
Language Matters



*Edited by David Cameron
and Richard Simeon*

Language Matters
How Canadian Voluntary Associations
Manage French and English



UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto



© UBC Press 2009

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher, or, in Canada, in the case of photocopying or other reprographic copying, a licence from Access Copyright (Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency), www.accesscopyright.ca.

20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 09 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in Canada with vegetable-based inks on FSC-certified ancient-forest-free paper (100 percent post-consumer recycled) that is processed chlorine- and acid-free.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Language matters: how Canadian voluntary associations manage French and English / edited by David Robertson Cameron and Richard Simeon.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-7748-1503-1

1. Language policy – Canada.
2. Canada – Languages – Political aspects.
3. Bilingualism – Canada.
4. Associations, institutions, etc. – Canada. I. Cameron, David, 1941- II. Simeon, Richard, 1943-

FC145.B55L26 2009

306.44'971

C2008-907822-5

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada through the Book Publishing Industry Development Program (BPIDP), and of the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Aid to Scholarly Publications Programme, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

UBC Press
The University of British Columbia
2029 West Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2
604-822-5959 / Fax: 604-822-6083
www.ubcpress.ca



To Stevie Cameron and MaryEtta Cheney



Contents

Preface / ix

Acknowledgments / xii

Acronyms / xiii

- 1** Language and the Institutions of Civil Society / 3
David Cameron and Richard Simeon
- 2** French-English Relations in Comprehensive Business Associations / 23
William Coleman and Tim Mau
- 3** Canada's English and French Farm Communities / 52
Grace Skogstad
- 4** Municipal Associations / 74
Don Stevenson and Richard Gilbert
- 5** Associations in the Voluntary Health Sector: The Heart and Stroke
Foundations of Canada and the Huntington Societies of Canada
and Quebec / 95
Richard Simeon
- 6** From Biculturalism to Bilingualism: Patterns of Linguistic Association
in the Canadian Council on Social Development / 121
Jane Jenson and Rachel Laforest
- 7** Managing Linguistic Practices in International Development NGOs:
The World University Service of Canada / 136
Cathy Blacklock

8 Two Voices for Human Rights: Amnesty International / 153
Michel Duquette and Sylvie Dugas

9 Accommodation at the Pinnacle: The Special Role of Civil Society's
Leaders / 174
Richard Simeon and David Cameron

Notes / 187

Bibliography / 204

Contributors / 207

Index / 209

Preface

Canada today is multinational, multicultural, and multi almost everything. Respecting and accommodating all these dimensions of difference are at once our greatest challenge and greatest opportunity.

Language and religion have defined the primordial lines of cleavage in Canada's historical experience. The Royal Proclamation of 1763, the Quebec Act of 1774, the Constitutional Act of 1791, the 1837 Rebellion in Lower Canada and the Durham Report that followed it, the Act of Union of 1840, Confederation in 1867, the Riel troubles in western Canada, the conscription crises of the two world wars – all of these have demonstrated just how important this cultural duality has been to our national existence.

With the secularization of Canada in the decades following the Second World War, the conflict between Catholic and Protestant has faded into the political background, and language has assumed pre-eminence in defining Canadian duality. How Canadians have responded to language in the postwar period is in important ways a critical template for how Canada has responded to the many other dimensions of Canadian diversity that together compose Canada's reality.

Most analyses of Canada's French-English duality have focused on the political and constitutional dimensions of the relationship. How should powers be distributed between federal and provincial governments? Should Quebec be constitutionally regarded as a "nation" within Canada or as a distinct society? Should there be symmetry or asymmetry in the powers of provinces? And so on.

These are critical questions that engage citizens, parties, and governments in an ongoing constitutional and intergovernmental debate. But there are equally critical questions relating to duality that are posed for groups and associations of citizens in their personal lives. Indeed, what goes on beneath the surface of political debate, in civil society, may be of even more fundamental importance to the future of the country. That is the premise underlying this book.

It presents a set of case studies of important Canadian voluntary associations. Each is engaged in the pursuit of specific objectives of importance to its members; all of them, in doing their work, have had to find ways to recognize and accommodate linguistic difference in their internal lives and in their external relations. Most of them have succeeded – but never without difficulty.

These studies are not designed to be historical accounts but snapshots taken of a variety of organizations at the same moment in time – namely, the concluding years of the twentieth century. Since the research was originally conducted, some of the dynamics we describe may well have changed – we are tracking moving targets – but our intention in this project has been to examine common themes in the lives of these organizations at the same historical moment so that the more general patterns of association can be identified and explained.

In exploring how voluntary associations today manage the complexities of language, our book has the immense advantage of building on the contribution of an earlier work. In the early 1960s, two pioneers of modern social science in Canada, Vincent Lemieux and John Meisel, collaborated in a study commissioned by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism to investigate how language difference played out in the lives of Canadian voluntary associations. Their work was the inspiration of our own. We revisit many of the associations they examined forty years ago while adding several that did not exist at the time.

And we come to some different conclusions. Their work, conducted in the early to mid-1960s, found many groups that were suffering from intense stress from and in some cases were almost paralyzed by linguistic conflict. Why? These were the early years of the Quiet Revolution. The Québécois were re-creating their national identity in a contemporary idiom. They were demanding both more autonomy for their own social, economic, and political institutions and more voice in Canada-wide institutions – which, as the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism amply demonstrated, did not represent them fully. At the same time, anglophone leaders of national associations were baffled by or resistant to the demands for change. The result was, in many associations, debilitating conflict.

The authors here tell a rather different story. Today linguistic conflict in most of the associations we studied is muted. Most have developed a mutually acceptable accommodation of their language differences. These arrangements take many forms, from the linguistic groups actually going their separate ways to more conventional federal solutions. In the conclusion, we seek to explain how and why these choices were made and the costs and benefits experienced by members of each of the language groups in the working out of these accommodations and in the pursuit of their common

goals. The practical ingenuity and problem solving reflected in these accommodations have, we believe, some larger lessons for accommodation in the wider Canadian society.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank first and foremost our colleagues and contributors to this volume for their commitment to the project and their diligence in helping to bring it to fruition. On their behalf, we want to express our deep appreciation to all those members and leaders of the voluntary associations discussed in this book for their kindness and generosity in providing information and responding to the questions posed to them by the authors. It is their experience we have tried to reflect, and we hope we have done so faithfully.

