1

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Attitudes Toward Language Policy in New Brunswick:
The 1985 Public Hearings on the
Poirier - Bastarache Report

by

Catherine Mary Steele, B.A.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Department of Political Science

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

1 August, 1989

© copyright
1989, Catherine Mary Steele

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

GOVERNEMENT DU CANADA

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

ISBN 0-315-60513-8

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis

"Attitudes Toward Language Policy in New Brunswick :
The 1985 Public Hearings on the
Poirier - Bastarache Report"

submitted by Catherine Mary Steele, B.A.
in Partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of Political Science

Carleton University

September 20, 1989

ABSTRACT

Language policy and bilingualism in New Brunswick continue to be controversial issues and spark heated debate. With an anglophone majority and francophone minority in proportions that mirror those on the national scale, the province is a microcosm of French-English concerns. Although the stability of the province has never been jeopardized by linguistic conflict, there remains a gap in the opinions and attitudes of francophones and anglophones regarding language policy designed to transform the province into a more bilingual one.

This Master's thesis undertakes a qualitative content analysis of 309 briefs submitted to the 1985 Advisory Committee on Official Languages by francophones and anglophones within the province in order to discover opinions and attitudes of both linguistic communities regarding language policy and its implementation in education and the civil service. Feelings towards bilingualism in general in New Brunswick were also explored. Furthermore, the goal of this thesis is to illustrate that the conflicting attitudes of francophones and anglophones are due to the failure of the provincial political elite of both parties to apply conflict-resolving mechanisms. These devices; depoliticization, secrecy, proportionality and consensus, are used by the elite to maintain stability and good relations. In addition to analyzing briefs, key members of the political elite who had been involved with the formation of language policy were interviewed.

Study of the briefs reveals that anglophones are uneasy about extending the privileges which they enjoy, such as the availability of services in their primary language or the opportunity to work in the language of their choice, to the other linguistic group. They dislike homogeneous schools, resent bilingualism in the civil service because they fear a loss of employment and doubt the merits of the principle of bilingualism. In contrast, francophones favor their own linguistically separate schools, resent anglophones enrolling in immersion, demand more progressive measures to ensure French government services and to allow them to work in the language of their choice, and deem the application of bilingualism in the province as a failure. Both groups express negative sentiments towards each other. This clash in opinions and attitudes is the result of the political elite neglecting to employ proportionality; that is, not only ensuring that civil service positions are distributed fairly between the linguistic communities but also that services of equitable quality are available in both languages. Also, even though depoliticization and consensus are used, the lack of debate on the linguistic question causes the masses to reject the compromise strategy of the elite. The result is a breakdown in elite/mass cohesion with the latter forming other organizations to use as vehicles of expression of their concerns over language policy thereby causing more conflict in opinions. In addition, the role of the media in promoting linguistic harmony or conflict cannot be denied. The political elite must convince them to take on a much more positive role in the linguistic debate than what is presently being done.

Therefore, while New Brunswick remains stable it is characterized by a sharp clash in French/English attitudes which could lead to even greater conflict. A "us versus them" mentality seems to dominate, and yet despite this there is no breakdown in stability. While the linguistic situation in the province is not as dire as the French or English extremists proclaim, there can be no doubt that a "linguistic undertow" or uneasy truce remains. Attitudes of francophones and anglophones toward each other must change.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Abstract	i
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vi
List of Figures	vii
 Chapter 1	
AN OVERVIEW OF LANGUAGE POLICY AND BILINGUALISM IN NEW BRUNSWICK	1
Thesis Plan	2
The Evolution of Francophone-Anglophone Relations	7
New Brunswick as a Pluralistic Society	18
 2	
LANGUAGE POLICY AND EDUCATION IN NEW BRUNSWICK	26
Historical Background (The Development of Provincial Education Policy)	27
Recommendations of the Poirier-Bastarache Report	35
Anglophone Attitudes/Opinions Towards Education	36
Francophone Opinions	43
Attitudes of Anglophone Educational Institutions and Organizations	46
Attitudes of Francophone Educational Institutions and Organizations	51
Anglophone and Francophone Attitudes on the Role of Education in Linguistic Relations	56
The Usage of Conflict-Resolving Mechanisms	58
 3	
LANGUAGE POLICY AND THE CIVIL SERVICE	62
Recommendations of the Poirier-Bastarache Report	66
Anglophone Objections Towards Bilingualism and the Civil Service	69
Anglophone Attitudes Towards the Civil Service	77
Francophone Concerns Over Bilingualism in the Civil Service	81
Conflict-Resolving Mechanisms	88

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 2-

4	VIEWS TOWARDS LANGUAGE POLICY AND BILINGUALISM IN GENERAL IN NEW BRUNSWICK	96
	Bilingualism-Good or Bad? Anglophone Attitudes	97
	Positive and Negative Francophone Attitudes Towards Bilingualism	102
	Bilingualism-A Divisive Factor?	107
	References to Other Linguistic Communities	109
	Anti-French/Anti-English Sentiments	114
	The Application of Conflict-Resolving Mechanisms	119
5	CONCLUSION	127
6	BIBLIOGRAPHY	134
7	APPENDIX	139

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
Table 1.1	Linguistic Profile of New Brunswick	3
1.2 & 1.3	Briefs Submitted to the 1985 Advisory Committee on Official Languages	25A 25B
2.1	Anglophone Briefs Submitted by Individuals Regarding Education	42
2.2	Francophone Briefs Submitted by Individuals Regarding Education	45
2.3	Anglophone Briefs Submitted by Schools, School Boards, Teachers Associations and Education Associations Formed by Parents	50
2.4	Attitudes of Anglophone Organizations Regarding Role of Education in Linguistic Relations	50
2.5	Francophone Briefs Submitted by School, School Boards, Teachers Associations and Education Associations Formed by Parents	55
2.6	Attitudes of Francophone Organizations Regarding Role of Education in Linguistic Relations	55
2.7	Attitudes of Francophone and Anglophone Individuals on the Role of Education in Linguistic Relations	58
3.1	Anglophone Concerns, Objections and Support for Language Policy in the Civil Service	88
3.2	Francophone Concerns, Objections and Support for Language Policy in the Civil Service	88
4.1	Positive and Negative Attitudes of Francophone and Anglophones Towards Bilingualism	107

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
Figure 2.1	Department of Education-Organizational Chart	30A

CHAPTER ONE

AN OVERVIEW OF LANGUAGE POLICY AND BILINGUALISM IN NEW BRUNSWICK

The foot-dragging slowness to recognize that the French outside Québec have any language rights at all is even apparent in New Brunswick, the only official bilingual province, where the path of implementation taken by the government has proven to be a rocky one! (Grondin, 1987)

With the December, 1988, Supreme Court ruling striking down Bill 101, Québec's French language charter, as unconstitutional and the subsequent reaction by Premier Robert Bourassa of Québec with the proclamation of Bill 178 which designated all exterior advertising of businesses as French only and allowed English only on interior signs, the language controversy has once again re-surfaced in Canada. For New Brunswick, however, Canada's only officially bilingual province, language and bilingualism have always been issues within the provincial political scene. Indeed the issues of language and bilingualism are woven into the fabric of the province's history though they have been particularly salient since the late 1960's. Projects on the national scale such as, the efforts of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism to come to terms with Canada's "two solitudes", the French and English; as well as, programs on the provincial arena such as the agenda of linguistic reforms undertaken in the late 1960's by then New Brunswick premier, Louis Robichaud, have both focused attention on language policy. Robichaud himself was part of the province's French community, "les Acadiens", who derive their name from

Acadie or Acadia, an area which the French settled before 1713 on the south shore of the Bay of Fundy in the province of Nova Scotia. Acadie was the physical wedge between the expanding empires of New France and New England. (Griffiths, 1969, 2) The province of New Brunswick was created in 1784 as a result of the partitioning of Nova Scotia but the Acadians had settled in New Brunswick in Caraquet and along the Bay of Chaleur and the eastern shore long before the province existed as a separate entity. (MacNutt, 1963,6)

At present, francophones in New Brunswick number 526,165 (see TABLE 1.1) and, therefore, comprise roughly thirty-one percent of the province's population. (New Brunswick Statistics Agency, 1989). But while francophones form the minority, anglophones constitute the majority group counting for sixty-eight percent of New Brunswick residents. These proportions of francophones to anglophones are indeed significant because they mirror the English-French ratio that exists on the national dimension. As a result, New Brunswick has been described as a "microcosmic province of the Canadian whole in terms of French-English relations" (Stanley, 1984,176). Therefore, it is this representative nature which makes the province an important one to focus on in order to reach a level of understanding of French-English relations.

THESIS PLAN

This Master's thesis undertakes a qualitative study of opinions and attitudes of francophones and anglophones towards provincial language policy in New Brunswick. This examination of opinions and attitudes

TABLE 1.1

Linguistic Profile of New Brunswick
(based on 1986 Canada Census Statistics)

Population of New Brunswick - 709,440

	Number of Francophones	% of Francophones (based on those who answered the census)
Language spoken at home - French	208,540	30.8%
Only language spoken - French (No bilingual capacity)	85,055	12.6%
	Number of Anglophones	% of Anglophones (based on those who answered the census)
Language spoken at home - English	464,990	68.7%
Only language spoken - English (No bilingual capacity)	411,535	60.8%

through a content analysis of 309 briefs submitted by members of both linguistic communities in the province reveals marked differences in attitudes about education, the civil service and bilingualism and provincial language policy in general.

It is the goal of this thesis to illustrate that this gap in opinions is due to the failure of New Brunswick to employ four conflict-resolving mechanisms, depoliticization, secrecy, proportionality and consensus; which according to Edmund Aunger, author of In Search of Political Stability A Comparative Analysis of New Brunswick and Northern Ireland, represent "specific strategies which have been employed by the elite to reduce the possibilities of conflict between the two blocs" and are used to maintain New Brunswick's politics of cooperation or "bonne entente". (Aunger, 1982, 154) The failure of the province to apply these conflict-resolving mechanisms translates into a breakdown of understanding between francophones and anglophones, divergent attitudes and opinions and ultimately conflict. Although the stability of New Brunswick society has not been jeopardized, the province is characterized by what can be described as an uneasy truce or calm between francophones and anglophones, "an undertow that could get worse if the language issue isn't treated". (Personal interview with Normand Martin, May 17, 1989)

This thesis undertakes a qualitative content analysis of 309 briefs submitted to the Advisory Committee on Official Languages' public hearings held in Fredericton, Edmundston, Grand Falls, Woodstock, St. John, St. Andrews, Sussex, Campbelltown, Bathurst, Chatham/Newcastle, Shippegan, Bouctouche, and Moncton. (consult TABLES 1.2 and 1.3) A qualitative

approach was decided upon in order to expose opinions and attitudes of francophones and anglophones towards provincial language policy, "Qualitative research effectively establishes how a target group relates to a problem, a concept, a product or service....allows for the effective probing of the relationships between consumer attitudes, opinions and behavior with respect to the project objective". (Saykaly, 1985, 9) The techniques used were a small number of personal interviews and qualitative content analysis of the briefs, "Content analysis refers to any procedure for assessing the relative extent to which specified references, attitudes, or themes permeate a given message or document". (Holsti, 1968, 597) The units of text analyzed were the 309 briefs of which 142 were presented in French, 146 presented in English and 21 bilingual briefs. The purpose of analysis was to discover the attitudes, opinions, feelings, or positions taken by francophones and anglophones towards New Brunswick language policy. It should be noted that the term "attitude" is used here cautiously and in a broad manner so that what is meant by attitude is "a predisposition to respond to a particular stimulus in a particular manner". (Manheim, 1975, 12) The attitudes are discovered in a secondary way; that is, opinions are discerned through analysis and since attitudes underly these opinions, they are indirectly revealed. Opinions and attitudes pertaining to education, the civil service and a general category of themes were the focus of the analysis.

This chapter, Chapter 1, deals with introducing the topic of study and provides necessary background information on New Brunswick linguistic relations. Chapter 2 focuses on feelings expressed in the briefs towards education, and poses the following questions: 1) What does the Poirier-Bastarache report say regarding education?; 2) Who is voicing concerns or

objections to government education policies?; 3) What are their main objections and what are these objections based on?; 4) Do any educational institutions or organizations voice objections over current education policies? 5) If so, Why and how do they view their role in French-English linguistic relations?; and 6) what are the views of anglophones and francophones on the role of education in bilingualism?

Chapter 3 examines feelings towards the civil service, the staffing of provincial departments and the provision of services in both languages by the province. This chapter does not deal with linguistic problems or policies in any particular department but makes the following inquiries; 1) What does the Poirier-Bastarache report have to say regarding the civil service?; 2) What are the objections voiced in the briefs regarding language policies in the civil service?; 3) Who is objecting, that is, would they personally be threatened by these language policies endorsing bilingual capacity in the civil service and face a loss of employment?; 4) Do any civil servants voice negative opinions towards bilingualism in the civil service?; and 5) What are the views among anglophones and francophones regarding bilingualism and the civil service?

Chapter 4 looks at other areas of concern expressed in the briefs such as; 1) Are there references to the linguistic situation outside the province, most notably, in the province of Quebec?; 2) Is bilingualism viewed in a positive or negative light?; 3) Are there fears of dividing the province with bilingualism or without it?; 4) and are anti-French or anti-English sentiments present? 5) If so, who expresses these? Chapter 5 is the conclusion of the thesis. Each

chapter also addresses how the province has partially failed to employ Auger's four conflict resolving mechanisms in the areas being analyzed.

THE EVOLUTION OF FRANCOPHONE-ANGLOPHONE RELATIONS

It is important to note that linguistic conflict in New Brunswick has not been continuous but cyclical in nature. A peak in linguistic anxiety is characteristically followed by an ebb in the tension until another event or political force causes the pattern to begin anew. Although turmoil between francophones and anglophones occurred as early as 1755 with the deportation or "le grand dérangement" of the Acadians by British rule and subsequent seizure of Acadian lands (Griffiths, 1969, 1), relations between the two linguistic communities remained uneventful, with the exception of 1875 when rioting over the Common Schools Act of 1871 resulted in the death of both a francophone and anglophone. The Act abolished separate schools and made English the language of instruction. (Stanley, 1972, 25) It was only after the adoption of the province's own Official Languages Act in 1969 by the Liberal government of Louis Robichaud, that anglophones and francophones were drawn once again into the controversy surrounding language policy in New Brunswick.

In actuality, Robichaud's attempt to pay heed to the existence of the French language began in 1966 when the Schools Act guaranteed that all students could receive instruction in their mother language whether English or French. A Faculty of Education (Ecole Normale) was also created in Moncton to train French-language teachers. Furthermore, Robichaud's Equal Opportunity Programme, implemented in 1967, "was a serious attempt to

deal with basic problems in the province, inequalities between regions and inadequacies of public services, particularly in the fields of health, welfare and education." (Stanley, 1984, 123) While the Programme was designed to provide a standard of services province-wide regardless of language, the French speaking population benefitted most due to their concentration in rural areas where the level of services provided was inadequate:

Equal Opportunity gave nothing to disadvantaged Acadians that it did not give to Anglophones in similar circumstances. But the one third of New Brunswickers who were French speaking lived mainly in the poorer areas which would benefit most from the reforms initiated by Robichaud and his Acadian-dominated government. (Starr, 1987, 24)

Therefore, the Equal Opportunity Programme was not therefore directly aimed at linguistic equality but had its greatest effect on the province's francophones. Acknowledgement of the francophone community was further demonstrated by the adoption of the province's own Official Languages Act in 1969, aimed at recognizing the French language and providing opportunities and government services to the Acadians in their own language. While this mobilization on the part of Robichaud's Liberal government was innovative and admirable, the Act was largely symbolic in nature since its most crucial provisions did not come into effect until 1977.

Even though New Brunswick's Official Languages Act of 1969 may have been impressive, Robichaud's ideas were not entirely original and instead reflected initiatives on the national political scene to come to terms with the French presence in Canada. In addition to the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference in 1967, whereby Premier Robichaud expressed

concern over Canada's duality and supported Québec Premier Daniel Johnson's assertions that the special character of Québec be observed, Robichaud demonstrated his desire to further French-English relations by recognizing the equality of the French language through the 1969 Act. It was also during this time that the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism had, "...admonished English Canadians for their refusal, in the past, to recognize the destructive effect of their attitude toward French language rights on national unity". (Stanley, 1984, 179) In fact, the New Brunswick Official Languages Act was a direct response to a recommendation made by the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Royal Commission. Therefore, the Official Languages legislation produced in 1969 is to be commended. Motivated by a desire to recognize the Acadians and their language rights as well as promote Canadian unity and provincial linguistic harmony, the Robichaud government followed the lead of a national Commission:

Here we are being asked to use the special values and experiences of our New Brunswick history in the cause of Canada's greater unity. Here we are being asked to make a venture provincially that will materially advance the fundamental purposes of our national confederation. Here we are to affirm the fact of Canada's basic linguistic and cultural duality, and acknowledge that this fact is fundamental, as well, for New Brunswick. (Synoptic Report of the Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick, March 28, 1968, 352)

Strangely enough, it was the Opposition party, the Conservatives, who had moved a year earlier that the province recognize the equality of both French and English only to have their motion defeated by Robichaud's majority government.

The Official Languages Act of 1969 designated the province as officially bilingual and contained provisions designed to recognize the equality of French and English, "...an officially bilingual province means that the principal public and private institutions will seek to provide services in two languages to citizens...What we are aiming for, then, is the equal partnership of all who speak either language and participate in either culture". (Ibid, 353) This general declaration of equality was in fact, stated in section 2 while section 3 dealt with the use of either language in the debates or legislative committees through simultaneous translation. Section 4 provided reports of legislative proceedings in both languages, and sections 5 through 15 were concerned with the provision of services in courts, municipal councils, public services and education. The government also committed itself to printing records, regulations, official documents and legislation in both languages, and agreed to provide the opportunity for a civil servant to work in either language. (Official Languages of New Brunswick Act, February, 1975)

The Act itself was preceded by a white paper, "Statement on Language Equality and Opportunity", in which Premier Robichaud stated that the stages of implementation would take "some years to achieve fully" but reiterated that provisions in the Act would be implemented in a fair amount of time, "The positive measures to ensure linguistic and cultural equality of opportunity in New Brunswick will not be achieved overnight neither will they require decades". (Synoptic Report of the Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick, Dec. 4, 1968, 707) Ironically and to the disappointment of the province's francophones, it took eight years before the critical sections of the Act of 1969 were implemented whereby proceedings and reports from the Assembly or its committees, official provincial

documents and the Royal Gazette were printed in both languages. Furthermore, the provisions allowing the mother tongue of the student to be the principal language of instruction in education and permitting either language to be used as communication for civil servants and public officers did not come into effect until 1977. (Official Languages of New Brunswick Act, February, 1978)

Robichaud's decision to implement bilingualism was not welcomed by all New Brunswick residents but he could neither ignore the Acadian people nor alienate English voters. As a result of his actions, conflict arose over possible concessions to the French component. For example, both the Orange Lodge and the Canadian Loyalist Association vowed to vote against the Liberal government in the next provincial election for choosing to follow the course of bilingualism.

The French-English clash over bilingualism was, however, most pronounced in Moncton. Roughly thirty-five percent of Moncton's population is francophone which, "...almost exactly parallels the French-English percentage in New Brunswick as a whole and is not greatly in excess of that of all Canada". (The Globe and Mail, March 1, 1972, 9) For instance, in 1968, two students from the Université de Moncton, the province's only French university, were denied their request that their case in court be heard entirely in French despite a 1967 amendment which provided for court proceedings in another language. The students had been charged with disturbing the peace for placing a pig's head on Mayor Leonard C. Jones' doorstep after he refused to hear their submission in French to Moncton City council and rejected the offer of a francophone councillor to translate.

Mayor Len Jones was again at the center for linguistic controversy in Moncton in 1972 when he rejected the use of bilingual municipal government street signs. Francophones and anglophones clashed once again just three years after the province was proclaimed as bilingual, and the sentiments expressed by both groups illustrated that regardless of new language legislation, attitudes regarding bilingualism had not changed. The newly elected Conservative government under Premier Richard Hatfield were at a loss on how to deal with the Moncton language dispute and Mayor Jones, whom Hatfield regarded as a bigot (Personal interview with Richard Hatfield, May 10, 1989). Anglophones within the city openly objected to the costs of bilingualism and perceived language policies, policies designed to increase the bilingual capacity of the province, as the cause for all of this linguistic discord:

.....rightly or wrongly many English-speaking Monctonians believed 'the French are taking over'.
.....Both English and French had lived together in peace in Moncton despite the history of conflicts between the two peoples but now 'agitation, propaganda and demagoguery' were driving a wedge between them. 'This is bilingualism and biculturalism'. (Globe and Mail, March 1, 1972, 9)

Furthermore, anglophones viewed the language issue as a political one and blamed the provincial government for its lack of leadership in the bilingualism debate:

I'd accuse the federal and provincial governments of discrimination for not having worked to establish proper conversational French programs in the English schools and by so failing, having created a situation where the requirements for bilingual

employees unduly favors the Acadians...on a practical basis there is no real need for bilingualism and from the political standpoint one has to keep the costs foremost in one's thoughts. (Arthur Buck, Progressive Conservative member of the New Brunswick Legislative Assembly, Ibid, March 2, 1972)

Despite this open display of English-French antagonism, this linguistic conflict quieted down (without any political interference) just as quickly as it had erupted. While many of the sections of the Official Languages Act of 1969 were coming into effect, the Conservative government virtually disappeared from the linguistic debate allowing francophones and anglophones to come to terms with each other on their own. No new language legislation was introduced, and French-English relations remained relatively stable until the early 1980's when the Hatfield administration's efforts to recognize further the province's francophones sparked heated debate once more.

In an attempt to protect francophone collective linguistic rights, the Conservative government passed Bill 88, an Act Recognizing the Equality of the Two Official Linguistic Communities in New Brunswick, in 1981. The bill was to be a mechanism which, "would govern relations as a whole between the two linguistic communities and their government", (Debates of the New Brunswick Legislative Assembly, Third Session of the 49th Legislative Assembly, Volume XIV, July 16, 1981, 6645) It affirmed and protected the equality of status, equality of rights, and privileges of both communities by ensuring the right of each community to distinct institutions; and promised to "take positive actions to promote the cultural, economic, educational and social development of the official linguistic

communities". (An Act Recognizing the Equality of the Two Official Linguistic Communities in New Brunswick, July 17, 1981)

The Bill itself was aimed at satisfying the province's Acadians, who had voted in 1979 at a provincial conference of the Société des Acadiens de Nouveau Brunswick (SANB) to form an Acadian province. Premier Hatfield's French lieutenant, Jean-Maurice Simard was advised by his friend, Michel Bastarache, to come up with some initiative to satisfy "les Acadiens", and Bill 88 was the result. (Personal Interview with Richard Hatfield, May 10, 1989)

Although the Bill did contain significant concessions for New Brunswick francophones it was no more than a symbolic move on the part of the government to pay attention to the needs of the Acadians. The vagueness of the legislation made it extremely difficult to implement. Consequently, it has remained idle although there are recent suggestions for it to be re-drafted and the wording tightened so that it can be enshrined in the Constitution Act of 1982. (Ibid)

Bill 88 did, however, re-iterate a commitment by the government to the francophone cause which was further emphasized with the release of the Poirier-Bastarache Report on 1984, "Towards Equality of Official Languages in New Brunswick". The report was the product of a task force, whose members included Bernard Poirier, Michel Bastarache, Robert Kerr and Martin Theriault. This group had been commissioned in 1980 by Premier Richard Hatfield to study revisions to the Official Languages Act of 1969¹. Even though the task force analyzed the provincial public service, municipal

services, public utilities and the private sector in order to determine the quality of services in both official languages as requested by the public, and the possibility for employees to work in the official language of his/her choice; it lacked a precise mandate of study. Clearly, this was a problem and according to former premier, Richard Hatfield, the report and its 96 recommendations turned out to be personal reflections of the writer, Michel Bastarache instead of research-based suggestions. Furthermore, because the original report was written in French it had to be then translated into English. The early publications were badly translated and much of the anglophone adverse reaction was a result of things not originally written. (Personal interviews with Richard Hatfield, May 10, 1989 and Normand Martin, May 17, 1989)

In addition, the Poirier-Bastarache report was excessively long and criticized for its methodology or lack thereof since the information for the report was gathered through only 77 interviews of community leaders (50 anglophones and 27 anglophones) and a content analysis of New Brunswick newspapers. No criteria were ever disclosed on how the interviewees or papers were chosen.

¹ The Poirier-Bastarache Report was completed in 1982 but due to an impending provincial election, the release of the report was delayed by the Hatfield government until 1984.

The most explosive elements of the report, however, were its wide sweeping recommendations which dealt with duality of services and decentralization both of which were designed to increase the number of

francophones employed by the public service and to provide services in both languages.

