Ottawa: Information Canada, 1970.

which the resolution of June was passed led to two court cases: in one the Parents Association sought to annul the election on the grounds of irregularities; and in the other the two commissioners opposing the unilingual resolutions, Jean Pappa and Léo Pérusse, sought to annul the resolution on the grounds that they were denied their right to speak. In the first action the Parents were unsuccessful, while on the second the dissenting commissioners eventually succeeded in the Appeal Court. However, the time consumed by the court cases permitted the controversy over language rights in education to grow. By now the issue was not French or bilingual classes but French schools or parental right to choose the language of instruction (French or English).

The Parents Association, led by Robert Beale, had shifted its demands for English, not bilingual schools. It demonstrated parental opposition to what they perceived as a denial of their rights by a march to Ottawa at the beginning of September, a move which led some Québécois to suggest the anglophones were the real separatists. Later, the Parents organized private basement classes, in English, for those Grade One students who were being forced into French classes. Though the classes were pedagogically successful, their financial burden proved a constant source of anxiety for the Parents Association. Beale made continual representations to the Minister of Education, Jean-Guy Cardinal, to intervene either to force the Saint-Léonard School Commission to restore bilingual (or English) classes or to subsidize the basement classes.

Despite the fact that the late Premier Johnson had promised that "there would be no second class citizens in Quebec" and that "rights as important as those of language would not be manipulated by a local board"<sup>41</sup> and despite Premier Bertrand's recognition of the cultural duality of the province, Cardinal seemed unable or unwilling to intervene in Saint-Léonard. In time anglophones in the province lost all confidence in the Minister. This development was important, in view of the later debates over school reorganization and over Bill 22: anglophones could not accept legislation entrusting wide discretionary powers to the Minister of Education.

A second result of the Saint-Léonard dispute was the rôle of pressure groups in keeping the issue of language rights before the public. John Parisella, in his thesis, illustrates how the original groups, the Parents Association led by Robert Beale and the Mouvement pour l'Intégration Scolaire led by Raymond Lemieux, were supported by a myriad of other pressure groups, both within the Montreal area and in the rest of the province. Many of these groups had only a handful of members such as the Conseil de la Légitimité Nationale, while others theoretically could count on thousands of members, such as the Sociétés Saint-Jean-Baptiste. Moreover, Parisella suggests, these pressure groups had overlapping memberships, thus making actual popular support difficult to determine. What was important was the fact that pressure groups were utilizing a number of means to influence political decisions.

Since the tensions in Saint-Léonard reflected those existing throughout the province, but especially in the Montreal region, it is not surprising that the issues raised by Saint-Léonard became provincial issues. As Saint-Léonard deteriorated, in December 1968 Premier Bertrand attempted to solve the crisis by introducing Bill 85. In brief, the bill attempted to strengthen the position of the French language in the province through various measures: these included power given to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Immigration to permit immigrants to

---

<sup>41</sup>*Le Devoir* 26 septembre 1968.

acquire a knowledge of French. However, the importance in educational terms lay in the fact that it accepted the principle of parental right to choose the language of instruction, or more precisely the right to an English education. It was this principle which became the object of heated debate in the hearings of the Education Committee. Perhaps because of the difficulty Bertrand had in selling the legislation to his caucus, or perhaps because of a realization of the controversy which the bill provoked, Acting Premier Cardinal sent the bill to Committee before approval in principle.

During the public hearings on Bill 85, there was by no means consensus on the issue. Most francophone groups which presented briefs tended to stress the concept that the rights of the collectivity superseded individual rights: consequently since demographically the Franco-Québécois collectivity was in danger, it had the right and duty to impose the collective will on the province, and to insist that francophones and Néo-Québécois must send their children to French schools. English schools would be maintained, but only within strict limits set by the French majority. Secondly, francophone groups insisted that the French Canadians constituted a nation, and the Quebec government, as spokesman for that nation, had an obligation to protect the French-Canadian culture. The State had a duty to insist that not only French become a viable language of work throughout the province, but indeed to proclaim French as the only official language of the province. For francophone groups, Bill 85 was deficient since it not only promoted individual over collective rights, but it consecrated privileges which English had gained by reason of military and economic control.