Many others have helped in this work. Vincent Lemieux and John Meisel, authors of the original monograph that inspired us, have supported this replication of their path-breaking study, and we hope we have kept faith with their vision. Jean Laponce, perhaps the foremost scholar of language and politics anywhere, has provided unstinting encouragement, and we are deeply grateful to Jean for his quiet, constant support. The Government of Canada, through many of its departments and agencies, was the major financial contributor to the research presented in this volume. We are especially grateful to Leslie Seidle for the assistance he offered us in navigating the highways and byways of the federal government. No work of this breadth is published without the help of skilled graduate students. We thank especially Julie Bernier and Luc Turgeon for their skill and insight and Elinor Bray Collins and Dubi Kanengisser for assistance in final editing. Finally, Sari Sherman and Rita O'Brien of the Department of Political Science at U of T provided organizational and administrative support at critical stages of the project, and we are very grateful to them for that.

Acronyms

AFMNB	Association francophone des municipalités du Nouveau-Brunswick
AFMO	Association française des municipalités de l'Ontario
AGA	annual general assembly
AI	Amnesty International
AKFC	Aga Khan Foundation Canada
ALS	amyotrophic lateral sclerosis
AMEQ	Alliance des manufacturiers et exportateurs du Québec
AMO	Association of Municipalities of Ontario
AUCC	Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
BCNI	Business Council on National Issues
CAUT	Canadian Association of University Teachers
CBIE	Canadian Bureau for International Education
CCA	Canadian Cooperative Association
CCC	Canadian Chamber of Commerce
CCCE	Canadian Council of Chief Executives
CCDM	Chambre de commerce du District de Montréal
CCFC	Christian Children's Fund Canada
CCIC	Canadian Council for International Cooperation
CCMM/BTMM	Chambre de commerce du Montréal métropolitain/ Board of Trade of Metropolitan Montreal
CCPQ	Chambre de commerce de la Province du Québec
CCQ	Chambre de commerce du Québec
CCSD	Canadian Council on Social Development
CEA	Canadian Export Association
CEAs	Canadian executing agencies
CEAD	Centre d'études arabes pour le développement
CEGEPs	Collèges d'enseignement général et professionnel
CEO	chief executive officer
CESO	Canadian Executive Services Overseas

CFA	Canadian Federation of Agriculture
CFCC	Community Funds and Councils of Canada
CFIB	Canadian Federation of Independent Business
CFMM	Canadian Federations of Mayors and Municipalities
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIDMAA	Centre d'information et de documentation sur la Mozambique et l'Afrique australe
CIHR	Canadian Institutes for Health Research
CMA	Canadian Manufacturers' Association
CME	Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters
COPEM	Comité de promotion économique de Montréal
CPC	Canadian Pork Council
CPQ	Conseil du patronat du Québec
CQDS	Conseil québécois de développement social
CROP	Centre de recherche sur l'opinion publique
CUS	Canadian Union of Students
CUSO	Canadian University Service Overseas
CWC	Canadian Welfare Council
DFC	Dairy Farmers of Canada
EFAI	Éditions francophones d'Amnesty International
ESR	European Student Relief
EUMC	Entraide universitaire mondial du Canada
EUMQ	Entraide universitaire mondiale du Québec
FA	federation agreement
FCEI	Fédération canadienne de l'entreprise indépendante
FCM	Federation of Canadian Municipalities
FIT	Foundation for International Training
FOE	Friends of the Earth
FPLQ	Fédération des producteurs de lait du Québec
FPPQ	Fédération des producteurs de porc du Québec
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GST	Goods and Services Tax
HEC	École des hautes études commerciales
HOPE	HOPE International Development Agency
HSC/SHC	Huntington Society of Canada/Société Huntington du Canada
HSFC	Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada
HSFO	Heart and Stroke Foundation of Ontario
IC	International Council
ICC	International Commerce Centre
ICHRDD	International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development

ID NGOs	international development non-governmental organizations
IEC	International Executive Committee
IFAP	International Federation of Agricultural Producers
IS	International Secretariat
ISS	International Student Service
KAP	Keystone Agricultural Producers
MBT	Montreal Board of Trade
MP	member of Parliament
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NFU	National Farmers Union
NGOs	non-governmental organizations
NHVO	National Volunteer Health Organizations
NSI	North-South Institute
ODA	official development assistance
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PQ	Parti québécois
SAP	South Asia Partnership – Canada
SHQ	Société Huntington du Québec
SUCO	Solidarité, union, co-operation
UCC	Union catholique des cultivateurs
UGEQ	Union générale des étudiants du Québec
UMNB	Union of Municipalities of New Brunswick
UMPQ	Union des municipalités de la province du Québec
UMQ	Union des municipalités du Québec
UMRCQ	Union des municipalités régionales de comté et des municipalités locales
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (now United Nations Children's Fund)
UPA	Union des producteurs agricole
WRAP	Wild Rose Agricultural Producers Association
WSCF	World Student Christian Federation
WSR	World Student Relief
WTO	World Trade Organization
WUS	World University Service
WUSC	World University Service of Canada
WUSQ	World University Service Quebec
YMCA	Young Men's Christian Association
YWCA	Young Women's Christian Association



Language Matters



1

Language and the Institutions of Civil Society

David Cameron and Richard Simeon

This book examines linguistic dualism in the Canadian voluntary sector. It sets for itself three goals.

- First, it aims to describe the patterns of linguistic association in several Canadian voluntary organizations. Which institutions and practices have they developed to manage their linguistic relationships? And how have these institutions and practices affected their capacity to cooperate in the achievement of common goals?
- Second, it attempts to establish the roles that the external environment and the internal organizational reality play in shaping the linguistic capacities and behaviours of selected voluntary organizations in Canada.
- Third, it seeks to uncover the extent to which and the ways in which the selected voluntary organizations contribute to social cohesion or its absence in a linguistically divided society.

The first goal is descriptive; the second and third are explanatory.

Thus, we ask how well do associations in the Canadian voluntary sector reflect, represent, and accommodate linguistic dualism in their structures, in their practices, and in the work they do? Do they contribute to building a civil society that is able to bridge or transcend the fundamental cleavages that divide Canadian society, or do they deepen the sociolinguistic divisions? Conversely, how significant is the state – federal and provincial – in structuring the patterns of linguistic association in the voluntary organizations of civil society? What impacts do French-English relations at the formal political level have on the groups we examine in the voluntary sector? These are the fundamental questions that underpin this study of a broad variety of associations in the Canadian voluntary sector. We focus on “patterns of linguistic association” in Canadian civil society and their implications both for the lives of these associations and for Canada as a whole.

Citizens, governments, and scholars have in recent decades devoted enormous effort to exploring national unity, the future of Quebec and Canada, and constitutional renewal. But while Canadians have debated a wide range of constitutional and institutional changes that might achieve a lasting political accommodation, they have seldom asked what is going on underneath this superstructure, in civil society, in the world of private, non-governmental associations? Is this world increasingly fragmented and divided along linguistic lines? Has our capacity for discovering the basis of coexistence or accommodation in areas of mutual concern been declining? Or have French- and English-speaking Canadians found the means to work together on the ground in ways that have escaped their political leaders? We believe that there is a rich array of relationships and practices within associations in civil society and that much can be learned from an intensive examination of their internal lives. Each has a distinctive story to tell, and their experiences over the past several decades are both a part of the grand narrative of civil society and a potential source of ideas and innovations for the political community as a whole.

