

## **Survival - New Views on Francophone Minorities in Canada**

Martin Spigelman

Volume 7, numéro 2, spring 1978

URI : [https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/acad7\\_2rv04](https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/acad7_2rv04)

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

### Éditeur(s)

The Department of History of the University of New Brunswick

### ISSN

0044-5851 (imprimé)

1712-7432 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

### Citer ce compte rendu

Spigelman, M. (1978). Compte rendu de [Survival - New Views on Francophone Minorities in Canada]. *Acadiensis*, 7(2), 141–150.

*Lamp*. Raddall won Governor General's Awards on three occasions, twice for non-fiction (for the two books of history just mentioned) and once for fiction. Other honours came his way, among them the offer of official eminence in his home Province.

The arduous development of the man as writer, the negotiations with editors and publishers, the eventual awards, the fulfilled career — all this will no doubt be of use to those future students Raddall had in mind. However, these apparently crucial pieces of information constitute what is predictable in the memoir. What is distinctive, what makes this autobiography engrossing, is that it shows us how active, how crowded, how protean one man's life can be. Thomas Raddall wrote books that are a contribution to the culture of Canada. But he was also an expert marine telegrapher; he knew storms at sea between Cape Race and Ireland; he fought with his fists on Sable Island, and lost his virginity at a Queen's County corn boil; he could handle a canoe or build a fire in the rain, learned the art of calling moose, and commanded men in time of war. The story of his own life is as captivating as any in his fiction.

ROBERT COCKBURN

### Survival — New Views on Francophone Minorities in Canada

In the late 1960s, René Levesque shocked Canadians by repudiating Quebec's supposed responsibility for the cultural welfare of the francophone minorities in the other provinces. While Levesque's disinterest was in keeping with Quebec's historic position, he was one of the first to argue openly that it was not worth sacrificing Quebec's quest for independence for the sake of an ideal which envisioned a country built upon absolute equality between its two founding peoples and which foresaw the cultural survival of these scattered groups. Levesque wrote that "this slow moving idealism enters the race like a utopian tortoise trudging along after the hare of galloping assimilation. But unlike the hare in the fable, this one is already winning . . ."<sup>1</sup> Anguished cries from Quebec's cultural hinterlands were immediately heard. Acadians in New Brunswick, Franco-Ontarians, French Canadians in western Canada all provided concrete evidence to repudiate Levesque. Their spokesmen, as well as those from Canada's academic communities, all protested that groups which had already survived countless vicissitudes would not now be overwhelmed by assimilative pressures. Articles in Mason Wade's *Cana-*

1 René Levesque, *An Option For Quebec* (Toronto, 1968), p. 84.

*dian Dualism* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1963) and C. F. MacRae's *French Canada Today* (Sackville, Mount Allison Summer Institute, 1961) provided forceful arguments in this vein.

Just as Levesque has won in Quebec, so his arguments, buttressed by overwhelming statistical evidence, seem to have won over Canada's academics. During the past few years, a number of valuable studies of francophone minority groups have been published. Though the specifics of each differ, essentially they are examining the same question — is survival possible? Setting the pessimistic tone that marks many of the studies produced recently is Richard Joy's *Languages in Conflict* (Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 1972). The pessimism this book exudes is somewhat remarkable as it was originally written and published, by the author himself, in 1967, a year when Canadians were confident and even the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism promised new solutions to old problems. One is tempted to speculate that Joy could not find a publisher because his conclusions contradicted the buoyant optimism evident in the country, although it is also possible that the publishers ignored him because he was an engineer rather than an academic.

Engineers are precise people and the author is certainly that. He does not claim to be discussing a group's emotional attachment to their language or religion. Cultural consciousness, group identification cannot be accurately measured and Joy does not claim to do so. Rather he shows in disturbingly explicit terms just how poorly the francophone minorities are faring. Using a wealth of data culled from the 1961 census, Joy argues that minority francophone groups are headed toward extinction. Joy reveals that in the Maritimes, outside of northern N.B., only 56% of those of French origin were still *able* to speak French; in western Canada 83%; in southern Ontario 82%. Only in northern N.B. (101%) as well as in northern and eastern Ontario (98%) are the statistics any more encouraging. In these areas, however, francophones constitute a very large proportion or a majority of the population. They have survived because they are the dominant groups at least in numerical if not in economic terms.

