CITC
CANADIAN ISSUES
THÈMES CANADIENS

Thomas H.B. Symons
Stuart Murray
Steven Schwinghamer
Randy Boswell
Hector Mackenzie
Catherine Duquette
Penney Clark
Alan Gordon

Marc-André Éthier
David Lefrançois
Donald J. Savoie
Stephen J. Toope
His Excellency the Right Honourable David Johnston
The Honourable Stéphane Dion

TO KNOW OURSELVES

MARKING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ACS

Summer 2013

0 61399 70412 2 04

✓ **YES** I would like to subscribe to ACS publications
OUI J'aimerais m'abonner aux publications de l'AEC

ACS • AEC
Association for Canadian Studies • Association d'études canadiennes

RECEIVE All new issues of **Canadian Issues** and **Canadian Diversity**
RECEVEZ Tous les nouveaux numéros de **Thèmes canadiens** et de **Diversité canadienne**

And automatically become a member of the **Association for Canadian Studies**
Et devenez automatiquement un membre de l'**Association d'études canadiennes**

Name/Nom : _____

Address/Adresse : _____

City/Ville : _____ Province : _____

Postal Code/Code postal : _____ Country/Pays : _____

Phone/Téléphone : _____

PAYMENT/PAIEMENT

Send with/Envoyer avec

☐ **Cheque/Chèque**

☐ **Visa credit card/Carte de crédit visa**

Visa Card no./N° de la carte visa :

☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

Exp. Date/Date d'expiration :

☐☐☐☐ (month/mois ☐☐ years/année ☐☐)

Amount/Montant : _____ $

CANADIAN ISSUES
THÈMES CANADIENS

CANADIAN DIVERSITÉ CANADIENNE

MEMBERSHIP FEES/FRAIS D'ADHÉSION
Magazine shipping included/Envoi postal des revues compris

	Canada	USA/États-Unis	International
Regular—1 year/ Régulier—1 an	$55	$90	$125
Regular—2 years / Régulier—2 ans	$100	$170	$240
Institutional/institutionnel	$90	$125	$160
Student or Retired/étudiant ou retraité	$25	$60	$95

PLEASE SEND FORM TO:

Association for Canadian Studies
1822-A Sherbrooke W, Montreal, Quebec, H3H 1E4
By fax: 514 925-3095

Or become a member through the ACS website at www.acs-aec.ca

ENVOYER FORMULAIRE À :

Association d'études canadiennes
1822-A, rue Sherbrooke O., Montréal (Québec) H3H 1E4
Par télécopieur : 514 925-3095

Ou devenez membre sur le site web de l'AEC à www.acs-aec.ca

CITC

CANADIAN ISSUES
THÈMES CANADIENS

SUMMER 2013

Canadian Issues is published by
Thèmes canadiens est publié par

ACS • AEC
Association for Canadian Studies • Association d'études canadiennes

CITC
CANADIAN ISSUES
THÈMES CANADIENS

RÉDACTEUR EN CHEF / EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Jack Jedwab

DIRECTRICE À LA RÉDACTION / MANAGING EDITOR
Julie Perrone

TRADUCTION / TRANSLATION
Victoria Chwalek & Julie Perrone

GRAPHISME / DESIGN
Bang Marketing : 514 849-2264 • 1 888 942-BANG
info@bang-marketing.com

PUBLICITÉ / ADVERTISING
julie.perrone@acs-aec.ca
514 925-3096

ADRESSE AEC / ACS ADDRESS
1822, rue Sherbrooke Ouest, Montréal (QC) H3H 1E4
514 925-3096 / general@acs-aec.ca

Patrimoine canadien Canadian Heritage

Canadian Studies Program
Programme des études canadiennes

Canadian Issues / Thèmes canadiens is a quarterly publication of the Association for Canadian Studies (ACS). It is distributed free of charge to individual and institutional members of the ACS. Canadian Issues is a bilingual publication. All material prepared by the ACS is published in both French and English. All other articles are published in the language in which they are written. Opinions expressed in articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the ACS. The Association for Canadian Studies is a voluntary non-profit organization. It seeks to expand and disseminate knowledge about Canada through teaching, research and publications. The ACS is a scholarly society and a member of the Humanities and Social Science Federation of Canada.

Canadian Issues / Thèmes canadiens est une publication trimestrielle de l'Association d'études canadiennes (AEC). Elle est distribuée gratuitement aux membres de l'AEC. CITC est une publication bilingue. Tous les textes émanant de l'AEC sont publiés en français et en anglais. Tous les autres textes sont publiés dans la langue d'origine. Les collaborateurs et collaboratrices de Thèmes canadiens sont entièrement responsables des idées et opinions exprimées dans leurs articles. L'Association d'études canadiennes est un organisme pancanadien à but non lucratif dont l'objet est de promouvoir l'enseignement, la recherche est les publications sur le Canada. L'AEC est une société savante et membre de la Fédération canadienne des sciences humaines et sociales.

Canadian Issues / Thèmes canadiens acknowledges the financial support of the Government of Canada through the Canadian Studies Program of the Department of Canadian Heritage for this project.

Canadian Issues / Thèmes canadiens bénéficie de l'appui financier du Gouvernement du Canada par le biais du Programme d'études canadiennes du ministère du Patrimoine canadien pour ce projet.

LETTERS/COURRIER

Comments on this edition of Canadian Issues ?

We want to hear from you.
Write to Canadian Issues – Letters, ACS, 1822A, rue Sherbrooke Ouest, Montréal (Québec) H3H 1E4. Or e-mail us at <julie.perrone@acs-aec.ca> Your letters may be edited for length and clarity.

Des commentaires sur ce numéro ?

Écrivez-nous à Thèmes canadiens
Courrier, AEC, 1822A, rue Sherbrooke Ouest, Montréal (Québec) H3H 1E4. Ou par courriel au <julie.perrone@acs-aec.ca> Vos lettres peuvent être modifiées pour des raisons éditoriales.

: @CanadianStudies

A WORD FROM THE PRESIDENT

JOCELYN LÉTOURNEAU is Canada Research Chair in Quebec's Contemporary History, Laval University (Quebec City, Canada). A member of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N.J., he's also fellow of the Royal Society of Canada and of the Trudeau Foundation. A regular visiting professor in foreign universities, he was the principal investigator in a SHRCC funded Community-University Research Alliance (Canadians and their Pasts). In 2010, he was a Fulbright scholar at both UC Berkeley and Stanford University, and a visiting scholar at the Institute for the Study of the Americas (University of London). Dr. Létourneau is the author or editor of many books. Among his major works are *Les Années sans guide : Le Canada à l'ère de l'économie migrante* (Boréal, 1996); *A History for the Future: Rewriting Memory and Identity in Quebec Today* (McGill-Queen's U. Press, 2004); *Le Québec, les Québécois : Un parcours historique* (Fides, 2004), *Le Coffre à outils du chercheur debutant*. Guide d'initiation au travail intellectuel (Boréal, 2006; transl. in Spanish and Portuguese) and *Que veulent les Québécois ? Regard sur l'intention nationale au Québec (français) d'hier à aujourd'hui* (Boréal, 2006). In 2010, he published *Le Québec entre son passé et ses passages* (Fides, 2010). He's actually working on a manuscript tentatively titled *Je me souviens ? Le Québec dans la conscience historique de sa jeunesse*.

Dear friends,

It is with enthusiasm that I have accepted to act as President of the Association for Canadian Studies for the next two years.

I have known the ACS for a long time. I participated in many conferences and seminars organized under its direction. Each time, those were events that had significant impact, either because of the importance and relevance of the issues discussed, the seriousness and quality of scientific exchanges, the interactivity and intellectual exchanges or simply because of the number and professional background of the events' attendees. In Canada, the ACS is currently one of the most active organizations in the field of scientific event planning, organization and management of scholarly networks and dissemination of knowledge to a non-university public.

The activity of ACS manifests itself in different ways: by sponsoring surveys, by producing studies and reports, by holding a multitude of events, and the publication of journals, especially Canadian Issues and Canadian Diversity. We must consider these two magazines, aesthetically appealing and with a reach well beyond academia, as important vehicles for the transmission of new ideas in the public space. To flip through the pages of these magazines is to read pieces, either in English or French, by almost all the great minds of the country and others abroad, on subjects so significant to the past, present and future of Canada. Short and accessible, the articles appearing in these journals reach large audiences, including students, presenting them with unpublished data, with the most recent works, with bearing issues or with new concepts elaborated by people who all have in common the drive to combine the scientific rigor of their research and the social relevance of their questions.

The ACS is not only a place of free and diverse speech, but a place of diversiform and eclectic exchange in which people from all rootedness and all ideational all horizons can express themselves and expose themselves, in an environment of intellectual vivacity and respect for differing opinions. Through the forums organized by the Association – often in collaboration with public or private partners – I was personally able to extend my contacts with colleagues and stakeholders which I would not have met otherwise, for example education specialists, elementary or high school teachers, policymakers acting at the provincial or federal level, scholars or practitioners, idealists or pragmatists, anglophones or francophones, students or seniors researchers from across the country.