The underlying premise that guides the project is that voluntary associations are central elements in the constitution of "civil society." A vibrant civil society, in turn, is essential to a healthy democratic politics, to building strong communities, and to innovation in public policy. This is because participation in associational life can provide education and experience in the "arts" of democratic participation, compromise, and the like and can help to build strong relationships of trust among citizens and groups. Moreover, effective associations are an essential means for citizens to achieve their collective goals through cooperative action, and they provide channels of communication between citizens and government. What is more, in recent decades, organizations in the voluntary sector have become increasingly important instruments for the achievement of public purposes that previously were regarded as the responsibility of the state; their health, therefore, and their capacity to express the structural values of the country as a whole are for this reason as well a matter of general concern.

In a society deeply divided along ethnic, linguistic, or regional lines, associations in civil society have another vital role. That role is to build linkages or bridges across the dividing lines and thus to help in achieving the accommodations necessary for successful coexistence. Associations that are able to bring members or representatives of the different groups together in face-to-face relationships, and that permit them to cooperate in meeting shared goals, despite linguistic or other such differences, may help to sustain accommodation in the wider political sphere. Conversely, associational patterns in which each group is rooted on one side or the other of the cultural divide, or in which relations between the groups are unequal and conflictual, or in which there is little capacity to pursue common goals are likely to undermine

social cohesion. As John Meisel and Vincent Lemieux pointed out in their study many years ago for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, it is through their associational linkages that Canadians of different backgrounds “come to grips with one another’s preoccupations, priorities, biases and that they attempt to reconcile such differences as may occur between them ... Voluntary associations are a microcosm of ethnic relations in Canada.”¹

Their *Ethnic Relations in Canadian Voluntary Associations* is in fact the inspiration and model for our project.² It was carried out in the 1960s for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. The pioneering work of these two scholars showed that the capacity of twenty Canadian voluntary associations to build bridges and establish an equal partnership between Canada’s two main linguistic groups was limited by the fact that francophones were under-represented in most mixed Canadian voluntary organizations and that their participation in these associations was handicapped by the dominance of English in most important communications and transactions. Francophones therefore sought either a greater voice in national associations or greater autonomy to pursue their goals within the Quebec community, putting major strains on many associations. As Meisel and Lemieux noted, “crises in the relations between the two official-language groups in voluntary associations have frequently coincided with, and could be linked to, prevailing political controversies between Ottawa and the government of Quebec.”³ They found that “there are serious disparities in the degree to which Francophone and Anglophone Canadians benefit from belonging to common associations and to which they participate in their activities; on the whole, Francophones are involved less – and often less effectively ... Most of the difficulties arise essentially from the fact that in many common associations, unilingual Anglophones predominate. A Francophone therefore often finds himself in the position of having to function in the English language if he wishes to benefit from his membership in a countrywide Canadian organization. This imposes obvious penalties and handicaps on members of the official-language minority.”⁴

The research we report on in this book returns to many of the issues Meisel and Lemieux addressed almost two generations ago. As we show in the following section of this chapter, the interest in revisiting their work is twofold. First, it allows us to see whether relations between francophones and anglophones within voluntary associations have evolved in the same way and at the same pace as relations between the two linguistic groups in the larger society. Second, it allows us to fill an important gap in our understanding. Although interactions between francophones and anglophones *within Quebec* have been widely studied since the 1960s, surprisingly little has been written on the evolution of interactions between the two linguistic groups at the pan-Canadian level, despite the obvious crucial importance of the issue.

The Political Context

This project is situated within the larger context of the evolution of French-English relations in Canada. How the associations we study deal with language in their own lives and work is profoundly shaped by this context; conversely, how associations manage language in their own affairs will play a part in how Canada as a whole succeeds or fails in maintaining a bilingual society and polity. As Meisel and Lemieux point out, “general conditions prevailing at any given time – quite independently of what is happening to any association – will affect what goes on inside it. This is so particularly with respect to political developments,” and in turn “the attitudes that voluntary organizations take towards the problem of finding a satisfactory basis for the creative interaction of the two communities have far-reaching consequences, both because of the example they afford, and because of the influence they exert on their members, the general public, and, in particular, politicians.”⁵

The profound cleavage between French and English has lain at the root of some of Canada’s most troubled periods, but, prior to Quebec’s Quiet Revolution of the early 1960s, conflicts arose out of the friction between two very different ways of life.⁶ *Linguistic* conflict was relatively muted. No Quebec political party, for example, included language issues as a part of its platform until well into the 1960s. The reason for the relative absence of linguistic conflict is that francophone Quebec and English Canadian societies remained largely isolated from each other, living within different frameworks of values and inhabiting distinctive socioeconomic structures. Despite some notable exceptions, civil society in Quebec in general was dominated by conservative values and by the church. It was resolutely inward looking, resisting rather than embracing modernizing forces. The rest of Canada – its federal bureaucracy an English-speaking institution,⁷ its business community largely anglophone and largely Protestant – had little incentive to engage with French speakers. To the extent that the two language groups did come into contact, the relationships were highly asymmetrical, reflecting the privileged position of the English Canadian minority in Quebec. English was dominant in virtually all areas of shared economic and social life. Prior to the Quiet Revolution, then, francophone and anglophone societies were like ocean liners passing in the night: sharing the same sea but with little need to communicate beyond the flashing signal lights between their governing elites. When major conflict did occur, for example, in the hanging of Louis Riel and in the two conscription crises, it arose out of the collision between two different societies and two discernibly different world views.

The Quiet Revolution fundamentally changed the relationship. At one time, anglophone commentators were inclined to suggest that, “if only

Quebecers could become more like us" (i.e., secular, urban, modern, industrial, bureaucratic), then the bases for conflict would fade away. The irony is that the modernizing revolution undertaken by Quebec in the early 1960s did exactly what the commentators suggested; Quebec did become "more like us." Urbanization, industrialization, and, most important, secularization fundamentally changed the social and economic environment that had sustained the old order.⁸ Now, instead of rejecting the activist state as a threat to religious values, Quebec embraced the state as the basic agent of change and *épanouissement*. As Ramsay Cook notes, "the state replaced the Church as the principal institution in the collective lives of Quebecers," and "only the state that French Canadians controlled could be expected to assume the task of making Quebecers *maîtres chez nous*: increasing their control over the economy and making their language the dominant one in public and private institutions" in Quebec.⁹ This process of secularization and modernization had the paradoxical consequence of bringing Quebec closer to English Canada and the rest of North America in terms of values, ways of life, and institutional arrangements. Yet, contrary to what some had expected, the result was not a decrease of conflict but an intensification of conflict both within Quebec and between Quebec and the rest of Canada.¹⁰