Because people are able to speak French does not mean that they do and many of Joy's charts indicate that indeed they do not! That is especially true for the young even in those areas contiguous to Quebec. "The trend that stands out, above all others, is that each generation moves closer to complete assimilation, as the forces of the [social and economic] environment gradually exert their influence" (p. 38). Only in Quebec itself does the French language, buttressed by legislation and by the increasing rate of emigration among the anglophone community, remain strong. The proportion of unilingual francophones in Quebec is, in fact, growing, leading to Joy's thesis that Canada is destined to become a state encompassing two unilingual *nations*, separated by a thin bilingual belt running from Sault Ste-Marie to

Moncton. Considering both emigration from these economically under-privileged regions and assimilation in places like Moncton, one must wonder whether even this belt will continue to reflect the Canadian dream of a country based upon duality. *Languages in Conflict* is disturbing but convincing.

Almost ten years after Joy, Thomas R. Maxwell picks up the thesis in *The Invisible French, The French in Metropolitan Toronto* (Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1977). Professor Maxwell has relied upon "over three hundred interviews" (p. 12) which supposedly represent the feelings of Toronto's 90,000 residents of French origin (1971). These interviews were all conducted in English, as only two of the ten interviewers (all graduates or graduate students in sociology) were fluent in French. That fact had to colour the responses given, for the French in Toronto do appreciate that they constitute only a small minority and might not have been willing to give answers offensive to the majority. Another problem with the process was that the interviews were conducted during working hours which meant that women and older, retired persons were over-represented. Since traditionally these two groups are more concerned with culture than the young and the working male, one must have some reservations about Maxwell's conclusions. The author has not explained his sampling methods in sufficient detail and seemingly has not compensated for their inaccuracies. Another disturbing feature involves certain contradictions and inconsistencies, most evident in Maxwell's treatment of the Acadian subgroup in Toronto, almost 19% of the total. Most often Maxwell conveys the common Toronto stereotype about Acadians being lower-class, on welfare, "slow to learn and harder to handle than other children", under-educated, and responsible for giving "the school a poor reputation as an educational institution" (p. 85). Yet elsewhere (p. 67) his evidence shows that in terms of family income, the Acadians as a group rank just slightly behind the Québécois and well ahead of Franco-Ontarians in Toronto.

The author makes one appreciate that the French minority in Toronto is composed of very different subgroups; he fails however to clarify just what the differences are. The Québécois, who constitute the best-educated and wealthiest subgroup, have little interest in the various existing parish and voluntary associations and hence fail to provide the necessary leadership for the other subgroups. The Québécois perceive such associations as serving immigrants, the European French, the Italians or the Portuguese, and French Canadians do not consider themselves immigrants even in Toronto. The associations' purpose is to facilitate integration into the dominant society. Acadians, Franco-Ontarians, the European French seem to welcome integration; the Québécois do not. Moreover, since it is the middle class and professionals who support these organizations, they have little appeal to the bulk of francophones who are working class. *L'Alliance Française*, according

even to its president, "tends to be rather intellectual, and a bit snobbish" (p. 117). Ethnic identification and unity, both so important for cultural survival, give way in Toronto to divisions based upon place of birth and class. The parish of Sacré-Coeur, traditionally the clerical heart of the French community, "is too slummy" (p. 73) for many middle-class respondents. Indeed the Catholic church has lost its historical role as the preserver of both faith and culture. In the Toronto case, it is clear that religious identification with the church takes precedence over ethnic identification. Even francophone priests, especially those native to Ontario, now differentiate between the two and emphasize faith rather than language.