For those anglophone groups which presented briefs, the argument was different. They argued that individual rights should take precedence over collective rights and, for that reason, supported the principle of parental choice of language of instruction. Moreover, they argued that anglophones had an acquired right to English schools: it was a right not a privilege. Indeed, the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal went so far as to suggest that by virtue of Section 93 of the BNA Act, language rights in education were guaranteed. In addition, anglophones pointed out the dangers promoting French at the expense of English: this was particularly so since English was essential to the functioning of the Quebec economy.

In addition to the public hearings on Bill 85, a demonstration in front of the legislature and public meetings indicated the growing force of pressure groups, particularly those opposed to the principles of Bill 85.

Sensing that Bill 85 was "a baby that no one wanted," in March 1969 Premier Bertrand announced that the government had no intention of proceeding with the bill. Pressure groups had played a significant rôle in the failure of the first attempt to solve the language debate.

In October 1969, the Union Nationale government attempted to resolve the Saint-Léonard crisis a second time, when it introduced Bill 63. Much simpler than Bill 85, ostensibly it was designed to expand the rôle of French in the province. However the significant clause was one requiring school boards to provide English-language education where demanded; that is, established in law the traditional policy of parental choice of language of instruction. Like its predecessor Premier Bertrand had difficulty in caucus, and like its predecessor, Bill 63 was subject to bitter controversy both inside and outside the National Assembly. The fate of Bill 85 led Premier Bertrand to proceed directly with Bill 63, refusing to send it to committee on the grounds that the view of the people had been presented in the hearings on Bill 85.

Although the Liberal Opposition pronounced itself in favour of the Bill, it did succeed in getting the rôle of the Office de la Langue Française strengthened especially in the area of the language of work. Real opposition came in the form of a vigorous filibuster of the so-called "circumstantial opposition," led by the Parti-Québécois leader, René Lévesque, and including the Liberal Yves Michaud and the the Unionistes Antonio Flamand and Jérôme Proulx. By superb use of intricate House rules, they were able to delay passage of the bill. They argued against parental choice, claiming that the future of the French language was in doubt: consequently they argued that English-language education should only be provided for the anglophones, and then only in proportion to their percentage of the population. Francophones and Néo-Québécois would be compelled to send their children to French schools. Moreover they demanded a clear requirement that French become the basic language of communication in the province. Though the filibuster failed, it became clear that the Parti-Québécois was increasingly replacing the Union Nationale as spokesman of the nationalist elements in the province.

Outside the House, pressure groups favouring French unilingualism and opposing parental rights to choose the language of instruction mounted a vigorous campaign. Through study sessions, student strikes, marches and rallies, and eventually a giant rally in front of the legislature, they attempted to persuade the government to drop the bill. The intervention of students (secondary and post-secondary) and youth had an ominous ring for federalists in Quebec. However, unlike with Bill 85, these pressure groups were better coordinated in their efforts by the Front de Québec Français which had support from trade unions, the Sociétés Saint-Jean Baptiste, and small political groupings. Though these demonstrations also failed to persuade the government, they gave the impression that the mass of Québécois opposed the bill and its principles. The government and opposition, it was argued, acted contrary to the interests and the will of the people.

Though Bill 63 established for the first time the legal basis for English-language schools and individual rights to education in the language of one's choice, it did not end the controversy. Moreover, it was one thing to proclaim language rights and another to create administrative structures to permit these language rights to be practised. It was this lack of administrative structures which worried English Quebecers.

One of the results which rapid development of Montreal's suburbs had caused was the growth of a large number of small school administrations—some forty-two by the late sixties. This had led to great inequities in the educational services provided throughout the metropolitan region. Consequently it was felt that school administration on the Island (and indeed through the province) should be reorganized on a more rational and efficient basis. This attitude had been expressed by the Parent Commission. Two additional studies later, in the fall of 1969, Jean-Guy Cardinal introduced Bill 62. In the words of Premier Bertrand, it along with Bill 63 were to be the cornerstones of a new Quebec.<sup>42</sup> Briefly, the bill envisaged reducing the number of commissions to eleven, and creating a three-tiered system of administration—school committee, school commission, and Island Council, with the latter body having considerable control over finances and planning. The bill was attacked on all sides.