The ACS is a place where strong personalities devoted to serious reflection and challenged by the major social issues, have given themselves the objectives, without claiming to have found the Holy Grail, to inspire debate, to encourage discussion and, if necessary, to change the orientation of our questioning in order to open different perspectives on the past, present and future.

With the team in place and other members of the board of directors, my main promise is to ensure that this great work continues.

GETTING TO KNOW OURSELVES: THE ASSOCIATION FOR CANADIAN STUDIES AND ITS EVOLVING 'IDENTITIES'

JACK JEDWAB, Executive Director of the Association for Canadian Studies

The Association for Canadian Studies (ACS) was created in 1973 as a non-profit organization with the mandate of initiating and supporting activities and projects associated with teaching and research in the field of Canadian studies. At the time of the Symons Report (To Know Ourselves) the ACS was in a formative stage and thus was not the object of specific attention in the Report. Yet the ACS was influenced by the findings of the Symons Report which reinforced its mission given the expressed concern over the population's lack of knowledge about their country. Over its forty years of existence, the mandate of the ACS evolved considerably. The Symons report emerged within the context of ongoing concerns over the relationship between English and French Canadians and the impact of immigration on intergroup relations in the country. These concerns were reflected in the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

The Association for Canadian Studies also aimed to provide a forum for reflection across various disciplines (i.e. history, politics, literature and sociology, etc.) by bringing educators and students together to encourage cross-disciplinary collaboration around the study of Canada. The objective was to instill students with a more comprehensive knowledge of the country. The idea would be to encourage the historians, sociologists and literature specialists to become Canadian generalists or as they were otherwise known as domestic "Canadianists". There was no need for "Canadianists" to relinquish their identification with a particular discipline. Yet there was some concern on the part of the discipline-based academics that by definition Canadian Studies necessarily implied inter-disciplinarity. This presumably meant that a Canadian Studies conference or publication must involve the broadest possible range of disciplines. If more than one discipline were not included in a project it was not "Canadian Studies" rather it was the "study of Canada"-it should be acknowledged that the distinction is not necessarily obvious or relevant. The latter option was the designation eventually chosen by McGill University when it established its Institute for the Study of Canada.

Still, the term Canadian Studies remained more popular as reflected by the number of universities that introduced Canadian Studies programs and offered undergraduate degrees in the field. Beyond the challenge of addressing "disciplinarians" within Canadian Studies was the matter of how and whether area studies such as Aboriginal studies, Quebec studies and Ethnic Studies to name but a few were to be subsumed within or co-exist with Canadian Studies. The area studies were also described as interdisciplinary thus broadening the challenge for CS wherein it needed to

determine how to deal with "interdisciplinarity within interdisciplinarity." Inevitably some disciplines and some areas would inevitably feel excluded.

The Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) created a Canadian Studies program (CSP) to promote knowledge about the country and sought to make the academy an important partner in pursuing that goal. During the 1990's with PCH-CSP support, the ACS attempted to create a meeting space for leadership of the Canadian Studies university programs and some of their students despite the risk this would exclude those from Universities without CS programs. PCH hoped the academy of "Canadianists" might be put to use to assist in the promotion of knowledge about Canada to the broader society. It came to realize however that the CS university programs were legitimately preoccupied with the objectives of their academic programs, and thus conferences and publications were geared towards faculty and students. Hence questions arose as to whether the academy constituted the ideal partner in supporting what was referred to as public education programs which in turn entailed the "popularisation" or, less appealing to Anglophones, the French term "vulgarisation" (rendering vulgar) of research and writing in the social sciences and humanities.

By the end of the 1990's the Canadian Studies Program of the Department of Canadian Heritage shifted course and determined that future funding would be directed at programs that on the one hand more clearly targeted the broader Canadian public as well as focusing in particular on the country's secondary students. Discussions between members of the academy only were less likely to secure funds from Canadian Heritage. The shift in priorities on the part of Canadian Heritage meant that the specific academic programs arising from the Universities within which they were located were to be increasingly directed to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council if they required funding for a project. While the Canadian Studies program still offered some very modest sums for university-based forums, that envelope was gradually being phased out. Continued support for the academy would be contingent on the extent to which it could support PCH's objective of reaching the broader population and/or teachers and students at the high school level.

The ACS mandate, mission and funding model were perhaps best described as a hybrid. In *Taking Stock: Canadian Studies in the Nineties*, David Cameron wrote that: "the ACS has always been something of a hybrid as an organization-part learned society, part publishing house, part program administrator, part social administrator for the community of 'Canadianists'. " While undertaking various projects for the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH), the ACS pursued activities common to learned societies with an annual conference and a refereed journal that published the conference's selected papers once per year. It also administered awards on behalf of the Government that encouraged academic writing. While delivering services to its membership to which it also had a constitutional responsibility, it was also accountable to the policy-makers that extended the bulk of the funding. The ACS needed to reconcile the policy objectives of its principle stakeholder with the academic orientation and goals of its members. By the end of the 1990's the legitimate academic pursuits were not deemed to be in line with the policies of the Department of Canadian Heritage. Under the circumstances, the Association for Canadian Studies needed to rethink its objectives accordingly, in light of the direction taken by its principle stakeholder and the majority of ACS Board members.

A 1999 Conference at McGill University on the state of teaching the history of Canada prompted the Canadian Studies program to prioritize the promotion of knowledge of Canada's history and seek ways to support those secondary school teachers that were deemed central in the pursuit of that objective. The idea of creating initiatives to support greater knowledge of Canadian history were in part aimed at addressing the challenge of offering a national vision or historic narrative, since education was a provincial responsibility, thus giving rise to multiple history programs and several accompanying narratives.

Given the success of the national history conference at McGill, at the behest of PCH, the Association for Canadian Studies would organize the next national history conference and examine the feasibility of making the event a biannual or annual gathering. The national history conference would become a central function in the contractual relationship between ACS and PCH. Other aspects of the ACS agenda also needed to be reconsidered. ACS participation in the Congress of the Social Sciences and the Humanities annual gatherings failed to yield the necessary critical mass of participants as

those academics and students that attended the Congress with ACS support naturally gravitated to their disciplines shortly after their presentation. This left very few people at the ACS general assembly. By consequence ACS ultimately chose to hold its annual conference outside the learneds. As to the ACS annual learned publication, *Canadian Issues*, in 1999 its funding was discontinued by the Federation of the Humanities and Social Sciences. To sustain the publication with PCH support required that it looked beyond its traditional academic readership.

The new *Canadian Issues* (CI/TC) evolved into a magazine format that showcased academic work in essays that ranged between 1500 and 3500 some of which were original essays and others condensed versions of longer essays that appeared in peer reviewed publications. The new format held considerable appeal to academics, policy-makers and civil society organizations which saw it as a forum within which to engage in public debates. To be fair, some academics felt the publication was of no use to the academy since the contributors could not make use of the non-refereed essays to bolster their resume towards upgrading their status in the academy.

CITC proved sufficiently popular by attracting a broad cross-section of contributors with the majority from the academy that valued the opportunity to share their work with policy-makers. Since it first appeared in the year 2000 the more than 50 editions of the publication have culminated in the production of well over 700 essays offering a rather sizable body of knowledge from many of Canada's leading experts in a wide variety of areas. The growing number of submissions to CITC offered impetus for the creation of a second similar publication that focused on the challenges confronting our society with respect to the increasingly diverse composition of Canada's population. In 2003, the ACS introduced the publication *Canadian Diversity* (CDC) and with the generous support of Rogers Media was able to secure funding to allow the production of 3-4 editions of the publication annually. The publication caught on quickly with the substantial numbers of academics, policy-makers and researchers attending Citizenship and Immigration Canada's national Metropolis conference. In 2005, Metropolis began commissioning editions of CDC touching upon the challenges of international migration. Certain editions of CDC had print runs of 25 000 for distribution within Canada and abroad while benefitting from contributions from some of the world's leading specialists on immigration, integration and identities. Currently in its tenth year of production, CDC has included over 500 contributions from scholars and policy-makers and is probably one of the most widely read publications in the globe that is singularly dedicated to the theme of diversity.

As the Department of Canadian Heritage expressed a desire to better understand the degree of knowledge about the country's history on the part of the Canadian public, the ACS took up the challenge of examining what Canadians know about history, about which specific areas of Canada's history they were most knowledgeable, where they learned about it and the impact on such knowledge on their identities. In pursuing that objective, the ACS developed an in-house research capacity. It was important in conducting research on knowledge about Canada's history to take into account various demographic considerations such as age, education, region of residence, language and immigrant status. Hence our in-house resources extended their area of expertise to include the study of our population and the salience of identities. We did this primarily via analysis of the census and through the use of public opinion surveys.