Why was this so? In large part, it was because Quebec and the rest of Canada were now no longer ships on different courses passing in the night. Now they were ships on the same course, embracing similar values and aspirations. To shift the metaphor, where once they were playing different games on different fields, now they were playing the same game on the same field. This had a number of consequences. First, it meant that they were now competing for the same things – for control over business enterprises and cultural institutions, for representation at the highest levels of the bureaucracy, and so on. Second, the opportunities and incentives for contact – indeed its necessity – were now greatly increased. Third, there was much greater awareness of the asymmetries and inequalities in these relationships. They were fully documented in the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism and elsewhere. These studies showed that francophones were symbolically excluded from the federal level (e.g., in the country's unilingual currency and its flag, the Red Ensign, which evoked the British connection); that francophones were greatly under-represented at the higher levels of the public service and in senior federal ministerial posts; that the incomes of francophone workers (even those who were bilingual) fell significantly below those of anglophones, especially in Quebec;¹¹ that the senior management and directors of major corporations in Quebec were overwhelmingly anglophone; and so on.¹² Moreover, other studies demonstrated that, in most of the rest of Canada, the francophone minority populations were declining and that rates of assimilation were high.¹³

It was a time when the terms of engagement between English- and French-speaking Canadians were being renegotiated at every level. Contacts were increasing, but how would they be played out? Both at the societal level and within individual associations, two broad strategies emerged, one led by French-speaking politicians in Ottawa, the other by French-speaking politicians in Quebec. The first might be called the pan-Canadian nation-building project, the second the Quebec nation-building project.

The first was founded on the premise that Canada could be a bilingual country, from sea to sea, or at least that a full provision of bilingual services would mean that people of either language group could feel at home anywhere in the country. At the governmental level, the centrepiece was the Official Languages Act. Where numbers warranted, Ottawa would serve Canadians in both official languages wherever they lived. Francophones would gain higher positions in the public service, and bilingualism among all senior government employees would be strongly encouraged. Special efforts would be made to preserve and protect official language minorities, whether francophones outside Quebec or anglophones within Quebec. Immersion programs in the minority language, an initiative widely supported among middle-class anglophones, would be strongly promoted. The federal government would invest resources in developing student exchange programs and encouraging voluntary associations to provide translation and related services. In general, quite apart from its larger constitutional agenda, this approach attempted to build networks and linkages that would bind francophones and non-francophones more closely together as part of a country-wide community.

The Quebec nation-building strategy responded to the same challenges quite differently. Again, in addition to its constitutional agenda of greater autonomy and perhaps sovereignty for Quebec, its program included Bill 101, the Quebec Language Law, designed to strengthen French as the dominant language within Quebec and to ensure that immigrants would be integrated into the francophone community; the establishment of a strong provincial state with political institutions capable of expressing and serving the Québécois identity; promotion of "Quebec Inc.," a Quebec-based business community closely linked to the provincial state; French-language public television and a wide variety of programs to stimulate arts and culture within the province; and the expansion of a distinct Quebec presence internationally, especially in francophone countries. Quebec leaders set out self-consciously to build a modern but autonomous Quebec-centred civil society, which was seen by many as a prerequisite to the goal of sovereignty.

It was in this fraught social and political context that Meisel and Lemieux conducted their study of associations. The groups they examined were themselves caught up in the stresses of socioeconomic change and in the larger political battles. Francophones in these groups had to choose whether

or not to continue to pursue their interests within pan-Canadian associations. Those who did were no longer willing to accept a subordinate status and agitated for greater recognition, greater representation, more effective bilingualism, and the like. Anglophone leaders were often confused and reluctant in their responses. Alternatively, francophones pursued the second strategy, which attenuated their linkages to pan-Canadian civil society and strengthened their engagement in a French-speaking Québécois civil society. This strategy included calls for greater autonomy for the Quebec wings or branches of the given Canadian association; movement toward something like “sovereignty-association,” in which an autonomous Quebec association would have a variety of linkages with its English Canadian counterpart; or outright independence – an entirely separate organization. Whichever strategy was followed, the associational milieu analyzed by Meisel and Lemieux was one of considerable tension and dynamism, as both language groups sought to develop new relationships.

A generation later, the fundamental question of the political relationship between Canada and Quebec remains unresolved, but “national unity” has ceased for the time being to be a central, actively debated public concern. Outside Quebec, to the extent that Canadians choose to discuss the matter at all, commitment to a single country that includes Quebec remains strong, but there is little apparent stomach for launching into a new round of formal constitutional talks. Inside Quebec, as well, there is little current inclination to debate the grand issues, but nevertheless among francophone Quebecers identification with Quebec as a national community is strong; it coincides, however, with a continuing belief in a Canadian identity. Political debate about the national question within the province has continued to focus on the alternatives of “renewed federalism” or “sovereignty partnership,” with relatively little support for the poles of outright independence or the status quo of the federal system.

But what has been going on beneath the level of formal politics, in civil society? Only a few incomplete indicators point to an answer. Within English-speaking Canada, the primary social change is the broadening of the range of politically relevant identities and the scope of political conflict. In the mid-1960s, social movements such as the women’s movement, environmentalism, and issues such as disability and sexual orientation had only just begun to emerge. Since then, Canadian politics has become infused with the politics of identity. The emergent identities cut across the long-standing verities of region and language that have traditionally characterized Canadian life. Moreover, high levels of immigration, coupled with the decolonization of Canadian immigration law, have changed the ethnic face of Canada’s large cities. Canadian society is becoming increasingly multicultural and increasingly diverse in ethnic, religious, and cultural terms. Moreover, the claims of Canada’s Aboriginal peoples have come to the fore

as they mobilize against economic and social discrimination to seek recognition of land claims and treaty rights and to pursue a form of self-government.

After Meisel and Lemieux wrote, these changes began to dominate English-speaking Canadian political discourse. No longer were French-English relations perceived as the only dominant fault line. Managing the Quebec-Canada relationship, while still critical, especially to governmental elites, was now only one of several structural issues confronting Canada. For associations such as those we have studied, the emergence of new issues and identity groups with their own claims for recognition and representation constituted another set of social pressures to which they had to respond. For some, balancing these new commitments with a longer-standing commitment to bilingualism would not be simple.