While francophones supported the report, anglophones were horrified and public reaction was so strong that the Conservative government appointed an Advisory Committee on Official Languages to hold public hearings around the province in order to further study reactions. The language issue had become such a hot potato that the government was not ready for it and, therefore, used the committee as a stalling device. (Ibid) This new eight member committee, "...adopted a three-part plan of action, including the province-wide dissemination of a large amount of written information on the Task Force's report, a public information phase carried out through ten public and twelve private sessions, and the final public hearing phase". (Report of the Advisory Committee on Official Languages of New Brunswick, 1986, 1)

As a result of the friction experienced in the public information sessions such as verbal and physical standoffs and egg throwing in Newcastle and Moncton, the committee's mandate was expanded to include an overall study of the use of the two official languages and the equality of the linguistic groups. While neither the government nor the opposition debated the language issue due to the possible political repercussions, a new political organization known as the New Brunswick Association for English Speaking Canadians, which had been first formed to oppose the flying of Acadian flag on government buildings to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the flag, became a vehicle for expression of anglophone dissent over the issue of bilingualism. The founder of the group, Len Poore, denounced full

bilingualism and blamed the Poirier-Bastarache report for disrupting the prior linguistic harmony, "This province went on so well for so long before the provincial government decided to push ahead with more bilingualism". (Montreal Gazette, December 22, 1984, B6) Poore seemed to spur on anti-French and reactionary anti-English sentiments, which appeared to have blended into the fabric of New Brunswick society. Despite agreement among the provincial Liberals and Conservatives to not debate the language issue, there was no consensus among the francophone and anglophone general public on how to act. While francophones wanted advancement in linguistic policy, anglophones wanted to put on the brakes, and at the crux of the dispute was the lack of proportionality in services and civil service jobs for the francophones. The clash between the two linguistic groups became the focus of attention of New Brunswickers as the radio, television and print media concentrated on the linguistic dispute. All of the old stereotypes, opinions, attitudes and arguments were presented once again.

The difficulties of two linguistic and cultural groups co-existing within one society such as those experienced in New Brunswick are not new, and in fact, have been examined in Arend Lijphart's theory of consociationalism. Edmund Auger's study of New Brunswick and application of the consociational model to the province, In Search of Stability ; A Comparative Analysis of New Brunswick and Northern Ireland, is particularly relevant since it is the failure of the province, particularly since the 1969 Official Languages Act of New Brunswick to apply Auger's four conflict-resolving mechanisms (some more than others in certain policy sectors) which has resulted in a polarization of linguistic groups and attitudes.

NEW BRUNSWICK AS A PLURALISTIC SOCIETY

Accounting for stability in a society characterized by cleavages or subcultures is the aim of Arend Lijphart's model of consociationalism. According to Lijphart, consociational democracy exists when in spite of fragmentation and the presence of subcultures, the government of the country, state or province remains stable. The constancy of systems such as these can be attributed to the elites of rival subcultures who "make deliberate efforts to counteract the immobilizing and unstabilizing effects of cultural fragmentation". A multiple balance of power among subcultures instead of a hegemony by one group is also conducive to consociational democracy and governmental stability. (McRae, 1974, 75) Distinct cleavages in consociational democracies such as the linguistic division between francophones and anglophones in New Brunswick, also make it probable that parties and interest groups will be organized as representatives of the political subcultures. (Ibid)

The application of the consociational model to Canada by Kenneth McRae illustrates that while the three axes of province, religion and language represent axes of segmentation within Canada, there is no correlation between political parties and any one of the axes. (Ibid, 247) Elite accommodation between subcultures in Canada occurs within political parties instead of between them. Furthermore, attempts to accommodate linguistic-cultural diversity between French and English through institutional arrangements have been unsuccessful and have only resulted in intensifying

these cleavages. Therefore, because Canada deviates from the model of consociationalism it is not a true consociational democracy. (ibid)

Edmund Aunger applies the consociational model to New Brunswick and declares that New Brunswick is also a segmented society due to the linguistic division or sharp cleavage of French and English. Each linguistic group constitutes a subculture with its own identity and communal symbols, (Aunger, 1981, 17) but what fascinates Aunger about New Brunswick is the maintenance of stability despite cleavages. He concludes that this has been made possible through the cooperation of the elites and their deliberate efforts to reduce conflict. As an example, Aunger points to the absence of third parties opposing the provincial policies and the work of both the Liberals and Conservatives to reduce linguistic alienation; i.e., it was under a Liberal government in 1969 that New Brunswick became a bilingual province while a Conservative government implemented crucial sections of the Official Languages Act of 1969. Exceptions to this third party vacuum include le Parti Acadien, a socialist party formed in New Brunswick in 1971 dedicated to defending the interests of the Acadian population which experienced only marginal success and never elected a member. The New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians which was created in 1984 and folded in 1986, never attained political party status. However, it did take on the function of a third party by articulating the concerns and complaints of the anglophone masses over bilingualism which were not voiced by the mainstream political parties. Although it opposed provincial policies, it was a pressure group rather than political party.

Indeed, Auger strongly believes in New Brunswick as a consociational democracy and isolates four specific devices - depoliticization, secrecy, proportionality and consensus - which the elite employ to resolve conflict and sustain the atmosphere of "bonne entente".

These four conflict-resolving mechanisms were derived from Arend Lijphart's seven "Rules of the Game"; the business of politics, the agreement to disagree, summit diplomacy, proportionality, depoliticization, secrecy and the government's right to govern; which Lijphart defines as tactics used by the political elite in the Netherlands to facilitate the process of accommodation. (Lijphart, 1968, 122-138) Not only does Auger apply Lijphart's mechanisms of proportionality, depoliticization and secrecy to his own analysis of New Brunswick as a consociational society, but his interpretation of these also reflects that of Lijphart's. For instance, depoliticization as interpreted by both Lijphart and Auger, involves removing an explosive issue such as language from the parties' platforms and political debates so that no one party is identified with the issue. While it is true that both the Liberals and Conservatives in New Brunswick avoid debating the validity or merits of bilingualism due to the fear of political repercussions, (Former premier Richard Hatfield notes that although it is numerically possible to form a majority government without francophone support, it is not "politically desirable") there have been attempts to fill this void of discussion by other organizations such as the New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians who polarize the French and English communities and succeed in making bilingualism and language policy very political issues.

Furthermore, the issues of bilingualism and language policy have taken on political dimensions due to the very lack of cooperation between francophone and anglophone business and intellectual elite. Aunger must be specific when referring to the New Brunswick elites involved in accommodation because in the case of New Brunswick, it has been only the political elite of both linguistic groups who have made any attempts at cooperating with regards to language policy. The anglophone business elite of provincial corporations such as N.B. Power or N.B. Tel were never overly enthusiastic about bilingualism and did "only what they had to do to get by" in compliance with the Official Languages Act of 1969. In addition, the francophone intellectual elite have come to rely on the provincial government as the protectors of their culture and language. In the past they have presented their policy requests and demanded that the government act without ever trying to convince their own community of the merits of their requests or trying to "sell" or explain their actions to the province's anglophones. The government is "the end all and be all". (Personal interview with Richard Hatfield, May 10, 1989) With anglophones and francophones moving in opposite directions cooperation between business and intellectual elite of the province is slow.

Depoliticization for Lijphart also involves the transformation of a contentious issue into a neutral one by focusing on its non-ethnic, non-linguistic or non-sectarian aspects. Although the most common use of depoliticization in New Brunswick involves the first interpretation; that is, removing the issue from political debate, the former method was employed when the merits of Robichaud's Equal Opportunity Program were discussed. This program was debated in non-ethnic, non-linguistic terms as the

efficiency of the proposal became the focus of discussion instead of how the francophones would benefit more from the program than the province's anglophones. The neutralizing of an issue by concentrating on its non-sectarian aspects is not widely used in New Brunswick. Therefore, depoliticization as examined by this thesis relies on the first interpretation by Aunger and Lijphart of removing the issue from the arena of political debate.

The mechanism of secrecy as defined by Lijphart and Aunger involves shielding the process of accommodation from publicity so that compromises reached in secret by the elite are not revealed to the mass or general public. Both Lijphart and Aunger refer to the role that the press plays in protecting the secret or confidential nature of negotiations reached during elite accommodation. However, neither explores the effects that press coverage of a contentious issue, such as language policy or bilingualism, can have on whether the mass accepts the compromises achieved by the elites of their respective groups. The constant media attention, particularly the negative attention results in keeping controversial issues in the spotlight and stirs up the arguments and stereotypes held by the subcultures. The repercussions of media coverage of issues which promote conflict among competing subcultures is another aspect of the mechanism of secrecy. It is this role of the press (as opposed to the role of the press as protectors of secret compromises reached in elite negotiations) which is studied in this thesis when examining the application of secrecy by the elite in New Brunswick.

The usage of the second tactic of secrecy in accommodations by the elite is difficult to determine by its very nature but the process of accommodation between the two groups in New Brunswick is anything but shielded from

publicity. English daily newspapers particularly the Fredericton Daily Gleaner, the Moncton Times and Transcript and the Saint John Telegraph continuously damage any progress made in linguistic relations for although they do not directly state their editorial position, these papers allow the language issue to fester with the constant printing of anti-French and anti-English letters which express bigotry and hatred². A study by Marc Johnson on the portrayal of the language issue by the anglophone press, Regard sur l'anti-bilinguisme, illustrates the negative role in language relations played by the press:

....je voudrais insister sur le fait que...l'argumentation anti-bilinguiste qui figure dans la presse anglophone.... Toutefois, il faut indiquer que leur impact est considérablement pondéré par l'ensemble de la présentation qui fait la presse de cette question...les arguments pro-bilinguistes ont subi une contamination par la proximité et le volume des arguments anti-bilinguistes. Ceci joue donc en faveur de l'argumentation anti-bilinguiste. (Marc Johnson, 1985, 36)

Therefore, the New Brunswick linguistic dilemma illustrates the difficulties that arise when attempts at French-English accommodation such as the Advisory Committee hearings are not shielded from public scrutiny and the negative press coverage(in this case, from the print media) that can result.

² -----
The effects of the francophone press are not studied in this thesis due to its unstable nature. Since the early 1980's, two francophone papers Le Matin and L'Acadie Nouvelle have folded leaving only one province wide daily newspaper L'Evangeline to serve the province's francophones.

The third conflict resolving mechanism, proportionality, has also posed problems for New Brunswick. For instance, Auger and Lijphart declare that tension between subcultures can be reduced through a policy of distributing scarce resources and positions of influence between the opposing blocs thereby eliminating anxiety from competition. Auger also states that this principle of proportionality is "widely accepted by both groups" in New Brunswick. This assertion is debatable considering the fact that it was the very lack of proportionality in services and the provincial civil service that prompted francophone cries for equality. For instance, in 1983, 30.4% of government employees were francophones (with French as their first official language) while 60.4% were anglophones. A 1987 linguistic profile illustrates a minimal increase; out of 9,808 provincial civil service employees, 67.9% are anglophones while 32.1% are francophones. In the senior executive category, francophones represent only 29.4% of the total number of employees. (Linguistic Profile of Employees in the Public Service, 1988, 6-8) The failure of the provincial government to implement any concrete mechanisms such as affirmative action programs designed to increase francophone representation further illustrates a lack of commitment to proportionality.

Proportionality can also be interpreted as the distribution of services of equitable quality among competing groups or blocs in society. Just as influential positions in the civil service are allocated among opposing blocs in order to quell anxiety and group conflict, services reflecting the needs of these groups must also be available in order to reduce tension further. In the example of New Brunswick, it is imperative to the lessening of francophone-anglophone conflict that services of equitable quality are offered in both languages. This dimension of proportionality, proportionality of services, is

ignored in the interpretations by Lijphart and Aunger but is included in the analysis of New Brunswick presented in this thesis.

Finally, Aunger's mechanism of consensus refers to the reduction of competition on contentious issues by having party leaders take up similar stances on divisive questions. (Aunger, 1982, 158) Consensus among New Brunswick political elites does exist in that both major parties, the Liberals and PC's, agree that bilingualism is important, the issue is an explosive one and the political ramifications too great for its merits to be politically debated. It is the perilous nature of the subject that results in neither the Liberals nor the Conservatives knowing how to approach the subject and deal with the issue. Groups such as the New Brunswick Association for English Speaking Canadians or le Parti Acadien capitalize on this consensus and lack of linguistic policy initiative by opening up a new forum for debate.

It is the partial failure of the New Brunswick political elite to employ these mechanisms of depoliticization, secrecy, proportionality and consensus which has resulted in a gap in attitudes and opinions regarding provincial language policy.

TABLE 1.2
BRIEFS SUBMITTED TO THE 1985 ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

TOTAL NUMBER OF BRIEFS - 309
NUMBER OF BRIEFS SUBMITTED IN FRENCH - 142
NUMBER OF BRIEFS SUBMITTED IN ENGLISH - 146
NUMBER OF BILINGUAL BRIEFS - 21

Place of Presentation	Number of Briefs	French Briefs	English Briefs	Bilingual Briefs	Briefs Submitted by Individuals (Private)	Briefs Submitted by Organizations (Public)
Fredericton	37	9	26	2	17	20
Edmundston	16	15	0	1	2	14
Grand Falls	18	12	6	0	9	9
Woodstock	6	0	6	0	0	6
St. John	39	4	34	1	24	15
St. Andrews	18	0	18	0	7	11
Sussex	17	0	17	0	8	9
Campbellton	19	15	2	2	2	17
Bathurst	11	8	2	1	3	8
Chatham/Newcastle	16	6	10	0	5	11
Shippegan	36	32	0	4	7	29
Bouctouche	16	14	0	2	4	12
Moncton	60	27	25	8	21	39

TABLE 1.3

	% ENGLISH BRIEFS	% FRENCH BRIEFS	% BILINGUAL BRIEFS	% OF PUBLIC BRIEFS	% PRIVATE BRIEFS
Fredericton	70.7	24.32	5.41	54.05	45.95
Edmundston	0	93.75	6.25	87.50	12.50
Grand Falls	33.33	66.67	0	50.0	50.0
Woodstock	100	0	0	100	0
St. John	87.18	10.26	2.56	38.46	61.54
St. Andrews	100	0	0	61.11	38.89
Sussex	100	0	0	52.94	47.06
Campbellton	10.53	78.95	10.53	89.47	10.53
Bathurst	18.18	72.73	9.09	72.73	27.27
Chatham/Newcastle	62.5	37.5	0	68.75	31.25
Shippegan	0	88.89	11.11	80.56	19.44
Bouctouche	0	87.50	12.5	75.0	25.0
Moncton	41.67	45	13.33	65.0	35.0

CHAPTER TWO

LANGUAGE POLICY AND EDUCATION IN NEW BRUNSWICK

Education in New Brunswick has served as somewhat of a testing ground with regard to relations between French and English and linguistic policies implemented by the provincial government which are designed to deal with their respective concerns over services in education. The role of mediator and balancing francophone educational needs with those of anglophones has been perilous. However, the department of Education has made sincere attempts to recognize the linguistic equality of French and English through administrative duality, homogeneous schools, that is, separate English and French schools (at present, no bilingual schools exist in New Brunswick); and the provision of second language training programmes in the English schools such as early French immersion, late French immersion, or the Core program; all of which enable students to develop a knowledge of New Brunswick's other official language, French.¹ An examination of history reveals numerous revisions in the school system and government policies dealing with bilingualism and education (which sometimes prompted anglophone-francophone conflict) in order to reach the present state of services in education, and also demonstrates the importance education by the provincial government as well as the province's francophones and anglophones.

¹ ----- Just now successful the Core program has been in promoting individual bilingualism is debatable. This initiative been criticized by anglophone parents who feel their children are lacking second language skills because the Core program is not extensive enough. Furthermore, those interviewed for this thesis (i.e., former Premier Hatfield, Deputy Minister of Education, Normand Martin; Deputy Minister of Health, Jean-Guy Finn; Chairman of the Board of Management, Gerald Clavette; and chairman of the Official Languages

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The first French-English clash over education policy occurred in the late nineteenth century when the center of dispute was the New Brunswick Common Schools Act of 1871. Prior to this Act, French Catholic parish schools operated on the funds from local taxation while the provincial government granted ten pounds sterling per year to each school in an English Protestant parish. The Act of 1871 required that schools of the province be non-sectarian and use texts prescribed by the Provincial Board of Education. It created School Boards, on the basis of the language spoken by the majority in the region giving them control over schools and powers of taxation (curriculum and teacher licensing remained under provincial control). The Act also restricted provincial financial assistance to state or "non-denominational" schools. Those citizens who insisted on sending their children to sectarian schools did so at their own expense and were still obliged to pay their taxes for the common schools. The exclusion of French schools from provincial financing was a serious setback for francophones, and tension between the two groups (francophones and anglophones) mounted as francophones sought repeal of the legislation only to have their efforts fail and the law upheld.

Branch, Bernard Poirier). All expressed reservations about the effectiveness of the Core program in promoting individual bilingualism and believed the program must be improved if anglophone students are to attain a level of proficiency in the French language.

Furthermore, it was the Common Schools Act, especially the mandatory common school tax, that led to the outbreak of violence at Caraquet in 1875 in which both a francophone and anglophone were killed. (Stanley, 1972, 25) The Act of 1871 also made English the language of instruction (French language instruction was available in grades 1-3). It was not until 1875 that the provincial government consented to the use of some French translations of English texts. However, for the most part schools continued to use English versions until 1940. (Poirier-Bastarache Report, 1982, 296) In 1878, the government permitted francophone teachers to be trained at the provincial Normal School. However, this was a minimal concession, and when Regulation 32 was proposed by Premier J.B. M. Baxter in 1928, advocating that local school boards adopt a bilingual programme, anglophone reaction was so strong that the suggested regulation was withdrawn. (Thorburn, 1961, 33)

At the beginning of the 20th century, education in New Brunswick was completely in English after grade 4. Furthermore, in comparison with English urban schools, French rural schools remained at a financial disadvantage due to the County Schools Finance Act of 1943 which made the county the unit for school financing in rural New Brunswick. Rural counties did not collect the amounts needed in taxation to offer the same educational opportunities as in urban areas. Since francophones were concentrated in rural areas, they were placed at a distinct disadvantage. In addition, English text books were always used even in secondary schools which provided French-language education.

It was not until 1967 under the New Brunswick Schools Act that attempts were made to equalize francophone and anglophone education by centralizing the administration of the education system. As a result, the provincial Department of Education assumed full responsibility for the financing of public schools in the province along with the determination of aims, objectives, priorities and general education policy which fell under the direction of the Minister of Education. The newly created 33 district school boards, which replaced the previous 422 boards, were responsible for adhering to and implementing provincial policy. This new Schools Act had been the product of an initiative under the equal Opportunity Programme of 1966 whereby the government sought to implement a programme which would provide an equitable standard of education to all students in the province, regardless of language (anglophone or francophone) or place of residence (urban or rural areas). The centralized administration of education removed francophone-anglophone, urban-rural school district disparities by controlling financing, curriculum and teacher licensing.

In 1974, the provincial government acknowledged the right of francophones to control their own educational services by dividing the department into two sections, one dealing with the English education system and the other with French education. The Minister of Education was to be assisted by two deputy ministers, one for each ethnic group, French and English. This departmental reorganization was a result of the 1973 MacLeod-Pinet Report which had recommended this division to better serve francophone and anglophone education needs:

The Deputy Ministers, one Francophone, the other Anglophone, guarantee equal treatment in matters relating to curriculum and quality of instruction in general. Each looks after both the teaching of the mother tongue and the second language for the linguistic group he represents, as well as other services directly associated with teaching. Each sector also controls the evaluation of its programmes. (Poirier-Bastarache Report, 1982, 298)

The present structure of the Department of Education illustrates how duality services both linguistic groups. See Figure 2.1

While the duality of structure was a significant move to recognize the linguistic equality of francophones, the recommendations implemented from the 1979 Finn-Elliott report, Report of the Committee on the Organization and Boundaries of School Districts in New Brunswick, calling for homogeneous school districts and schools were of critical importance to New Brunswick's francophones. (New Brunswick, 1979, 43)

Historically, pupils in bilingual areas (communities having both English and French speaking populations) were put together in the same classrooms and taught in English although French-speaking pupils received instruction in French reading and French grammar from French textbooks while the English pupils received some instruction in French as a second language from different textbooks. When French textbooks in subjects other than grammar and reading began to be introduced in the 1950's, it became necessary in linguistically mixed areas to place French and English speaking pupils into separate classes in the same school building. These were bilingual schools having separate classes for French and English but the same principal and administration.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION_ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

The Finn-Elliott report called for the abolition of bilingual schools because these institutions furthered the assimilation of francophones and recommended that schools be re-organized on a first language basis, French or English. These would be known as homogeneous schools. The demand for homogeneous schools had been expressed by francophones in Moncton as early as 1959 when they requested that a French language school be established. The francophone requests and petitions were blocked by English language associations, and consequently, French-English conflict arose. The school was eventually built in 1963. Furthermore, the report suggested that school districts be unilingual and organized on a linguistic basis. School districts 4 (Bathurst) and 3 (Dalhousie) had already been divided on a language basis into two administrative structures in 1978 and 1979 respectively, at the population's request. Homogeneous schools and unilingual school districts were implemented by the Hatfield Conservative government, and at present each of the linguistic groups of the province has all the structures required to administer the educational process in its own language including teachers, trustees and Home and School Organizations. (New Brunswick, 1984, 20-22)

In addition to changes made in education policy to recognize francophones and linguistic equality, the province's efforts to make opportunities available to students to learn a second official language through various programmes, also illustrates an evolution in the department of education to come to terms with bilingualism.

For example, the province offers a Core program (French Second Language as an integral part of the core curriculum) whereby anglophone students can learn French as a second language, Early Immersion in which pupils begin their instruction in year 1 and Late Immersion in which pupils begin their instruction in year 7. In immersion programs, the second official language is used as the medium of instruction though at present only French Immersion exists for anglophones students, and there is no district in the province where a student may receive his/her entire 12 years of public school education in Immersion. (Personal interview with Normand Martin, May 17, 1989) The learning of a second language is compulsory for both anglophones and francophones until grade 10.

The goal of the Core French as a Second Language Program is, "...to provide students with the ability to communicate adequately in the second language, and to provide students with linguistic tools to continue their second language studies by building on a solid communicative base," (Dept. of Education, Policy Statement, 1983, xii) but it also seeks to provide anglophone students with an appreciation of francophone culture (specifically, the Acadian culture) by stressing cultural awareness and seeks to promote mutual linguistic understanding. Anglophone students who follow the Core program until the end of grade 12 are expected, 1) to have reached a level 2 on the New Brunswick Language Proficiency Scale, "able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements"; 2) to be able to complete minimal writing activities; 3) to have developed favorable attitudes towards those who

speak French as a first language. (Ibid) At best, this is functional bilingualism²:

LEVEL 2: NEW BRUNSWICK LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY SCALE

Able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements. Can handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations including introductions and casual conversations about current events, as well as work, family, and autobiographical information; can handle limited work requirements, needing help in handling any complications or difficulties; can get the gist of most conversations on non-technical subjects (i.e., topics which require no specialized knowledge) and has a speaking vocabulary sufficient to express himself simply with some circumlocutions; accent, though often quite faulty, is intelligible; can usually handle elementary constructions quite accurately but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar.

At the end of grade 12 students should be able to describe and narrate in the past, present and future time. They are able to participate fully in casual conversations; that is, they are full partners in the discussion, not merely reactors. (Ibid)

In contrast, the goal of an Immersion Program is, "to develop in pupils a high degree of proficiency in their second official language", but at the same time, instructional time in the first official language must be maintained at a sufficient level so that the student does not lose his/her first language. (Ibid)

² --- The Poirier-Bastarache report advocated students attaining a level of passive bilingualism. The aim of passive bilingualism is to develop second language comprehension so that a francophone could converse with an anglophone in French and have the anglophone understand. Similarly an anglophone could speak to a francophone in English and be understood

Higher education in New Brunswick falls under the direction of the Department of Advanced education and training and is not covered by any language legislation. Higher education, universities and colleges, will not be focused upon in this study because views presented in the 309 briefs analyzed tended to deal with language policy and the public education system. At present, L'Université de Moncton is the only french language institution of higher learning in the province. It was established in 1963 by an Act of the New Brunswick Legislature following the recommendation of the Deutsch Report, the 1962 Report of the Royal Commission on Higher Education in New Brunswick.

While education is one of the sections where a great deal of progress has been made regarding linguistic equality, problems still remain. Normand Martin, francophone Deputy Minister of Education, notes that the Core program is unsuccessful because it results in only slight progress in language training and he believes that only complete immersion will effectively teach the second language. However, the overwhelming English nature of the province means that even those in immersion may lose their knowledge of French due to the English environment he/she lives in. Ways and methods to improve educational opportunities in the public school system for anglophones and francophones were in fact one category of study of the Poirier-Bastarache Report.