Given the evolved ACS mandate to stimulate public discussion and national conversations about Canadian history and identities, it followed that research findings be communicated to the media. We frequently timed the dissemination of research with a conference or with the release of a publication. By 2003, research had emerged as an important part of the ACS agenda and we have become one of the most quoted organisations in national and regional print and electronic media. We have been engaged to conduct research by an increasing number of governmental and non-governmental bodies on a rather diverse set of topics which generally touch on our national identity. A strong case can be made that research generated by the ACS has had an impact on policies in the areas of national governance, immigration, official languages and multiculturalism. Over the past decade, rarely has a week gone by that the research disseminated by the ACS has not been the object of media coverage in some part of the country. The frequent media references to the ACS have meant that Canadian Studies has enjoyed considerable brand recognition probably a factor contributing to the retention of the name Canadian Studies by the Department of Canadian Heritage.

GOVERNANCE

The constituency of the ACS has always been diverse but over the past decade has become increasingly so. Constituency is not meant to refer to those individuals involved in organizational governance nor confined to the membership. Rather it refers to the individuals that attend the conferences, contribute to the publications and subscribe to them and follow the research. Membership in the ACS has fluctuated greatly but gains have been dependent on the extent to which the ACS successfully required membership from those securing funds via its awards, conference travel support or discounts its or other publication subscriptions (in exchange for the discounts the other organizations sought ACS subsidies). When PCH made it clear that it would no longer fund, either directly or indirectly, its scholarly activities, the membership would inevitably decline and must to the displeasure of other Canadian studies organizations the subsidies would be discontinued. By desire and necessity, the ACS reached out well beyond the academy to include a wide range of policy-makers and civil society representatives all with a shared interest in and commitment to the advancement of knowledge about Canada. In doing so, the ACS contributed to broadening the definition of who belonged to the community of domestic Canadianists.

With nearly 15 years of involvement with this organisation and having worked closely with the Canadian Studies program of PCH, I think I can safely be dubbed a "Canadianist de souche" (a rooted Canadianist). The diversification of the community of Canadianists has been reflected in the composition of its Board of Directors. It is worth noting that neither the ACS Board nor its Chair were confined to members of the academy. In 1998 the ACS Chair was a senior official from the National Library and Archives. Since 2000, the ACS has been fortunate to have outstanding Canadianists serve as Chair from different sectors such as Foreign Affairs senior historian Hector Mackenzie, Acadian Studies Guru Maurice Basque, former Constitutional Law Professor Honourable Herbert Marx, activist scholar and civil society champion Professor Minelle Mahtani, University of Alberta constitutional law professor and activist the late Gerald Gall and currently one of Canada's most respected historians Université Laval's Jocelyn Letourneau.

The ACS has a Constitution which de jure makes it accountable to its membership and they in turn are represented by a national Board of Directors. Unlike many associations the revenue of the ACS is not driven by membership dues or members donations which together account for less than one percent of overall income. ACS funding arises largely from conference proceeds, publications and research projects undertaken by the ACS for various government and non-government organizations the principal support originating with the Department of Canadian Heritage. The funders have a large stake in the organisation and righty expect the projects they contract to the ACS to effectively respond to a set of agreed upon objectives. The projects that the ACS undertakes are consistent with its current mandate which focuses on the promotion of knowledge about Canada. The ACS needs to think in terms of partners and stakeholders in the construction of its program. ACS member's main motivation for joining is to secure the publications and this does not make for a considerable organizational "stake" or "buy in". This reality raises important issues about the associative dimension of the ACS especially where managerial remuneration is not derived from the membership. Such questions confront several associations in light of government cuts and declining numbers of individuals from the academy. Many observers see the ACS as think tank or research institute addressing questions about Canadian identities. Both in Canada and abroad there has been significant change to the academy, civil society and government but not always sufficient thought directed at how they can collaborate successfully. In the next edition of CI/TC I will offer some insights and ideas on how the study of Canada and the Association for Canadian Studies can most effectively adapt to the changing circumstances and ideally grow stronger in going forward.

ON THE SYMONS REPORT

JULIE PERRONE, Assistant Director of the Association for Canadian Studies

One of the themes for this special edition of Canadian Issues is the fortieth anniversary of the Association for Canadian Studies. Inevitably, our reflection took us to the founding of the ACS, which we attribute in large part to the Symons Report. Hence, to mark our fortieth anniversary is also to celebrate Tom H.B. Symons' critical work on the state of the knowledge which Canadians have about their country. Encouraging Canadians to know more about "themselves" has been and will continue to be a dominant objective of the ACS.

Because the articles in this issue begin with a reflection on the Symons Report, some background on the report and its recommendations will serve as an introduction.

The Commission on Canadian Studies was appointed by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada on June 28 1972, to conduct "a careful examination to determine whether the country's universities were paying adequate attention to Canadian conditions and circumstances, and to the needs and problems of this country, in their programs of teaching and research."[1]

At the head of the Commission was Thomas H.B. Symons, founding president of Trent University. Although the work of the Commission has come to be known as the Symons Report, there was a sizeable team working under Professor Symons. As research associates, the Commission appointed Marcel Caya, Ralph Heintzman, Thomas McMillan and Lucien Michaud. The research coordinator was Michael Jenkins. Jamie Benidickson, James Colthart, James Fulton, Brian Greer, Marguerite Maillet, Pierre Marin, Donna McGillis, Ian McLeod, Robert Stephenson and Dixon Thompson were research assistants. James Page acted as consultant for community colleges, William Young for audio-visual and John Martyn for schools.

To proceed with its inquiries, the Commission organized public meetings across the country, surveyed university departments and curricula, reached out to different constituencies within Canada, and contacted Canadian scholars living outside of Canada.

Based on this outreach, as well as extensive research, the Commission provided insight into the state of Canadian Studies in Canada. As the Report states, the first difficulty encountered was the very definition of the term 'Canadian Studies' which differed greatly from one individual to the next. In line with its mandate, the Commission provided this definition: "teaching or research in any field that, as one of its major purposes, promotes knowledge about Canada by dealing with some aspect of the country's culture, social conditions, physical setting, or place in the world."[2] The definition of Canadian Studies as laid out by the Commission has continued to evolve over the past 40 years.

The Report itself featured eight sections: curriculum, science and technology, the Canadian component in education for the professions, Canadian Studies abroad, Canadian Studies in the community colleges, archives and Canadian Studies, Audio-Visual resources and other media support for Canadian Studies, and, finally, the private donor and Canadian Studies. The Commission provided in-depth analyses of each of these sectors as well as several recommendations.

With regard to curriculum, the Commission found that universities did not consider the topic of Canadian Studies significant enough to give it much attention. So much so that it concluded: "there are few other countries in the world with a developed post-secondary educational system that pay so little attention to the study of their own culture, problems and circumstances in the university curriculum."[3] To remedy this glaring disregard, the Commission made several recommendations, ranging from the creation of a committee in each university mandated to consider the Report and to find ways to implement some of the recommendations; to a greater focus on local and regional studies; more support for the arts; more interactions between levels of education; further development of bilingual capacities; and the recruitment of faculty "sensitive to the academic and cultural environment of Canadian society."[4]

In science and technology, the Commission argued that there was a frequent lack of consideration of Canadian matters. The Report stated, "…although science is international in scope, there are aspects of both science and technology that are particularly pertinent to Canada."[5] Scientific research, when paired with the consideration of specifically Canadian issues, could help Canadians learn more about their physical environment and find ways to better use and protect its resources. To this end, the Commission made recommendations which included the conduct of environmental impact studies for development projects, the creation of a university of the north, better access to, and better dissemination strategies for, research and data, the inclusion in curricula of a course on the history of science and technology in Canada, and more funding for science museums.

In terms of professional education, the Commission argued that no matter how specific the professional program, it needed a Canadian component to prepare future professionals for the Canadian context. As Professor Symons wrote, "In order to be able to make their best contribution, members of the professions in Canada must know this country well – know its institutions, culture, history, and problems – and be prepared to meet its needs and circumstances."[6]

The Commission widened the scope of its study to examine knowledge about Canada elsewhere in the world. It argued that for Canadian Studies to flourish abroad, there needed to be a conscious effort on the part of the Canadian government to "take a new and more active approach to the cultural aspects of its international relations."[7] To address the situation, the Commission made general recommendations including, for example, to give more attention to Canadian Studies in the activities of the Department of External Affairs; hire more cultural officers and attachés; create university chairs in Canadian Studies at selected locations abroad; and encourage academic travel and student exchanges. In addition to these, the Report listed a number of country-specific recommendations.