Quebec society underwent many of the same demographic changes as the rest of Canada in this period. Social movements, such as the feminist movement, were very strong in Quebec. While French-speaking Canadians confronted many of the same issues that their anglophone counterparts addressed elsewhere in Canada, relations between the two linguistic groups in the women's movement were strained, partly because the anglophone movement tended to look to Ottawa for redress (in part a consequence of federal sponsorship of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms), while the Quebec women's movement, like most other "progressive" movements in the province, tended to identify more strongly with the Quebec government. Indeed, it appears that, given the alternatives of either forming alliances across language groups or forming alliances and networks across identity groups within a single linguistic milieu, the latter predominated in most cases. While Quebecers remained deeply divided in their preferred constitutional option, the decades of Quebec institution and network building were forging an ever more cohesive and far-reaching Quebec-based civil society, in which linkages and associations across the language frontier and outside Quebec were playing less and less of a role in the lives of Quebecers. This is, of course, not to deny that very important relationships with the rest of the country continued to exist, but the impression remains that Quebecers increasingly participated in them as self-conscious members of a fully distinct and integrated society, a French-speaking national community within Canada.

For associational life, these developments in Quebec meant that many of the issues that Meisel and Lemieux considered remain alive today. A diversity of arrangements continues to characterize linguistic patterns. In a number of cases, the level of tension associated with an asymmetrical arrangement has declined as both sides have come to reasonably settled understandings, which, if not celebrated, are at least accepted. In other cases, Quebec wings of pan-Canadian associations have gained greater autonomy or even full

independence. Again, they may well cooperate frequently with their anglo-phone counterparts but now as autonomous entities.

Hence the paradox. Quebec and the rest of Canada are in many respects much more alike as societies than they were in the past, yet the level of segmentation between the two communities remains high. What Donald Smiley argued in 1992 remains broadly true today: "The ongoing territorial separation of the two language groups means that on a day-to-day basis most citizens of one are not in contact with members of the other."¹⁴ In fact, when one looks at the books and the newspapers Canadians read, the television they watch, and the music they listen to, one is entitled to conclude that the "two solitudes" are still very much alive.¹⁵

As Harvey Lazar and Tom McIntosh have recently noted, this diagnosis, relating to Canadian popular culture, largely holds true at the level of civil society as well: "Turning to the connections between Quebec and the rest of Canada, it is our sense that the political chasm is as wide as ever. Economic connections remain thick, but there is little cross-pollination in culture. Connections within civic society are uneven. In labour they are formal but not strong. French-speaking Quebecers generally do not move to other regions of Canada. Business ties between English- and French-speaking Canadians are substantial but many of the pan-Canadian social movements are poorly represented or not represented at all in Quebec, where Quebec-based groups have entirely separate organizations."¹⁶

But this is an incomplete picture. While we know much about some aspects of the relationship, we know very little about others. There is considerable public opinion data on attitudes and values, though much less on interactions between the two language groups and the feelings members have about each other. There is a virtually endless literature on political relationships and the related constitutional debates. What is missing – apart from the pioneering but now dated study of Meisel and Lemieux – is deeper information on whether and how English and French Canadians work out their day-to-day relationships as they seek to pursue common goals in the voluntary sector. This is a critical part of the larger puzzle; the observation of Raymond Breton in *Les frontières culturelles et la cohésion du Canada* (1981) remains true today: "L'interaction sociale des Canadiens français et des Canadiens anglais, tant sur le plan de la masse que sur celui de l'élite, a fait l'objet de peu d'études systématiques."¹⁷

The premise underlying the present volume is twofold. First, it is our belief that patterns of associational life can be expected to reflect and respond to the changing social and political context that we have just described. Our individual case studies will explore how various associations do so. In this sense, the voluntary associations are the dependent variables. But, second, we assume that voluntary associations, as a central part of civil society, can

also help to shape it. Looked at from this perspective, voluntary associations may be understood as independent variables.

Beyond this, it is possible that the examination of relationships within these associations will help us to point to some of the ways in which civil society in Canada is likely to evolve in the future. Indeed, as we examine how associations deal with the accommodation of linguistic difference, we may learn some lessons that can not only be applied to other associations facing the same challenges but also serve as reference points for Canadians seeking a lasting political accommodation.

Theoretical Background

Underpinning this exploration is a large question of great theoretical and practical interest. What is it that holds the constituent groups in divided societies such as Canada together? Most simply put, where is the glue? As we noted at the outset, a starting point for this inquiry is the hypothesis that a large part of the answer must lie in the character of a country's civil society. We approach our work with the following questions in mind. What is the relationship between political institutions and the nature and structure of civil society? Does it matter what kind of organizations and associations exist in the voluntary sector? What are the grounds of social cohesion? In what sense and in what form is it necessary? What – at the level of civil society – are the terms of coexistence between the constituent groups in divided societies? In this enterprise, the question of coexistence and cohesion in divided societies arises at two levels. First, in the case studies, we explore the sources of cohesion or division within individual associations; in the last chapter, we reflect on the implications of these experiences for society and government in Canada as a whole.

Let us now examine four differing theoretical approaches to the question of how social cohesion can be achieved in divided societies. First is the “contact thesis.” Most crudely stated, it argues that, the more members of differing cultural groups engage in face-to-face relationships (“contact”), the more likely it is that they will develop positive feelings toward each other.¹⁸ “To know you is to love you.” At the societal level, promoting contact (as with student exchanges and the like) will result in greater harmony and unity. But as Donald Forbes, Canada’s leading student of the contact hypothesis,¹⁹ insists, “linkages (or contacts) among individuals with different social norms (languages, cultures, values, etc.), while they may in a sense knit a society together, tend also, and more strongly, to divide it into self-consciously opposed identity groups ... Linkages within and between such groups can be a basis for wider conflicts rather than benign cooperation.”²⁰ More contact, then, may lead to increased respect and acceptance or to greater prejudice and rejection, depending on the circumstances in which it occurs. It can lead to greater awareness of differences, for example, in

cultural styles or substantive interests but not necessarily greater acceptance of these differences. In the minds of the minority, it may engender greater fears of assimilation. The alternative to “to know you is to love you” is “good fences make good neighbours.”

It is worth underlining two implications. First, whether contact leads to harmony or division will depend greatly on the nature of the contact: whether the individuals in contact possess equality of status; whether there is “co-operative or competitive” interdependence in the pursuit of common goals; and whether contact itself has broad support in the wider society and among those in authority.²¹ Second, we should not expect contact in itself to dissolve all conflict. Rather, “the conflicts will be managed by practical devices.”²² At the societal level, this management includes political arrangements such as brokerage parties, federalism, and language laws. At the group level, it means the role of analogous devices such as patterns of representation, language use, and so on.

Certain hypotheses flow from this analysis. We would expect harmonious relationships within an association to be stronger when its members come together as equals, when they gain mutual benefit from the exchange, and when there is strong normative support for the linkages in the relevant environment. Similarly, they will be stronger when the constitutional arrangements within a group – both structural and procedural – provide proportionate recognition, accommodation, and representation to both cultures.