The basic problem, and one which Maxwell acknowledges, is that the francophones of Toronto have little desire to remain what their parents were. The ethnic cohesion, so easily preserved in regions of francophone numerical superiority, is lacking in Toronto. The francophone clubs, the French-language schools, the French-language church and parish, all crucial for survival, are weak because few care for them. Most of the city's French came to Toronto for economic reasons and are quite willing to accept the anglicization necessary for material gain. Maxwell correctly believes that "institutional completeness" is essential for group survival. In Toronto, such completeness is almost totally lacking and there is little social participation within ethnic boundaries. The government of Ontario may make French an official language, French-language radio and television may spread, new French cinema may open, an increased number of French-language schools may be established. But given the residential dispersion, the pervasive influence of English, the overwhelming preoccupation with class, the animosities between subgroups (there is even a group of French speaking sephardic Jews under the umbrella provided by *La Maison Française de Toronto*), the "Invisible French" may soon become extinct. Professor Maxwell refrains however from actually drawing this conclusion, possibly because so much has transpired since the mid-1960s when he conducted his research. Moreover, Maxwell assumes that a French "community" should exist in Toronto, although because of the very distinct backgrounds and cultures of the various subgroups there is simply no reason why it should. The French community in Toronto is not an entity, but rather a collection of individuals and groups. Perhaps because there is no cohesive community to threaten the anglophone majority, Toronto appears to be a hospitable milieu for the minority. Evidently there is no overt discrimination and the city's francophones, whether as individuals or as groups, have consequently been lulled into a state of not defending their particular cultures.

In an earlier era, when "racial" animosities were more intense and both Toronto and Ontario were less a mosaic, French Canadians were more defensive and instinctively understood the importance of "institutional completeness". French Canadians had to remain apart and had to have the means

of living apart if they were to survive. This is the subject of another relatively new study of Franco-Ontarians, Robert Choquette's *Language and Religion, A History of French-English Conflict in Ontario* (Ottawa, University of Ottawa Press, 1975). The title is very much an overstatement; this is a study of one aspect of that conflict. Focusing upon the university, the episcopal succession and the bilingual schools questions, Professor Choquette details the intense French-Irish Catholic conflict in Ontario through the first three decades of this century. While he maintains that English-Canadian nativism is not his subject, he does make some rather dubious and superficial comments about that Anglo-Protestant majority. He emphasizes that Ontario's Protestants were much more amenable to compromise than was the Irish Catholic faction in the province. The Protestants were worried not by French-Canadian "aggression" but by the supposed inefficiency of the bilingual schools. To them, Ontario was an English province and it seemed only reasonable that even the French-Canadians learn that language. When this was proven to be possible by reforming the existing system, Regulation XVII could quietly be adjusted.

The Irish-Catholics were after something else, not efficiency as some claimed, but supremacy within the church hierarchy. The French Canadians, whether in Manitoba, Ontario or New Brunswick, felt that the Catholic church had to be as much a "national" as a universal institution. The church and its clerics had a responsibility to defend the nationality of its adherents. The Irish hypocritically said no; Canada was an "English country" and the church had to be English if it, its schools and its appeal to Protestants were to survive. Professor Choquette clearly exposes the irony evident in the Irish position. Claiming to defend the church, they were destroying it by publicizing its internal divisions and by exposing it to general ridicule. Irish and French Canadian prelates and activists were anything but charitable or even Christian during this conflict. *Canadien* parishioners publicly protested their bishop's bigotry while a priest sued that same bishop in the civil courts; parishioners in one area seized the rectory and expelled their priest, only to be themselves brutally expelled by the police and soldiers acting for the bishop. One of Choquette's main purposes is to show that both the French-Canadian and the Irish-Catholic leaders were equally racist, defensive, and militant. They "fought so bitterly because they were so much alike" (p. 257). If there was a villain, it was clearly Bishop Michael Fallon, whom Choquette views as insecure, devious, racist and unethical, possessing "all the makings of a dictator" (p. 227).