Anglophones resented what they perceived as a lack of guarantees for minority groups. There were no provisions to guarantee that minority language groups would be represented on the unified non-confessional commissions. Nor were there guarantees given that administrative posts for the minority language groups would be

<sup>42</sup>*Journal des Débats* 30 octobre 1969, p. 3441.

created to ensure quality education. And, there were no guarantees of minority representation on the all-powerful Island Council which would be appointed by the government. The latter criticism was crucial, in view of the lack of confidence which the anglophone community had in Cardinal, a lack of confidence born out of the Saint-Léonard crisis. Moreover, the anglophones felt that too much power was given to the Island Council, and that the school commissions, in which anglophones had some influence, were in effect reduced to administrative, not policy-making bodies. Finally, anglophones suggested that the lack of language guarantees for minorities meant that anglophones would move west, francophones move east where they could find school commissions controlled by their own language group. In place of unified non-confessional boards, anglophones wanted linguistic division.

For francophones, the basic criticism was over government appointment to the Island Council, a betrayal of democracy it was felt.

According to Pierre Fournier, the basis for anglophone demands of linguistic division and reduction of the financial powers of the Island Council was economic. That is, they (and particularly the Protestants) wanted to retain their better equipped schools and, hence, their economic superiority. In his analysis, Fournier indicates the close relationship between the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal and The Montreal Board of Trade, and the rôle which businessmen played in the Association for Reform in Education in mobilizing public opinion against the bill. And, in his discussion, Fournier constantly points to the reorganization which had taken place in metropolitan Toronto, and particularly the Goldenberg Report. However, the Toronto reorganization did not abolish confessional boards, as Bill 62 did, nor were members of the Metropolitan Board appointed by the cabinet as was the case in Quebec, but by school boards. And any local board which objected to the Metropolitan Board's decision regarding budget estimates could appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board. Consequently there were differences in the way Ontario attempted to rationalize school administration and create equality of opportunity and the way Quebec was proposing.<sup>43</sup> It was not so much that anglophones opposed the objectives of Bill 62, but rather the means by which these objectives were achieved. Interestingly, Anglo-Catholics had no trouble accepting unified commissions. Partly because of public debate, and partly because of an impending election, Bill 62 died on the order paper.

When the new Liberal Minister of Education, Guy Saint-Pierre, introduced Bill 28, a modified version of Bill 62, in July 1971, many of the anglophone concerns had been accepted. For example, the bill created administrative posts in each school commission especially charged with the education of the linguistic minorities. Moreover, in the event that representatives of linguistic minorities were not elected to school commissions, the Minister could appoint up to two additional commissioners. Finally, the cabinet only appointed four of the fifteen members of the Island Council, whose power over facilities had been reduced. But the principle of unified non-confessional commissions had been retained. Fournier sees in these modifications proof that anglophones had succeeded in influencing the government far more than had francophones. However, Fournier neglects to mention that the Commission d'Écoles Catholiques de Montréal had advocated these administrative guarantees for language minorities, and that Claude Ryan of *Le Devoir* questioned the wisdom of establishing unified commissions at this time.

Nonetheless, despite these modifications, Anglo-Protestants still continued to

<sup>43</sup>W.G. Fleming, *Ontario's Educational Society* vol. II: *The Administrative Structure*, University of Toronto Press, 1971, pp. 179-221.

attack the principle of unified non-confessional boards, claiming that they were unconstitutional because of the confessional guarantees of Section 93 of the BNA Act. Moreover, Anglo-Protestants suggested that reorganization of school boards in itself needed time to overcome difficulties, without the additional problem of reconciling linguistic groups. Thus it was too soon to create unified commissions. It would be easier and more efficient (without duplicating services) for a linguistic division on the Island, at least as a first step. Anglo-Catholics did not object to unified commissions, but wanted some provision whereby school commissions could share services where the small Anglo-Catholic population made it uneconomic for each commission to do so. The Franco-Protestants objected to the fragmentation of their group.

On the other hand, francophones objected to Ministerial appointment of language minority representatives as undemocratic. Saint-Pierre reduced their status to observers. Secondly, some francophones such as the labour unions claimed that the reduction in powers of the Island Council meant that it would have little means to establish equality of educational opportunity for the poorer areas of the city, which coincidentally happened to be French. The anglophone schools of the west half of the Island would continue to have better facilities. Thirdly, some francophones claimed that administrative guarantees to English in effect consecrated privileges for English. Finally, French unilingualist groups used the opportunity of public hearings on Bill 28 to demand that not only French be made the working language of the new commissions but that Bill 63 be repealed. This later demand was made on the grounds that statistics suggested that the choice permitted under Bill 63 allowed a more rapid drift towards anglicization by francophones and Néo-Québécois alike. Rather than promoting the French fact, Bill 63 endangered it more.