A second and somewhat more recent theoretical approach is found in the burgeoning literature on “social capital.” Social capital theory in a sense extends the logic of the contact hypothesis by positing the social benefits that are assumed to arise out of the relationships of trust and reciprocity created by associational life, by contact; social capital is composed of social linkages, which are held to build social trust and mutual understanding, leading to greater cooperation and reduced conflict.

Social capital is widely understood to be subdivisible into two forms: “bridging” and “bonding.” Bonding capital is the glue that holds communities and associations of similar people together, that maintains their solidarity and commitment, often at the expense of the potential links with people outside the group. Bridging capital is composed of the networks and inter-relationships that bring into association and mutual respect people who are different from one another and groups that are diverse. Where bonding capital consolidates solidarity in a context of relative uniformity, bridging capital fosters unity in a context of pluralism. Clearly, there is a place for both forms in any society, but the bridging version is of particular importance in maintaining social cohesion in pluralistic societies and is often crucial to stability in divided societies.

Robert Putnam, the most prominent exponent of social capital theory, speaks of bonding (or exclusive) social capital as “a kind of sociological

superglue."²³ This form of associational life can be problematic in a country characterized by deep linguistic, cultural, or religious divisions. Indeed, it leads us to think of a country not as a single civil society but as two or more distinct or separate civil societies. Each may be rich in social capital in many ways – and hence build strong trust among its own members – but the danger is that they will exist in isolation, defining themselves and their identities in opposition to the “other” and thus perpetuating and deepening conflict. Here there are echoes of the contingent or contextual reality of the contact hypothesis as highlighted by Forbes. As Breton puts it, “increasing social capital solely within ethnic or racial boundaries without forming any ‘bridges’ between groups may be a source of conflict, hence the importance of cross-community activities and structures to ensure that social participation and interpersonal relationships extend beyond ethnic boundaries.”²⁴

The social capital approach requires cross-cutting aggregation (bridging capital), but the presence of two or more major linguistic groups will tend to favour language-based aggregation and segregation along linguistic lines (bonding capital) most of the time. In cases where groups aggregate across linguistic lines, asymmetry will usually prevail since language groups rarely have the same power and status. The idea of bridging capital suggests that in such societies it is essential that there be some shared level of identity and common values and that it is critical to sustain networks that will bring members of the different communities together in relationships of mutual trust. “Frequent interaction among a diverse set of people,” says Putnam, “tends to produce a norm of generalized reciprocity. Civic engagement and social capital entail mutual obligation and responsibility for action.” He further claims that, “the more we connect with other people, the more we trust them.”²⁵ In his study of communal conflict between Hindus and Muslims in India, Ashutosh Varshney found that the conflict was minimized and contained in cities where local associations of traders and other business-people bridged religious lines. “Vigorous associational life acts as a ... constraint on the polarizing strategies of political elites.”²⁶ As Deepa Narayan puts it, “social cohesion requires not just high social capital within groups. It also requires dense, though not necessarily strong, cross cutting ties among groups.”²⁷

This perspective suggests that we should assess our associations in terms of their success in bringing large numbers of francophone and anglophone Canadians together in face-to-face meetings based on equality, trust, and mutual understanding. As we shall see, this ideal is seldom met. Three sets of factors militate against it. First, there are enormous distances in Canada, which mean that a relatively small proportion of British Columbians and Quebecers will ever have the opportunity to sustain face-to-face contact. Their relationships will be mediated by others; they will mainly be indirect and second hand. Second, language differences are a profound barrier to

communication, and bilingualism is not widespread. At the national level in 1996, 41 percent of francophones were bilingual, while just 9 percent of anglophones were bilingual.²⁸ In 1996, the rate of bilingualism in Quebec was 38 percent (the highest rate in Canada), while the national average rate of bilingualism was 17 percent.²⁹ Almost 34 percent of francophones in Quebec were bilingual, while less than 7 percent of anglophones outside Quebec were bilingual.³⁰ All provinces except Quebec and New Brunswick were well below the national average of 17 percent. For instance, Ontario's rate was 11.6 percent, British Columbia's 6.7 percent, Alberta's 6.7 percent, and Manitoba's 9.4 percent.³¹ Only a small minority of anglophones and a larger minority of francophones are capable of full communication in the other language. Third, most of the associations we studied – and, indeed, most pan-Canadian associations – are not mass membership organizations with high degrees of member participation. Rather, they are increasingly specialized, with power highly concentrated in a small elected leadership and in professional staffs. In most, the rank and file are not so much “members” as “volunteers” or “contributors.”³² This reality limits the capacity of associations to support close links between individuals across the cultural divide.

The third approach to understanding cohesion in divided societies places much less emphasis on mass engagement in civil society. It argues that close contacts among individual citizens are not necessary – or perhaps even desirable. Segmented, isolated civil societies can still cohere as long as there is overarching cooperation among the elites.³³ It is they rather than individual members who must cooperate in mutual trust. In some ways, this “elite accommodation” approach, associated with Arend Lijphart, directly contradicts the civil society approach. In other ways, however, the disagreement is simply about the level at which accommodation will take place. Two hypotheses relevant to our study flow from our consideration of the elite accommodation approach. The first is that the success of cross-group accommodation within an association depends largely on the commitment of its elites to a harmonious relationship. The second is that in most groups the relationship between anglophones and francophones will be an indirect one, mediated through the interaction of small, bilingual elites.³⁴ Where this approach falls down, however, is that it does not help us to predict whether or not the elites will be committed to maintaining the relationship, the essential precondition of the elite accommodation model.

The search for the grounds of commitment leads us to suggest a fourth approach to understanding the accommodation of language within groups, one that owes much to a public choice approach to understanding political behaviour. It argues that successful accommodation will depend on how leaders and activists in the group weigh the costs and benefits of further cooperation. Divided societies may function and even prosper as long as the benefits of doing so clearly outweigh the costs. With this in mind, we need

to pay attention to the role that cooperation plays in contributing to the participants' success in meeting their basic goals – from combatting heart disease to promoting international human rights. The benefits of cooperation in turn will depend on a number of factors, including the nature of the interest involved, the cost of cooperation, and what it takes to access the resources required to achieve group goals. In some cases, the incentives to work together will be very strong, in others less so or non-existent.