Ability to converse in the one's second language is not a necessity. The aim of passive bilingualism is to develop comprehension skills so that francophones and anglophones can speak with each other in their first language and be understood.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE POIRIER-BASTARACHE REPORT

The Poirier-Bastarache report proposed only three recommendations concerning education. First, it proposed that, "a new second language training program be established within the school system, its purpose being to guarantee that all high school graduates be at least passively bilingual". Second, it suggested that, "student exchange programs, scholarships and special projects be set up in the area of language training to bring support to the public policy favouring personal bilingualism". The Poirier-Bastarache's final recommendation pertaining to education was that, "the Official Languages Act set out the duty of the government to provide a school system organized on the basis of homogeneous schools and school districts of each official language, these schools and districts being administered by representatives of the respective official language communities". (Poirier-Bastarache Report, 1982, 295) Homogeneous schools and school districts is a policy that is followed by the provincial government and are contained within the School Act. Therefore, their continuance depends upon the will of the provincial government because an administration could make an amendment to abolish them though it is unlikely that this would ever happen due to the dangers of alienating francophone and even anglophone voters.

These recommendations of the Poirier-Bastarache report are perhaps the least revolutionary or explosive in nature of the report. Opinions and

attitudes regarding education and language policy expressed in the 309 briefs focused not only on Poirier-Bastarache recommendations but also on provincial education policy, the present state of education and perceived difficulties in ensuring the same quality of education for francophones and anglophones.

Once again, the questions which this section on education endeavours to answer are: 1) Who is voicing concerns or objections to provincial educational policies?; 2) What are their main objections and what are these objections based on?; 3) Do any educational institutions or organizations object?; 4) If so, why and how do they view their role in education and French-English linguistic relations?; 5) How do anglophones and francophones view the role of education in promoting bilingualism? Also, this section examines the application of Auger's four conflict-resolving mechanisms, particularly proportionality though in a different dimension than what Auger and Lijphart intended.

ANGLOPHONES ATTITUDES/OPINIONS TOWARDS EDUCATION

In the 309 briefs examined in this study, francophones and anglophones were found to express different attitudes regarding provincial education policy and the quality of language programs received by each linguistic group. Not only did anglophones express discontent with the present state of policies in education but they also reacted negatively to the Poirier-Bastarache recommendations dealing with education. Out of 146 briefs submitted in English and 21 bilingual briefs, 94 of them (52.29%) reveal dissatisfaction with education in New Brunswick and the standard of

language training in public schools. This is in contrast to 142 French briefs in which only 33 (23.24%) even included a discussion on education.

In briefs presented by anglophones (excluding those presented by schools, school boards, teachers' associations and parents associations dealing with education which are examined separately) their attitudes about education and bilingualism can be classified into 3 categories; 1) Support for present projects such as Core and Immersion but a demand to upgrade second language programs; 2) Opposition to the current policy of homogeneous schools and districts and duality within the department of Education favouring bilingual schools instead, and; 3) Rejection of second language training because it is too costly, not beneficial and funds spent on it could be put to better use in other sectors.

Several briefs expressed the sentiments of support for Core and Immersion language programs but also demanded that improvements be made. This support is based on the belief that through education, children will acquire the skills needed to become bilingual. For example, brief 006E written by Harold Phalen of Fredericton states that while the New Brunswick education system has tried to ensure that anglophone children will attain some level of bilingualism, this has not occurred nor has acceptance of bilingualism by these students increased. Mr. Phalen states that both of these problems can be solved by improving the Core program which serves the majority of anglophones.

Of the forty briefs from St. John, a city with Loyalist heritage and an English majority, nineteen briefs deal with the topic of education and ten of

these state that education, specifically language training is the key to the province's future. Education will produce bilingual citizens and thereby result in a bilingual province, "All we have found leads us to the conclusion that the basis for further development of a bilingual society lies in the educational system of the province". (Brief 285E, Saint John Labour Council, Saint John, 1985, 5) Increasing the availability of French Immersion and upgrading the Core program to make bilingual citizens is dependent upon government funding but only four English briefs call for an increase in funds in order to improve existing language programs. For instance, brief 835E submitted in Moncton by a group of private citizens states that if New Brunswick is sincerely committed to bilingualism, the education system must change. French immersion must be made available to all and must be continuous from grade 1 to grade 12. Furthermore, education must a priority for the New Brunswick government and the department should receive more money. This group of citizens points to amounts spent on the Poirier-Bastarache report (estimated at \$500,000), French newspapers and Acadian Cultural Centers such as one in Moncton, and questions why education does not receive equal financial treatment!

Anglophone opinions opposing homogeneous schools and districts and duality within the department of Education are prevalent and based on several factors. For example, brief 009E submitted by Cynthia Urquhart, a teacher at Fredericton's only high school, states that homogeneous schools are not providing language skills. However, she feels that bilingual schools with classes in French and English would increase knowledge of the languages through class instruction and exposure to the languages outside of class time. Indeed, five other briefs from Fredericton alone express the same

attitude and go even further by rejecting homogeneous schools and departmental duality:

A school in areas where there are French and English students should serve both cultures, so as not to segregate students and create negative feelings - prejudice and bigotry. "Duality" must be avoided. The duality where it already exists must be corrected. Its costs financially and socially (by creating prejudice) are too great. (Brief 025E, Keswick Ridge Women's Institute, 1985, 3)

Several reasons are given by opponents of duality and homogeneity. For instance, brief 152E submitted by a student in Grand Falls favors bilingual schools and is opposed to homogeneous schools because he believes the latter do not offer French language programs of equal quality; that is, the French learned in French schools is superior to French taught as a second language in English schools. Brief 017E by the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire also states that duality and homogeneity does not provide equal opportunity in second language training to all children while brief 814E of Moncton by the New Brunswick Women's Institute is opposed to duality, homogeneous schools and French Immersion on the basis that all of these are divisive and are pushing francophones and anglophones further apart.

Cost is another factor used to reject duality and homogeneity. Brief 205E by the Upper St. John River Valley Chapter of English Speaking Canadians in Woodstock declares that costs in education would be cut by using only one language. Judith Wilson, brief 368E of St. Andrews also supports this reasoning as does brief 032E, Ronald Steeves of Fredericton.

Three briefs want the elimination of duality and homogeneous schools altogether because they perceive them to be "tools of the French". Brief 263E by the Loyal Orange Lodge of St. John opposes the above because they represent, "Another attempt to divide and conquer!". (Brief 263E, 1985, 3) Brief 008E, submitted by Murray Jones of the Fredericton Orange Lodge echoes these sentiments and views homogeneous schools as schooling for the French. Dorothy Brown (brief 277E of St. John) is almost fanatic in her rejection of separate schools and French immersion, "French immersion schools are not the answer. They are an abomination, especially when taught from grade one. It seems entirely too much like brain-washing and Hitler Youth for my liking". (Brief 277E, 1985, 5) Although her brief is full of very strong anti-French sentiments, her discussion of education focuses on her demand that all children must be taught equally in English and French. She believes that this can be accomplished best through bilingual schools.

The third category of anglophone attitudes believes that second language training are too costly, not beneficial and the funds used for it could be put to better use. These opinions were present in eight of the anglophone briefs. For example, brief 021E submitted by the New Brunswick Association of English speaking Canadians is completely against all study of the French language, "French studies happen to be the 'in thing', but this does not constitute acceptance of the French ultra nationalist dream...". (Brief 021E, Fredericton, 1985, 2) The greatest opposition however, comes from the St. John briefs. Brief 272E by Blaine Higgs states that money spent on teaching French could be better used to provide jobs while briefs 278E and 279E by David McCurdy and Elaine Moyer respectively, both hold the opinion that bilingualism through language programs in the school system is a waste of

money, and funds spent on these initiatives are taking money away from the equality of basic education. Also, brief 281E by Monica Mooney expresses the attitude that language teaching and bilingualism is too costly for the school system and are not needed when English is the language of the majority. Francophone students can maintain their language through usage at home and Core language instruction which anglophone students receive.

Briefs 360E by Brian Tatton and 366E by Lawrence Young, both of St. Andrews, and brief 558E by the Village of Nelson-Miramichi echoes the sentiments that French immersion weakens English education and is too costly to be spending funds on it.

Finally, eight briefs discuss and oppose the Poirier-Bastarache recommendation of passive bilingualism on the basis that passive is not enough and according to brief 828E by Dr. Susan Purdy, does not bring any understanding of the culture of the other language group. Only one brief mentions and in fact supports the exchange programs suggested by Poirier-Bastarache and none of the briefs deal with protecting homogeneous schools in legislation such as the Official Languages Act.

These are the main concerns and objections by anglophones to New Brunswick's education policy. Many of the briefs contained more than one of the aforementioned attitudes. There were also several briefs which voiced no discontent over education but instead stated how they, the individual or association viewed the role of education in linguistic relations between

anglophones and francophones. The latter attitudes will be examined near the conclusion of this chapter.

*TABLE 2.1

ANGLOPHONE BRIEFS SUBMITTED BY INDIVIDUALS REGARDING EDUCATION TOTAL - 94		NUMBER OF ANGLOPHONE BRIEFS	
1)	Support for Core and French Immersion; demand to upgrade these programs	39	41.49%
2)	Opposition to homogeneous schools and districts, and duality within the Department of Education; favors bilingual schools	16	17.02%
3)	Second language training is too costly, is not beneficial and funds spent on it could be put to better use in other sectors	8	8.51%
4)	Opposed to passive bilingualism	8	8.51%
5)	Supports exchange programs	1	1.06%

* Briefs submitted by schools, school boards, teachers associations, and parents' associations regarding education are dealt with separately by TABLE 2.3.

FRANCOPHONE OPINIONS

In contrast to anglophone briefs, those submitted by francophones contain little evidence of dissatisfaction with New Brunswick education as it remains today. Eighteen briefs support the Core program and French immersion programs and value education as crucial in the attainment of provincial bilingualism, "Nous sommes d'avis qu'il revient au système d'éducation d'offrir à tous les citoyens du Nouveau-Brunswick, quel que soit leur lieu de résidence dans la province, l'occasion d'apprendre et d'utiliser l'autre langue". Brief 459F from Campbellton submitted by Denis LeBlanc, who received 80% of his schooling in English also expresses the attitude that education is important because it provides the opportunities for second language acquisition, "Il est de mon opinion que le système scolaire serait davantage pour apprendre le français pour ceux qui le désirent bien". Three briefs from the Moncton area alone; 809F by La Société des Acadiens du Nouveau-Brunswick (SANB), Conseil Petitcodiac; and 826F by Le Conseil de Travail de Moncton et Région are all of the opinion that second language training is important and must be made available to everyone along with "une programmation culturelle en milieu scolaire". (Brief 809F, Moncton, 1985, 3)) Surprisingly, none of the francophone briefs calls for more funding for language programs.

But while these briefs lend support for language programs some also take the position that not enough is being done for francophones and the quality of education they receive. For example, brief 112F of Edmundston submitted by Le Conseil de Travail District d'Edmundston expresses the view that francophone students must take courses in English because unilingual

French cannot compete with anglophones on the job market. In addition, one brief submitted by a group of parents protesting the closure of a French school in Grand Falls declares that anglophone students are favored by education policies while francophone students are the victims of discriminatory policies. In accordance with this line of thinking, Claude Michaud of Grand Falls (brief 161F) is upset that French schools must pay more for French texts.

In light of francophone concern over their education it was hardly surprising to discover that none of the twelve francophone briefs which deal with homogeneous schools and duality, two factors which were created in response to francophones' demands, opposed these measures, "Depuis peu d'années, nous avons nos écoles et nos districts scolaires français; c'est la dernière victoire d'une lutte scolaire". (Brief 110F, John Vallilée, Grand Falls, 1985, 5) Duality and homogeneous schools are valued by francophones because these structures allow them to control their own education system as well as promote their own culture, "La dualité au Ministère....dans lequel les francophones gèrent maintenant leur système éducatif". (Brief 454F, Les Dames d'Acadie de Campbellton, 1985, 3) La Société Culturelle de la Baie des Chaleurs expressed the same attitude, "Quelle différence avons-nous notée et quelle facilité nous remarquons depuis que nous pouvons gérer nos propres affaires à l'école". (Brief 462F, Campbellton, 1985, 4) One brief submitted by Jean Gauvin, then minister of Housing in the Hatfield administration and a former teacher, also denounces bilingual schools but gives no basis or reason for his opposition.

Furthermore, only two briefs mention and support the Poirier-Bastarache recommendations for homogeneous schools legislation and the call for passive bilingualism. Clearly, francophones are more concerned over the quality of language education they receive than having anglophones or francophones reach a prescribed level of bilingualism.

* TABLE 2.2

* FRANCOPHONE BRIEFS SUBMITTED BY INDIVIDUALS REGARDING EDUCATION TOTAL - 33		NUMBER OF FRANCOPHONE BRIEFS	
1)	Support the Core program and French Immersion	18	54.55%
2)	Support duality, homogeneous schools and districts	19	57.58%
3)	Support for protection of homogeneous schools through legislation	2	6.06%
4)	Support for passive bilingualism	2	6.06%
* Briefs submitted by schools, school boards, teachers associations and parents' associations dealing with education will be dealt with separately by TABLE 2.4.			

As was the case with anglophone briefs, several francophone briefs contained more than one point.

ATTITUDES OF ANGLOPHONE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Briefs by educational institutions and organizations were examined separately because of their unique position regarding language programs. Nineteen briefs were submitted by anglophone schools, schools boards, teachers associations and parents associations and like those by private and public organizations, it is also possible to categorize their attitudes and opinions, and how they view their role in linguistic relations.

Fourteen of these briefs support the Core and Immersion programs but objected to their current standard and call for improvements and upgrading. For example, brief 001E by School District 26 of Fredericton states that through the school system functionally bilingual students can be produced. They suggest compulsory second language training from grades 2 through 12, and call upon the province to provide adequate programs, equipment and funds, "...The Board of School Trustees of District 26 strongly encourages the provincial government to procure federal funding for this province in second language education". In addition, brief 162E from Grand Falls (School District No.50), brief 255E from St. John (Canadian Parents for French), 458E from Campbellton (School District No.38), 560E from Chatham/Newcastle (School District No.8), and 822E from Moncton (Board of School Trustees No.15); all express the attitude that the Core Second Language Program is not enough. Not only does it need upgrading so that students who follow it may become bilingual, but more immersion programs need to be offered so that children who want to enroll in immersion are not excluded because of numbers. At present, some areas choose names for immersion through a lottery because

demand exceeds available resources. Of the 136,287 pupils in New Brunswick's public schools, only 16,219; that is, 11.9% are enrolled in Immersion. (New Brunswick Department of Education, Elementary and Secondary Education Statistics, 1988, 2) Both Immersion and Core need more funds and brief 822E suggests that money spent on French services could be better employed on language program initiatives.

Furthermore, of the six anglophone briefs that discuss homogeneity and duality, all oppose it. Brief 159E from Grand Falls takes the position that homogeneous schools have resulted in a loss of contact between French-English counterparts and has led to suspicions, accusations and unfair practices between the two groups. Another Grand Falls brief, 163E dislikes homogeneous schools because parents have no choice where to place their children since the New Brunswick Schools Act requires that one parent be francophone if a child is to attend a French school. The brief goes on to state that instead of separate schools there should be bilingual schools or at least mobility between homogeneous schools, and views duality within the department of Education as a device of separation. Briefs 560E and 564E also object to homogeneous schools because of the loss of cultural contact and the isolation between francophones and anglophones which results, "The parallel system unfortunately has resulted in the isolation of the two language groups so that English and French children can no longer work and play together in the same school milieu". (Brief 564E, Chatham/Newcastle, 1985, 6) Only one brief, 259E of St. John rejects homogeneous schools on the basis of cost.

Two briefs express support for duality and the system of homogeneity of which the most notable supporter is the New Brunswick Teachers' Association (NBTA) representing 5200 public school teachers. Their brief reveals that although at one time they favored bilingual schools because they believed these institutions would foster mutual respect and understanding, it is now an "inescapable fact" that unilingual school districts have removed a source of conflict, they channel resources effectively and provide better learning opportunities for anglophone and francophone children. But while the NBTA supports homogeneity and duality, they still believe that in the long term a lack of respect and cooperation may result. In the opinion of the association, equality of access to education by the two linguistic groups is the "surest guarantor of future cultural/linguistic equality".

In addition, the eight briefs which discuss passive bilingualism all oppose it in favor of a more active or functional level of bilingualism, and the brief presented by the University of New Brunswick (UNB) states that passive bilingualism is "both offensive and fallacious" and will discourage a majority of the population (anglophones) from acquiring the "necessary objective qualifications for provincial employment". (Brief 003E, UNB, Fredericton, 1985, 5)

Regarding the attitudes of these organizations towards the role of education in promoting linguistic relations, brief 001E saw New Brunswick schools as pioneers in second language education, "New Brunswick's pioneering work for Canada in this field should be encouraged and rewarded. This successful initiative will pave the way for the rest of Canada to establish

programs for children that will enhance bilingualism and cultural identity". (Brief 001E, School District 26, Fredericton, 1985, 10)

Four briefs explicitly state that it is the role of education not only to produce bilingual students but also to foster relations between anglophones and francophones. Brief 255E by the St. John branch of the Canadian Parents for French states that second language programs will help to foster attitudes of understanding towards French language education while brief 259E by St. John School Board No. 20 acknowledges the importance of second language instruction as a vehicle for mutual understanding and appreciation between both groups.

However, two anglophone briefs by education organizations viewed the role of education and second language programs in a more opportunistic light. For example, brief 458E by School District No. 38 of Campbellton declares that anglophones are not prepared for bilingual positions because the Core program is not extensive enough. This group stresses a need for better language training but for one reason, to enable anglophones to obtain employment;

In District 38, our first immersion students are graduating this year. For the first time our students will be able to fill bilingual positions. This was the point of the whole program, that English and French job applicants would be on an equal footing. Will this be so? (Brief 458E, Campbellton, 1985, 5)

Brief 822E by a Moncton school board reinforces this attitude by stating that Immersion and Core programs must be improved because anglophone

parents want their children to be able to compete with their bilingual francophone peers. Furthermore, brief 003E submitted by UNB vehemently opposes passive bilingualism because it will eliminate anglophones from obtaining jobs.

TABLE 2.3

ANGLOPHONE BRIEFS SUBMITTED BY
SCHOOLS, SCHOOL BOARDS, TEACHERS
ASSOCIATIONS AND EDUCATION
ASSOCIATIONS FORMED BY PARENTS
TOTAL - 19

NUMBER

1)	Support Core and Immersion Programs; demand for improvements - more programs, more funding	14	73.68%
2)	Object to homogeneous schools and districts and duality within the department of Education	6	31.58%
3)	Oppose passive bilingualism	8	42.10%

TABLE 2.4

ATTITUDES OF ANGLOPHONE ORGANIZATIONS
REGARDING ROLE OF EDUCATION IN
LINGUISTIC RELATIONS

NUMBER

1)	Pioneers in second language instruction	1
2)	Role of education to produce bilingual students and foster linguistic relations	4
3)	Language programs must produce bilingual anglophones so that they can obtain civil service positions and compete with francophones	2

ATTITUDES OF FRANCOPHONE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

In contrast to anglophone briefs, those submitted by francophone organizations dealing with education voiced little objection to current education policies. Only four of the twenty-seven briefs even acknowledged the importance of second language programs in a bilingual province such as New Brunswick or demanded improvements in second language programs in French schools, "...une programme intensif de formation des enseignants qui dispensent l'enseignement de la langue seconde dans les écoles françaises est essential..." (Brief 010F, School Board No. 51, Fredericton, 1985, 6). Several of these briefs did however note the progress that had been made in this department regarding francophone rights, "Education est sans contredit le domaine où les progrès ont été les plus remarquables. Les droits doivent être reconnus officiellement si on veut en assurer la permanence". (Brief 636F, Le Cercle No. 7 de l'Association des Enseignants Francophones du Nouveau Brunswick (AEFNB), Shippagan, 1985, 3) In fact, the strongest and most numerous opinions regarding education focused on how to keep concessions to francophones which they had won. For example, seventeen of these briefs unequivocally support homogeneous schools and duality within the department and believe these factors to be crucial to francophone education:

La création des deux districts homogènes et autonomes a été très bénéfique dans ce sens qu'elle a permis à chacun identifier ses besoins. Cette organisation a permis aux deux groupes de maintenir des liens dans certains champ d'activités tout en respectant les aspirations propres à chacun sur les plans linguistique et culturel. (Brief 502F, La Commission Scolaire Jérôme Boudreau No. 41, Bathurst, 1985, 2)

Duality within the department and homogeneity are considered by francophones as their own personal victories in the battle for their linguistic rights, "Si le ministère de l'Education présente la plus belle image de l'égalité cette victoire est due au fait que les éducateurs francophones (les Acadiens) de la province ont bataillé" (Brief 165F, Le Cercle 32 de l'Association des Enseignants Francophones du Nouveau Brunswick (AEFNB), Grand Falls, 1985, 4). The briefs contain the opinion that not only has duality within the department prompted francophone-anglophone cooperation, "Dans le système éducatif, nous nous rendons compte, qu'au niveau ministériel, la dualité a créé une plateforme où la collaboration et l'esprit d'entente entre les deux secteurs, anglophone et francophone, existent" (Brief 004F, Teachers Association of School District No. 51, Fredericton, 1985, 2); but it has also resulted in better-educated francophones, "La dualité au sein du ministère de l'Education et le programme de chance égale pour tous a grandement contribué à une croissance du nombre de diplômés à tous les niveaux". (Brief 464F, District Scolaire No. 37, Campbellton, 1985, 5) In their concern for homogeneity, briefs 109F of Edmundston by Le Cercle 33 de l'Association des Enseignants Francophones du Nouveau Brunswick (AEFNB) and 636F by Le Cercle No. 7 de l'Association des Enseignants Francophones du Nouveau Brunswick (AEFNB) of Shippagan both support the Poirier-Bastarache recommendation for protection of homogeneous schools in the Official Languages Act of 1969.

Furthermore, briefs 155F and 157F of Grand Falls submitted by La Comité des parents de Notre-Dame-des-Lourdes and District scolaire No. 32 respectively, both stress the need to maintain francophone schools especially in areas where anglophones dominate. They call upon "les Acadiens" to

always fight for control over their own education. Brief 557F by L'Ecole Lord Beaverbrook of Chatham/Newcastle underlines the necessity of offering the same quality of education regardless of whether the school is anglophone or francophone. This attitude is re-iterated in Bouctouche brief 707F by Le Conseil scolaire No. 13 and brief 116F by Fédération des Associations Foyer-Ecole du New Brunswick who want more French texts in French schools, "Il est essentiel de maintenir des subsides additionnels pour l'achat de livres français qui coûtent plus cher que les livres anglais". (Brief 707F, Bouctouche, 1985, 3)

In response to the Poirier-Bastarache recommendations of passive bilingualism, brief 502F of Bathurst submitted by the Board of School Trustees No. 42 and brief 463F by Conseil scolaire No. 35 of Campbellton oppose it for only one reason, "Il ne va pas assez loin" (Brief 463F, Campbellton, 1985, 3). Briefs 632F of Shippagan and 711F of Bouctouche support it. Only one brief, 463F of Campbellton favors provincial exchange programs and provincial scholarships for language training. These are in fact, the only francophone briefs in the category of education organizations which deal with the Poirier-Bastarache suggestions.

Only two of these francophone briefs acknowledge that education can play a role in linguistic relations between New Brunswick's francophones and anglophones. Brief 707F by Le Conseil scolaire No. 13 of Bouctouche states that education will mean more bilingual citizens which, "...devrait contribuer à faire tomber des préjugés, à faciliter une meilleure compréhension et conduire à une appréciation mutuelle". Brief 604F of Shippagan by l'Association des Enseignants Francophones du Nouveau

Brunswick (AEFNB) du district scolaire No. 5, also believes that education will remove prejudice against francophones and anglophones and gives francophone education, particularly teachers, another responsibility, "Le rôle de l'enseignant et l'enseignante est primordial pour l'identification de la jeunesse à sa culture acadienne...Les animateurs dans le domaine linguistique et culturel". Briefs 005F of Fredericton, 109F of Edmundton by Le Cercle 33 de l'Association des Enseignants Francophones du Nouveau Brunswick (AEFNB) and 456F by Campbellton are of the same opinion that French education and schools are integral to promoting French culture.