Considering what Choquette writes about Fallon and part of the church in Ontario, it is rather surprising that this book was ever written. While Episcopal Archivists are notoriously reticent about letting their darkest secrets see the light of day, the author apparently had unrestricted access. Consequently the book's greatest strength lies in its ability to confirm what

previously had been only suspected. One of its weaknesses, however, is that Professor Choquette is overwhelmed by a wealth of material and the reader is often lost in a maze of detail which is intelligible only to those very familiar with all the issues. While the book is interesting and useful, it is unfortunate that the author was in a rush to publish his truly dramatic material. The work's clarity and themes could have been sharpened; the conclusion could have been less contradictory and superficial; the annoying number of factual and spelling errors could have been corrected; other people's interpretations of the same issues could have been more fully considered.

One problem in both Maxwell and Choquette's books is that the authors have failed to place their studies into any sort of broader Canadian context. For example, by the time Fallon was appointed (1909) to the see in London, the New Brunswick Acadians had just about resolved their own bitter conflict with the local Irish establishment. The issues of bilingual schools and colleges, of ethnic survival, of institutional completeness all had their day in the Maritimes long before the rest of Canada became cognizant of the problems. However, few authors have presented the instructive and illuminating Acadian situation to Canadian audiences. The Acadians have been the subject of many monographs but most of these have concentrated on "Le Grand Dérangement" and have been characterized by polemics, panegyrics and romanticism rather than historical objectivity and analysis.

Fortunately, recent writers have finally taken the advice of Pascal Poirier, one of the earliest and most important Acadian leaders: "Nous n'avons rien à gagner à fausser l'histoire, et l'exagération qui rend notre cause plus belle, l'affaiblit".<sup>2</sup> Even if the purpose of history is to foster national pride, the Acadians do not need distortions. This is more than evident when one reads Naomi Griffiths' *The Acadians: Creation of a People* (Toronto, McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1973). Its most serious defect is its length. Writing for the Frontenac Library series, Professor Griffiths had less than one hundred pages in which to cover over three centuries of the Acadian experience. By devoting most of her attention to the pre-deportation period, she does an admirable job though one should complement this book with her excellent article in *Acadiensis*.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, one must regret that only five pages, replete with photographs, were given to "Acadian Nationalism", only 13 pages to the century before confederation, and only two pages to a much needed bibliographical note. The author's basic theme, that the Acadians constituted a distinct nation as early as the seventeenth century, is not new. However, Griffiths has gone further than others in explaining this nation and docu-

2 Pascal Poirier to Valentin Landry, 28 décembre 1901, Poirier Collection, 6.1-7, Centre d'études acadiennes, Université de Moncton.

3 N. E. S. Griffiths, "Acadians in Exile", *Acadiensis*, IV (Autumn, 1974), pp. 67-84.

menting its existence. The Acadians came from all regions of France, from Scotland, Ireland, England and even Portugal. Once settled, this admixture of peoples was moulded into a distinct and cohesive North American nation by circumstances, by the environment and certainly by adversity. Contrary to what others have claimed, the deportation did not create the nation; rather the Acadians survived this cataclysm because they were a nation. Afterward, they were as uncomfortable in France as in England. No romanticism, no tale of Evangeline, no fictional stories about long marches home are needed for this history to serve as a source of pride for later generations.

In the context of this review, Griffiths' book is interesting because of what was responsible for Acadian survival. Isolation, both before and after 1755, was the key factor just as it is presently for the Franco-Ontarians studied by Maxwell. The mixing of a clearly dominant culture with a weaker one cannot take place without serious losses for the latter. Outside pressures and discrimination maintained Acadian cohesiveness just as the lack of overt discrimination is contributing to the assimilation of the French in metropolitan Toronto. Effective leadership and responsive social and economic organizations have aided the Acadian struggle; the absence of these has had serious consequences in Toronto. A sense of having been unjustly treated combined with a sense of both moral superiority and messianic duty animated the Acadians as much as Robert Choquette's Franco-Ontarians.