A filibuster by the Union Nationale, Créditiste and Parti-Québécois opposition parties led the Bourassa government to withdraw the legislation.

The third attempt to reorganize school administration on the Island came in the fall of 1972, when the Minister of Education, François Cloutier, introduced Bill 71. The legislation unified the school commissions on a confessional basis, until such time as the Island Council drew up a plan for a more permanent reorganization. This latter concession was in response to criticisms that Bills 62 and 28 had been drawn up by technocrats, without consideration to those actually administering schools on the Island. The decision to unify on a confessional basis was in response to Protestant threats to take to court action if unified commissions were established.<sup>44</sup>

Bill 63 and parental right never entered the debates over Bill 71, largely because the issue had been debated earlier in the session when the Parti-Québécois introduced a private members bill on the language conflict. Moreover, the Gendron Commission was due to report at the end of December. However, the Parti-Québécois and the Union Nationale as well as labour leaders and nationalist groups would have preferred unified school commissions. Moreover, government refusal to hold public hearings kept public controversy to a minimum.

Since it preserved their educational autonomy, the Anglo-Protestants were pleased with Bill 71. There was no immediate prospect of a situation whereby they would be dominated by French Roman Catholics. However, the position of the

---

<sup>44</sup>A study commissioned by the Ministry of Education, François Chevrette, Herbert Marx, et André Tremblay, *Les Problèmes Constitutionnels posés par la Restructuration Scolaire de l'Île de Montréal*, suggested unified commissions were constitutional.

Anglo-Catholics had changed. During the debates over Bills 62 and 28, they had supported the concept of unified commissions. Their experience in association with French Roman Catholics in the same commission, especially in the CECM, had led them to believe that the two linguistic groups could work together. French Canadians had historically given Anglo-Catholics considerable autonomy. However, by 1972 the mood had changed, perhaps because of difficulties Anglo-Catholics were having in school boards outside the Island of Montreal, and perhaps because French Canadians were more insistent *Néo-Québécois* attend French schools. In any case, Anglo-Catholics sent a 100,000 signature petition to the Minister of Education requesting two separate Anglo-Catholic boards (or parity with Anglo-Protestants), since they had about as many students as the Protestant community. They were concerned about the fragmentation of their community, especially in the East End, and felt that religious education as well as quality English education would not be provided, despite Bill 63. The Anglo-Catholics also wanted a measure of control over their schools to ensure cultural survival. However, the Minister refused to give in.

By the end of 1972, legally there was parental choice as to the language of education, and some guarantees given that every school board had to offer education in the two languages. Moreover in Montreal the Anglo-Protestants at least had succeeded in maintaining a certain measure of autonomy and to that extent the anglophone community had administrative structures to guarantee quality English-language education. But the fight for language rights in education was far from over. Anglo-Catholics were not satisfied. And many Franco-*Québécois* continued to oppose English "privileges" and, consequently, called for the repeal of Bill 63. Indeed the *Mouvement Québec Français*, a coalition created by the trade unions and especially the *Société Sainte-Jean-Baptiste de Montréal*, was organized to rally public opinion against Bill 63. School closures, caused by population movement from the inner city to the suburbs, and teacher surpluses, caused by lower birth rates, were both blamed on the fatal effects of Bill 63. Complaints were made that the anglophone community had better facilities. And fear of anglicization led militants to oppose English immersion courses and dual-language schools.

The issue of educational rights and consequently of cultural survival broke open again in the spring of 1974 when the Bourassa government introduced Bill 22. The legislation, which declared French the only official language in the province and which made French the language of public and institutional communication throughout Quebec, severely restricted the rôle of English in the province. For the purposes of this paper, the significant portions dealt with education. Bill 63 was repealed, and in its place school boards were granted the right (but not the obligation) to provide English-language education for those children specifically passing tests indicating competency to follow education in English. Otherwise, students attended French schools. As a result of public hearings, the bill was amended to compel boards to provide education in both languages, but giving the Minister the right to limit the growth of the English-language sector.

French unilingualists attacked the bill, largely because it did not go far enough, particularly in the critical area of the language of work. Others wanted all *Néo-Québécois*, whether they spoke English or not, to attend French schools, claiming that a flood of English-language immigrants could still threaten the demographic balance.