In addition, brief 104F by l'Association des Professeurs et des bibliothécaires du Centre-St. Louis-Maillet and brief 109F by Le Cercle 33 de l'Association des Enseignants Francophones du Nouveau Brunswick (AEFNB) both draw a causal relationship between lack of education obtained by francophones and the lower socio-economic status they hold. For them, education is the key to improving their standard of living and has nothing to do with promoting cultural understanding. For example, compared to the anglophone population New Brunswick's francophones are under-educated; 8% have finished university, 39% have a level of grade 8 Education and 54% dropped out of school between grade 8 and 12. In addition, those areas where francophones form the majority experience high unemployment and levels of poverty, "Il existe un lien causal entre cette situation educationnelle et les maux socio-économiques qui nous assaillent...la langue et le bien-être sont bien reliés". (Brief 109F, Edmundston, 1985, 7)

TABLE 2.5

FRANCOPHONE BRIEFS SUBMITTED BY
SCHOOLS, SCHOOL BOARDS, TEACHERS
ASSOCIATIONS AND EDUCATION
ASSOCIATIONS FORMED BY PARENTS
REGARDING EDUCATION
TOTAL - 27

	NUMBER	
1) Support Core and Immersion Programs; demand for improvements	4	14.81%
2) Support for homogeneous schools and districts and duality; concern over maintenance of these programs	17	62.96%
3) Supports enhanced protection of homogeneous schools in Official Languages Act	2	7.40%
4) Supportive of passive bilingualism	2	7.40%
5) Oppose passive bilingualism	2	7.40%

TABLE 2.6

ATTITUDES OF FRANCOPHONE ORGANIZATIONS
REGARDING ROLE OF EDUCATION IN
LINGUISTIC RELATIONS

	NUMBER
1) Role of education to produce bilingual citizens and foster linguistic relations	2
2) French education must promote French culture	4
3) Education will allow francophones to improve their socio-economic status	2

ANGLOPHONE & FRANCOPHONE ATTITUDES ON THE ROLE OF
EDUCATION IN LINGUISTIC RELATIONS

As mentioned earlier, 39 anglophone briefs support the Core and French Immersion programs on the basis of the idea that through education will come bilingualism. However, only seven (briefs 025E, 270E, 551E, 565E, 804E, 812E, 828E) are of the opinion that education represents the solution to linguistic conflict and francophone-anglophone clashes. These contain the attitude that through education and second language training will come "an evolutionary shift in attitudes" and an understanding of the other culture whether anglophone or francophone. Not only will education produce bilingual citizen and equality of French and English but the future of anglophone and francophone cooperation lies in education, "We must emphasize education and tolerance for our youth". (Brief 551E, Town of Chatham, 1985, 6) Brief 565E by the New Brunswick Association of English speaking Canadians represents an interesting variation on the above opinions. While they endorse second language education they do not see it as promoting changes in anglophone or francophone attitudes, "We may not have changed our attitudes but we would have avoided the head on conflict". (Brief 565E, Chatham/Newcastle, 1985, 6)

Five briefs express a very different view of education which has nothing to do with promoting linguistic harmony. These presentations take the position that language programs are advantageous only because they help anglophones compete with francophones for employment particularly in the provincial civil service, "Second language training should commence at the earliest in the schools because this would produce bilingual people who could

fill civil service bilingual positions". (Brief 260E, John Arbow, St. John, 1985, 3) French immersion and better language training programs would balance the disparity which presently exists whereby most of the province's bilingual population are francophones.

In sharp contrast to anglophone briefs, only one (brief 826F) of those submitted by francophones expresses the attitude that education and second language training will promote cultural understanding, "l'Education joue un grand rôle dans l'entente entre les deux communautés". (Brief 826F, Conseil de travail de Moncton et Région, 1985, 4) Instead, francophones are anxious that anglophones are becoming bilingual through French immersion and that they may be surpassing francophones by filling bilingual positions. For example, brief 104F by Alonzo LeBlanc of Bouctouche views education as another area where anglophones are trying to dominate francophones, "...Immersion totale,...mais ce n'est généralement ni par sympathie ni par francophonie que les parents anglophones poussent soudainement leurs enfants vers l'apprentissage du français...; mais uniquement dans un but mercantile et lucratif. C'est une nouvelle escalade de domination par les Anglais". (Brief 104F, 1985, 6) The result of this anxiety is the attitude of francophones expressed in seventeen briefs that education is a means to be used by them to promote their own existence and betterment through improved English second language programs for francophone students, improved French schooling and above all the maintenance of homogeneous schools and duality. In total, six francophone briefs dislike anglophones dominating immersion because they feel threatened by the augmentation of bilingual anglophones.

TABLE 2.7

ATTITUDES OF FRANCOPHONE AND ANGLOPHONE INDIVIDUALS ON THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN LINGUISTIC RELATIONS		
	NUMBER OF ANGLOPHONE BRIEFS	NUMBER OF FRANCOPHONE BRIEFS
1) Through education will come solution to linguistic conflict	7	1
2) Education will help anglophones compete against francophones for employment	5	-
3) Education must further the existence of francophones and French culture	-	17

THE USAGE OF CONFLICT RESOLVING MECHANISMS

Of the four conflict resolving mechanisms; depoliticization, secrecy, proportionality and consensus, it is the failure to employ the third, proportionality, that has resulted in divergent attitudes of francophones and anglophones towards education. Lijphart's and Aunger's use of the term "proportionality" focuses on proportionality within the government and elected office and the allocation of positions within the cabinet and civil service. However, he neglects the importance of proportionality of services, the distribution of services of equitable quality in French and English to francophones and anglophones. Proportionality of services in education, that is, giving everyone an equal opportunity to an education in the language of

their choice as well as a chance to follow the language programs they wish whether it be Core French or French immersion is of critical importance.

As illustrated earlier in this chapter, both francophones and anglophones support language programs in the schools but only anglophones demand more programs as well as more money for these initiatives. For anglophones, Core Second language and Immersion represent their only chances to obtain knowledge of the French language and attain some level of bilingualism. Therefore, their desire for more funds and more programs are fuelled by their anxiety that they are not receiving their proportionate share of language training in public schools. They fear that francophones are eliminating anglophones from possible employment because of their superior language skills acquired through the usage of French at home and at their own homogeneous schools. Anglophone opposition to homogeneous schools and duality is based on this anxiety and also on the belief that the quality of their own English education is suffering at the hands of education for francophones.

There is in fact some basis for these fears and evidence that anglophones are on the disadvantaged end of services in education. For instance, New Brunswick receives federal funds specifically designated for its second language programs, and in 1985, it was allocated 3.5 million dollars by Ottawa. Of this money, 2.8 million was spent on second language programs for anglophones still leaving demand for these programs exceeding available resources. There are also discrepancies in funding for school districts which are funded on a per pupil allocation basis. School boards serving a minority language group in the area receive more money per pupil than the other

boards to ensure an equitable level of education, and in 1982-83, one minority board was funded at more than twice the normal per pupil rate. i.e., \$5,000 per pupil. However, minority schools are not necessarily all French as some anglophones would argue. In areas such as Caraquet and Edmundston, it is the English schools who are the minority schools and may benefit from extra funding. Furthermore, according to Normand Martin, the francophone Deputy Minister of Education, nearly all of the new French schools being built contain libraries and theatres designed to be big enough to serve the francophone community who may lack these resources. The same does not hold true for construction of English schools. In fact, French schools are overbuilt according to Department guidelines. (District 20 brief, 1985, 4-5) It is difficult to determine if the quality of francophone and anglophone education is of the same level (possibly attempts by government to make up for past deficiencies in francophone education) but displays of inequitable government funding such as those above lead to the perception by anglophones that proportionality of services is not present in education.

In addition, while francophones support current language programs in the schools, their attitudes focus on maintaining homogeneous schools and duality which they feel are critical to their own education, language and culture. They see these concessions as their proportionate share of services in education. It is interesting to note that in their anxiety over the services they receive in education neither francophones or anglophones exhibit concern over whether the other linguistic group is being treated fairly by education policy.

CHAPTER 3

LANGUAGE POLICY AND THE CIVIL SERVICE

The civil service in New Brunswick has been the target of much of the anger and anxiety towards provincial language policy by both francophones and anglophones. Anglophones resent any move by the provincial government to employ more francophones. Since anglophones often lack the second language skills needed to compete for civil service positions, they fear a loss of employment. In addition, francophones are discontent with the lack of leadership shown by the government in correcting the under-representation of francophones within the civil service. These concerns place the province's francophone and anglophone communities at cross-purposes and the result is very distinct opinions and attitudes regarding language policy, bilingualism and the civil service. At the very crux of the francophone-anglophone conflict surrounding the Poirier-Bastarache report was bilingualism in the civil service and the proportionality of francophones to anglophones in civil service positions. The 1982 Poirier-Bastarache report stated that of the 7,912 positions available, 2,200 (27.5%) were occupied by francophones while anglophones counted for the remaining 5,712 (72.5%). The most recent Provincial Civil Service Linguistic Profile from 1988 shows a slight increase with 67.9% of positions occupied by anglophones while 32.1% are francophone employees.

Under section 10 of the Official Languages Act of 1969, every civil servant has the right to work in the language of his/her choice and must seek to provide services and communications to the public in either official language:

Subject to section 15, where requested to do so by any person, every public officer or employee of the Province, any agency thereof or any Crown corporation shall provide or make provision for such person:

- a) to obtain the available services for which such public officer or employee is responsible, and
- b) to communicate regarding those services, in either official language requested. (Official Languages of New Brunswick Act, 1969)

Despite this section, there were no concrete mechanisms designed to increase francophone representation within the civil service after the implementation of Official Languages Act of 1969. Enforcement of sections of the Act was left up to the initiative of individual departments but without any specific programs to hire francophones, the attempt by the government to recognize francophones within the civil service was more of a symbolic gesture. Furthermore, the fact that section 10 did not come into effect until 1977 also draws questions about the government's commitment to the province's francophone community.

The impact of the Official Languages Act on the provincial civil service was one of the areas of study of the Poirier-Bastarache report. It discovered that none of the provincial departments had carried out an assessment of the measures to be taken in order to meet the requirements of the Act of 1969. A lack of awareness of what was involved in implementation also existed among the departments. Furthermore, to allow departments to meet the costs of implementing the Act, a special budget was included when section 10 came into effect. However, without any directive, criteria, timetable or control measures from the Premier, departments were left on their own:

Our program does not include quotas. Nor does it include designated positions and a grant for bilingualism. No one will lose his position because of the implementation of the Act and no one will have his job description or salary scale changed following this Act. (Press release by Premier Hatfield, December 19, 1976; quoted in Poirier-Bastarache Report, 1982, 144)

As a result of the Act, bilingual personnel were added to provide bilingual services particularly in those communities where the level of services did not meet the linguistic needs of the area. These communities were bilingual areas such as Campbellton and Grand Falls where significant numbers of both linguistic groups were present. Positions which required direct contact with the public were made bilingual first, "...the predominant criterion is the existence of direct contact with the public. Bilingualism was encouraged at the local counter where the public was met face to face..." (Poirier-Bastarache Report, 1982, 147). Bilingual personnel were also added in response to demands by the public for services in their own language. It is not clear just how many requests were necessary before the addition of bilingual personnel was made but the cheaper and preferred solution by the New Brunswick government to meet francophones' requests was translation, seen as "the least bothersome solution". Although translation is slower, it is still used in written communications while interpreters are used in oral communications. These services are used mostly by francophones as the majority of translations are from English to French. (Personal interview with Bernard Poirier, June 27, 1989)

Another plan designed to achieve bilingualism in the civil service is to enroll employees in language courses in order to provide bilingual services

when necessary. This method has not met with great success as the percentage of drop-outs is high. Also, the number of employees who use their skills once the course is over is small:

Language training courses have been seen as a means to conform to the provisions of the Act without having to fire personnel who did not have the required knowledge. The objective is commendable and this method should succeed. So, why have we obtained only mediocre results? (Poirier-Bastarache Report, 1982, 147)

An additional problem with these language courses is that no established degree of bilingualism is expected of these employees by the government.

Furthermore, the Poirier-Bastarache report examined recruiting and found that the government preferred to fill future positions with bilingual personnel rather than to add bilingual personnel immediately. This was seen by the authors of the report to further prolong implementation of Section 10 of Official Languages Act of 1969. (The government still has adopted no policies in regards to personnel recruiting and as a result, when a position becomes vacant the department must determine its own language hiring requirements. The criteria which they establish must then be forwarded to the provincial Civil Service Commission.) The Poirier-Bastarache report also concluded that in general the working language of departments is still English. Also, due to the haphazard changes made in departments, citizens have no more opportunity to obtain services in French than prior to 1977. Furthermore, monies from the special budget tended to be channelled into translation rather than creating permanent bilingual positions. Once again,

had directives and standards for recruiting been established, departments could have made more advances in bilingual positions.

As a response to these findings, the Poirier-Bastarache report made several recommendations on how to increase francophone representation and improve French service within the provincial civil service. These suggestions were the most well known and the most controversial of the whole report.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE POIRIER-BASTARACHE REPORT

In dealing with the dilemma of linguistic representation in the civil service, the Poirier-Bastarache report rejected several mechanisms such as parallel structures (the doubling of existing services) because it hinders the integration of official languages. Linguistic quotas in the hiring practices were also refused due to the problems they present in promotions and filling supervisory positions. Also, designating jobs as bilingual was dismissed because of the time needed to train bilingual staff. This method also angers the linguistically disadvantaged group, the province's anglophones, who feel they are being discriminated against. Formal institutional bilingualism which represents the system which the New Brunswick government is following, was also declared a failure in recognizing the linguistic equality of francophones and anglophones.

As a result of the unsuccessful government efforts, the Poirier-Bastarache report adopted four objectives regarding the provincial civil service:

- 1) the necessity of assuring that all citizens receive services in both official languages at the level of all departments and agencies of the government, services that will be of equal quality, whether furnished in English or French;
- 2) the necessity of assuring reasonable access to a career in the public service by all citizens and the possibility of working there in the official language of one's choice;
- 3) the necessity of assuring an equitable representation of both language groups in the public service;
- 4) the necessity of recognizing local identity of linguistic groups, and their legitimate desire of seeing the government administration reflect the geographic distribution of the population. (Poirier-Bastarache Report, 1982, 414)

In keeping with these objectives, the report advocated restructuring of the provincial civil service on the basis of duality and regionalism to better serve the province's francophones. Duality translates into the division of every branch and department of government into French and English sections, "...they should ensure a functional division of labour in terms of the clientele and of the right of civil servants to work in their own mother tongue. The language of work of each section would therefore, be the language of civil servants who comprise it, either French or English." (Ibid, 416) Coordination of services would be done by bilingual personnel at the upper levels of the department. Furthermore, according to the authors of the report, the concept of duality would not require the duplication of existing services but instead would be a restructuring of the existing administrative system with a specific timetable to measure progress.

Another mechanism advanced by the report was regionalism. What was meant by this was not the territorial delivery of services as in Belgium or

Switzerland but the recognition of regional and linguistic identities of francophone regions of New Brunswick. The government administration must identify with the French culture and francophone community and allow greater francophone participation. Therefore, to achieve this, the Poirier-Bastarache report proposed the decentralization of government departments and agencies to areas where there is a francophone majority. Employing more francophones would "break the hegemony of the anglophone environment over the government and to give to Francophones the essential feeling of belonging". In areas where francophones form the majority, the Poirier-Bastarache report recommended that the government ought to present a francophone profile while still adhering to the Official Languages Act.

Reaction by anglophones to these recommendations was strong and negative. While some briefs supported the four general objectives, they resented the mechanisms, duality and decentralization, by which these goals could be attained. Not surprisingly, francophone briefs were supportive of the Poirier-Bastarache recommendations designed to increase their representation within the civil service. As with the views on education, attitudes expressed in the briefs regarding the civil service touched upon much more than just Poirier-Bastarache recommendations and therefore, give an overview of opinions and positions regarding language policy, bilingualism and the provincial civil service.

The questions this section attempts to answer are: 1) What are the objections voiced in the briefs regarding language policies in the civil service? 2) Who is objecting, that is, would they personally be threatened by

bilingualism in the civil service and face a loss of employment?; 3) Do any civil servants voice negative opinions towards bilingualism in the civil service?; and 4) What are the attitudes among anglophones and francophones regarding bilingualism and the civil service?

ANGLOPHONE OBJECTIONS TOWARDS BILINGUALISM AND THE CIVIL SERVICE

Of the 146 anglophone briefs and 21 bilingual briefs, there were only 44 which did not take a position on bilingualism and the civil service. The attitudes expressed can be divided into two categories: 1) opposed to any language policy aimed at bilingualism in the civil service and rejects the Poirier-Bastarache recommendations of duality and decentralization and 2) favors a civil service language policy and the Poirier-Bastarache suggestions. The opinions of the first division are not only verbally stronger but also more numerous than those of the latter.

For example, 89 of the 123 briefs oppose duality and decentralization as recommended by the Poirier-Bastarache report. Brief 007E by Cameron King, P.Eng. of Fredericton, objects to duality and bilingualism in the civil service because "almost without exception, national and international firms are anglophone". While he supports the concept of duality in the department of Education because of the nature of the education system, he is opposed to bilingualism in the hiring of personnel because he believes this would inhibit the hiring of those who have the necessary experience and qualifications but lack language skills:

To legislate and impose French as a working language and on an equal footing with English in

the civil service in Fredericton is to completely upset the normal routine of communication within the civil service and to the private sector. I suspect the real purpose of this being included in the recommendations is this qualification would lead to more Acadians being hired or promoted, not necessarily because bilingualism itself was required. (Brief 007E, Fredericton, 1985, 86)

Several briefs also express the fear that anglophones will lose out on employment to francophones because the latter possess superior language skills. In fact, this is the most prevalent factor in the opposition to any kind of language policy in the civil service. Forty-six written anglophone briefs stress that merit must be emphasized over competency in both languages in hiring. These presentations state that qualifications and expertise in the area are more important than ability to speak French and English, and unnecessary language regulations will shrink job opportunities for anglophones. Furthermore, promotions or advancement must not hinge on language requirement, "Bilingualism enforced would mean a freeze on hiring anglophones and promoting those who aren't bilingual". (Brief 352E, Town of St. Stephen, 1985, 4) Brief 359E by Brian Tatton is also of the opinion that francophones should not be given priority over anglophones in the job search while brief 553E by Dan LaBerge of Chatham/Newcastle takes the position that bilingualism should not be legislated as a job prerequisite. The New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians also has the attitude that qualifications and competency are the first requirements for civil service employment. They go on to suggest that bonus points could be offered for those who speak a second language when competing for jobs. Bilingualism should be viewed as an asset but certainly not a necessity.

The anglophone phobia of being discriminated against in seeking civil service employment plays an important role in the rejection of bilingualism, duality and decentralization. Some briefs express the sentiment that bilingual positions in the civil service are established solely for the benefit of the province's francophones, "The impatience of Acadians if correctly indicated by the report seems to be more a play for power within the civil service and that bilingualism as such is only a screen by which this can be achieved". (Brief 007E, Cameron King, 1985, 8) Brief 027E by Professor and Mrs. Ruthven states a common anglophone opinion. They believe that many jobs are closed to unilingual anglophones at both federal and provincial civil service levels, and the provincial government is ignoring its responsibilities to both anglophones and francophones by focusing only on the latter linguistic group, "The government should be concerned about the efficiency and not the provision of jobs for a particular sector of the population". In addition, brief 202E submitted by the Village of Perth Andover expresses the opinion that francophones are being given the majority of jobs to increase their number in the civil service even though they may not be fluently bilingual or have the merit to be appointed. Also, brief 252E by Nancy Clark-Teed, a former minister of Health and Community Services in the Hatfield government, is opposed to language policy within the civil service because, "A bilingual civil service is not within our grasp". She utterly rejects duality as "an obsession among the 'nationalist' fringe of the Acadian community; the Société des Acadiens du Nouveau Brunswick and the Parti Acadien". Furthermore, Gary Tiner of St. John dismisses bilingualism as a qualification for a civil service position as "irrelevant" and states that a language policy encouraging this will only succeed in excluding the majority of applicants, the province's anglophones. Brief 359E by Brian Tatton also takes the position

that bilingualism in the civil service means more civil service jobs for francophones as does brief 368E also of St. Andrews by Judith Wilson, who goes on to state that francophones dominate the provincial civil service and are given preference because they are determined to be bilingual more readily than anglophones. She also believes that francophone or bilingual civil servants have reduced the quality of provincial services.

In addition, brief 414E by Wilson Gilmore of Sussex opposes bilingualism in the civil service because it results in unfair discrimination against anglophones. He believes that many francophones are not bilingual yet still obtain civil service positions while anglophones are rejected because they lack the language skills. Hiring more francophones means less opportunities for anglophones, "Increasing the representation of francophones in the civil service is a blatant example of the length to which the French activists will go to promote their dying language,...". (Brief 414E, 1985, 3) Briefs 415E by the Canada Party in Sussex and 559E of Chatham/Newcastle by Donald Leslie object to any recruiting or affirmative action programs to increase francophone representation because this method would prevent anglophones from obtaining employment or promotions to senior positions. Furthermore, brief 817B by the New Brunswick Federation of Labour notes that anglophone civil servants are apprehensive about their future status within the provincial civil service. As a result, any efforts to accelerate the hiring of bilingual staff could have adverse effects on unilingual, anglophone employees. They underline that it is imperative that employees are not denied promotions because of a lack of knowledge of a second language.

A few briefs fear the worst. They predict that bilingualism in the civil service will force anglophones to leave the province in order to find employment and only invite a migration of francophones to New Brunswick. Briefs 007E by Cameron King of Fredericton, 835E by Debbie Bulmer, Sue Bowser et al, and 844E by the New Brunswick Federation of Home and School Associations all argue that hiring with an eye on linguistic capacity will result in an outmigration of New Brunswick anglophones.

Furthermore, several presenters express the opinion that there is no need to facilitate the hiring of francophones in the civil service. For example, brief 020E by the Town of Oromocto states that the hiring procedure should be left as is because bilingualism within the civil service is progressing and in three years, linguistic representation will be equitable. Brief 027E by Professor and Mrs. Ruthven supports this assertion and denies the need for any affirmative action programs since bilingual personnel are increasing on their own. Brief 204E by McCain Foods Ltd. argues that bilingual capacities in the civil service have grown without government intervention.

Anglophone opposition to the Poirier-Bastarache recommendation of duality is strong. Eighty-nine anglophone briefs oppose duality on the basis of cost and the divisive nature of the concept. Duality is seen as expensive, a form of separation, and a tool for promoting the isolation of the province's two linguistic communities. It is not viewed as the solution to New Brunswick's language problems. Furthermore, anglophones interpret duality as an increase in the civil service and greater financial costs for the province, "One cannot establish a dual process in the civil service without hiring a vast number of additional individuals. We can ill-afford to have our economic

priorities biased in factor of language rights instead of jobs and economic growth". (Brief 270C, City of St. John, 1985, 11) Briefs 367E by CUPE 1253 of St. Andrews and 416E by Eldon Buchanan of Sussex both have the attitude that duality is a step back from bilingualism, encourages unilingualism and allows unilingual francophones to not learn English, "Duality separates the two linguistic groups reducing exposure to second language and informal learning". (Brief 367E, CUPE 1253, 1985, 3) In addition, brief 564E rejects duality because it would be costly, inefficient and lead to greater linguistic conflict, "Duality would lead to pronounced jealousies and conflicts...and could provide the impetus for further alienation, violent conflict and eventual separation". Dr. Susan Purdy of Moncton characterizes duality as, "a prop to hold a small group together ... not a solution to the problem of survival of the Acadians". (Brief 828E, Moncton, 1985, 12)

Two briefs which emphatically express discontent with the proposed duality are 551E by the Town of Chatham and 833E by the Shediac Cape branch of the New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians. For example, the Town of Chatham sees no merit at all in the proposal, "We oppose in the strongest possible terms, the principle of duality....a senseless and expensive duplication of services in every part of the province....in a divisive way, will create even greater barriers to cooperation between linguistic groups by creating a sense of isolation in every region of this province". (Brief 551E, Chatham, 1985, 3) Furthermore, the New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians views duality as, "A clear case of separatist intent!". Two other briefs, 552E of Chatham/Newcastle by the Town of Newcastle and 844E by the New Brunswick Federation of Home and School Associations, also oppose duality because they believe it would create

language ghettos and view it as a concept similar to apartheid, "The Poirier-Bastarache report is a retreat from bilingualism to a society which would be increasingly divided into ghettos, an apartheid concept where English and French grow increasingly isolated from each other". (Brief 552E, 1985, 10)

In contrast to the boisterous opposition to duality, only seven briefs mention the Poirier-Bastarache recommendation of decentralization though all seven oppose it on the basis of cost, inefficiency and possible fragmentation of services. Briefs 020E of Fredericton by the City of Fredericton and 162E of Grand Falls by the Board of School Trustees No. 50 both express concern that decentralization must occur in English areas as well as French in order to benefit both linguistic communities equitably.