Even though it was concerned primarily with Canadian universities, the Commission broadened its scope by also including community colleges. To prepare their students for the Canadian job market, the Report argued, colleges needed to "relate their curricula and their planning to Canadian requirements."[8] The recommendations made with regard to community colleges included, the need for greater knowledge of college programs in universities and vice-versa; more provincial funding for college libraries; greater collaboration with museums and art galleries; and making Canadian studies an "integral part of formal college education."[9]

In the Archives and Canadian Studies section, the Report focused mostly on access to and funding for archival institutions, as the Commission believed that archives are the foundations of the study of Canada. Indeed, the Report states that "…the future quality of Canadian Studies is directly linked to the condition and resources of Canadian archives. It is not too much to say that Canadian archives are the foundation of Canadian Studies."[10] Among the recommendations issued by the Commission were the creation of a national network of regional archives and a national guide of resources, the development of a public awareness program, the implementation of archival services in every university, courses on archival procedures, and the creation of a permanent film archive.[11]

The Commission also considered media support for Canadian Studies, noting already in the mid-1970s that the use of non-print media was fast developing. The section on Audio-Visual resources and other media support for Canadian Studies sought to make teachers and scholars aware of these resources, which were at the time often rejected as teaching devices. To change this way of thinking, the Commission made such recommendations as reviewing educational budgets to allow for the acquisition of audio-visual materials, the inclusion of media production companies in academic conferences, the organization of a national conference with a view "toward achieving a standard Canada-wide classification system for media materials,"[12] greater communication between museums, art galleries and universities, and a request for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to make its materials available at a lower cost to universities.

A last section of the Report focused on the private donor and Canadian Studies. Given the context of increasing government cuts, the Commission looked at private donors as a potential source of funding for Canadian Studies initiatives. Stating that "emphasis in the past has perhaps been too much on raising money for bricks and mortar,"[13] the Report suggested that donors may now be interested in teaching and research projects. On this particular aspect, the Commission recommended, among other things, the seeking out of private sector support, greater availability of information on Canadian foundations, and greater balance in regional funding.

All in all, the Report touched upon a great many areas where Canadian Studies did not receive the attention they deserved, and where there existed significant opportunities to increase the knowledge of Canadians about their own country. There were significant changes implemented by universities, community colleges, libraries and the national government in response to the Symons Report and at least two subsequent reports taking stock of these changes. The great influence this report has had on Canadian Studies is unquestionable, and the articles featured in this publication touch upon the many places to which this influence has spread.

NOTES

1 T.H.B. Symons, To Know Ourselves. The Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies, Volume I, Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1975, 2.

2 *Ibid*., 5.

3 *Ibid*., 128.

4 *Ibid*., 134.

5 *Ibid*., 141.

6 *Ibid*., 180.

7 T.H.B. Symons, To Know Ourselves. The Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies, Volume II, Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1975, 45.

8 *Ibid*., 58.

9 *Ibid*., 66.

10 *Ibid*., 69.

11 *Ibid*., 82-85.

12 *Ibid*., 104.

13 *Ibid*., 113.

REFERENCES

The subsequent reports:

James Page, Reflections on the Symons Report. The State of Canadian Studies in 1980, Report prepared for the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada, 1981.

David Cameron, Taking Stock: Canadian Studies in the Nineties", Montreal: Association for Canadian Studies, 1996.

For more on Canadian Studies, visit the Canadian Encyclopedia website at: http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/canadian-studies

For more on the Commission on Canadian Studies, consult the archival fonds at Trent University: http://www.trentu.ca/admin/library/archives/86-031.htm

For more on Thomas H.B. Symons, visit his archival fonds, searchable at: http://www.trentu.ca/library/archives/97-019.htm. A new anthology entitled *Tom Symons: A Canadian Life*, edited by Ralph Heintzman and published in 2011 is also available.

FORTY YEARS ON: AN INTERVIEW WITH THOMAS H.B. SYMONS

Professor **TOM H.B. SYMONS** is a teacher and writer in the field of Canadian Studies and public policy. He has written extensively on intellectual, cultural, and historical issues, and on international academic and cultural relations. He is the Founding President of Trent University, serving as its President and Vice-Chancellor from 1961 to 1972, and since that time as Vanier Professor and Vanier Professor Emeritus. He was appointed to the Board of Directors of the Ontario Heritage Trust in 2006, and became Chairman in 2010.

Professor Symons served as Chairman of the Commission on Canadian Studies from 1972 to 1984 at the request of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), and as Chairman of the Commission on Commonwealth Studies from 1995-1996 at the request of the Commonwealth Secretary General. He was Chairman of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada for the decade from 1986 to 1996, and Chair of the Canadian Polar Research Commission in 1988. He is a Member of Council of the Historica Foundation, a Member of the Council of Advisors of the Heritage Canada Foundation, and a Governor of the Fathers of Confederation Buildings Trust in Charlottetown. Professor Symons is Honorary President of the Peterborough Historical Society, Past Chair of the Council of the Canadian Canoe Museum, Founding Chair of the Canadian Association in Support of the Native Peoples, Chair Emeritus of the Peterborough Lakefield Police Services Board, and served on the Panel appointed by the Canadian Government to report on the Future of the Trent-Severn Waterway, 2007-2008.

He has also served as Chair of the National Library Advisory Board, Chair of the National Statistics Council, Vice-Chair of the National Capital Planning Committee, Chair of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, Chairman of the 500 plus-member Association of Universities of the Commonwealth, and Chair of the International Board of United World Colleges.

Professor Symons became an Officer of the Order of Canada in 1976 and a Companion of the Order of Canada in 1997. He was appointed a member of the Order of Ontario in 2002. In 2012, Professor Symons was awarded the Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Medal, and received a Knighthood from the Vatican in the Order of Saint Sylvester.

ON THE COMMISSION

The Commission was a great team of mostly young people who genuinely cared about what we were doing, all talented and bright individuals, mostly serving on a voluntary basis.. We would often talk about our work half way through the night, about how best to address issues or to resolve problems. We had fun, we enjoyed each other's company, we cared about what we were doing, and we thought it was worthwhile.

There was also a large Advisory Panel of experts in various fields. Liaison Persons at universities and colleges across Canada, and often beyond, were also asked to serve as reference points to assist the Commission with its work.

THE CONTEXT FOR THE COMMISSION

First of all, I certainly was aware, when I was asked by the AUCC, to Chair a Commission to examine the state of teaching and research about Canada, that there was quite a bit of indifference about the subject and about the proposal to have such a study undertaken. A number of colleagues, university presidents, and other academic leaders, were surprised that I accepted the invitation to lead the Commission, and that I would devote my time to such a "shallow and pointless endeavour", as several described it.

Many thought the subject was not actually worthy of serious examination. Indeed, one colleague thought it was very parochial, very provincial: "it's rather like collecting postage stamps," he told me "and a grave misuse of your time". Certainly, this was one of the most prevalent attitudes towards the Commission on Canadian Studies. History itself was pretty unfashionable then, but at least American and European histories were perceived as dealing with great broad-ranging issues, whereas Canadian affairs were seen to be small potatoes, a minor footnote.

There was indifference but there was also hostility. The response to the Commission was much more politically charged than perhaps anticipated. There were people who felt very strongly that it was dangerous and anti-intellectual, indeed unscholarly in fact, for a country to be preoccupied with itself, or paying too much attention to itself. And there were those at the other end of the scale, the very 'hyped up' Canadian nationalists, who said the Commission should burn the American flag on the steps of Parliament and declare our independence from Fortress America..

But there was also an atmosphere in which quite a few people increasingly thought it was important to look at the question: how much attention and what sort of attention were Canadians devoting to the study, understanding, teaching, and research about their own affairs? In the vast middle between the extreme nationalists, and those who felt indifference or hostility to Canadian Studies, we found there were a great many people in every province, and in every institution, who had a growing concern about whether the country was doing itself justice with the amount of education and research it devoted to its own affairs.

In short, there were, broadly, three kinds of attitudes towards Canadian Studies at the time of the Commission's appointment: indifference, antipathy, and growing concern.

RESPONSES TO THE COMMISSION AND ITS WORK

The response, not only to the Commission's report, but in terms of the help we received throughout the process, was extraordinary. It went far beyond anything anybody had expected. This incredible response told us very quickly that the Commission was timely and that it was dealing with something that needed and deserved attention from the education community.

We received over 1 000 briefs, and approximately 2 500 people attended public hearings across the country. The Commission travelled right across Canada, visiting every province and the northern territories. It also corresponded extensively with scholars from Canada and abroad. Close to 30,000 letters were sent our way, all of them acknowledged, in fact, a great many of them actually received detailed replies from the Commission. The response was massive, and quite positive. Many of these letters came from Canadians who were abroad, Canadians living elsewhere but looking in, who were in a position to compare the situation in Canada to similar concerns in another country, another way of living. Responses also came from virtually every cultural group in Canada and from every part of Canada.

We were swamped. Those who were indifferent or hostile to the study thought it would wrap up in 6 weeks to 6 months. In reality, it took a few years! It was a very substantial, worthwhile, and significant exercise.