There are unavoidable costs associated with bilingualism and linguistic accommodation, and they will fall both on individual members of linguistic groups and on the groups themselves. The burden of these costs may be distributed symmetrically or asymmetrically. They are partly financial in the obvious sense of the need to pay for translations of publications and websites and to provide simultaneous translations at meetings.³⁵ But they are also psychological and personal. There are two dimensions: the cost of language acquisition and the communication disadvantage that one always has to bear when one's native language is not used in most transactions. The implications of having a mother tongue different from that of the majority are uncovered in the following quotation from Phillippe Van Parijs, even though he is speaking about the consequences of having a mother tongue different from the official language: "Having a mother tongue different from the one adopted as the official language puts one at a multiple disadvantage. People in that position have to bear the heavy cost of acquiring proficiency in a foreign language. They are handicapped, relative to natives of the official language, in economic and political competition. Most seriously perhaps, their self-respect is under pressure as a result of the subordinate, inferior status given to something as deeply associated with themselves (in other people's eyes and their own) as their mother tongue."³⁶

These kinds of costs fall on both language groups, of course, but they tend to be borne most heavily by the members of the minority community. As Jean Laponce has demonstrated, there is a powerful tendency toward linguistic homogeneity in any group unless there are strong countervailing factors: "As a general rule ... languages in contact, to the extent they cannot ignore each other, will show stratification. Further, except when the object is to forbid rather than to facilitate communications, the dominant language will tend to become the only language."³⁷ Generally, "the minority is more conscious of being a minority – and thus different – than the dominant group is of being dominant," just as "the left-handed is more conscious of being left-handed than the right-handed individual is."³⁸ He adds that "asymmetrical power sharing between two language groups results in the dominant group having the power to decide how the burden of bilingualism will be borne." Occasionally, the dominant group will decide to assume most of the costs, but more frequently the dominant group shifts the cost of bilingualism onto the ethnic minority.³⁹ In national or Canada-wide associations, most

of the accommodations to achieve linguistic harmony will necessarily be made by francophones.⁴⁰ To reduce this burden, the minority-language group will often diminish contact with the majority-language group by means of territorial concentration or – in the voluntary sector – by separate and distinct unilingual associations.

The associations we studied display considerable variety in membership and participation of the two linguistic groups in their lives and activities. The form and extent of francophone participation, given the inherent tendency toward asymmetry, depends on two sets of factors: the benefits francophones gain from the relationship (and their consequent willingness to bear the costs) and the extent to which associational practices help to minimize or equalize the costs (e.g., through translation). Net benefits for both groups may well be highest when the organizational form provides for maximum autonomy for each language group, but this may be at the price of less intense, and perhaps less effective, cooperation on shared goals.⁴¹

We believe that this approach is a powerful challenge to those who emphasize contact, shared identities, or mutual goodwill. Instead, it suggests that each group will weigh the costs and benefits of continued association and act accordingly. Several hypotheses also flow from this perspective. The greater the interdependence between the groups, and the more necessary it is to achieve mutual goals, the larger the incentive to cooperate. Groups can coexist and interact effectively independently of shared identities or values; they can do so because they see themselves as linked communities of fate. They cooperate not because they love each other but because they need each other.

Each of these theoretical approaches, we believe, has something to contribute to our account of associational life in Canada and its voice in the country's grand narrative. We might characterize the contributions each makes by proceeding in reverse order from the sequence in which they have been presented above. What might be called the political economy of linguistic association – our fourth approach – provides an excellent way of explaining why English- and especially French-speaking Canadians would take the trouble of associating together in pursuit of shared objectives. Why bear the costs of cross-language association? The existence of common interests is foundational. In the absence of such interests, there is no reason to associate, but the mere existence of common interests cannot in itself explain association.

To explain the coming together of members of the two language communities in a joint enterprise, one must look to the pattern of incentives and constraints generated by the wider political environment in which they function. The larger the gains from cooperation, the greater the willingness to invest efforts and resources in promoting accommodation. The larger the gains, the more willing are both anglophones and francophones to bear the

costs and make the necessary compromises. In developing their formal and informal structures and practices, each group will push for arrangements that minimize the costs to them while at the same time not losing the benefits that come from working together. The structural asymmetry that marks relations between French and English means that the calculus is different for each of the two groups; since the costs borne by the participating French-speaking Canadians will almost always be higher than those for participating English-speaking Canadians, the benefits from association must be clearer and more marked. The calculus will also vary depending on the issues in which the groups are engaged. For example, if it is one that, under the Constitution, falls unambiguously within provincial jurisdiction, then there is less need for cross-group cooperation; the reverse holds true for matters clearly lying within federal jurisdiction. If economic interests are central to success, and they cut across group lines, then again cooperation is facilitated.

If the political economy of linguistic association helps to explain *why* groups form across the language divide, it does not in itself help us to understand *how* they go about it. For an answer to that question, it is useful to turn to the consociational model. As we will see, the way in which our voluntary associations organize themselves is chiefly via elite accommodation. Relatively small groups of associational leaders and professional staffs, broadly representative of the two linguistic communities, assume the responsibility of running the organization at the pan-Canadian level and make specific arrangements to accommodate French and English in their headquarters and in their services to the regional organizations and rank-and-file membership. Among this elite, especially among the professional staff, one typically finds a substantially higher level of bilingualism than exists in the membership as a whole, and often one also finds an investment in a set of carefully elaborated linguistic practices that permit unilingual board members and other actors to function satisfactorily at the peak of the organization in a two-language environment. Within effectively functioning pan-Canadian voluntary associations, it is often the institution itself that assumes the burden of bilingualism, through the production of documents in both languages, through the linguistic capacities of its professional staff, and at times through simultaneous translation.

If these theoretical approaches help to explain why and how voluntary organizations form and function across the language divide, one is still left with the need to understand what – beyond the bare calculus of cost and benefit – accounts for those pan-Canadian associations that come together and stay together. What explains institutional momentum and the desire, when confronted with crises and challenges, to make things work? Here we think it is useful to appeal to the first and second theoretical approaches we

discussed above, namely the contact hypothesis and social capital theory. In those associations that continue to operate on a pan-Canadian basis, that do not fragment or collapse, that do not radically reconfigure themselves as separate operations, there seems to be evidence of the contact hypothesis functioning in its benign form. The associational leadership's experience of working together on practical problems, of jointly pursuing common objectives, appears in many of the cases we studied to produce sentiments of mutual regard and mutual comprehension. Collaboration in these cases appears to foster – to move to the notion of social capital – the growth of trust and feelings of reciprocity. Consistent with the social capital model, the elite accommodators are invested in the relationship and in the successful pursuit of their common enterprise. Calculations of interest are clothed over time with sentiments of mutual regard, of loyalty, even of affection; a culture of accommodation and collegueship is formed that offers incentives, beyond pure interest, to manage and nurture the relationship. This, at any rate, is what can be observed in some of the best-functioning pan-Canadian associations we studied. In some other cases, on the other hand, the conditions of continuity have not existed, and the organization has folded or been transformed; even there, at least in circumstances in which French and English successor organizations are created out of the collapse of a pan-Canadian institution, relations between them are frequently good, although, consistent with our theory, the connections that exist are much more narrowly calculated on the basis of self-interest.