Therefore, these are the main anglophone objections to language policies in the civil service. With the majority of these briefs, it is impossible to know if they are objecting because they would face a loss of employment due to language policy since no biographical information on the presenters was provided. However, five of the presenters explicitly stated that they were or once were employed as a civil servant and consequently, based their objections on personal experience. For example, brief 028E submitted by Lloyd Nickerson, a former provincial Chief Electoral Officer for 12 years, is opposed to duality on the basis of cost and stresses that even without language policies, francophones are obtaining civil service positions. Although he favors bilingualism, he rejects decentralization as a mechanism to employ francophones and states that there is too much haste in implementing bilingualism in the civil service. Briefs 032E, 033E, and 037E by Ronald Steeves, Lucide Rioux and Glenna Fraser all object to duality on first-hand

experience. Ronald Steeves states that he was turned down for a provincial civil service position because he lacked second language skills. Indeed it is hard to tell whether this was the reason but his belief that an increase in the bilingual capacity of the civil service equals discrimination against anglophones is based upon personal experience. Lucide Rioux, also a former civil servant, dislikes duality due to the financial implications and is not convinced it would provide services of equal quality. Translation between upper levels in provincial departments would still be necessary so he argues that it is best to stick to translation where the costs are more acceptable. He believes that the Poirier-Bastarache recommendations are designed to eliminate anglophones from employment. Any action to make the civil service more bilingual would only force out anglophones since they lack mastery of the second language and adult language training programs are not working. Glenna Fraser agrees that adult language programs are not meeting with success but she believes that certain front line positions should be classed as bilingual and employees should be willing to learn another language if it is required. One former civil servant was upset that the provincial MLA's would not take a stand on the language issue. (Brief 365E, Frances A. Moffatt, St. Andrews, 1985, 2)

Finally, it is interesting to note that brief 253B submitted by N.B.Tel, objects to special programs to increase francophone representation because they feel that discrimination against New Brunswick's francophones does not exist. They quote statistics such as, 29% of the top positions in the civil service are occupied by francophones, and state that hiring should be on a merit basis. This was one of the companies singled out by former premier

Hatfield as doing as little as possible to comply with Official Languages legislation.

ANGLOPHONE ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE CIVIL SERVICE

Not all of the anglophone briefs expressed negative opinions towards language policy and the civil service. Although they are few in number, some briefs contain support for duality. For example, brief 001E by the Board of School Trustees of District 26 agrees with the concept of duality although they want more details on bilingualism in hiring and promotion within the civil service. Brief 003E by the University of New Brunswick also supports duality though only in the department of education and favors the promotion of French as a language of work and service within the provincial civil service in order to send a positive signal to Acadians about the value of their language. Furthermore, brief 023E by Mr. D.G.O. Kingston, then regional vice-president of the Public Service Alliance, expresses an unique anglophone attitude in that he personally endorses duality because it would provide equality of service. Although he worries about the divisive nature of duality, he feels that this mechanism will make up for the minimal progress in bilingualism and the civil service:

Of the recommendations found in the report, the only one that in any way bothers me is concerning duality in government departments which, in my view, is a move in continuing to view ourselves in a we-they scenario. However, when one considers the meager progress that has been made since 1969, it may possibly be the only manner by which equality of service to all our citizens can be achieved in a reasonable period of time. There is no question in my mind, however, that had we not foot-dragged since 1969, and had truly attempted to

implement the Official Languages of New Brunswick Act, it would not at this time be necessary to consider duality as an option. Then again, those who procrastinate must pay the price for that procrastination. (Brief 023E, D.G.O. Kingston, Fredericton, 1985, 4)

While brief 026B by the New Brunswick Hospitals Association opposes duality in the area of health because of costs, they do acknowledge the advantages of working and receiving services in one's own language. Brief 036E by the Fredericton Chamber of Commerce supports bilingualism in the civil service while rejecting duality as do 12 other briefs.

It is hardly surprising that briefs 108B by the City of Edmundston and 628B by the Ville de Lameque from areas where francophones form the majority endorse duality, decentralization and bilingualism and want more services in French.

For them, translation is not suitable because it results in misinterpretation, and they demand services in their own language, "....we are far from being able to say that the services rendered by our province are equal in quality and efficiency in both official languages". (Brief 108B, La Ville d'Edmundston, 1985, 3) There are other anglophone briefs which express the opinion that francophones should have access to services in their own language, have French as a working language and equitable representation within the civil service. For example, brief 204E by McCain Foods Ltd. states that the government must build upon the bilingual civil service positions that exist in order to recognize the francophone community. Brief 352E by the Town of St. Stephen also expresses the opinion that there must be more francophones in the civil service and believes that francophones have the

right to services in their own language and of equal quality. Brief 362E by the Charlotte West Liberal Association states that duality of services and bilingual positions may be necessary where strong percentages of anglophones and francophones are present in order to ensure both receive the services they are entitled to. While they recognize the francophone community, they go on to stress that there must be equality of opportunity in hiring in areas which are predominantly French speaking so that anglophones are not excluded from employment.

Finally, one angliophone brief expressed a unique attitude in that no jobs either in the provincial civil service or even the private sector should be classified bilingual until all New Brunswick children have been properly educated in both languages. This attitude was prevalent in brief 835E by Debbie Bulmer and Sue Bouser. Brief 009E by Cynthia Urquhart also stresses that until the education system allows anglophone children to catch up in their language skills, few civil service positions should be classified as bilingual. No time frame is given by either brief.

These are the positive attitudes towards language policy and the civil service expressed in the anglophone briefs. Although they are small in number, the same is not true for positive attitudes in the francophone briefs who welcomed the Poirier-Bastarache recommendations and new advances in language policy and the civil service.

TABLE 3.1

ANGLOPHONE CONCERNS, OBJECTIONS AND SUPPORT FOR
LANGUAGE POLICY IN THE CIVIL SERVICE

TOTAL NUMBER OF BRIEFS DEALING WITH CIVIL SERVICE = 123

	Number of Briefs	
1) Oppose duality	89	72.36%
2) With bilingualism in the civil service, anglophones will lose jobs to francophones	46	37.40%
3) Francophones already have fair representation in the civil service	3	0.81%
4) Oppose decentralization	7	5.69%
5) Support duality	3	2.44%
6) There is a need to recognize the province's Francophones by providing services in French and granting the opportunity to work in their own language	6	4.87%

FRANCOPHONE CONCERNS OVER BILINGUALISM IN THE CIVIL SERVICE

Of the 146 francophone briefs, 102 deal with the civil service . From these 102 briefs, 54 supported the Poirier Bastarache recommendation of duality while 38 agreed with the Poirier-Bastarache suggestion of decentralization of services. In addition to these specific concessions, there was an overwhelming demand for services in the French language and access to a career in the civil service in one's own language as 102 briefs expressed these sentiments.

Francophone support for duality was based on the opinion that only through separate linguistic administrations would New Brunswick's francophone community achieve provincial services of equitable quality, "Je crois que ce genre de dualité devrait exister dans tous les autres ministères et offices gouvernementaux. Il m'est difficile d'être servi adéquatement en français..." (Claude Michaud, brief 161F, Grand Falls, 1985, 2). According to several francophone briefs duality represents the only solution to ensuring that francophones are treated fairly within the civil service, "Puisqu'il semble que seule la dualité fasse avancer les situations dans tous les domaines, nous appuyons donc le principe de la dualité proposé par le rapport Poirier-Bastarache." (Brief 462F, La Société Culturelle de la Baie des Chaleurs, Campbellton, 1985, 5) The mechanism of duality also symbolizes a way for francophones to combat assimilation by anglophones in the work environment. (Brief 704F, Alonzo LeBlanc, Buctouche, 1985, 5) Furthermore, brief 706F likes the idea of administrative duality because it would be a more efficient way to serve the needs of the province's francophone community, "Si le gouvernement établissait des unités françaises pour un certain nombre

de ministères, les employées compétentes qui y travailleraient pourraient le faire dans leur langue sans nécessité d'être bilingues". (Brief 706F, Bouctouche, 1985, 2) In contrast to anglophone briefs who denounced the concept of duality because it meant duplication of services, several francophone briefs viewed duality as nothing more than administrative reorganization, "Ce n'est pas nécessaire de dédoubler mais aménager l'appareil gouvernemental et fournir les effectifs linguistiques nécessaires afin d'arriver à un dualisme réaliste". (Brief 708F, Bernard Richard, Bouctouche, 1985, 3) Brief 608F by l'Hôpital l'enfant Jésus Inc. also downplays the duplicate nature of duality, "Dualité ne vise pas à doubler les services; le système administratif actuel soit réaménagé". Le Conseil du Travail District d'Edmundston, brief 112F, further denounces the anglophone opposition to duality on the basis of cost, "Nous sommes entièrement d'accord avec le concept de la dualité dans les services gouvernementaux. Nous ne supportons pas la duplication et la division de service mais l'argent ne devait pas être la barrière qui limite ou empêche l'implantation du bilinguisme ou de système de dualité". (Brief 112F, 1985, 7)

In addition, several briefs express the attitude that duality is crucial because it will increase the amount of power that francophones possess in the civil service, "La fonction publique devrait être également réparti entre anglophones et francophones. Peut-être n'y voyez pas la différence, mais pour nous elle est énorme de conséquences sociologiques et politiques". (Brief 605F, L'Union Acadienne pour le culture populaire Inc., Shippagan, 1985, 10) Duality would also place more francophones within the civil service and increase their under-representation which several briefs correlate with

the lower socio-economic status of the New Brunswick francophone community in general:

L'absence des francophones aux postes décisionnels.. 1) elle ne leurs (sic) permet pas de bénéficier des retombées économiques importantes provenant directement des emplois créés; 2) priver les Acadiens d'un pouvoir de décision qui leur est nécessaire en vue d'orienter et de planifier leur développement (Brief 619F, Société des Acadiens de Nouveau Brunswick de Tracadie, Tracadie, 1985, 6)

Brief 012F by La Société des Acadiens de Nouveau Brunswick also establishes a relationship between language and economics:

Le rapport Bastarache-Poirier ne trace pas de liens directs entre ces disparités socio-economiques et la sous-représentation des Acadiens au niveau de la fonction publique. Mais lorsque l'on connaît l'influence que les hauts fonctionnaires exercent dans les prises de décision, l'élaboration des politiques et l'affectation des budgets, il serait naïf de croire que les deux phénomènes ne sont pas reliés. (Brief 012F, Edmundston, 1985, 3)

Obtaining more civil service positions is therefore, important to New Brunswick's francophones because they can obtain more power, "C'est aussi le fait que nos priorités sont déterminés par d'autres, en accord avec leurs intérêts, plutôt qu'en fonction de notre réalité propre". (Ibid) Also, increased representation in the civil service is viewed by francophones as bringing an improvement in their finances, "C'est explicitement afin d'éviter de vivre en marge de la gouverne des affaires publiques que les Acadiens veulent se donner des structures de participation". (Ibid)

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

The support for decentralization is also based on this premise. By offering more opportunities to francophones within the civil services through re-location of government branches to French areas of the province, local francophone economies would receive a financial boost, "Les budgets régionalisés afin d'assurer une répartition équitable et la déconcentration pourrait favoriser le développement régional". (Brief 114F, La Société Louis-Napoléon-Dugal (SANB), Edmundston, 1985, 5) This brief also expresses dissatisfaction with the current level of bilingualism in the civil service, "...mais dans plusieurs cas de services, le bilinguisme se limite au secrétariat...aux échelons supérieurs de la fonction publique, on risque fort de devoir se contenter de services traduits, les longs délais et moins bonne qualité de services". (Ibid)

The lack of services in French and opportunities to work in one's own language is of paramount importance to the francophones as illustrated by the numerous references made in the briefs. For example, several briefs stress that as francophones they have a right to services in their own language. They should not have to settle for translations or oral interpretations which are the methods currently employed to serve French requests, "Le recours à la traduction ou à l'interprétation ne suffit pas, à notre avis, pour assurer des services de qualité égale". (Brief 010F, School Board No. 51, Fredericton, 1985, 7) Brief 012F by the SANB also takes the position that translation is not bilingualism nor equality of the province's two linguistic communities, "...le bilinguisme institutionnel, que nous appelons par expérience le "gouvernement par traduction" ne représente plus une option satisfaisante pour assurer l'égalité...ce système n'a réussi qu'à reconfirmer l'unilinguisme

du plus fort et du plus nombreux". (Brief 012F, Edmundston, 1985, 3) Brief 101F by Maurice T. Bourque, LLB, expresses the frustrations francophones experience when dealing with the civil service where anglophones form the majority:

Quand un citoyen francophone téléphone à certains bureaux du gouvernement à Fredericton et qu'il se fait dire au départ, "I'm sorry I don't speak French" par une personne dont une des fonctions est de donner des renseignements au public, il ya une violation constitutionnelle flagrante des droits linguistiques de ce citoyen! (Brief 101F, Maurice T. Bourque, Edmundston, 1985, 4)

Brief 111F by L'Association des Accidents de Travail du Nord Quest cites difficulties in dealing with the provincial Workmen's Compensation Board located in Saint John because the latter bureau provides services in English with little provision for services for francophones. Furthermore, 40% of the designated bilingual staff of the Commission cannot serve francophone clients in their own language. Francophone patients must rely on translations produced only after delays. Briefs 114F and 115F by La Société Louis-Napoléon-Dugal de SANB and Le Comité pour un Institut Francophone de Formation Agricole, both demand government publications in French instead of badly translated French versions from English originals. In fact, the latter brief suggests that decentralization would bring direct service whereby offices in French areas would conduct all correspondence in French and better serve the public, "...la décentralisation est plus efficace pour mieux répondre aux besoins de la population et faciliterait la livraison de services de qualité égale dans les deux langues officielles". (Brief 115F, Grand Falls, 1985, 4) Brief 155F by Le Comité de Parents de Notre Dame de Lourdes supports decentralization because of the same reasons, "...appui une politique de

décentralisation au niveau des services gouvernementaux, notre population sera mieux servie dans leur langue et sur leur territoire", (Brief 155F, Grand Falls, 1985, 2) as does brief 555F by Le Cercle Français de Newcastle.

In total, 102 briefs demanded access to services in their own language and not translations, "Nous considérons que tous les ministères devraient offrir automatiquement des services en français à la population francophone puisque nous sommes des citoyens à part entière. C'est une simple question de respect, de droit et de justice". (Brief 456F, Le Cercle 37 de l'AEFNB, Campbellton, 1986, 5) The lack of French services and abundance of translation means that francophones are forced to endure delays in services:

Si les anglophones faisaient l'effort d'inverser la situation, ils verraient que les services publics offerts en français laissent à désirer. Toute lettre envoyée en français passe par le service de traduction et reste sans réponse pour une période allant d'un à six mois...une personne francophone trouve sa performance largement entravée par le fait de devoir traduire continuellement. (Brief 457F, La Federation des Dames d'Acadie, Campbellton, 1986, 3)

In addition, several briefs call upon the provincial government for concrete actions to secure more positions in the civil service and more services in French. For instance, brief 164F by SANB de la Grande Rivière states that for 2 years the government should hire only francophones in the civil service to amend their under-representation. "Si le gouvernement était sincère, il remplacerait les fonctionnaires démissionnaires, retraités et autres par des personnes d'origine acadienne". Brief 613F by Les Dames de L'Acadie de Lameque of Shippagan demands "une programme spéciale de recrutement des cadres francophones soit mis en place pour une periode de

sept ans" in order to remedy the injustices suffered in the civil service by francophones.

Clearly then the most outstanding concern of francophones is ensuring equality of access to provincial services in their own language. This is why they extend support towards duality and decentralization of services. This would assure francophones of receiving aid in their own language and not subject to delays and translations. Furthermore, they rely on the government to take action to deliver services in their language and see this as a right and not a privilege. Proportionality of services, that is, the distribution of services of equitable quality to francophones and anglophones, is overlooked by Auger in his discussion of proportionality who focuses on the division of civil service positions between both linguistic communities. The absence of French language services has resulted in disappointment and resentment by New Brunswick's francophone community towards anglophones and particularly the provincial government administration. However, it is not only the failure of the government to employ the conflict resolving mechanism of proportionality both of services and in civil service employment, that resulted in divergent attitudes.

TABLE 3.2

FRANCOPHONE CONCERNS, OBJECTIONS AND SUPPORT FOR
LANGUAGE POLICY IN THE CIVIL SERVICE

TOTAL NUMBER OF BRIEFS DEALING WITH CIVIL SERVICE = 102

1)	Support Duality	54	52.94%
2)	Support Decentralization	38	37.25%
3)	Demand for services in their own language and opportunities to work in their own language; dissatisfied with current level of these	102	100%

CONFLICT RESOLVING MECHANISMS

The issues of francophone representation in the civil service and services in French of equal quality to those enjoyed by anglophones were never debated by either the Conservatives or Liberals. In fact, the opposition Liberal party was noticeably absent in discussing the merits of proposals to benefit the province's francophone for fear of political fallout of votes, and the only political party conflict over the Poirier-Bastarache recommendations was not interparty but intraparty within the Conservatives. Members Nancy Clark Teed, Keith Dow and Bev Harrison, all from Saint John objected to concessions to the province's francophones while Jean Gauvin representing the French area of Tracadie spoke up for the privileges of the minority. Despite a lack of debate between the two main parties, the short-lived New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians did argue and oppose measures perceived to be aiding the province's francophone minority while hurting the majority, anglophones. Although the association had no formal

or specific policy proposal, it opposed all aspects of bilingualism. In a June 25, 1984 article in the Montreal Gazette entitled, "Protection of francophones coming under attack in New Brunswick", Len Poore, leader of the organization, blasted any policy initiatives within the civil service, "The Acadian association will, within a short period of time, harass the government in power today into a situation where you become third class citizens unless you get off you butts and do something about it"... Poore wants a return to equal opportunity civil service. "(The Globe and Mail, Canadian Press Index, June 25, 1984, 8) Poore and his association viewed duality of services as a waste of time and money:

But he says New Brunswick does not need and cannot afford, the kind of language duality recommended in the report..."Look it makes a lot more sense to give language training to the 2 per cent of the francophone population that can't speak English, or say they can't, than it does to pay for dual services in a place like Fredericton, where there are very few French-speaking people". ("New Brunswick language proposals kindle fear", The Globe and Mail, Michael Harris, December 19, 1984, 13)

The question of cost was frequently mentioned by Poore as reason to reject francophone requests, "...for Poore, the real problem is economic...The frustrations are because of high unemployment and the cost factor of implementing. When you've got the second highest welfare group in the country how can you justify spending millions and millions on a so-called cultural project..." (Ibid, "Language pot close to boil", December 21, 1984, 8)

Although Poore's group never evolved into a political party and folded before even appointing candidates to run in a provincial election, he reported

to have 9000 members. The association's mission was simple, "...protecting English interests from a perceived bilingual threat". (Montreal Gazette, Canadian Press Index, June 1, 1984, B12) and in doing this, Poore focused on bilingualism in the civil service and its detrimental effects on the province's francophones, "Poore said he had no idea when he formed the group that 'our hope to turn back the clock on bilingualism and restore English rights in the province would have such support'...The association wants Premier Richard Hatfield's PC government to 'abolish bilingualism as a prerequisite for being hired as a civil servant'. (Montreal Gazette, U.P.C., June 11, 1984, A7) Even without a formal political platform, Poore succeeded in making bilingualism a contentious political issue by debating its merits and spurred on anti-French opinions such as those revealed in an article in the Montreal Gazette, "New Brunswick language now sparked by jobs fear":

'Why it's Len Poore', beamed Paul Jacques, a civilian who teaches industrial mechanics. 'Put her there, brother', said Jacques as he extended his right hand. 'I want you to know', said Jacques, his right arm now firmly around Poore's shoulders 'that me and alot of the boys sent in our 5 bucks (enrollment fee) to keep this thing going. Because they'll shove it right down our throats if we don't fight back'...'The Acadians will take over this province if we don't stop them'...'I'll beat the hell out of the first Frenchman who steals my job because he happens to be bilingual'...'Here I am with two university degrees...and I know damned well I can't get the high paying federal or provincial jobs that a francophone can'. (Ibid, Claude Arpin, December 22, 1984, B6)

Clearly then, Len Poore and his New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians politicized the language issue and heightened French-English tensions by entering language policy in the civil service into the arena

of political debate. The Liberal and the Conservative parties never entered into discussion with Poore or further ignited his rhetoric. Certainly, the provincial government and political elite of the major parties did employ the mechanisms of depoliticization as well as consensus whereby they attempted to reduce polarization of the French and English communities by taking similar stances on the issue of language policy in the civil service. However, the New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians deliberately chose not to follow this path.

This division of opinions of the elite and masses is significant because as Lijphart points out, one of the conditions crucial to the success of consociationalism is elite-mass cohesion. There must be internal political cohesion of the subcultures, "The elites have to cooperate and compromise with each other without losing the allegiance and support of their own rank and file. When the subcultures are cohesive political blocs, such support is more likely to be forthcoming". (Lijphart, 1972, 84) Therefore, the political elite must be able to carry along their followers and secure their support for any compromises reached.

While the francophone and anglophone political elite of New Brunswick agree with concessions being made to both linguistic communities, the masses are not so eager. The development of an organization such as the New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians illustrates a break in elite-mass cohesion and the refusal of the anglophone mass to go along with language policies proposed by the elites. The formation of le Parti Acadien is an example of the francophone mass rejecting the plans of the francophone elite. This breakdown in elite-mass

cohesion is another contributing factor to conflicts in attitudes and opinions of francophones and anglophones.

Furthermore, the vacuum of debate created by the use of depoliticization and consensus by the elites leads to the formation of groups who have concerns or grievances not voiced by the mainstream parties. It is ironic that although these mechanisms contribute to stability and the maintenance of "bonne entente" and are regarded by Lijphart and Aunger as "conflict-resolving mechanisms", they also result in the conflict of attitudes of francophones and anglophones.

Although it is difficult to ascertain whether the method of secrecy in elite negotiations was employed, it is important to examine the press coverage which the question of bilingualism in the civil service received by the 3 English dailies, The Daily Gleaner, The Telegraph Journal and the Moncton Times Transcript. In Aunger's discussion of how the "bonne entente" is maintained in New Brunswick, he ignores the role which the media can play in either helping French-English relations or raising the anxiety level and conflict between the two linguistic communities. As a study of New Brunswick English newspapers by Marc Johnson illustrates in, Regard sur L'anti-Bilinguisme, the written press coverage of the Advisory Committee Hearings was largely negative.

For example, the argument that increased bilingualism in the civil service would mean less jobs for anglophones was put forth by Len Poore and his Association in the Saint John Telegraph-Journal on October 18th and 26th, November 16th, December 14th and 17th, 1984; and printed in the Moncton

Times and Transcript October 19th, November 1st and December 17th, 1984. Furthermore, the Fredericton Daily Gleaner not only printed articles on Poore's views on bilingualism but allowed several anonymous and very harsh anti-French letters to the Editor to be printed as well:

....la perte progressive d'emplois pour les unilingues anglophones dans les fonctions publiques provinciale...Cet argument est avancé avec fogue par Len Poore, illustre représentant de l'Association for English speaking Canadians of New Brunswick...On avancé que les jeunes anglophones doivent de plus en plus, sinon tous, quitter la province et se rendre dans l'ouest pour se trouver du travail puisque tous les nouveaux emplois et ceux qui sont renouvelés dans la fonction publique sont réservés aux francophones, parce que bilingues. (Johnson, 1985, 7)

Poore's argument that the provincial government was catering to francophones further polarized the French-English communities and once again this line of thinking was covered by the print media:

La formule la plus courante est que "The government is trying to ram French down our throats", y compris dans les comptes-rendus journalistiques...Len Poore est encore ici à l'avant-scène pour défendre cet argument. Il a souvent l'occasion de le dire dans ses lettres à l'éditeur ou encore quand il a l'audience de la presse. (Ibid, 11)

Indeed, the manner in which the media portrays bilingualism in general effects French-English relations and in the case of New Brunswick has widened the gap in attitudes and opinions of francophones and anglophones regarding language policy. Articles, editorials and biased, unedited letters to the editor all contributed to the divergent opinions of the province's two major linguistic groups:

Outre le contenu qui est expressément dit dans les articles, éditoriaux, chroniques ou lettres à l'éditeur, on peut dégager une production de sens dans la mise en scène de l'information. Le travail qu'effectue la presse n'est en effet pas limité à la récolte d'informations 'objectives' et à leur exposition dans ses colonnes...Il est intéressant de regarder en premier lieu la partie éditoriale et les chroniques qui expriment la position officielle du journal ou de certains de ses employés les chroniqueurs., L'impact des propos qui sont tenus sous ces rubriques est plus grand parce que jouissant d'une notoriété plus importante. (Ibid, 25)

Finally, it was the failure of the political elite, (particularly the Conservative administration) to adequately distribute positions of importance in the provincial public service among francophones and anglophones which led to the formation of different attitudes regarding the civil service. Anglophones opposed methods to redistribute these positions for fear of loss of employment (even though the individual may not have personally been threatened) while francophones widely favored the Poirier-Bastarache suggestions. Also, the failure of the provincial administration to ensure that proportionality of services existed, that is the availability of services of equal quality to both francophones and anglophones, further contributed to the gap in attitudes. Government services in the language of one's choice are paramount. Allowing anglophones this privilege while making services in French difficult to obtain for francophones could not help but lead to dispute.