Anglophones were more upset, especially since the rôle of English had been reduced. To declare Quebec a French province was a backward step. Indeed, some

felt the bill was unconstitutional on several grounds. More importantly, they objected to the provisions of the language tests: their demands for cultural autonomy and the lack of confidence in the bureaucrats led them to believe their English-language education would be denied on the basis of unfair tests. That is, there was no indication as to who would make the tests up and what they would consist of. Moreover, there was no appeal from the body administering the tests; at least in Ontario an appeal procedure was laid out in its Act. Nor was there a guarantee on quality education.

The ethnic community opposed the fact that parental choice had been abolished, and that their children, including those in families where older children already attended English schools, would, it appeared, be forced to attend French schools. They resented the implication in the Act that they would make up for the demographic deficiencies of French Canadians. "Before they did not want us at all . . . Now that their birthrate has fallen drastically we're suddenly welcome . . ." <sup>45</sup> And both anglophones and the ethnic community were opposed to what amounted to a rejection of the Gendron Commission recommendation that Bill 63 be retained and English retained as a "national" language. <sup>46</sup>

Why did the Bourassa government move at this time? In part it may have been that events had moved faster than the Gendron Commission. Certainly the growing electoral strength of the Parti-Québécois, committed to repealing Bill 63 and making French the official language of work, may have prodded the government into action. It may well have been seen an attempt to pass the legislation now in the hopes of defusing it as an election issue in 1977. More important perhaps were economic considerations. For the Bourassa government, the more important clauses of the legislation dealt with the public sector, the labour code, the professional services, and communication. Projected labour shortages in the eighties would mean that unless French were made the priority and predominant language in the world of work, the immigrants required to fill the jobs would continue to align themselves with the English-speaking community. It may be that as French becomes more entrenched in the economy of the province and as English as a second language is more successfully taught in French schools that the bill will be modified. Moreover, there is talk within the anglophone community of a challenge over the constitutionality of segments of the legislation. Indeed, until the courts decide, provincial jurisdiction over language rights is somewhat controversial.

This essay has attempted to point out some of the factors which have led up to the language controversy. It is important to note that several of these factors only appeared in the decade of the sixties. And, though language has always been a dividing force in Quebec since 1760, it was only in the last decade that the issue affected large segments of the population, and mass opinion was mobilized (by pressure groups) in favour of one or the other side of the debate. And though the debate over Bill 22 concerns the right to an English-language education in the strict legal sense, the controversy includes administrative guarantees for quality education. Given current anglophone distrust of bureaucratic regulations, they will not be satisfied until their educational system, and hence cultural survival, is guaranteed. Moreover francophones will continue to demand limits on English rights until they, the francophones, are assured of their cultural survival. And just as the French Canadian demands provincial autonomy in education and economics to protect his culture, so too the English Quebecer wants educational autonomy to protect his culture.

<sup>45</sup>*The Montreal Star* 18 March 1974.

<sup>46</sup>Gendron Commission, *Language Rights*, p. 81.

LOREN JAY LIND, *The Learning Machine: A Hard Look at Toronto Schools*. Toronto: Anansi, 1974. 228 pp. Cloth \$8.50. Paper \$4.95.

In the three and a half years that Loren Lind was education reporter for the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, he had occasion to browse in nearly all the precincts of a giant bureaucracy known as the Toronto school system. During that time his editors frequently killed or emasculated his news stories, thus frustrating his attempts to portray the interlocking tenacles of the bureaucracy. Fortunately, the House of Anansi, one of the country's new innovative publishers, has now provided the opportunity for Lind to put together this all-encompassing view. The result is the first comprehensive analysis of the largest school system in English-speaking Canada. The result also provides a sophisticated discussion of the tensions between "bureaucracy" and "community," the two opposing forces that promise to dominate the politics of education in all Canadian urban centres during the latter half of the 1970's.

The "bureaucracy versus community" theme takes some time to emerge from the pages of *The Learning Machine*. Lind begins his "hard look" at the classroom level with vivid portrayals of the interaction between teachers and pupils. He compares the teaching/learning process at an inner-city elementary school with that at a well-appointed school in an affluent neighbourhood. He shows us what happens to non-English speaking immigrant children when they arrive at school. He describes the fate of lower class children in "opportunity" classes and in vocational schools. To illustrate the politics of curriculum change, he takes us step by step through the attempts to provide a relevant family life and sex education program.