I should mention that the response continues through to today, some 40 years later! It's a rare day when I don't have at least one letter, email, or telephone call arising from the work of the Commission asking for information, help, or guidance. Every month or two, one or two new files are created, which keep track of what's going on in the field of Canadian Studies in Canada and abroad. The Commission has had a huge tail! In consequence, there is a very substantial body of papers pertaining to the Commission at the Trent University Archives. Recently, I transferred additional papers, which filled some 22 large boxes, organized into about 1,125 files.

EXPECTATIONS AND RESULTS

What I most hoped for, from our work at the Commission and the ensuing report and its recommendations, was an increased awareness of the validity, the value, and the necessity of looking at the Canadian dimensions in every aspect of education and knowledge. Even when dealing with Ancient Greece, for example, you need to know the history of Canadian scholarship and activity in that field, and you need to understand what the Canadian role in such study and research has been, as well as understanding the immense and pervasive legacy of the classical world in our philosophy, culture, language, literature, and political institutions. Similarly with the study of moon rocks: in which a number of Canadians and Canadian institutions have been engaged. There is always a Canadian dimension in the exploration of knowledge. It may not be as large in some areas, it may vary in others. But it should be constant and pervasive. This fact is much better recognized now, some 40 years after the Commission began its work, and this is due, in part at least, to its work.

I was also hoping for more concrete things: for more resources to be devoted to the enlargement of knowledge about Canada and about Canadian affairs, about its spiritual, educational and cultural world. That happened, too, and it often happened as a fairly direct result of the Commission's work. Let us look at some of these results.

The Commission helped to create a great surge in the support for archives. This new interest developed in fields which had otherwise never paid much attention to the value of archival materials. The Commission put forward 31 recommendations for action related to archives. Almost all of those recommendations have been implemented, many of them very quickly, and some of them on a surprisingly substantial scale. We also saw increased support, as hoped for and urged in the Report, for reference materials. *The Dictionary of Canadian Biography* (DCB), an invaluable tool for Canadian scholars and students in any field, was very largely a response to the Commission's Report, and I was asked to serve on its founding Advisory Board. *The Encyclopedia of Canadian Music*, a marvellous and authoritative work, was also encouraged as a concept by the Commission's Report, based on the remarks made on the cultural life of the country, and, again, I was invited to serve on its Advisory Board.

In several instances special programs and initiatives were created as a result of the Commission's Report. For example, citing recommendations in *To Know Ourselves*, the Canada Council created the Canadian Institute for Historical Micro-Reproductions, which launched a huge initiative to record and preserve copies of Canadian print newspapers, from the beginning, providing an initial two million dollars for this purpose. This has been an utterly vital development in Canadian Studies, significant for every one concerned with anything to do with the historical life and development of the country. This recommendation was acted on within months of the publication of the Commission's Report.

There were 61 recommendations made with regard to curriculum and most of them have been implemented.

There were 46 recommendations with regard to science and technology, which were reviewed in a series of meetings by the Science Council and the National Research Council which I was invited to attend.

In regard to education for the professions, one predominant general concern emerged which led to a major recommendation, calling for a conscious and deliberate attention to be given in a balanced way to the Canadian components in any program of professional education.

For Canadian Studies Abroad, we proposed 88 recommendations, a very large number. We paid strong attention to this particular question, and received good briefs or communications from Canadians living in 30-40 different countries. The Department of External Affairs, after some fudging, did implement support measures to encourage teaching and knowledge about Canada abroad and I would give them great credit for doing that. The Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, and Alberta were also very helpful in this matter.

The Commission also underlined the value of foreign students coming to study in Canada and of sending Canadian students abroad, making 24 recommendations on this topic. People thought we would be focused inwards and were thus quite surprised that we examined this particular issue in such depth. But our argument was that, to be a good Canadian, one needed to know about everybody else, and about the place of Canada in the world. Canadians learn a great deal about their own country when they are elsewhere, or when they are with others from elsewhere, when they are in a better position to asses our differences. Not everyone can travel, so how wonderful to have students from all over the world coming to the school where you are and to have the opportunity to benefit from their presence.

The Commission noted, similarly, the value of an appropriate mix of faculty from outside of Canada and the importance of Canadian faculty gaining experience in other countries.

There were 28 recommendations for community colleges. I think that surprised people because they thought we were purely a university commission. However, we decided very early on that the postsecondary field was one large community with a great many shared problems and that the community colleges needed to be included in our reflection. My colleague James Page was the leader on this file and he did a fantastic job.

There were 23 recommendations concerning technological support, including audio-visual resources and media supports, as something which makes a significant difference to how extensively and effectively the tasks of education and research can be done in Canadian Studies as in any other area, but perhaps more so given the propinquity of such studies.

The need to stir up the private sector and to rally the support of private donors was another area of concern, and the Commission made 23 recommendations pointing to the needs and opportunities for benefactions, grants, and donations to support the enlargement of teaching and research about Canada.

I should also mention the development in museums, galleries, and heritage conservation, which has been extraordinary. The increasing presence and role of Canadian museums and art galleries, and the development of heritage programs and heritage trusts (both government and private) is a profoundly significant development. There are heritage programs or trusts in nearly every province and territory now, whose aim is to promote the preservation, the use, and the teaching about heritage in all its forms: natural sites, pioneer villages, inventions, discoveries, cultural and demographic foci, artistic achievements, battlefield sites, significant events and people, and much more. Heritage recognition is a major development that has expanded exponentially in the last generation.

The Commission paid attention, especially in its third volume, to the question of balance. Chapters focused on demography, and on the status of women in Canadian academic life. It argued that if an educational structure disadvantaged in any way half its population, this was a huge disservice to the field of knowledge about Canada, and, indeed, everything else! Both genders have to be fully in the picture. 30 recommendations were made to improve the status of women in Canadian academic life.

All this led to a degree of awakening and a shift in attitude: It reduced the indifference and hostility towards Canadian Studies, and it enlarged in a thorough and scholarly way the number of people who began consciously to think about the legitimacy of looking at their country's own problems and prospects.

ON THE STATE OF CANADIAN STUDIES PROGRAMS IN CANADA

In the early stages after the report, people started counting flags: how many universities had created departments or programs of Canadian Studies? And I think that's a mistake. The bigger question is whether or not there is an appropriate awareness of, and attention to,

the Canadian content, context, and dimensions in each department or program, to the extent that it is appropriate or desirable in that field. The gain in these terms has been significant. The actual number of formally designated Canadian Studies programs wavers up and down. For a while there was a steady growth, but several have dropped out. However, those which remain have grown stronger.

I think it is very important to have some programs that are specifically called Canadian Studies, because they can act as spark plugs. Some classes have 'Canadian' in their title, but that may mean little or nothing. Is the content that ought to be there effectively there? Is attention being paid to the Canadian contributions or to the Canadian needs? Are they receiving the full attention and support that they need and deserve? We've come a long way, but there is still a long way to go. I think it's important for people to sort out the difference between being simply critical and thinking critically. It's desirable to think critically in every area of knowledge, while it is tiresome and counterproductive to be simply critical. This applies in Canadian Studies as in every other field.

ON THE STUDY OF CANADA ABROAD

The overseas dimension of looking at the state of research and teaching about Canada became a major dimension of the work of the Commission on the state of Canadian Studies. And I think the situation has improved immeasurably. There are now numerous societies for the study of Canada in many other countries. They are doing a good job of keeping in touch with one another and with Canadian scholars in Canada. Canadian Studies used to be only in the United States and the United Kingdom and parts of Western Europe. It has now spread to Australasia, Latin America, Asia, Africa, Central and Eastern Europe. Many universities in other countries may not have full programs on Canadian studies, but Canada will be featured in some ways: through its history, its geography, its people, its attitudes, its culture. It will appear in one way or another in their programs and curriculum. While the situation abroad has changed greatly for the better, there is still more to be done.

The Francophonie and the Commonwealth are two examples of a very rich and very real connection for Canadian Studies. Many universities in communities with which we have old and special ties are quite active in the teaching of Canada.

As for the recent major cuts to Canadian Studies abroad, I will say that a mature and intelligent country should realize that a good foreign policy involves academic and cultural dimensions. I think it is a great mistake even in this current economy of some degree of recession to cut back on that which supports a well-informed knowledge of Canada abroad. Such knowledge supports business, exports, foreign policy, diplomacy, defence. Cutting back on the support of Canadian Studies abroad is exactly the wrong direction to take, and this needs to be said loud and clear.

CANADIAN STUDIES AND INTERDISCIPLINARITY

Interdisciplinarity remains a good approach to Canadian Studies, but I would suggest that whether it is the best approach really depends on the circumstances – on the students and teachers and their preferences, needs and resources. But the idea of looking at Canadian things in the whole when you can is a good one. Knowledge of any subject can be enriched by looking at it from every side. I think it is a mistake, for example, to concentrate our energies only on history. To limit the viewing of Canada through an exclusively historical lens leads to unbalanced and stunted scholarship.