Therefore, in both the areas of education and the civil service anglophones and francophones viewed bilingualism and language policy in

different lights. While francophones wanted progressive measures in the civil service, anglophone objected and urged a slower process. In the area of education, it was the anglophones who felt they were being treated unfairly by not having the proper second language programs in their schools.

Indeed, there does not appear to be any common ground in attitudes or opinions of francophones and anglophones. The next chapter examines attitudes towards the idea of bilingualism and language policy in general.

CHAPTER 4

VIEWS TOWARDS LANGUAGE POLICY AND BILINGUALISM IN GENERAL IN NEW BRUNSWICK

The briefs submitted to the Advisory Committee not only expressed opinions on the areas of education or the civil service but also contained attitudes on the topics of language policy and bilingualism in general. It is important to note the distinction that exists between language policies, those which define how to provide services in both English and French to both linguistic communities, and bilingual policies (such as second language programs) which are designed to increase the bilingual capacity of New Brunswick residents. This distinction is not made by authors of the briefs. Therefore, this section focuses on attitudes towards bilingualism in broader terms, that is, the co-existence of francophones and anglophones in New Brunswick, the recognition of the equality of status and language, and the provision of government services in both languages. The designation of New Brunswick as a bilingual entity came about of course with the Official Languages Act of New Brunswick of 1969. The acknowledgement of collective rights and privileges of both linguistic communities through Bill 88 further affirmed the unique identity of the province. Furthermore, the protection of New Brunswick's bilingual nature is protected in the Constitution Act (1982) under section 16(2). The provision of services in both languages by the provincial government and institutions of the Legislature as well as federal institutions situated within the province is guaranteed by sections 20(1) and 20(2), while the equality of the rights of citizens to use either French or English in court proceedings under sections 19(1) and 19(2). The equality of the rights of citizens to use their language in debat

m exists in New Brunswick.

This chapter makes the following inquiries: 1) Is bilingualism viewed in a positive or negative light?, 2) Are there fears of dividing the province with or without bilingualism?, 3) Are there references made to other linguistic communities such as Québec?, and 4) Are anti-French or anti-English sentiments present? If so, who has them? This section also examines whether the lack of application of conflict resolving mechanisms by the political elite contributed to the gap in attitudes or opinions.

BILINGUALISM - GOOD OR BAD? ANGLOPHONE ATTITUDES

Of the 146 English briefs and 21 bilingual briefs, 93 (55.68%) expressed a positive opinion towards bilingualism. A positive attitude was attributed to those briefs which supported language programs, bilingual services, bilingual capacity in the civil service and the overall equality of the two linguistic groups. For example, brief 003E by the University of New Brunswick states that the acquisition of a second language whether English or French can only be beneficial, "Nobler reasons are also provided involving the personal enrichment, 'cultural relativism' and tolerance which results from understanding a second language...these benefits apply to all forms of language acquisition and increase with the individual's proficiency". (Brief 003E, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, 1985, 6) Also, brief 011E by Gerry Hill of Fredericton declares that language rights of all New Brunswickers must be respected, "I am also deeply committed, in a personal sense, to the concept of bilingualism, and to equality in language rights for both English and French-speaking Canadians". Even those briefs which

oppose the proposals of the Poirier-Bastarache report, still express a positive view of bilingualism, "Ideally, we would like to see all citizens of New Brunswick at least passively bilingual. We believe that there is a positive attitude towards bilingualism in Fredericton". (Brief 019C, City of Fredericton, 1985, 3) In addition, several briefs express the idea that bilingualism means recognition of New Brunswick's francophone and anglophone communities. Therefore, it is a cohesive influence. Respecting the francophone minority and offering services in both languages is perceived by some anglophones as a valid goal, "The majority of New Brunswickers have never objected to bilingualism. Most welcomed it as a means of uniting this province as well as this nation. Bilingualism can only facilitate better understanding among all New Brunswickers". (Brief 154E, Lois Jensen, Grand Falls, 1985, 4) Brief 204E by McCain's is also of the opinion that both anglophones and francophones support the development of bilingualism in the province, "Most anglophones accept and understand why francophones should be treated differently than other minorities in New Brunswick". Furthermore, while several briefs view bilingualism in a positive light, they favor a non-legislated, evolutionary approach to bilingualism. Seven briefs from Saint John express the opinion that bilingualism should be by choice, not forced, and should not be subjected to further legislation. For example, brief 254E by the Saint John Construction Association supports the provision of services in both languages but objects to any further language laws because it might result in an exodus of capital investment and companies from the province. Brief 273E by Dr. George Bates also views bilingualism as a positive thing for the province but sees no need for additional legislation and has reservations about the effects of more language laws, "I have become acutely aware that by making New Brunswick

officially bilingual, the cause of Acadians may possibly have been helped, but for the province a monster has probably been created". (Brief 273E, Dr. George Bates, Woodstock, 1985, 4)

Other anglophone briefs such as 357E by the St. Stephen-Milltown Chamber of Commerce support bilingualism but believe that it will take time for it to come to fruition and moving too quickly with language legislation would be disastrous. Brief 362E by the Charlotte West Liberal Association also stresses that the province must allow "a reasonable period of time" before an acceptable level of bilingualism can be reached. In fact, twenty-two anglophone briefs express the sentiments that bilingualism is a positive thing but can only be achieved through time and gradual change.

With the exception of ten briefs who neither favor nor oppose bilingualism, the remaining sixty-four English and bilingual briefs view bilingualism in a negative light. They disagree with equality of languages and services and feel the anglophone majority are being threatened by the francophone minority. For example, brief 006E by Harold Phalen objects to equality of services in both languages and argues that not only is bilingualism too costly for New Brunswick but it is not necessary since English is the dominant language in society:

It is unfortunate that so many are under the illusion that the vast majority of Canadians accept bilingualism with open arms and that objections come only from bigoted, biased, redneck anglophones. New Brunswickers certainly want all citizens to be equal but anglophones are not prepared to become second class citizens in this province. The major working language of Canada and North America is English...New Brunswickers

and Canadians must accept that English is the predominant language in all other provinces and would be used in most situations. (Brief 006E, Harold Phalen, Fredericton, 1985, 5)

Brief 007E by Cameron King, P.Eng., also expresses the opinion that French can never truly be on an equal basis with English. To legislate this would be unnatural, "...the French language is not naturally on an equal footing with English. No disrespect for the French language is intended...To legislate and impose French as a working language and on an equal footing with English in the civil service in Fredericton is to completely upset the normal routine of communication within the civil service and the private sector". (Brief 007E, Cameron King, Fredericton, 1985, 3) In addition, brief 021E submitted by the New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians argues that historically, the French are a conquered people. Therefore, the English language should and must prevail. The will of the anglophone majority must take precedence. Indeed briefs 032E, 033E, and 034E by Ronald Steeves, Lucide Rioux and Doreen Fraser respectively, all argue that the English are being discriminated against even though they are the majority, and brief 034E even suggests that the Official Languages Act of New Brunswick of 1969 be repealed, "...stop ramming French down our throats. Then we will have harmony again". Brief 034E, Fredericton, 1985, 8)

The greatest opposition to bilingualism was in briefs from the predominantly Loyalist, anglophone areas of Saint John and Saint Andrews. For instance, nineteen of the thirty Saint John briefs view bilingualism negatively. They argue that as the language of a conquered people, French should not be given equal status as English. These briefs take the position

that French services are not essential because most francophones know English anyway and the wishes of the francophone minority to protect their own language and culture should not be forced upon the anglophone majority. Briefs 257E and 258E by Gary Tiner and Mary Lyndon and Kathleen Northrup of Saint John both argue that francophones should preserve their own culture without the forced preservation that comes with government intervention.

Furthermore, ten of the twenty-one briefs from Saint Andrews object to bilingualism because they are not convinced of its merits. They too express the view that services should be in English, the language of the majority. They resent what they perceive to be the forcing of French upon anglophones. Brief 364E by J.C. Dunfield argues that the English are the majority and based on history should, therefore, be supreme. He also believes that the basic principles of bilingualism are somewhat flawed and difficult to achieve. Furthermore, he disagrees with the federal and provincial Official Languages Acts and the sections of the Constitution Act (1982) recognizing both languages because they are "undemocratic policies of Trudeau who failed to work for the majority".

Six English briefs view bilingualism in such a negative light that they propose that the Official Languages Act of New Brunswick be repealed so that the domination of anglophones by francophones will end. Without this Act, anglophones will be able to obtain jobs which they believe that francophones are taking away from them. These briefs state that the Provincial Official Languages Act of 1969 promotes separation. Consequently, sticking to only one language, English, would be more beneficial for New Brunswick.

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE FRANCOPHONE ATTITUDES TOWARDS BILINGUALISM

As with the anglophone briefs, francophone opinions are divided on whether bilingualism is a positive or negative concept. However, 84 of the 142 French briefs (59.15%) favor bilingualism because it brings equality of language and service and allows them services in their own language. For instance, brief 004F by the Teachers Association of School District No. 51 supports steps being taken to make New Brunswick a bilingual province such as second language education programs. They favor equality of the French and English languages because it means bilingual communications. For francophones, the greatest bonus of bilingualism is government services available in French. However, brief 117F by l'Association générale des étudiants de Saint Louis-Maillet states that the theory and practice of bilingualism are two different things, "Quoique la loi (OLA 1969) semblait fonctionnelle en théorie, elle ne l'a sûrement pas été en pratique (sic)". (Brief 117F, Edmundston, 1985, 3) Several francophone briefs stress the importance of the provision of services by bilingual staff and ensuring the bilingual capacity of institutions such as hospitals. Brief 465F by Les Filles de Marie de l'Assomption supports bilingualism and the recognition of francophones' rights but also emphasizes that their aim as francophones is not to deprive anglophones of power or disrupt New Brunswick society, "Nous ne voulons pas enlever à la majorité importante en nombre que nous sommes soient reconnus". (Brief 465F, Campbellton, 1985, 7) Furthermore, brief 508F by Le Village de Petit Rocher favors bilingualism and looks for concrete mechanisms to make New Brunswick a bilingual society, "Nous

souscrivons entièrement au principe du bilinguisme total dans notre province, mais nous réalisons qu'il faut du temps et de la bonne volonté doublés d'un système scolaire efficace qui permettra à nos jeunes de demain de réaliser cet objectif". (Brief 508F, Bathurst, 1985, 3)

Also, while francophones support bilingualism, "...le richesse qu'est le bilinguisme", (Brief 705F, Le Cercle 12 de l'AEFNB, Buctouche, 1985, 2) there is also the belief that progress has been slow since 1969 and anglophone attitudes have not evolved, "Certains Monctonians refusent d'admettre le fait français...ce climat social (des services français) influence leur attitude en classe. Comment défendre le bilinguisme en classe si n'existera pas dans les services". (Brief 710F, Le Cercle 13M de l'AEFNB, Moncton, 1985, 6) For New Brunswick to be truly bilingual, bilingualism must be recognized throughout the province, "...l'urgence pour notre province d'adopter des moyens qui permettront la réalisation du bilinguisme partout dans la province". (Brief 610F, Le Club de l'Age d'Or de Shippagan, Shippegan, 1985, 4) Therefore, to ensure that the principles of bilingualism are followed throughout the province, francophones call upon the government to implement concrete enforcement measures. Brief 810F by Les Dames de l'Acadie de Moncton even supports a new language law, "Qu'à l'embauche, établir des critères au niveau du langage...soit exiger le bilinguisme". (Brief 810F, Moncton, 1985, 2) Indeed, eight briefs demand government action on ensuring bilingual services and call upon the administration to redefine and make clearer the principles of bilingualism. Brief 821F by La Société des Acadiens du Nouveau Brunswick also suggests an information campaign to education anglophones on the benefits of bilingualism and convince them of its merits. In addition, brief 859F by Roger Doiron argues that francophones pay their taxes thereby

deserving to receive services in their own language, and anglophones must respect this.

Of the remaining francophone briefs, eleven argue for services in their own language and their own French language institutions but do not take a position on bilingualism. The forty-seven briefs left express a very negative view of bilingualism. For example, brief 012F by La Société des Acadiens du Nouveau Brunswick supports the Official Languages Act of New Brunswick of 1969 and the right to services in one's own language but is upset that services promised in the French language still are not offered. For them, bilingualism has only meant a continuation of unilingual anglophones, "Le bilinguisme institutionnel, que nous appelons par expérience le "gouvernement par traduction" ne représentent plus une option satisfaisante pour assurer l'égalité....ce système n'a réussi qu'à reconfirmer l'unilinguisme du plus fort et du plus nombreux". Francophones assert that a bilingual province should be one where francophones can obtain services in their own language and not necessarily one where all residents can speak both English and French:

Pour nous, une province officiellement bilingue n'est pas une province dont tous les habitants doivent nécessairement parler les deux langues. C'est une province dont les institutions tant publiques que privées sont en mesure de dispenser leur services dans les deux langues, à des citoyens qui peuvent fort bien dans l'immense majorité être des unilingues. (Brief 012F, SANB, Fredericton, 1985, 10)

Brief 031F by Le Cercle Français de Fredericton also opposes bilingualism because it has meant a continuation of services in English:

Il semble qu'en surface le gouvernement fonctionne de façon bilingue. La réalité en est tout autre....l'anglais demeure la langue couramment utilisé au travail...Cette réalité constitue une forme d'assimilation inacceptable pour la population française de Fredericton. (Brief 031F, Fredericton, 1985, 4)

Indeed, the greatest opposition to bilingualism is based on the perception by francophones that bilingualism is not serving their linguistic needs because services are not available to them in their own language. They express the opinion that while bilingualism has been furthered by the Act of 1969, it has not progressed as promised since it is the francophones and not the anglophones who have attained a personal capacity to function in both French and English. Francophone briefs contain the attitude that it is they who remain "defavorisés" because anglophones do not yet accept bilingualism. The provincial Official Languages Act of 1969 is not strong enough to halt the assimilation of francophones, "O.L.A....un chien sans dents qui peut faire peur mais pas très mal". (Brief 708F, Bernard Richard, Buctouche, 1985, 3)

All of the briefs opposed to bilingualism express these opinions and contend that because bilingualism has not been respected, it has not worked, "Ils trouvaient que pour une province qui se prétend bilingue, et dans une région à forte majorité francophone de surcroît, services publics bilingues voulaient tout simplement dire unilingues anglais". (Brief 457F, La Fédération des Dames d'Acadie, Campbellton, 1985, 5) Therefore, forty-seven francophone briefs reject bilingualism, "Les Acadiens ont des ideaux qui dépasse de beaucoup celui de bilinguisme. Il vise égalité pleine et entière...." (Brief 605F, L'Union Acadienne pour la Culture Populaire Inc., Shippagan,

1985, 2) and opt for separate administrations and institutions instead. Duality represents to them the only solution to halting assimilation. The predominantly francophone areas of Edmundston and Grand Falls were the most opposed to bilingualism as twelve out of the fifteen Edmundston francophone briefs (80%) and eleven out of twelve French language Grand Falls briefs (91.67%) held the opinion or attitude that bilingualism has had only a negative impact.

As TABLE 4.1 indicates, despite gaps in attitudes and opinions, the majority of francophones and anglophones who submitted briefs support bilingualism and view it in a positive light. Certainly, this positive attitude must be seen as a contributing factor to the stability of New Brunswick and perhaps this favoring of bilingualism is why very few briefs express the fear of dividing the province with or without bilingualism.

TABLE 4.1

**POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ATTITUDES OF FRANCOPHONES AND
ANGLOPHONES TOWARDS BILINGUALISM**

<u>ANGLOPHONES</u>	<u>FRANCOPHONES</u>	
Total Number of Briefs - 167	Total Number of Briefs - 142	
	Number of Anglophone Briefs	Number of Francophone Briefs
1) Bilingualism is an asset to the province	93 (55.68%)	54 (59.15%)
2) Bilingualism is a hindrance	64 (38.32%)	47 (33.10%)

BILINGUALISM - A DIVISIVE FACTOR?

Of the 146 English language briefs and 21 bilingual briefs, only eight (4.79%) are of the opinion that bilingualism divides the province putting francophones against anglophones. For example, brief 008E by Murray Jones from the Provincial Loyal Orange Association states, "This will drive a wedge between French and English...and right now we have the fear that someday instead of the people of this province living in harmony there could even be blood shed". (Brief 008E, Fredericton, 1985, 3) He also takes the position that the francophone minority trying to influence the whole majority could cause a violent reaction. This is somewhat of a radical view but brief 011E by Gerry Hill expresses fear of division of the province due to extremists and attitudes such as these. In addition, brief 027E by Professor and Mrs. Ruthven states that bilingual policies have become a means of reverse discrimination against

the anglophone majority and their implementation has proved to be divisive and has not brought the two groups together as hoped. Brief 258E by Mary Lyndon and Kathleen Northup also stresses that further promotion of bilingualism will be disastrous, "The interference in the natural evolution of language has the potential to lead to destruction". (Brief 258E, Saint John, 1985, 5)

Only two anglophone briefs have the attitude that without bilingualism, the province would face a split, "...government efforts should be directed toward unifying all Canadians living in New Brunswick not segregating them...The best way to break down linguistic tension is through a widening of bilingualism...The feelings of isolation are a resultant of unilingualism on both sides". (Brief 015E, S.B. Benton, Fredericton, 1985, 3) Brief 023E by D.G.O. Kingston also argues that without bilingualism and understanding between the two linguistic groups, division will follow, "We can no longer afford to go off in two camps opposing each other. That will serve no useful end! It will, on the other hand divide us as a people. Such division would be a disaster". (Brief 023E, Fredericton, 1985, 6) In addition, he refers to the New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians as dangerous because they tend to divide rather than unite.

Interestingly enough, not one francophone brief expressed fear of dividing the province either with or without bilingualism. Certainly, it would make little sense for francophones to argue against bilingualism, equality of language and equality of services. Even though the level and quality of services available in French may not be of the standard they desire and may be too slow in coming, francophone briefs do not react to

anglophone criticisms of bilingualism by predicting doom and gloom without it or further advancement in French services.

Similar to opinions on possible effects of bilingualism, references to and comparisons with linguistic situations outside the province, particularly in Quebec, are contained almost exclusively in anglophone briefs.

REFERENCES TO OTHER LINGUISTIC COMMUNITIES

Anglophone briefs made the greatest number of references (twenty-one) to the linguistic situation in Québec and the relations that exist in that province between francophones and anglophones. Indeed the majority of these comparisons and references to Québec are far from positive. For example, brief 007E by Cameron King, P.Eng., blames the influence of Québec for the Poirier-Bastarache report's recommendations designed to enhance the status of the French language and improve French-language services:

The authors of the report had the time and professional help to research and prepare their views, including some advice from Québec nationals who probably had definite opinions on how to enhance the French language and advice on agencies and methods for implementations used in the province of Québec, which the authors seem to look on with favor for possible use in New Brunswick. (Brief 007E, Fredericton, 1985, 5)

His belief that Québec nationalists somehow contributed to the Poirier-Bastarache report is erroneous since the four member committee never interviewed anyone from outside the province. The only people whom the committee turned to for advice in choosing the seventy-seven interviewees

and newspapers to be analyzed was an Ottawa-based public opinion survey company. (Personal interview with Bernard Poirier, June 27, 1989) Brief 007E also objects to Québec being used as a model of how to deliver French services since francophones in Québec form a majority while they are only a minority in New Brunswick. Furthermore, briefs 011E by Gerry Hill and 019E by the City of Fredericton are both of the opinion that language policy in Québec has had disastrous effects and do not serve as positive examples of English-French relations, "The restriction of language rights among English speaking residents of Québec,...in recent years does not serve as positive examples to me of the way our country should respond to minority groups or its bilingual history, culture and reality...Looking at the history of Québec for the first 100 years of Confederation is certainly no great testament to fairness and justice for minority groups, either". (Brief 011C, Gerry Hill, Fredericton, 1985, 5)

Perhaps the most negative reference to Québec comes from brief 021E submitted by the New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians who blame the province's linguistic problems on Québec:

Today we are seeing a situation of mischief developing in the province of Québec, as it relates to Canada. Of course, the skilled agitation of our Acadian population in the province of New Brunswick by the ultra nationalists, is stirring emotions that ought to have no place in the development of our Province and for that matter Canada. (Brief 021E, Fredericton, 1985, 2)

These ultra nationalists which the association refers to and despises are former Prime Minister Trudeau and the former premier of Québec, the late René Levesque:

The Language issue in the province must be equated to the dubious successes on the Federal level in the manipulative tactic of former Prime Minister Trudeau and his counterpart Premier Levesque of Quebec-allegorically- 'two peas in a pod' - each performing their role in the issue of bilingualism and French rights in Canada. (Ibid, 11)

Several anglophone briefs are also of the attitude that increased usage of French in New Brunswick will have disastrous effects. They believe that the demand for more French services by francophones is based on the desire by francophones in New Brunswick to emulate Québec, "Will the Official Languages Office, in the future, move to regulate the hiring policies of private business as seems to be the case in Québec? Private sector fears of a 'Quebec-like' regime which regulates a variety of business practices are not unfounded". (Brief 270E, City of Saint John, 1985, 15) There is indeed an anglophone phobia of New Brunswick "becoming another Québec". They oppose further language legislation because it may mean an exodus of businesses and residents and more French language services could make it easier for francophones, particularly from Québec, to obtain employment:

...then I feel very strongly that all sections of the province of New Brunswick will have a large influx of people coming to this province from Québec...jobs that are to be created, could very well be taken up by Québec foreigners, who no doubt will push themselves upon the English speaking people of this province and more likely demand that the francophones be more superior than the anglophones. (Brief 359E, Brian Tatton, St. Andrews, 1985, 2)

Therefore, anglophones refer to Québec to warn of what could happen if New Brunswick proceeds with further language legislation. Moreover, brief 023E by D.G.O. Kingston uses Québec as an example of what can happen if New Brunswick continues to ignore the demands of its francophones. He recounts his experiences as a resident of Montreal during the F.L.Q. crisis when bomb threats were made against the bridge connecting Montreal and Ile de Perrôt, and makes an ominous prophecy, "If New Brunswick continues to deny rights to 1/3 of our population, the same thing could happen". (Brief 023E, Fredericton, 1985, 1) In total, twenty-one (12.57%) anglophone briefs point to Québec as a bad model to follow. Brief 833E by the New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians expresses contempt for French activists in Québec. They argue that since Québec chooses to make the language of the majority, French, the province's only official language, New Brunswick should do the same and use only English. Also, brief 162E by the Board of School Trustees No. 50 has a unique attitude in that they complain that New Brunswick's anglophones in majority French areas are losing services just as the English minority in Québec, "Are we to be treated like the English minority of Québec? It is true that minorities in Québec or New Brunswick can be under-served or under-represented in the civil service unless safeguards are built in". (Brief 163E, Grand Falls, 1985, 3)

Clearly, these anglophones briefs make no distinction between the aspirations and desires of francophones in Québec who form the majority of the population and those of New Brunswick's minority francophone community, les Acadiens. New Brunswick does not use Québec as a model regarding language legislation and les Acadiens and les Québécois are indeed

two very different groups as brief 627B by Arthur William Landry of Shippagan tries to establish. He objects to any comparisons between Québec's francophones and New Brunswick's Acadians, "We've never been, and indeed never intend to be, the inhabitants of the sunny slopes of a Westmount overlooking the slums of some Anglo-Saxon St. Henri". (Brief 627B, Shippegan, 1985, 4)

In contrast to anglophone references to Québec, only six (4.23%) francophone briefs even mention "la belle province". Even then the group they most identify with is Québec's anglophone minority and not its francophones:

...ne pas les confondre avec les radicaux que les Québécois qui se sont établis dans le compte après 1939 n'ont pas le même compartement que les autres francophones parce que étant habitués à vivre dans une majorité francophone ils voient plus rapidement les anomalies dans les services censés être bilingues. (Brief 455F, Emery LeBlanc, Campbellton, 1985, 6)

Unlike the francophone majority in Québec, "Les francophones néo-brunswickois se retrouvent, à la différence du québécois, triplement minoritaire". (Brief 109F, Le Cercle 33 l'Association des Enseignants du Nouveau Brunswick (AEFNB), Edmundston, 1985, 4) Therefore, the francophone minority of New Brunswick identifies more readily with the anglophone minority in Québec and their fight for equality of language and services, "Nous avons voulu nos écoles françaises comme les Anglais au Québec ont tenu à garder leurs écoles anglaises". (Brief 151F, John Vallilée, Grand Falls, 1985, 4) As a result of the similarity in circumstances, Brief 626F by Louis Godin feels that this means that the anglophone minority in Québec

support "les Acadiens", "Je crois que la minorité anglophone du Québec très bien portante et très bien protégée, a bien compris cette reciprocité en apportant leur appui aux francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick dans le présent débat linguistique". (Brief 626F, Shippagan, 1985, 5) Godin's assumption of mutual support is on the mark since in the midst of controversy surrounding the Poirier-Bastarache report during the egg throwing at the public information sessions of the Advisory Committee, Eric Maldoff, then president of Alliance Québec, made a plea to New Brunswick's moderate English majority to respect the legitimate rights of the Acadian minority. (The Financial Post, Canadian News Index, March 30, 1985, 14) Alliance Québec also presented a brief at the 1989 New Brunswick public hearings on the Meech Lake Accord arguing for protection of minorities including francophones outside of Québec, New Brunswick's Acadians.