Design of the Study

Each of the following chapters focuses on the “patterns of association” found in a particular organization or set of organizations. We define these patterns as the organizational forms and practices that have been developed to represent and manage linguistic dualism within each association. With each of the associations, we use “the same slice of history.” We examine them during the period running roughly from the mid-1960s to the mid- to late 1990s. The decade of the 1960s saw the advent of the Quiet Revolution in Quebec and the operation of the federal Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. It was also the period when John Meisel and Vincent Lemieux were completing the study upon which our book builds. In the three decades that followed, Canada went through a tumultuous struggle to accommodate its French- and English-language communities, and it is within the context of this dynamic historical period that we examine the linguistic lives and practices of our voluntary associations. We begin by providing a general profile of each group: its mission, its history, its organizational structure, its resources, and so on. We then situate each group within the larger context of voluntary agencies in its sector.

The body of each chapter examines critical dimensions of internal group life. We look at language use, both in the public face of the association and in its internal communications. We look at how linguistic dualism is reflected in representation on boards, executives, committees, and other decision-making bodies and in the formal and informal practices of group governance. Here we address questions such as what are the burdens and costs of bilingualism, and who bears them? What are the friction points, and how well have they been addressed? Are there pressures for major changes either in formal rules or in informal practices? Have there been critical turning points when linguistic tension came to a head or the organization made fundamental changes in structure or practice? To what extent do these associations provide opportunities for positive, mutually supportive relationships between French- and English-speaking Canadians? How do they balance the need to reflect Canadian dualism against the need to respond to other dimensions of Canadian diversity, including regionalism and multiculturalism? We conclude each case study with some reflections on how these associations might better accommodate and build bridges in their own life and work and with some thoughts about the implications of their experiences for the larger question of building bridging capital in Canada.

Our basic dependent variables throughout these studies are the nature and quality of the relationships and interactions between language groups within the association. To what extent are they characterized by mutual trust and confidence or by distrust and avoidance? To what extent is there cooperation or conflict? To what extent is there mutual recognition and equality in the relationship? And how well are the groups able to collaborate in meeting their shared goals?

We do not presume that any single model or set of practices provides an "ideal" model for the relationship. Indeed, our cases demonstrate a rich array of forms and practices. In some cases, there is a single national association composed of individual members or local chapters. Others, following the larger Canadian pattern, are federations, with an overarching national association and ten provincial associations, exercising different degrees of autonomy. Yet others are "confederal," with the national body being a creature of the provincial associations. All these forms seek to integrate francophones and anglophones into a single organizational structure. In another group of associations, however, distinct francophone and anglophone organizations may coexist, either with both going their own, largely separate, ways or cooperating on shared goals through various forms of "sovereignty-association." Each form is likely to develop different dynamics with respect to membership, representation, language use, and so on and to encounter different sorts of challenges. Unitary associations, for example, may be paralyzed by linguistic conflict or may marginalize members of the minority language group. More separated groups might find it hard to

cooperate or, on the other hand, they may find that removing the language “block” facilitates cooperation and trust.

Finally, we are interested in what explains the patterns we have found. First is the larger social and political context. The internal lives of associations do not exist in isolation from trends in the society in which they are embedded. Heightened linguistic tension at the national level is likely to be reflected in the debates within associations. A trend toward decentralization, asymmetry, or secession in pan-Canadian politics will be reflected at the group level. Hence, we locate the evolution of each group within the broader political context.

A second set of explanations we explore lies in the relationship of the groups we have studied to the federal and provincial aspects of the Canadian state. Associations interact with the state in many ways: it can be the source of funds and support, the object of pressure and lobbying for goals important to the groups, and so on. The state in turn depends on associations in civil society to achieve many of its goals. Groups can help to deliver services through partnership arrangements; they can be a vehicle through which governments communicate to citizens. And they can be instruments through which governments attain larger societal goals – including the building of civil society. In the period covered in these studies, both the federal and the Quebec governments were involved in nation-building projects. As part of this strategy, both worked to strengthen their own linkages with associations by building them into their own policy networks, by providing financial support, and, in the federal case, by encouraging greater bilingual capacity in Canada-wide associations. More generally, group structure and dynamics will also be affected by the extent to which the issues the group is concerned with lie primarily within federal, provincial, or shared jurisdiction. “Bien qu’elles soient indépendantes, les associations bénévoles sont sensibles aux modifications de l’environnement politique dans lequel elles fonctionnent, surtout si leurs objectifs sont controversables et consistent à influencer la politique de l’État.”⁴²

The third set of explanations for patterns of association lies within the groups themselves. Much will depend on the nature of the group’s goals and the extent to which achieving them depends on cooperation across language groups. The more this is so, the more the group will be prepared to meet the inevitable costs associated with bilingualism, and the more its members will work at accommodation. How and how well they manage this depend greatly on another factor: the leadership’s commitment to the bilingual goal and their willingness to deploy the resources needed to achieve it.

The subsequent chapters weave all three sets of explanations together. Seven case studies are presented here. They are in no sense a random sample of the tens of thousands of voluntary associations that exist in Canada. They have been chosen to represent a number of specific sectors.⁴³

- In Chapter 2, William Coleman and Tim Mau explore English-French relations in Canada's comprehensive business associations.
- Grace Skogstad, in Chapter 3, examines linguistic relations in Canada's key farm organizations.
- Chapter 4 looks at a too-often neglected dimension of the public sector, specifically municipal associations, notably the Canadian Federation of Municipalities. This study is distinctive in that the organizations represented are governments rather than civil society associations. Don Stevenson and Richard Gilbert are responsible for this study.
- Richard Simeon, in Chapter 5, addresses language practices in the health sector, reporting specifically on the experiences of the Heart and Stroke Foundations of Canada and the Huntington Societies of Canada and Quebec.
- Jane Jenson and Rachel Laforest study the Canadian Council on Social Development in Chapter 6.
- Cathy Blacklock, in Chapter 7, introduces an international dimension, reflecting on the experience of the World University Service of Canada.
- Finally, in Chapter 8, our second study devoted to the world of international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), Michel Duquette and Sylvie Dugas offer an account of the history of Amnesty International.

These diverse associations demonstrate a wide variety of organizational forms – federal, confederal, sovereignty-association, separated. All have undergone important changes in their continuing search for accommodation over the period studied. Such changes over time can be particularly well documented in the three case studies that replicate those conducted by Meisel and Lemieux: the studies of business, agriculture, and municipalities.

We approach this project both as citizens and as scholars. As scholars, we believe that the pages that follow will contribute to the growing literature on civil society, civic engagement, and social capital. Too few studies in this area have explored what affects the ability of associations to build effective bridges between groups in societies, like Canada, that are characterized by deep cultural cleavages. As citizens, we believe that there is much to be learned from the experiences of these non-governmental associations. The rich variety of ways they have found accommodation will provide lessons for citizens and policy makers as they seek accommodation on the larger constitutional plane.