KNOWLEDGE OF HISTORY AND ATTACHMENT TO COUNTRY

I think this is a very deep question. Do Canadians need to know their history? They don't have to but they ought to, because their feeling for, and understanding of, their country will be greatly informed and enriched. We are lucky in Canada because it is such a beautiful land that one could just look around and feel great pride without knowing a damn thing about it! Love of country is simpler than history. In a very simple not jingoistic way, the love of your home and native land is a first level of knowledge. The second level is to learn about the country, its nature, its problems, its potential. Greater knowledge leads to greater understanding and greater affection for the country. It will make it possible for a country and its citizens to make better future decisions. Knowledge about Canada allows Canadians to better understand their country and to better serve it.

I feel the need to quote here what I ventured to write on page 12 of the Commission's Report: "the most valid and compelling argument for Canadian Studies is the importance of self-knowledge, the need to know and to understand ourselves, who we are, where we are in time and space, where we have been, where we are going, what we possess what our responsibilities are to ourselves and to others."

DO CANADIANS KNOW THEMSELVES BETTER TODAY?

I would say, in many ways they do. At least they know more about one another now, and that knowledge embraces more than the community they live in. People in southern Ontario, for example, are, I believe, better informed about what's going on in the Maritimes, or in Quebec, or in the North or the West, than was the case 40 years ago.

But we need a broader vision. Canada is a complex country, and in many ways it is becoming even more complex, and definitely not simpler. With the development of new territories in the north, with Canada's increasing international role, with the demographic changes in age, ethnic background, language, etc., it has become a more challenging, but also more interesting place.

SHOULD EVERYONE KNOW A MINIMAL SET OF FACTS ABOUT OUR HISTORY?

Every Canadian should know the broad history of the country. That doesn't mean just of one part or one element of the country. I am a little suspicious when a government wants to tell me what I ought to know. I think it's very desirable for people to have a sufficient knowledge of the nature, problems and identity of the country, in order to be a good citizen. The question of education for and about the country is very, very important. I would back away, however, from anything that would lead people to believe that there is one true story. Canada's history and experience is a broad and complex thing, with a lot of shaky episodes that we need to face up to.

WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY IS IT TO KEEP OUR HISTORY AND TO DISSEMINATE IT TO LATER GENERATIONS?

It is both an individual and a collective responsibility. I wouldn't want to live in a country where a chosen few, a special few, no matter how good their intentions, are the custodians of our identity and our self-knowledge. It is so important that it be something in which all individuals participate and which then results in a collective responsibility. Having said that, there is a need, which we have to recognize, to have spark plugs, some active practitioners whose job it is to remind us of what we need to know and what we need to do, what the facts are, what research has been done, and what research needs to be done. These will often find their place in education, and in entities like boards of education, but ultimately it's for all us. But you do need to have some centres, some programs, which will provide a continuing focus on the study of Canada.

The concept of citizenship is really important here. One cannot be a good citizen, something we should all aspire to be, without endeavouring to learn how the country works; to know the apparatus of government; and to be well enough informed to be able to know and understand, and to debate and decide, on policy issues. Civic knowledge and civic membership are utterly fundamental.

CONCLUSION

We face clearly a great many challenges, in an increasingly complex country in an increasingly complex world. But I'm very optimistic looking at the future. I think Canadians have the ability, the track record, and the opportunity to acquire, and to develop the knowledge to be good citizens and to make a good contribution to the rest of the world. Balance, perspective and resilience, I think those are qualities that are abroad in our land. The situation calls also for a deep affection for our remarkable country and a growing recognition of the importance of our rich heritage – cultural, natural, and built. Heritage is at the heart of everything and from it we should take pride and pleasure in our diversity and in our growing confidence about our place in the world. I think a Canadian degree of self-knowledge and ability to contribute usefully to the world is progressing pretty well, very nearly as it should. But we have more to do.

A FOUNDATION ON CONVERSATION: LEVERAGING THE ROLE OF DIALOGUE AT THE CANADIAN MUSEUM FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

STUART MURRAY was appointed as the first Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the new Canadian Museum for Human Rights, Canada's fifth national museum and the first to be built outside the National Capital Region, in September 2009. Mr. Murray has served as President and CEO of the St. Boniface Hospital and Research Foundation since 2006. He became Leader of the PC party of Manitoba in 2000 and resigned in 2006. Stuart also worked as President and CEO of DOMO Gasoline Corporation Ltd. from 1989 to 1999. His past positions include working with the Prime Minister of Canada from 1985-1989, Media Director and fundraiser for the Canadian Opera Company as well as Road Manager for the rock band Blood, Sweat & Tears. Stuart has also been very active in the community. As volunteer Chairman of the 1999 World Junior Hockey Championships in Winnipeg, Stuart and his team organized what was the most successful tournament in its 20-year history. He was also Manitoba Co-Chair of the Royal Winnipeg Ballet (RWB) Sustaining Applause Campaign, raising in excess of 10 million dollars. He received the Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Medal in 2012 for his contributions to Winnipeg and Manitoba.

ABSTRACT

What do Canadians see when challenged to examine their country through the lens of human rights? Does our sense of national identity change? Is there a shift in our shared aspirations for Canada, Canada's obligations to the world, or our responsibility as individual Canadians to one another? From 2008 through 2012 the Canadian Museum for Human Rights engaged citizens from every part of Canada in an unprecedented national discussion, uniquely framed to evaluate our nation's strengths, shortcomings and future challenges from a human rights perspective. The result was an expectedly complex weave of stories, insights and observations, punctuated by often intensely personal accounts of the attendant challenges of enduring and overcoming barriers to the rights many of us are able to take for granted. This national exercise served to highlight human rights successes consistent with what many identified as Canadian ideals of inclusion, equality and fairness, such as the then-recently won right of same-sex couples to marry. It also served to underscore persistent, deeply rooted barriers still facing many Canadian citizens; the inveterate poverty and associated gaps in health and education endured by many Aboriginal Canadians as a frequently cited example. The Museum's nationwide consultation yielded a rich picture of Canadians' expectations for a national human rights museum, their perspectives on how the Museum could best serve Canada, and most significantly, how the Museum could best empower its visitors to identify and dissolve the obstacles that continue to impede the rights and opportunities of many, both within Canada and abroad. This essay explores the inherent value of a pan-Canadian human-rights discussion in fostering a shared national ideal, the essential role of conversation and dialogue in giving shape to the Canadian Museum for Human Rights' galleries, exhibits and programs, and the unique role of dialogue in allowing the Museum to fulfill its public mandate to inspire its visitors to help advance the rights of all.

Four decades ago T.H.B. Symons bestowed on Canada a generational landmark; a blueprint designed to better the way the country learned about itself, the scope of its character and the reaches of its ambition.

Canada's places of higher learning were the intended and most immediate beneficiaries of Symons' inquiry, his appraisal of "the state of teaching and research in studies relating to Canada" undertaken to sharpen the tools with which we taught, pondered and debated our nation within our academic institutions.

Yet the larger legacy of Symons' remarkable contribution to Canada, I would argue, is yet to be fully known, because the seeds of his pan-Canadian effort of the early and mid-1970s continue to foment new growth, and much of it beyond the boundaries of Canada's colleges and universities.

As CEO of the Canadian Museum for Human Rights (CMHR), I know this first-hand. Ours is a relatively small staff, headquartered in Winnipeg, Manitoba. And yet we have within our fledgling ranks no fewer than three graduates of Trent University, the small-but-venerable institution, synonymous with Canadian Studies, of which Symons served as founding president and instilled in so many a persistent curiosity to find and unearth the enigmatic machinery that makes this country tick.

That pronounced passion for Canada – its idiosyncrasies, its contradictions, its promise – is the requisite to taking up the considerable and at times daunting challenge of crafting, from the ground up, a museum tasked with untangling a central thread in the story of this country's democratic evolution, and in turn equipping Canadians with the tools to author fresh chapters. We at the CMHR are privileged to have among us staggeringly accomplished graduates of many of Canada's esteemed universities; some the direct descendants of Symons' Trent, but all linked by a profound interest in the successes and stumbles that have come to define this country. The fuller measure of Symons' legacy arguably rests here; the long reach of the debate spawned by his inquiry and numerous recommendations having impacted the way so many of our universities approached the teaching and study of Canada, and the progeny of those institutions now engaged in grand undertakings of their own at places like the Canadian Museum for Human Rights.

Indeed, as we will explore here, there are echoes of Symons inherent in both the creation and the aspiration of the Canadian Museum for Human Rights. Symons was lead architect of a national discussion that sought perspective on Canada through the lens of teaching and scholarship. From 2008 through 2012 the CMHR facilitated a national discussion of its own, engaging some 3,500 Canadians from every region of the country to solicit perspective on Canada through the lens of human rights. It is my own sincere hope that as with Symons, the value of return on our museum's national exercise will continue to reveal itself decades from now. But even today, it has served to establish an infrastructure on which to build, for the first time, a uniquely Canadian museum fully dedicated to the cause of human rights. This "foundation on conversation" defines the very character of the Canadian Museum for Human Rights; it is the summation of the qualities that afford the museum its distinct "Canadianness;" it informs the mechanism by which we develop and program our museum exhibits; and it is the soul of our learning and public programming offerings, which are as essential to our museum's mandate as the exhibits themselves.