The author's findings are consistent with those of any good investigative reporter with a strong social conscience. The middle class ethos prevails in our public schools; children from lower class backgrounds fare more poorly than their more privileged peers; competition still rules the classroom, despite the Hall-Dennis report (*Living and Learning*, 1968); the schools deny a place to the language and culture of immigrant groups; the high schools dictate the purposes of the elementary schools; opportunity classes and vocational schools are dead-end institutions; open-area classrooms do not automatically lead to an "open" approach to teaching.

Lind's major contribution is his analysis of *why* things happen the way they do, why class bias prevails and why there is so much mind-numbing dullness in the schools. He rejects both the "capitalist conspiracy" theory recently enunciated by George Martell (*The Politics of the Canadian Public School*, 1974), and the "mindlessness" attack of Charles Silberman (*Crisis in the Classroom*, 1970).

I certainly don't believe the school's salvation lies in simply getting more 'exceptional teachers' into the system. It lies in changing the system so that schooling is a function of democracy, rather than system-bound bureaucracy (p. 1).

As Lind turns to analyze such topics as school architecture, educational finance, school board administration, and the all-powerful provincial ministry of education, he pins the blame on the bureaucrats—the local and provincial administrators working at cross purposes to neighbourhoods and local communities.

On one side stands the humanist wanting to adapt the institution to human needs, seeking a remedy for wrongs and a just distribution of the benefits of education. On the other side stand the technicians, those skilled in the technologies of organization, efficiency, cybernetics, and learning, the people who can do it (p. 179) . . . The school bureaucracy as it is serves its own needs. The ruling ethos of school government drives itself into the classroom by the implicit influences of bureaucratic control (p. 216).

But educational administrators will maintain that the trend of the past decade

towards more teacher control of curriculum has resulted in more de-centralized decision-making. Lind conclusively shows that this is more illusion than reality; the teacher's freedom is more and more circumscribed as the important decisions regarding class size and financing are increasingly made by remote municipal and provincial bureaucrats. "We see that control has moved to the top, far removed from the true centre of growth and change, the person and the community" (p. 219).

"The schools do not have to be the agents of a centralized bureaucracy" maintains the author. His alternative proposal is that schools become accountable to their own neighbourhoods through community councils of elected parents, teachers and older students. "A change of awareness demands a new order, and the model most likely to bring it is the local community in all its permutations," (p. 228). Unfortunately, Lind does not devote enough attention to analyzing how and why community control would benefit students more than our present pattern of bureaucratic control. We need more information on community involvement at Park and Kensington schools, more on the Trefann Court mothers, and on the various Toronto ventures into "alternative" schools. But *The Learning Machine* does provide solid information on the present model of educational administration; the obligation is now on community groups and "reform" trustees to use it to lead to change.

In the final analysis, this book is as much a signpost for the future as a map of the present, as relevant to any urban school system as it is to Toronto. The reader's response will be conditioned by his own personal view of the future of our civilization. If that view if one of institutional conformity imposed from above, then he or she will support the bureaucratic and technocratic imperative so castigated by Loren Lind. But if he sees pluralism and community decision-making as a means of reducing impersonality and alienation in schooling, then he will support the author's call for a reassertion of neighbourhood control.

Robert M. Stamp  
The University of Calgary

John O. Fritz, *My Encounters With Alternatives*. Toronto: The Canadian Education Association, 1975. Pp. 34. \$2.00 (paper, with endplates and bibliography).

It is regrettable that Professor Fritz' study did not enable him to report at greater length on his encounters, for he offers some interesting observations on alternative schools. His style is informal and reportorial, and he remarks that

... along with the frequent use of personal testimony, I interject my own biased impressions and substantiate them occasionally by way of some reflective analysis and interpretation, (p. 6).

It is doubtful that the analysis does substantiate Professor Fritz' impressions, but at least his reporting is balanced: he touches on difficulties, such as the rapid turnover and "burnout" of teachers, as well as commenting favourably on the ethos of the schools and relations between teachers and pupils.

His final estimate is optimistic:

Perhaps alternative schools, regardless of their balance sheet of successes and failures, will yet succeed in forging new visions of the possible in education, (p. 28).

There is no balance sheet in *My Encounters With Alternatives* which would justify this optimism, and it is important to note some of the lines of inquiry suggested by the reported impressions. The dominant impression is of the commit-