The final category of attitudes to be examined by this chapter is the anti-French and anti-English sentiments expressed in the briefs by both francophones and anglophones.

ANTI-FRENCH/ANTI-ENGLISH SENTIMENTS

In total, 25 (14.97%) anglophone briefs express anti-French sentiments, that is, anger and resentment directed at the province's francophone community as well as blaming them for any linguistic discord. As the province's majority, anglophones seem fearful of extending the rights and privileges that they themselves enjoy to the province's francophones through bilingualism, "New Brunswickers certainly want all citizens to be equal but anglophones are not prepared to become second class citizens in this

province". (Brief 006C, Harold Phalen, Fredericton, 1985, 3) Anglophones interpret any enhancement of services to the francophones as a subsequent restriction on the privileges received by the province's English population. They view the Poirier-Bastarache report and its recommendations as a project for French control, "The Poirier-Bastarache report commissioned and financed by the government of New Brunswick, was not written toward equality of official languages in New Brunswick but researched and written by francophones for enhancing the status of Acadians and their language and restricting the anglophones and the English language". (Brief 007E, Cameron King, P.Eng., Fredericton, 1985, 2)

The strongest anti-French attitude is expressed in the briefs submitted by the New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians. This is hardly surprising since the group opposed all aspects of bilingualism. In brief 021E, they go back in history to argue that the Acadians are a conquered people and were never treated unfairly by the British:

British patience finally exhausted itself, so that in the summer of 1755 some 6000 Acadians-men, women and children were detained and loaded on to sailing vessels for distribution...The backbone of the Acadian resistance...was finally broken with peace restored....(Brief 021E, Fredericton, 1985, 2)

The brief goes on to state that francophones continue to push for bilingualism and in doing so, are responsible for all of the province's linguistic discord, "There is no foreseeable end to the constant and increasing demands of the Francophone ultra nationalists until, French influence is totally recovered in Canada...to avenge the loss of Acadia..." (Ibid) Allowing civil servants the choice of which language they wish to work in is nothing

more than evidence of "French authoritarianism", and the Association feels francophones must be 'put in their place', "They, the ultra nationalists must be taught and made to understand, there is more in the wide scope of what constitutes Canada than their grubby ambition". (Ibid, 16)

Although these are very harsh opinions, several anglophone briefs follow this line of thinking by asserting that the Official Languages Act of New Brunswick of 1969 was instigated by francophones to increase their power. Francophone demands for services in their own language should be ignored anyway because the English are the majority and history shows that they should prevail:

English speaking people of New Brunswick fought a battle with the French for these rights...You know what causes wars don't you...it's when you want what don't belong to you...These kinds of reports leads us, or is meant to lead us in my opinion to a French republican state, and maybe the biggest mistake the English speaking people have done is to have let the French use our language, now they are turning onto us. (Brief 034E, Doreen Fraser, Fredericton, 1985, 10)

The provincial Official Languages Act of 1969 and the Poirier-Bastarache Report are viewed by anglophones as, "tools for Acadians to get into the Provincial government through the back door because they could not make it through the front door with the Acadian party". (Brief 260E, John Arbow, Saint John, 1985, 6)

The strongest and greatest amount of anti-French opinions were in the briefs from Saint John (eight out of thirty-five briefs - 22.86%), Fredericton

(five out of twenty-eight briefs - 17.86%) and Saint Andrews (five out of twenty-one briefs - 23.81%).

It would be erroneous however to think that feelings of prejudice or contempt are expressed only by anglophones. Indeed anger and resentment are also present in the francophone briefs though these feelings are directed towards the province's anglophones instead. In total, twenty-six (18.31%) francophone briefs have the attitude that anglophones are holding back the progress of francophones by refusing to acknowledge rights and services granted to them by the Official Languages Act of 1969 and the Constitution Act (1982):

C'est explicitement afin d'éviter de vivre en marge de la gouverne des affaires publiques que les Acadiens veulent se donner des structures de participation...Nous aurions pu répondre aux déclarations mesquines, aux idées étroites et sans avenir, véhiculées par un certain groupe d'anglophones, encourageant nous aussi la turbulence dans les rencontres publiques et les médias d'information. (Brief 012F, SANB, Fredericton, 1985, 10)

Furthermore, several francophone briefs express the opinion that anglophones continue to belittle them and treat them as second class citizens, "Trop souvent, on entend, eh! les français, vous avez reçu beaucoup, arrêtez d'être si exigeant-arrêtez de vous plaindre...Alors, les francophones doivent continuer à se faire traiter en citoyen de deuxième ordre". (Brief 013F, François Volpé, Fredericton, 1985, 2) Francophones are upset that in spite of measures designed to help maintain their culture and language, assimilation of francophones continues. Anglophones still do not understand francophones needs:

La plupart de ces parcelles de "mieux-être" ont du être arrachées à coup des contestations et à chaque fois, il nous a semblé que ce n'était que 'concession' face à un montagne des revendications. Il devient épuisant à la longue de passer pour des éternels 'chialeux' afin de pouvoir vivre comme d'autres citoyens qui continuent de nous considérer comme des conquis, des citoyens de 'seconde classe'. (Brief 109F, Le Cercle 33 d l'AEFNB, Edmundston, 1985, 5)

Indeed, francophones feel that there exists a lack of comprehension by anglophones towards the purpose or objective of making services available in both languages and delegating French and English equal status, "...une minorité d'anglophones ne comprend pas le but et la direction...nous envisageons un problème d'attitude". (Brief 112F, Le Conseil du Travail District d'Edmundston, Edmundston, 1985, 4) In addition, brief 164F by SANB, La Société de la Grande Rivière, stresses that only francophones in the province suffer injustices with regards to linguistic rights and any concessions to the Acadians are never seen as acceptable by the anglophones:

Le gouvernement aura à chercher des compromis, des contraintes acceptables pour protéger le patrimoine du peuple acadien...ces compromis ne sont pas facilement acceptables par la majorité anglophone. On se demande pourquoi la majorité devait se plier à la minorité...Ces injustices sont faites seulement aux francophones. Se nous étions des anglophones nous n'aurions jamais à les subir. (Brief 164F, Grand Falls, 1985, 6)

Brief 165F by Le Cercle 32 des l'AEFNB echoes these opinions, "...la reticence de certains à accepter ce concept du bilinguisme après quinze années d'existence légale, demontre qu'une certain mentalité bigote existe toujours vigoureusement au New Brunswick et se porte bien". (Brief 165F, Grand Falls, 1985, 3) The strongest or most numerous anti-English sentiments were

not presented by any one organization as was the case with anglophones but were in the briefs from the francophone area of Grand Falls whereby six out of twelve briefs (50%) contained resentful statements directed at the province's English community.

THE APPLICATION OF CONFLICT-RESOLVING MECHANISMS

Why is it that these differences in attitudes regarding bilingualism as a positive or negative thing or feelings of anger against the other linguistic group exist? They are a result of the failure of the province's political elite to apply the conflict-resolving mechanism of proportionality within the civil service and proportionality of services as well as the negative portrayal by the English media of the provincial language debate.

As discussed in previous chapters, the mechanisms of depoliticization of and consensus on the province's language policies have been successfully employed. Since the language issue is such a sensitive and explosive one, there is an unwritten agreement between the Liberals and Conservatives to leave it out of any political debates. Yet despite this consensus there are perceptions of politicization of language by both francophones and anglophones and the identity of bilingualism is strongly tied to the Hatfield administration. This is not surprising since it was under Hatfield's Conservative government that sections of the provincial Official Languages Act of 1969 were implemented, that Bill 88 proclaiming the equality of the French and English communities was passed, and the bilingual nature of the province was entrenched within the Constitution Act of 1982.

Anglophone briefs express dissatisfaction with legislation put forth while Richard Hatfield was premier because they perceive him to be using the language issue to win votes:

Now, however, the French, having purchased the dubious services of a few federal politicians, a majority of the New Brunswick PC's and New Brunswick Liberals, are attempting to push their language and culture on the majority at our expense. To the French in New Brunswick...irregardless of what Mr. Hatfield may have told or promised you, if he believes that we the majority are going to go to sleep while you run over us, he is in for a shock. (Brief 284E, J.L. Gilliland, Saint John, 1985, 8)

Brief 287E by a card-carrying PC member sees the government's efforts to offer services to the province's francophones an outright betrayal of anglophones, "The way Mr. Hatfield has turned his back on anglophones is equal to Judas Iscarot. Is Mr. Hatfield and the rest of the anglophone members so blind that they can't see what is happening?" (Brief 287E, George Avery, Saint John, 1985, 3) Furthermore, brief 358E by the Town of St. George states that language problems should be left to the people to solve and the government's involvement is nothing more than political opportunism, "Who wants bilingualism? Apparently, many francophones do not, and I'm sure, not many anglophones do. Was it something that was done to get a few more votes from 'Northern' New Brunswick"? (Brief 358E, St. Andrews, 1985, 4) Brief 360E even suggests that anglophone reluctance to accept bilingualism is due to the mishandling of the issue by the government, "...anglophone distrust...is in no small part due to the way in which the Premier has politicized the issue over the past ten years and used it as a means to greater political power...I am persuaded that the current

government sees the language issue as a political problem rather than a question of what is or is not good government. I simply do not trust our Premier..." (Brief 360E, Don Olmstead, St. Andrews, 1985, 6) Therefore, Richard Hatfield and the Conservative government are seen by anglophones as 'catering to the wishes of the French' in order to obtain francophone votes and remain in power, "Our Premier is attempting to make a name for himself as the leader of a truly bilingual province or perhaps as the savior of the francophones and, while I realize that he needs their votes to stay in power, I don't think we should suffer as a result". (Brief 368E, Judith M. Wilson, St. Andrews, 1985, 4) Twenty-six anglophone briefs (15.57%) contain the attitude that the language issue is being made into a political one by the Conservative administration under Hatfield in exchange for gains in votes.

Indeed, Richard Hatfield developed a close relationship with the province's Acadians. He took on the role of defender of their rights and privileges as a result of the advance made in language legislation while he remained in power. His efforts were rewarded with francophone votes thereby removing a traditional bloc of support from the Liberals. (Aunger, 1981, 159) However, not all francophone briefs are grateful to Hatfield for his efforts. Some briefs interpret the lack of progress in bilingualism and language policy as the Conservative government using the issue as a political manoeuvre to win votes. Francophones look to the government as the defender and promoter of their rights but, "Les politiciens ont malheureusement joué trop longtemps avec nos droits dans toute cette affaire de bilinguisme...." (Brief 509F, Gilles Halley, Bathurst, 1985, 4) Therefore, they demand that the government act without further delay to ensure language rights are obeyed. Furthermore, brief 616F by Le Conseil

régional de la Société des Acadiens de Caraquet interprets this delay as an interest more in votes and political power than caring about minority rights, "Si nous ne voulons pas que les nôtres soient complètement rayés du processus décisionnel du gouvernement provincial et ce sous les yeux bienveillants de nos ministères et de nos députés acadiens, qui semblent être beaucoup plus préoccupés par la petite politique que par les intérêts supérieurs de leurs électeurs." (Brief 616F, Shippagan, 1985, 2) In addition, briefs 816F by the Acadian Society of Policy Analysis, 820F by Gilles Theriault and 821F by the SANB, conseil Petitcodiac all call for more government action and leadership in language policy and chastise the "passive attitude" which they perceive that the government has adopted towards bilingualism. In total, seventeen francophone briefs (11.97%) are of the opinion that language policy and bilingualism are used by the Hatfield government for political ends.

These feelings of politicization of the language issue were no doubt heightened by the formation of the New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians whose anti-French, anti-bilingualism rhetoric awakened the views of extremists and further polarized the province's anglophone and francophone community.

The failure to ensure proportionality within the civil service and proportionality of government services, equitable services in both languages, has been explored in previous chapters. The viewing of bilingualism in a negative light by francophones due to the lack of services in their language further underlines how crucial the provision of services in French and

English is to maintaining the "bonne entente" and good relations between francophones and anglophones.

Lijphart's and Aunger's mechanism of secrecy seems to have been applied as best as can be determined but there is one other variable not explored by them which is a factor in the maintenance of linguistic stability. This variable is the influence of the English media, particularly the 3 major daily newspapers, The Daily Gleaner, the Saint John telegraph, and the Moncton Times Transcript. (The influence of the French print media is difficult to determine because since 1982, 2 papers, L'Evangeline et Le Matin have been created and folded making analysis of their impact difficult) The negative coverage which the English press devotes to language policy and bilingualism in general is not realized by any anglophone presenters since media influence in the language issue is not mentioned in any of the briefs. However, five francophone briefs do include the English media in their briefs. For example, brief 114F by La Société Louis-Napoléon-Dugal is of the opinion that the English press helps foster anti-French sentiments, "La presse anglophone en général a voulu la présenter comme un geste des anglophones contre une discrimination faite à leur égard. Elle a ouvert toutes grandes ses pages mêmes aux propos non fondés et même racistes" (Brief 114F, Edmundston, 1985, 8) Brief 620F by Linda Haché also blames the anglophone media for their disruptive influence:

Depuis avril 1984, les journaux anglophones ont regorgé de textes à l'opinion du lecteur qui faisaient injureaux francophones. Ces journaux ont aussi contribué, à leur façon, et notamment par leur contenu éditorial, à bafouer les droits des francophones, à discréditer le mandat et le rôle de

vosre comité, et à condamner le rapport Bastarache-Poirier. (Brief 620F, Shippagan, 1985, 4)

Furthermore, brief 634F by Dr. Alphee Michaud, editor of Les Editions du Nord, small community newspaper publications in northern New Brunswick, agrees with the above opinions. He has the attitude that the English press is doing a disservice to its readers, "La presse anglophone en général, surtout la presse écrite, a fait à notre avis un très mauvais travail de décrire la situation actuelle des deux communautés linguistique...la presse anglophone reflète beaucoup plus les radicaux anglophones et leurs idées que les supposés modérés anglophones". (Brief 634F, Shippagan, 1985, 6)

The English print media was in fact the focus of the study by Marc Johnson, Regard sur l'Anti-bilinguisme. He discovered that six principal arguments against bilingualism were continually advanced by the anglophone print media. It is not surprising that these arguments; bilingualism is too costly, increased bilingualism means less jobs for anglophones, the majority should rule, the government is moving too quickly on bilingualism and shoving French down anglophones' throats, bilingualism will only divide and disrupt anglophone/francophone harmony, and bilingualism is a French plot for power; are also present in the anglophone briefs analyzed for this thesis. Johnson examines the press coverage given to each of these statements and his findings bear relevance as to why anglophones resent language policy and why the diversity in attitudes exists. For instance, the idea that more bilingualism equals less jobs for anglophones was printed in the Times and Transcript October 18, and 26, November 16, and December 14 and 17, 1984; and in the Telegraph-Journal October 19, November 1 and 17, 1984. The argument that the English

majority should rule also received extensive coverage from the Telegraph Journal on October 10, 1984; December 15, 20, 21, 1984; January 7, 10 and 11, 1985; as did the proposition that bilingualism divides which was printed in the Telegraph Journal December 1, 8 and 31, 1984; and in the Times and Transcript on December 1,3,4,5,22 and 26, 1984. Furthermore, the idea that bilingualism is a French plot was printed in articles in the Telegraph Journal on August 2, November 1, and December 1,5 and 20, 1984 and January 10, 1985.

The danger however, of the English newspapers lies not only in the repetition of negative views regarding language policy which are printed in articles by the papers' staff but also in the opinions and attitudes which come across in editorials and letters to the editor. The latter of these contain very harsh, prejudicial remarks by anglophones against francophone and vice versa. The Daily Gleaner of Fredericton has of late come under harsh criticism by La Société des Acadiens du Nouveau Brunswick as well as political elite such as Richard Hatfield, for their editorial policy of allowing unsigned anti-French and anti-English letters to be printed. These letters, based on rumours of linguistic injustices, bring up and reinforce old arguments against bilingualism and language policies. They also further promulgate the anger and resentment between francophones and anglophones. While the political elite cannot control the print media, the media must be convinced of its impact and take on a new role of conciliator between francophones and anglophones. They could also educate the residents of New Brunswick on language policies of the province and their benefits.

In conclusion, the media does indeed play a role in the maintenance of linguistic relations and stability. Though at present they are a negative factor, they could narrow the gap in attitudes and opinions of anglophones/francophones towards language policy with a change in their own printing policies. The media could also depoliticize the New Brunswick language issue by removing it from unnecessary additional public scrutiny in their publications.

The wide sweeping influence of the print media must therefore be included along with the failure to apply the conflict resolving mechanism of proportionality as contributing factors to the diversity of attitudes of francophones and anglophones towards language policy in New Brunswick. The attitudes and opinions examined in this chapter indicate the impact of these variables and just how differently francophones and anglophones view language policy and bilingualism in general.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

That anglophones and francophones have different attitudes and opinions towards language policy in New Brunswick is hardly startling or surprising considering that they represent two cultures, one forming the majority of the province's population while the other constitutes a minority, and are characterized by different historical backgrounds and different languages. Diversity in attitudes of anglophones and francophones is not to be condemned. Indeed, society would be very dull and monotonous if all of humanity adopted the same view points. However, it is when these opinions of the English and French in New Brunswick clash resulting in disharmony or unrest thereby threatening the linguistic stability of the province, that these attitudes and the causes of their variation need to be analyzed. What lends significance to this analysis and the study of language policy and bilingualism in New Brunswick is that the province constitutes a microcosm of French-English proportions on the national dimension.

From this qualitative study of attitudes towards language policy and bilingualism in general and those pertaining to education and the civil service, it appears that as the majority, anglophones are reticent about extending opportunities and services to the francophone minority for fear of placing themselves at a disadvantage whether it be in the education system or civil service employment. Francophones as the minority resent the anglophone hesitancy to make available rights and privileges secured under the Official Languages Act of New Brunswick of 1969 and the Constitution Act (1982). As a result, francophone actions to obtain that which they feel

entitled to become combative instead of co-operative. They favor their own schools, control over their education, increased access to civil service positions and services in their own language through separate institutions and administrations. It is important to note that positive and negative reaction to language policy and bilingualism exists on both sides of the dispute as does prejudice or contempt of the other linguistic group. Furthermore, this clash of opinions and attitudes is the product of a failure of the political elite to employ the conflict resolving mechanisms of depoliticization, secrecy, proportionality and consensus, used to maintain good relations or "bonne entente" between francophones and anglophones. As analysis has shown depoliticization, consensus and secrecy have successfully been applied by the francophone and anglophone political elite but the result has not necessarily been linguistic harmony as Aunger and Lijphart proposed. Even though the Liberals and Conservatives have removed the language policy issue from any political debate by adopting similar platforms so as to avoid the fallout of voter support, this has not stopped other political organizations such as the New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians or the more recent Confederation of Regions Party (COR) from politicizing the language issue and polarizing the province's English and French communities.

Both of these organizations capitalize on the vacuum of debate, created by the elite applying depoliticization and consensus. They focus on language policy and bilingualism and consequently, resurrect all of the old arguments and feelings against or for the policies. These groups also succeed in putting francophones against anglophones thereby causing attitudes and opinions to conflict. Another result of the formation of these groups is a breakdown in

cohesion between elites and the masses particularly among the anglophones. Indeed one of the conditions vital to the success of consociationalism as outlined by Lijphart is that the elites must have the support and allegiance of their subcultures and their followers. While the anglophone political elite are content with not debating the language issue in order to have linguistic harmony, the anglophone masses appear not to be. In fact, one anglophone brief was quite irate at members of the provincial assembly for not taking a stand on the language question. While stability in the province is maintained in spite of this breakdown in elite-mass relations, this rupture does contribute to the conflicting attitudes and opinions of francophones and anglophones.

This division between elites and masses is not unique to anglophones however. The Parti Acadien was formed in 1971 to defend Acadian concerns and in doing so also politicized the language issue. They too represented a break from the course chosen by the francophone political elite to work within existing political parties with the anglophone elite to reach a compromise in language policy.

The gap in attitudes between francophones and anglophones is also due to the failure of the political elite to apply the mechanism of proportionality within the civil service. Although at present, francophones are adequately represented in the public service on a province wide basis accounting for 32.1% of the 9,808 employees, a number which almost equals their percentage in the province's population, there still exists a problem of representation at the Fredericton Central Office where francophone

employees account for only 695 employees or 18.4% of the total. (New Brunswick Linguistic Profile of Employees in the Public Service, 1988)

While anglophone briefs express the attitude that language requirements have no room in civil service employment francophones argue for greater representation. It is the failure of the political elite to ensure that francophones are adequately represented at all levels of the civil service (the majority of francophone civil servants are employed in the lower echelons such as at the operational level) which has contributed to this gap in opinions.

Furthermore, while the francophone mass is upset at their numbers within the civil service, the francophone political elite seem content. This too indicates a breakdown in elite-mass cohesion and leads to a clash of opinions regarding language policy. Personal interviews with some of this elite including Bernard Poirier, the Director of Official Languages in New Brunswick, reveal that this bloc feels francophone representation on the whole is satisfactory, although problems remain at the central office and various regional offices. Consequently, the francophone elite reject any special employment programs for francophones while the mass demands more progressive actions.

Two other conflict resolving mechanisms not included in Lijphart's and Aunger's analysis which also contribute to the clash of francophone and anglophone opinions in New Brunswick are proportionality of services, (equitable services available in French and English), and the coverage of the issue by the English print media. Government services must be available to

both francophones and anglophones in the language of their choice. The failure of the political elite to ensure this particularly in the area of health has led to increased francophone demands which in turn has aggravated anglophones. Services of equitable quality in both languages is crucial and must be employed by the elite to maintain "bonne entente". In addition, due to the influential nature of the English print media they too play a role in English-French relations. Jean Guy Finn, Deputy Minister of Health, notes that as a child growing up in northern New Brunswick he never heard of or read about the English in the province. He read only French newspapers and watched French television. However, the expansion and development of telecommunications technology has heightened awareness of the existence of another linguistic community and increased contact between francophones and anglophones. (Personal interview with Jean Guy Finn, June 22, 1989) The political elite cannot control this factor (the media) as they do with depoliticizing the issue but the print media must become aware of their impact and give positive press coverage to the language policy issue thereby reducing the French-English clash of opinions. Indeed, the print media could play the role of education and conciliator of francophones and anglophones instead of the promoter of further linguistic disharmony.

The failure of the provincial political elite to apply all of Lijphart's and Aunger's conflict-resolving mechanisms has resulted in conflicting attitudes and opinions of francophones and anglophones but it is important to note the additional factors of proportionality of services and the influence of the English print media which also play a role in English/French relations. These latter two elements are important modifications. Still, Lijphart's and Aunger's mechanisms are vital to explaining the stability of New Brunswick.

In spite of linguistic and cultural cleavages, and the development of a split in the cohesion of mass-elite relations, the province remains an example of the success of consociationalism.

Yet in spite of this stability, clashes in opinions and attitudes between New Brunswick's anglophones and francophones continue to occur and the threat of this opposition evolving into a full-fledged conflict looms in the background. While political elite (and gradually business and intellectual elite) are receptive to compromise and concessions made to both linguistic communities, attitudes of the francophone and anglophone masses must be altered so that they too accept the equality of the French and English and the provisions made to each group. There is a feeling amongst the political elite of 1989 that a change in attitudes is the only way to overcome the undertow of linguistic conflict so that more and more people see the benefits of language policy and bilingualism. However, the question remains on just how to change these attitudes. There appears to be no easy or fast solution to the clash of opinions of francophones and anglophones. Furthermore, Jean-Guy Finn, Deputy Minister of Health, suggests that separate institutions and government departments for francophones and anglophones would be a method of solving inadequate access to services in one's own language and complaints of not being able to obtain civil service employment because of not being fluent in both French and English. Only those at the top levels of the department or institution, the elites, would have to be bilingual in order to avoid isolating each French and English department. The masses would be separated from each other in their own departments thereby removing constant contact and the potential for conflict. This idea is similar to the

Poirier-Bastarache report's recommendation of duality but there are problems with both the cost and feasibility of this proposal.