There are key differences: most appreciable among them, the seismic shift in the communications landscape in the years since Symons. While there remains no perfect surrogate for the inherent humanness of face-to-face communication, technology has unquestionably brought us closer together. At the very least, it affords us the chance to extend the opportunity for dialogue to more places, to communicate more frequently, and to better negotiate the logistics of orchestrating a national conversation in a country challenged by having "too much geography."

Yet conversation is conversation. The byproducts of dialogue have not changed. When we speak to each other we generate heightened perspective, tolerance for different ideas, and, although not always, and not always all at once, respect, acceptance and understanding. These "dividends of dialogue" are the precursors to the advancement of human rights, and it's for this reason that dialogue is both the objective and guidepost for virtually every aspect of our work.

In the context of creating a national human rights museum, what does this dialogue-driven approach yield? What are its implications for Canada as a nation, or for ourselves as Canadians? Most significantly, what does it

mean for the museum's mandate, which is not merely to foster opportunities to examine rights issues, but to effect genuine change in the lives of others by advancing the cause of human rights both at home and abroad?

THE ANSWERS ARE SEVERAL.

First, much as the outcomes of Symons' investigation allowed us to better know ourselves, the CMHR's national public engagement exercise served to add new texture and detail to the national portrait. Yet our work also proved to be one of excavation and, we hope, over time liberation of stories central to our nation's evolution that have nonetheless been hidden or long ago tucked away in the darker recesses of our past. Among the more salient examples is the long-stifled narrative surrounding Canada's residential schools, the multi-generational impacts of which continue to shape the lives of First Nations and the wider story of our nation in untold ways. The Holodomor, too, was identified as a grievous human failing that had in many ways shaped Canadians, primarily those of Ukrainian heritage who came to Canada to build new lives and took up the task of also helping build what were then the beginnings of contemporary Canada. "Forgotten" stories of resilience and triumph like that of Nova Scotia's Viola Desmond, whose refusal to surrender a seat designated for whites predated Rosa Parks' act of courage by a full decade, were cited as examples of glaring gaps in the nation's understanding of itself. We were reminded, too, that apart from missing pieces in the story of Canada's historical failings to protect the rights of its own citizens, also absent from the national consciousness were the prouder moments that marked Canada's considerable contributions to the world in the field of human rights. John Peters Humphrey, we were reminded, is far from a household name in this country or any other, yet he was the Canadian who penned the inaugural draft of the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

This national conversation revealed much about how we as Canadians viewed our country. It allowed us to become cognizant of the gaps and exclusions that were most apparent to others, and it will prove, I believe, to allow a much fuller, much more complete picture of Canada to emerge that will contribute to a far more detailed – yet ultimately clearer – view of who and what we are as a nation. We have seen and studied the image in analog; let us now view it in high-definition.

This unprecedented dialogue also served to identify Canadians' expectations for a national museum dedicated to the cause of human rights. We heard many times that the CMHR had an obligation to help fill in the missing chapters of Canada's story. History continues to prove that too many nations forever refuse to acknowledge and confront their human failings. Certainly Canada's own human-rights record is not without blemish. Far from it. Yet our consultations with Canadians highlighted a frequently shared belief that a willingness to confront, apologize for and learn from past failings was also a point of pride; a differentiator many felt was inherently Canadian. Most consequential to the museum's mandate, Canadians were also candid about what they did not want their human rights museum to become. Canadians articulated in the clearest terms the museum's responsibility to deliver a fulsome, unflinching portrait of Canada's achievements and atrocities. But there was no public appetite for a 160,000-square-foot human rights museum entirely dedicated to the past. The lion's share of the museum's work, we were told, must be invested in the future, focused on allowing Canadians to both envision and help build the kind of Canada that would fully reflect Canadians' highest shared ideals.

An inclusive, non-hierarchical approach to dialogue has similarly been embraced by the museum as a formal research tool, reflective of both the organizational values of the Canadian Museum for Human Rights, but also essential to preserving the essential "humanness" of the stories the CMHR has been entrusted to tell. Research founded on open dialogue is central to the museum's commitment to decolonize the exercise of research gathering, but it also yields a much richer illustration of the stories that comprise Canada's human-rights evolution. A key tenet of the museum's research effort involves our oral history project, which will not only be an inexhaustible trove of source material for future researchers, but is indispensable to our planned programming and exhibits. Although many of those interviewed for the museum's oral history project were so identified because of their contributions around distinct issues under the broader umbrella of rights, it is never our practice to initiate an interview with specific inquiry about disability rights, or gender rights, or same-sex rights. Instead, we commence the process in the broadest possible terms – we take a life history. Consistently, this serves to uncover a persistent truth: that rights issues are often intertwined and interrelated, even within one person's own life. The

remarkable story of British Columbia's Chris Morrissey is a distinct example. She is most often celebrated for her landmark work around same-sex immigration rights and her work on behalf of gay and lesbian refugees escaping persecution in other nations. But this is a woman of 70 years who has contributed a lifetime of human rights advocacy. Only in capturing, quite literally, the story of her life, do we also now have profound insight into her having grown up as a homosexual person in mid-twentieth century rural Canada, her life as a nun, her romantic relationship with her life partner, who was also a nun, and how the confluence of these experiences was entirely foundational to the refugee work for which she's most widely recognized. This is but one small example among many that illustrates that people are not the product of a single event or experience, but rather are shaped by a host of factors over the course of their lives. The museum's life history approach allows us a far more comprehensive understanding of our participants, underscores their essential humanity and complexity, and ultimately allows us to build a far richer collection of profound national and international value.

Embracing dialogue as the central plank in the CMHR's creation is also central to our effort to deliver an immersive, participatory experience that reflects a fundamental rethinking of the traditional museum visit. This effort begins with the conceptual exhibit design – for example, a cross-Canada advisory council comprised of disability advocates that allows us to ensure universal design and the opportunity for full participation is *built in* to our exhibits via an inclusive, bottom-up process, as opposed to being merely *fit in* later. The outcome of this approach is a museum that is setting new Canadian *and global* standards for universal accessibility. This is a wonderful and rightly proud contribution to the world in Canada's name, and it would have been fully impossible in the absence of the museum's dialogue-first approach. But it goes further, because many of the exhibits themselves embrace this spirit of dialogue. They are more than interactive, they are responsive, both to the actions of the visitor engaging with the exhibit, but in some parts of the museum, to the actions and behaviours of other individuals. The exhibits foster contemplation, then, not simply of subjects and things, but of how our thoughts and actions affect and influence other people, and how theirs in turn affect us. Implicit in the museum experience are all the hallmarks of a great conversation.

Of highest significance, however, is the museum's mandate and responsibility to create the tools, mechanisms and motivation to spur new dialogue; to allow Canadians to shape discussions of their own both within the boundaries of the museum and beyond; to fuel a broadly inclusive narrative about the future of our country where all can contribute toward creating a culture of human rights.

To some extent, we can leverage existing and emerging tools: social media is at once a potent force in dissolving barriers to human rights and also familiar and intuitive to a new generation of Canadian leaders. But we can also work with educators' groups like the Canadian Teachers' Federation to open an interprovincial dialogue around how best to incorporate human rights learning into the curriculum to spur fresh dialogue within our schools. We can leverage technology to bring the conversation happening inside the museum to those in other cities and even other countries. And we can then extend to museum participants, no matter who and where they are, the invitation and the means to bring the fruit of that discussion back to the museum, effectively creating a feedback loop that will continue to take on new shapes, offering a real-time glimpse of the evolving portrait of our nation; a temperature reading providing insight into the tenor and tone of discussion on rights issues over time; and in turn an evolving sense of where we are and where we are going.

As we look back on the tremendous impact of the Symons report in helping us come to better know ourselves, the CMHR in turn commits to preserving and fueling that same quest for civic understanding and discovery, and to continue to make the national conversation ever more representative, more inclusive and more illuminating.

The Canadian Museum for Human Rights is the promise that a national process of inquiry will continue in perpetuity. And we will inspire our fellow citizens to ask questions that, even when we look back at the founding of the CMHR forty, fifty or sixty years on, will remain every bit as fresh, potent and relevant as they are today:

As Canadians, what can we contribute? As a great nation, what kind of country do we wish Canada to be?