Since the second World War, these factors have weakened in Acadian society, a process ably examined by Marc-Adelard Tremblay in two articles reprinted in his *Communities and Culture in French Canada* (Toronto, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973). Outside of northern New Brunswick, industrialization, technological change and economic recession are ravaging traditional Acadian society. Because Acadian communities are no longer self-sufficient, there has been a massive outflow of people, a break-up of the crucially important family unit, and an influx of ideologies incompatible with traditional life. Considerations of class are destroying once homogeneous communities. Clerics, traditionally important in Acadian society, no longer possess great moral authority. Traditional values remain but are incapable of competing with demands imposed by economic realities. Tremblay offers four suggestions which could aid Acadian survival — economic development, a higher level of education, the democratization of elites, and the "arrangement of social space" (p. 73). Should these not be attainable, then one may take Griffiths' traditional society, apply Tremblay's analysis and extrapolate to Richard Joy's dismal conclusions. Those Acadians outside of the bilingual belt, like the French Canadians outside of northern and eastern Ontario, will disappear leaving two unilingual nations within the Canadian state.

Tremblay, Maxwell, Choquette and even Joy to a lesser extent, all stress the importance of an effective elite in their respective societies. Two new biographies examine specific individuals who, along with Pascal Poirier, were



part of the Acadian elite and as such were instrumental in reawakening Acadian consciousness in the late nineteenth century. The first biography, by Rev. Camille-Antonio Doucet, is *Une Etoile s'est levée en Acadie — Marcel-François Richard* (Rogersville, the author, 1973). Mgr. Richard was an incredibly energetic and zealous colonizer, priest, merchant, educator and Acadian nationalist with one goal in life — the creation of a self-sufficient, Catholic and French patrie. It would have its own business enterprises, its own Acadian schools and colleges, its own localized and nationalized church. Richard would and indeed did confront anyone, including his bishop, who hampered his endeavours. Father Doucet clearly admires his subject even though for obvious reasons he is reticent to make judgements about Bishop Rogers and the whole Irish-Acadian confrontation. Doucet is content to let his ample documentation tell the story and the result is most satisfying. Richard was a likeable, straightforward and admirable individual; writing his biography was, at least in that regard, an easy task.

More difficult was Della M. M. Stanley's biographical task in *Pierre-Amand Landry* (Moncton, Editions d'Acadie, 1977). Landry, like Richard, certainly deserves a public resurrection because of his many accomplishments. His list of personal achievements, dating from the 1870s until the first World War, include being one of the earliest Acadian M.L.A.'s and M.P.'s as well as the first Acadian lawyer, cabinet minister, judge, Supreme Court Justice and Chief Justice of New Brunswick. In his last years some suggested that he be made Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick; this honour eluded him, though possibly as compensation, he was knighted. As Ms. Stanley indicates, the honours awarded him flattered the entire Acadian nation.

Unlike Richard, however, Landry was not consumed by just one objective, an objective which did not necessarily include himself. Ms. Stanley admires Landry as a biographer must. She stresses his service not only to the Acadians but also to all New Brunswickers. She compares him to Henri Bourassa in their shared concept of a binational Canada based upon linguistic and religious equality. Her portrait of Landry places him well above the intellectual and ethical level of most Maritime politicians in this period. Nonetheless, this reader has some reservations about the author's infatuation with Landry. To her credit, Stanley does draw attention to the seamier side of N.B. politics but at the same time she glosses over Landry's part in them. Landry was a politician and politics in N.B., as A. J. Doyle has documented in *Front Benches and Back Rooms* (Toronto, Green Tree Publishing, 1976), was a rather sordid affair. Landry, as Minister of Public Works, used patronage as effectively as anyone — in the late 1870s, his constituency received almost \$8,000 for bridges while Northumberland, represented by an opponent, received all of \$800. Federally Landry ran in Kent County rather than in his own area, not because he wished to do battle with George McInerney but because Kent had an Acadian majority. Landry may have sought, as Stanley

suggests, “un esprit véritablement canadien” (p. 241) which ignored racial and religious differences, but he was astute enough to know that politics did not operate on that level. On many occasions he wrote to Tilley, Langevin or even Macdonald soliciting posts for his supporters on the basis of their ethnic background. Just as often, he wrote soliciting a position for himself.