The ultimate goal of any New Brunswick government is, therefore, to gain the acceptance of provincial language policies and the idea of bilingualism by both the anglophone and francophone population. It is a lofty aim, in fact, almost inconceivable. However, the consequences of either the acceptance or rejection of language policy are so great that it is crucial that the political elite assume the leadership roles. New Brunswick has already made history by becoming Canada's first officially bilingual province and that sense of pioneerism is still present in the thinking of both the francophone and anglophone elites and some of the masses who feel that New Brunswick has and must continue to serve as a positive example of the co-existence of French and English. Provincial language policies, bilingualism and how these are received by New Brunswick's francophones and anglophones are indeed history in the making with New Brunswick playing the role of pioneers of language legislation and stable French-English relations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books, Scholarly Works

Aunger, Edmund A. In Search of Political Stability. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1984.

Beaudry, C.S.C., René, R.P. "Les rapports ethniques dans les provinces Maritimes". Ed Mason Wade. In Canadian Dualism. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960, 374-383.

Cannon, Gordon. "Consociationalism v Control: Canada as a Case Study". Western Political Quarterly XXXV:1, M 1982:50-64

Dugas, Marie-Claire. Tout ce que vous avez toujours voulu savoir sur les langues officielles. Moncton: Centre de recherche en linguistique appliquée de l'Université de Moncton, 1988.

Finn, Jean-Guy. "Language Planning in New Brunswick". 1986. (Unpublished paper)

Griffiths, N.E.S. The Acadian Deportation. Toronto: Copp Clark Publishing, 1969.

Grondin, Conde. Political Science 3722 Handout, University of New Brunswick, 1987.

Hannay, James. History of New Brunswick. 2 Vols. Saint John, New Brunswick: John Bowes Publishing, 1909.

Hatfield, Michael. "H.H. Pitts and Race and Religion in New Brunswick Politics". Acadiensis 4 (No.2), 1975, 46-65.

Holsti, Ole R. "Content Analysis". In The Handbook of Social Psychology Vol. II Second Edition. Ed. Gardner Lindzey and Elliott Aronson. Phillipines: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1968.

_____. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Phillipines: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

Johnson, Marc. Regard sur l'Anti-bilinguisme. Moncton: Privately printed, 1986.

- Joy, Richard. Languages in Conflict. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1967.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1973.
- Lijphart, Arend. The politics of accommodation: Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands. Berkeley, and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968.
- _____. "Consociational Democracy". Ed. K.D. McRae. In Consociational Democracy. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974, 70-90.
- Lustick, Ian. "Stability in Deeply Divided Societies: Consociationalism v Control". World Politics, 31 (1979), 325-344.
- MacNutt, W.S. New Brunswick A History: 1784-1867. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1963.
- Manheim, Jarol B. The Politics Within A Primer in Political Attitudes and Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc., 1975.
- McRae, K.D., "Consociationalism and the Canadian Political System". Ed. K.D. McRae. In Consociational Democracy. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974, 238-262.
- Nevitte, Neil. A Review of In Search of Political Stability: A Comparative Study of New Brunswick and Northern Ireland by Edmund Auger. In Canadian Journal of Political Science, Volume 15, 1982, 206-208.
- _____. Education Two Centuries of Progress 1784-1984, by Clarence Saykaly, Michael C. Optima Guide to Public Opinion Research Ottawa: Optima Research, July, 1985.
- Snow, Gérard. Les Droits Linguistiques des Acadiens du Nouveau-Brunswick. Etude réalisée pour le compte du conseil de la langue française du Québec, 1981.
- Stanley, Della. Louis Robichaud A Decade of Power. Halifax, N.S.: Nimbus Publishing Ltd., 1984.
- Stanley, G.T. "The Caraquet Riots of 1875". Acadiensis 2 (No.2), 1972, 21-38.
- Starr, Richard. Richard Hatfield The 17 Year Saga. Halifax, N.S.: Tormac Publishing, 1987.
- Thorburn, High. Politics of New Brunswick. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961.

Newspaper Articles

Arpin, Claude. "N.B. language row sparked by jobs fear". Montreal Gazette, 22 December, 1984, B6.

_____. "N.B. hearings on bilingualism begin calmly". Montreal Gazette, 12 March, 1985, B1.

_____. "Quebec no language model". Montreal Gazette, 14 March, 1985, B1.

_____. "Language plan would harm medical services". Montreal Gazette, 15 March, 1985, B1.

_____. "Language rights fight divides Acadians". Montreal Gazette, 16 March, 1985, B5.

_____. "N.B. group's quarrel saps anti-bilingualism fight". Montreal Gazette, 29 October, 1985, B5.

Bertrame, Julien, "Acadians still feel like second class citizens". Ottawa Citizen, 28 January, 1989, B16.

Calhoun, Sue. "Bilingualism in N.B.:Acadians still feel second class". The Globe and Mail, 16 May, 1985, 7.

Camp, Dalton. "Jobs are behind N.B. fracas". Montreal Gazette, 18 December, 1984, B3.

Canadian News Index. "N.B. Language hearings continue". The Financial Post, 30 March, 1985, 14.

Canadian Press Index. "New Brunswick better able to give French services". Montreal Gazette, 7 January, 1984, A8.

_____. "Pro-anglophone association formed in N.B.". The Globe and Mail, 21 April, 1984, 5.

_____. "N.B. francophones want a new social contract". Montreal Gazette, 1 June, 1984, B12.

_____. "Protection of francophones coming under attack in N.B.". The Globe and Mail, 25 June, 1984, 8.

- _____. "N.B. Tories are shaken by anger over French". The Globe and Mail, 13 December, 1984, 11.
- Carroll, John. "Moncton could become proving ground for Canadian biculturalism". The Globe and Mail, 1 March -2 March, 1972.
- Clark, Kathryn. "N.B. language hearings criticized as stalling tactic". The Globe and Mail, 19 September, 1984, 4.
- _____. "Quiet dignity replaces violence in first N.B. language hearings". The Globe and Mail, 15 March, 1985, 3.
- Harris, Michael. "N.B. language proposals kindle fear". The Globe and Mail, 19 December, 1984, 13.
- _____. "Language pot close to boil". The Globe and Mail, 21 December, 1984, 8.
- United Press Canada. "N.B. English rights group may form party". Montreal Gazette, 11 June, 1984, A7.
- Wood, Chris. "New plan could shatter N.B.'s uneasy language truce". Montreal Gazette, 21 November, 1984, B6.
- _____. "N.B. Language split widens after anglo leader [Horace Hanson] quits". Montreal Gazette, 7 December, 1984, B1.

Official Documents

- New Brunswick. Synoptic Report of the Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick, 28 March, 1968.
- _____. Report of the Royal Commission on Higher Education in New Brunswick, by John Deutsch, 1969.
- _____. Official Languages Act of New Brunswick, 1969.
- _____. Official Languages Act of New Brunswick, including revisions, 1975.
- _____. Report of the Task Force on Social Development, 1971.
- New Brunswick Department of Education. Education Tomorrow, by G.E. Malcolm MacLeod and A.A. Pinet, 1973.
- _____. The Government's Response to Education Tomorrow, by the Honorable J. Lorne McGuigan, Minister of Education, 1974.

_____. Report of the Committee on the Organization and Boundaries of School Districts in New Brunswick, by G. Forbes Elliott and Jean-Guy Finn, 1979.

_____. The Government's Response to the Elliott-Finn Report, by the Honorable Charles Gallagher, Minister of Education, 1980.

New Brunswick. Debates of the N.B. Legislative Assembly 3rd Session of the 149th Legislative Assembly, Volume XIV, 16 July, 1981, 6645.

_____. Bill 88, A Bill Recognizing the Equality of New Brunswick's Two Linguistic Communities, 1981.

_____. Official Languages Branch. Towards Equality of Official Languages in New Brunswick, by Bernard Poirier and Michel Bastarache, 1982.

New Brunswick Department of Education. Policy Statement on Immersion and the Core Program, 1983.
Cormier, 1984.

New Brunswick. Report of the Advisory Committee on Official Languages of New Brunswick, by Irene Grant-Guerette and Lloyd B. Smith, 1986.

New Brunswick Board of Management. Official Languages Policy, 1988.

New Brunswick Department of Education. Elementary and Secondary Education Statistics, 1989.

_____. 1987-88 Annual Report of the Department of Education, 1989.

New Brunswick Official Languages Branch. Linguistic Profile of the N.B. Civil Service, 1989.

Personal Interviews

Clavette, Gérald, Chairman of the New Brunswick Board of Management. Interview by author, 14 June, 1989.

Finn, Jean-Guy, Deputy Minister of the New Brunswick Department of Health. Interview by author, 22 June, 1989.

Hatfield, Richard. Former premier of New Brunswick. Interview by author, 10 May 1989.

Martin, Normand. Deputy Minister of Education(Francophone Services).
Interview by author, 17 May, 1989.

Poirier, Bernard. Chairman of the Official Languages Branch. Interview by
author, 27 June, 1989.

APPENDIXFREDERICTONBriefs presented/Mémoires présentées - 37

School District No. 26	Public	001E
Association des Conseillers scolaires francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick	Public	002F
University of New Brunswick	Public	003E
Cercle 51 de l'AEFNB	Public	004F
AEFNB	Public	005F
Harold Phalen	Private	006E
Cameron N. King	Private	007E
The Provincial Loyal Orange Association of New Brunswick	Public	008E
Cynthia Urquhart	Private	009E
Conseil scolaire no 51	Public	010F
Gerry Hill	Private	011E
SANB	Public	012F
François Volpé	Private	013F
The New Brunswick Nurses' Union	Public	014B
S.B. Benton	Private	015E
Club Richelieu de Fredericton	Public	016F
IODE	Public	017E
SANB Fredericton	Public	018F
City of Fredericton	Public	019E

FREDERICTON - Briefs/Mémoires

Town of Oromocto	Public	020E
The New Brunswick Association of English Speaking Canadians (Chaley)	Public	021E
William Taylor	Private	022E
D.G.O. Kingston	Private	023E
Dr. Everett Chalmers Hospital	Public	024E
Keswick Ridge Women's Institute	Public	025E
The New Brunswick Hospital Association	Public	026B
D. & P. Ruthven	Private	027E
Lloyd Nickerson	Private	028E
Phillip Foreman	Private	029E
Harold Wilkins	Private	030E
Le Cercle français de Fredericton	Public	031F
Ronald L. Steeves	Private	032E
Lucide Rioux	Private	033E
Doreen Fraser	Private	034E
Keith D. Phinney	Private	035E
Fredericton Chamber of Commerce	Public	036E
Glenna M. Fraser	Private	037E

EDMUNDSTONBriefs presented/Mémoires présentées - 16

L'Association du Barreau du Madawaska	Public	100F
Maurice F. Bourque	Private	101F
L'Association sportive du Nord-Quest du N.B.	Public	102F
Centre Universitaire Saint-Louis-Maillet (Arts et Lettres)	Public	103F
Association des Professeurs et des bibliothécaires du Centre Universitaire Saint-Louis-Maillet	Public	104F to 107F
La Ville d'Edmundston	Public	108B
Le Cercle 33 de l'AEFNB	Public	109F
Jean-Paul L'Italien	Private	110F
Association des Accidentés de Travail du Nord-Quest	Public	111F
Le Conseil du Travail District d'Edmundston	Public	112F
Les Associations Progressistes-Conservatrices du Comté de Madawaska	Public	113F
La Société Louis-Napoléon-Dugal	Public	114F
Le Comité pour un institut francophone de formation agricole	Public	115F
Fédération des Associations Foyers-Ecole du N.-B.	Public	116F
Association générale des Etudiants, Centre universitaire St.-Louis-Maillet	Public	117F
La Chambre de Commerce de Saint-François	Public	118F

GRAND FALLS/GRAND SAULTBriefs presented/Mémoires présentées - 18

John Vallillée	Private	151F
Philip Grondin	Private	152F
Jean-Paul LaForge	Private	153F
Lois Jensen	Private	154E
Comité des parents de Notre-Dame-des-Lourdes	Public	155F
Nelson G. Lynch	Private	156F
District scolaire No 32	Public	157F
Donald Fraser Memorial School	Public	158E
District 31 Education Committee	Public	159E
Association des Directions d'Ecole du District Scolaire No 32	Public	160F
Claude Michaud	Private	161F
Board of School Trustees No. 50	Public	162E
Association of Parents for Fairness in Education- Grand Falls District 50 Branch	Public	163E
La Société de la Grande-Rivière (SANB)	Public	164F
Le Cercle 32 de L'AEFNB	Public	165F
Patricia Cyr	Private	166F
Gérald Clavette	Private	167F
Robert Thériault	Private	168F

WOODSTOCKBriefs presented/Mémoires présentées - 6

Town of Woodstock	Public	201E
Village of Perth-Andover	Public	202E
Town of Nackawic	Public	203E
McCain Foods Ltd.	Public	204E
Upper Saint John River Valley Chapter of English Speaking Canadians	Public	205E
York-North Progressive Conservative Association	Public	206E

SAINT JOHNBriefs Presented/Mémoires présentés - 41

Saint John Board of Trade	Public	251E
Nancy Clark Teed, MLA Saint John South	Private	252E
NBTel	Public	253B
Saint John Construction Association	Public	254E
Canadian Parents for French	Public	255E
Francis L.G. Brown	Private	256E
Gary Tiner	Private	257E
Mary T. Lydon & Kathleen M. Northrup	Private	258E
School District No. 20	Private	259E
John Arbow	Private	260E
Dr. Sarath Punna	Private	261E
United Empire Loyalist Association	Public	262E
Loyal Orange Lodge	Public	263E
The Rev. Mr. E. Lloyd Lake	Private	264E
----Not presented		265
Albert Comeau	Private	266F
Conseil de Saint-John de la SANB	Public	267F
Conseil Scolaire No 52	Public	268F
Cercles 19,20, & 52 de l'AEFNB	Public	269F
City of Saint John	Public	270E

SAINT JOHN - Briefs presented/Mémoires présentés

Village of St. Martins	Public	271E
Blaine M. Higgs	Private	272E
Dr. George Bate	Private	273E
Saint John Firefighters	Public	274E
Elouise Caulfield	Private	275E
George F. Teed	Private	276E
Dorothy W. Brown	Private	277E
David S. McCurdy	Private	278E
Elaine Moyer	Private	279E
Malcolm Vail	Private	280E
Monica Mooney	Private	281E
Judith MacPherson	Private	282E
T.A. Robson	Private	283E
Jim Gilliland	Private	284E
Saint John Labour Council	Public	285E
Michael Wilson	Private	286E
George Avery	Private	287E
-----Not presented		288
Dolores Cook	Private	289E
Usha Tewari	Private	290E
School Districts	Public	291E

ST. ANDREWSBriefs Presented/Mémoires présentées - 19

St. Andrews-by-the-Sea	Public	351E
Town of St. Stephen	Public	352E
Village of McAdam	Public	353E
The Charlotte County Hospital	Public	355E
St. Andrews Chamber of Commerce Inc.	Public	356E
St. Stephen-Milltown Chamber of Commerce	Public	357E
Town of St. George	Public	358E
Brian F. Tatton	Private	359E
Don Olmstead	Private	360E
H.A. DeWolfe	Private	361E
Charlotte West Liberal Association	Public	362E
St. Stephen Presbytery of the United Church	Public	363E
J.C. Dunfield	Private	364E
Frances A. Moffatt	Private	365E
A. Laurence Young	Private	366E
Canadian Union of Public Employees, Local 1253	Public	367E
Judith M. Wilson	Private	368E
New Brunswick Firearms Association	Public	369E

SUSSEXBriefs presented/Mémoires présentées - 17

Town of Sussex	Public	401E
Hazen Myers, MLA	Private	402E
School District No. 18	Public	403E
NB Nurses Association-Saint John Chapter	Public	404E
J. Allison Elliot	Private	405E
Lorne Matheson	Private	406E
Ben MacCauley	Private	407E
Kingston Poll Committee	Public	408E
Association of Villages of Kings & Queens	Public	409E
Frank Wuhr	Private	410E
Village of Norton	Public	411E
NB Association of English Speaking Canadians, Sussex Chapter	Public	412E
Sussex and District Chamber of Commerce	Public	413E
Wilson Gilmore	Private	414E
Canada Party	Public	415E
Eldon Buchanan	Private	416E
Peter Powning	Private	417E

CAMPBELLTONBriefs presented/Mémoires présentées - 19

Cité de Campbellton/City of Campbellton	Public	451B
Le Cercle des Dames d'Acadie de Dalhousie	Public	452F
Hôpital régional Campbellton Regional Hospital	Public	453B
Les Dames d'Acadie de Campbellton	Public	454F
Emery LeBlanc	Private	455F
Le Cercle 37 de l'AEFNB	Public	456F
La Federation des Dames d'Acadie	Public	457F
School District No. 38	Public	458E
Denis LeBlanc	Private	459F
School District No. 36	Public	460E
L'Association des Accidentés de Restigouche	Public	461F
La Société Culturelle de la Baie des Chaleurs	Public	462F
Conseil scolaire No 35	Public	463F
Conseil scolaire No 37	Public	464F
Les Filles de Marie de l'Assomption	Public	465F
Municipalité de Kedgwick	Public	466F, Video
Conseil J-Arthur Melanson de la SANB	Public	467F, Video
SANB Petite Rochelle	Public	468F, Video
Société Culturelle de Restigouche Ouest	Public	469F, Video

BATHURST

Briefs presented/Mémoires présentées - 11

Fédération des Agriculteurs du NB	Public	501F
La Commission scolaire Jérôme Boudreau	Public	502F
Board of School Trustees No. 42	Public	503E
Guy Clavette	Private	504F
City of Bathurst/Ville de Bathurst	Public	505B
La Société des Jeux d'Acadie	Public	506F
La Ville de Beresford	Public	507F
Village de Petit-Rocher	Public	508F
Gilles Halley	Private	509F
Paul Duval	Private	510E
Les Dames d'Acadie de Bathurst Inc.	Public	511F

CHATHAM/NEWCASTLEBriefs presented/Mémoires présentées - 16

Town of Chatham	Public	551E
Town of Newcastle	Public	552E
Dan LaBerge	Private	553E
NB Library Trustees Association	Public	554E
Le Cercle Français de la Miramichi Inc.	Public	555F
Conseil scolaire No 53	Public	556F
Le Cercle 53 de l'AEFNB	Public	557F
Village of Nelson-Miramichi	Public	558E
Donald Leslie	Private	559E
School District No. 8	Public	560E
Le Conseil conjoint des communautés francophones de Northumberland	Public	561F
Jocelyne Durelle	Private	562F
Giselle Kerr	Private	563F
School District No. 10	Public	564E
New Brunswick Association of English-Speaking Canadians-Miramichi Chapter	Public	565E
A.J. LaBerge	Private	566E

SHIPPAGANBriefs presented/Mémoires présentées - 37

Ville de Shippagan	Public	601F
L'honorable Jean Gauvin, MAL	Private	602B
Association des professeurs du Centre Universitaire de Shippagan	Public	603F
AEFNB du district scolaire no 5	Public	604F
L'Union Acadienne pour la culture populaire Inc.	Public	605F
Le Club Richelieu de Caraquet	Public	606F
Le Cercle des Dames d'Acadie de Shippagan	Public	607F
Hôpital l'Enfant Jésus Inc.	Public	608F
Le Club de l'Age d'Or de Shippagan	Public	610F
Le Mouvement Coopératif Acadien	Public	611F
Ville de Tracadie	Public	612F
Le Cercle des Dames d'Acadie de Lamèque	Public	613F
Ville de Caraquet	Public	614F
Louise Blanchard	Private	615F
La Chambre de Commerce de Caraquet	Public	616F
Conseil régional de la Société des Acadiens de Caraquet	Public	617F
Le Cercle des Dames d'Acadie de Tracadie	Public	618F
Conseil régional "François-de-Bellefeuille" SANB de Tracadie	Public	618F
Linda Haché	Private	620F
Association des pêcheurs professionnels acadiens	Public	621F
<u>SHIPPAGAN - Briefs/Mémoires</u>		
Jean Hébert	Private	622B

Village de Bas-Caraquet	Public	623F
Pierre Arsenault & Hilarion Melanson	Private	624F
La Coopérative de logement et production culturelle Ltée	Public	625F
Louis B. Godin	Private	626F
Arthur-William Landry	Private	627B
Ville de Lamèque/Town of Lamèque	Public	628B
Alyre A. Morais	Private	629F
Le Cercle des Dames d'Acadie de Caraquet	Public	630F
Le chapitre des infirmiers et infirmières de la Péninsule Acadienne	Public	631F
AEFNB du district no 6	Public	632F
Société Dentaire de la Côte Nord	Public	633F
Le Voilier/Le Point et Week-end	Public	634F
Village de Sheila	Public	635F
Le Cercle No 7 AEFNB	Public	636F
L'Association Progressiste-Conservatrice de la Circonscription de Caraquet	Public	637F

BOUCTOUCHEBriefs Presented/Mémoires présentées - 16

Village de Bouctouche	Public	701F
La Classe de Droit 12-2 de l'Ecole Polyvalente Clément-Cormier	Public	702F
Village de Cap-Pelé	Public	703F
Alonzo LeBlanc	Private	704F
Le Cercle 12 de l'AEFNB	Public	705F
District scolaire no 39	Public	706F
La Conseil scolaire no 13	Public	707F
Me Bernard Richard	Private	708F
Fernand Arsenault	Private	709B
Le Cercle 13M de l'AEFNB	Public	710F
District scolaire no 12	Public	711F
Société Nationale des Acadiens	Public	712F
Société Acadie en Forme	Public	713F
Henri-Eugène Duguay	Private	714F
Ville de Shédiac/Town of Shediac	Public	715F
Le Cercle 39 de l'AEFNB	Public	716F

MONCTONBriefs Presented/Mémoires présentées - 60

City of Moncton/La Cité de Moncton	Public	801B
Maurice A. Léger	Private	802E
Faculté des Arts de l'Université de Moncton	Public	803F
Moncton District Council of Home and School Associations	Public	804E
Assomption Compagnie Mutuelle d'Assurance-Vie	Public	805B
Greater Moncton Chamber of Commerce/Chambre du Commerce du Grand Moncton	Public	806B
Rosella Melanson	Private	807F
Gérard Etienne	Private	808F
Conseil de Promotion et de Diffusion de la Culture	Public	809F
Les Dames d'Acadie de Moncton	Public	810F
The Riverview War Veterans and Ex-Servicemens Association	Public	811E
Village of Petitcodiac	Public	812E
Maritime Conference English/French Relations of the United Church of Canada	Public	813E
New Brunswick Women's Institute	Public	814E
ADDTLUM	Public	815F
Egalité	Public	816F
New Brunswick Federation of Labour/La Fédération des travailleurs du Nouveau-Brunswick	Public	817B
Town of Sackville	Public	818E
<u>MONCTON - Briefs/Mémoires</u>		

Canadian Parents for French-New Brunswick Branch	Public	819E
Gilles Thériault	Private	820F
SANB conseil Petitcodiac	Public	821F
Board of School Trustees No 15	Public	822E
Moncton North Progressive Conservative Association	Public	823E
APENB	Public	824B
Marc Johnson, U de Moncton	Private	825F
Conseil de travail de Moncton et Région	Public	826F
Suzanne Poussart	Private	827F
Dr. Susan Purdy	Private	828E
Dr. Eldon Hay	Private	829E
New Brunswick Association of English-Speaking Canadians	Public	830E
Marion V. Corey	Private	831E
Eileen Higgins	Private	832E
New Brunswick Association of English-Speaking Canadians-Shediac Cape Chapter	Public	833E
New Brunswick Teachers Association	Public	834E
Debbie Bulmer, Sue Bowser, et al	Private	835E
Faculté des Sciences Sociales	Public	836F
NB Association of Registered Nurses	Public	837B
Syndicat Canadien de la fonction publique-Local 821 <u>MONCTON - Briefs/Mémoires</u>	Public	838F
Claire LeBlanc	Private	839F

New Brunswick Chamber of Commerce	Public	840B
Léon Thériault	Private	841F
Réjean Picard	Private	842F
Certified General Accountants Association of New Brunswick	Public	843B
NB Federation of Home and School Associations (English Section)	Public	844F
Florence R. Crandall	Private	845E
Néré St-Amand	Private	846F
Conseil de Chevaliers de Colomb du Christ-Roi No 7952	Public	847F
Les Dames d'Acadie de Dieppe	Public	848F
La Faculté des sciences de l'éducation	Public	849 F
Conseil des Médecins et Dentistes de l'Hôpital Dr. G-L Dumont	Public	850F
S.R. Jones	Private	851E
Margaret LeGood	Private	852E
Centre d'Etudes Acadiennes	Public	853F
Ecole de droit, Université de Moncton	Public	854F
Michael Ferguson	Private	855E
Projet Solidarité Internationale-Education Permanante-Université de Moncton	Public	856F

MONCTON - Briefs/Mémoires

Activités Jeunesse	Public	857F
York Sunbury Barristers' Society	Public	858E
Roger Doiron	Private	859F
Willard Esty	Private	860E

END

1 5 0 4 9 1

FIN