While not wishing to be unfairly critical of what is a good biography, this reader wonders whether Ms. Stanley was sufficiently sceptical when approaching her sources and assessing her subject. Some generalizations about his role in that particular society are necessary and a beneficial starting point would have been the consideration raised by Seymour Leventman:

The minority leader must be acceptable to his own people, but his position depends ultimately on his acceptance by the majority . . . . In his tenuous position he must pacify both groups. He must integrate their conflicting demands, those of the minority group requiring commitment to its most cherished values, including claims for social equality, and those of the majority group requiring acceptance of its values, including maintenance of its dominant position. The minority leader must negotiate between “selling out” his own people by overcompromising their demands and threatening the power of the majority by overdemanding social equality. Although his position rests on “two centres of gravity”, it is the majority group whose judgment of his acceptability ultimately matters.<sup>4</sup>

For a nationalist leader, Landry seems to have paid an inordinate amount of attention to the majority. He wrote to other politicians, and even Langevin, in English; he often spoke English even to Acadian audiences; he was a fierce partisan who, in spite of his constituency, supported successive Conservative governments on the Riel question, on the imperial question and even on the conscription question. Tremblay writes of the new class lines that divided Acadian society after the 1940s; considering Landry’s education, career, honours and politics, one suspects that these divisions have much deeper roots. One last nagging reflection about Landry’s nationalism — he married an Irish-Catholic and passed on so little of his “nationalism” that two of his children left their patrie for Alberta! To his credit Landry was tireless in promoting the Acadian Renaissance in all its forms and the author accurately reflects his importance. Landry understood that Acadian society would have to change and adapt if it was to survive and he led that adaptation process.

Della Stanley, perhaps like Landry, is also trying to bridge two worlds. Like some Acadian historians in the past, she creates a mythical hero out of

4 S. Leventman, “Minority Group Leadership” in B. Rosenberg, *et al.*, *Mass Society in Crisis* (N.Y., 1964), pp. 604 - 5. Quoted in Maxwell, *The Invisible French*, p. 11.

an “ordinary superstar”. Yet for the most part she brings her abilities as a professional historian into her work. *Pierre-Amand Landry* is well written, based upon solid documentation (although footnote 29, chapter 6 is rather confusing consisting as it does of three question marks), and very effective in portraying both the man and his milieu. One can only hope that her book will soon be republished in English so that it may be available to a larger and increasingly inquisitive audience. Indeed, one would hope that all the books cited in this review become more widely read. For a country trying to determine what it wants to be, they offer valuable insights into what it has been and what it is. Taken together they serve to indicate that Quebec is not entirely correct in dismissing the minority groups as being irrevocably lost to the French culture. If these groups wish to survive, they probably can since it has not been governmental or overt Anglo-Protestant pressure that has caused their denationalization to this point. Rather it has been their own lessening self-consciousness, their own lack of organization and their own economic situation. Quebec could stimulate at least the first two of these factors.

MARTIN S. SPIGELMAN

### The Beothucks: Questions and Answers

The original Red Indians were the indigenous people of Newfoundland, and the last of them died in 1829. They have come in for considerable attention of late, mainly because their fate represents Canada’s contribution to the sad history of genocide. The long-standing source for most of our knowledge about the natives of Newfoundland is J.P. Howley’s *The Beothucks or Red Indians* (Cambridge, 1915), the result of a lifetime of collecting material, written, oral and artifactual. The work was well done: if Howley missed a document, so did everyone else. The book, long out of print, was made available to the general public in the Coles Canadiana Series (Toronto, 1974). In order to meet contemporary tastes, the introduction to the reprint featured a spurious atrocity story fabricated for a *Maclean’s Magazine* article of 1959.<sup>1</sup>

From the first, the Beothucks have attracted romantic writers. An anonymous author in the *Federal American Monthly* (June, 1844) recorded that they “descend far under ground in winter, and lead a kind of fairy life; that they have power to change themselves into birds and fishes . . . ” (p. 524). The writer depicted “Mary May, the Newfoundland Indian”, and told her story with a strange admixture of historical fact and creative imagination. This romantic tradition has its current

<sup>1</sup> Harold Horwood, “The People Who Were Murdered for Fun”, *Maclean’s Magazine*, 10 October 1959.