LOCATING AUTHORITIES: PUBLIC EXPERTISE, HERITAGE INSTITUTIONS AND THE RECENT PAST

STEVEN SCHWINGHAMER is an Historian at the Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21, where he conducts research related to Canadian immigration history in order to support the museum's programs and exhibitions. He has been with the museum since 2000. His recent projects include explorations of the built heritage of immigration sites and research on constructions of desirability and undesirability in Canadian immigration practice. He is affiliated with the Gorsebrook Research Institute at Saint Mary's University and the Centre for Oral History and Digital Storytelling at Concordia University. He holds an MA in History from Saint Mary's University.

ABSTRACT

Public expertise operates in historic sites in deep and important ways whether it is engaged by the institution or not. Moving that intersection of disciplinary and organic historical knowledge into an open exchange is important: this will enable institutions to learn from their visitors' organic knowledge of the past. Opening that exchange entails certain challenges. Visitors to heritage institutions, especially those co-located with sites of memory, have to negotiate a set of authorities and tensions as part of entering into a participatory relationship with the institutions. Valuing and mobilizing the organic knowledge of the past carried in our publics requires deliberate cultural and methodological shifts by heritage organizations.

The relationships between historians or historical institutions and their publics are lively issues in current debate.[1] Based on these conversations, there is an opportunity to expand current approaches to the relationships between museums and members of the public. First-person forms of historical evidence are enjoying priority in many institutions and exhibitions, whether through the inclusion of oral history or other sources that document and reflect personal experience. This is a sensible extension of the influence of the explorations of social historians and the development of museums' willingness to explore multiple historical narratives about an event. This work is valuable and important, and documenting experiences across many perspectives enriches our canon of source materials. Further, memory-based inquiries can create new resources for the museum and for other researchers. Collaborative exploration of the past also builds upon a host of discussions on the shared construction of meaning around historical sites.[2] In the case of historical projects whose mandates include the past eighty years (the recent past, for the purposes of this paper)[3], the distributed public expertise on their subject area is not just an asset or an avenue for expansion: it is an essential resource.

The need for expanding our concepts of the authority relationships between public and cultural institutions may be best appreciated through reference to an analogy for describing a participatory project at a museum: baking a cake with a child.[4] This analogy may not be the best model for implementation in historical institutions dealing with the recent past. In these cases, participation with a public is not analogous to baking a cake with a young helper. The locations of authority, expertise and experience in that analogy are fairly straightforward. Even the collaborative co-creation that can be imagined is understood to be highly mediated and predicated on the museum's permissions and capacities: the museum is the senior partner and sets the parameters. This transmissive model of the pedagogical relationship around museums persists in sections of museum practice and also in the public. Susan Crane reflected on responses to this, pointing out that "[t]he more curators or historians make themselves visible to museum visitors, the more the visitors react warily, unsure if they are really being asked to engage in discussion (which would necessarily involve opinion), or whether they are simply being instructed in a new way."[5] To overcome this hesitation, there are all sorts of existing participatory structures that encourage creativity and expression on the part of museum visitors. For example, Simon provides many suggestions and points to the substantial social, learning and work value of participatory work to museums.[6] Our challenge is to consider and expand our concept of collaborative work to encompass the needs of institutions that identify first-person narratives as central historical resources. The methods, ethics and results of collaborative inquiry methods make definitions of expertise that heavily favour disciplinary knowledge very problematic and probably untenable in public historical settings. Certain expertise and knowledge of recent historical events is broadly dispersed: it is held in the memories of individuals. Therefore, many visitors may themselves carry relevant knowledge and expertise into a site.

This situation has a particular resonance with the well-known work by Michael Frisch and Dwight Pithcaithley dealing with Ellis Island, a "landmark/shrine whose history, in the broadest terms, already has meaning and familiarity to most of those visiting it", which creates "a very special public-historical interpretive challenge".[7] The challenge, created in no small part by the intersection of disciplinary and organic knowledge of the past, may be engaged through Kathleen McLean's proposal that we "embrace the contributions of expert knowledge and at the same time expand our definitions of 'expert' and 'expertise'."[8] Crane points to some of this organic knowledge with her notion of an "excess of memory"[9] and the concept certainly implicates individual relationships with collective memory and the enactment of public histories. Most current theories of learning in museums have embraced a constructivist approach – people make meaning by situating new information in relation to their existing internal canon.[10] This means that public expertise operates in historic sites in deep and important ways whether it is engaged by the institution or not. Moving that intersection of disciplinary and organic historical knowledge into an open exchange is important: this will enable institutions to learn from their visitors' organic knowledge of the past.

Opening that exchange entails certain challenges. Visitors to heritage institutions, especially those co-located with sites of memory, have to negotiate a set of authorities and tensions as part of entering into a participatory relationship with the institutions. In part, this arises from the site's location. Sophie Forgan has pointed to several aspects of museum buildings proper in relation to their subject matter and their visitors, including the notable consideration of the "particularity of place".[11] In the case of Pier 21, "place" is central to the institution in its exploration of historical immigration. Questions of origins, destinations, routes and ports are the framework of policies and personal narratives alike in the history of immigration. Beyond this, the physical place of the Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21/ Pier 21 National Historic Site is a designated place with attached histories that are still new enough to overlap with individual and collective memory among many visitors. Many of the site's visitors have connections to the peak years of the site's historical immigration operations in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Other visitors have personal memories or experience linked to immigration at other times or through other sites. The site, as an artefact and memory aid in its own right, is evocative of those connections.

Further on the place of Pier 21, it embodies place-based historical tensions. When the facility was under construction in the 1920s, immigration authorities angrily rejected the possibility of moving into "shed 21". The very use of the site for immigration only came after more than two years of bureaucratic cat-fighting, from

late 1925 through the end of 1927. Resentment among agents and officials in various departments over the move simmered for years after arrival, as is well-expressed by the pointed refusal to pay a single utility bill for what was billed as the "best immigration facility on the continent" over the span of almost four years.[12] The site's current heritage designation captures the tension well – although perhaps inadvertently – in saying the site embodies the policies, practices and procedures of early-twentieth century immigration to Canada. Given the numerous examples of what were, even in that era, ethically and legally problematic exclusions in Canadian immigration, the description underscores the complexity of Pier 21's history. Further, as Doreen Massey has argued, place is built out of articulations of social relations with both local and wider contacts and context.[13] Substantially different understandings of the social relations around the building – not the "best facility", but a contested facility – make Pier 21 a notably different historic site.

This brings us to the second area of authorities bearing on historic sites: those of the people in the space, staff and visitors alike. Frisch has recently commented on the need to "enact an active dialogue between experience and expertise, between people working together to reach new understandings."[14] For a site bearing on recent history, visitors may bring significant and unique historical authority into the space every day. At Pier 21, that authority relates to personal experiences of the immigration process, but this kind of specific content is not the catalyst for shifting the valorization of organic knowledge of the past. Perhaps a regimental museum greets a veteran of service, or an agricultural museum welcomes a family of farmers, or a pilot visits a transportation museum. These visitors are all creating meaning through a process that has significance to the institution beyond goodwill, effective visitor learning or riveting opportunities for social and media engagement. They are unique and valuable learning partners for the institutions: a participatory approach to interpretation may open the possibility for the museum to appreciate some aspects of the meanings created by these people in the museum space. The autobiographical aspect of this history, its personal anchoring amid illumination of larger events, cements the site's relevance and prevalence in people's personal archives.[15] The resulting memories and artefacts are dispersed across Canada and can only be opened to the institution through the participation of the individual holders. This underscores the importance of a re-imagination of the role of the public and the locations of authorities for sites exploring the recent past.

If the museum has appropriate programs, new disciplinary historical resources can be created from the visitors' organic knowledge of the past. To return to the example of Pier 21, some visitors come on a pilgrimage to the site to recollect their first steps in Canada, and when they arrive at the site, many wish to share and explore their memories with others, including staff. Their conversations on tours reshape almost every single visit, and each visit is a learning opportunity for the museum. As is indicated by the fact that much of this is revealed in conversation, however, guests of the museum at Pier 21 interpret the site history in relationship to the staff. For example, potential oral history participants occasionally align current staff with the interests of the historical department of immigration. Visitors also make more routine assumptions about museum authorities and expertise, and sometimes de-value their own experience based on presuming that museums would not acknowledge their authority or expertise. These visitor responses are complicated by the emotional situation of being present in an interpreted historic space that also is placed in memory. The intersection shapes the stories that emerge both from the past and present places at Pier 21. Plaques and exhibits – authoritative displays, but also interruptions of remembered space – can alter visitor expression, unfortunately, sometimes resulting in a "text echo" embedded in their storytelling as experiences are filtered through over-valued museum presentation.

Gaynor Kavanagh, in *Dream Spaces*, asks in opening his discussion, "[i]f an exhibition makes someone cry, either then or later, or laugh with derision, what is this and what should this mean to the museum?"[16] This is real dilemma for sites that engage with living history. Certainly, visitors cry at Pier 21. The transmissive, novice-expert dynamic gets overturned in cognitive, affective and social spaces within the museum because of the distributed expertise and experience in its public. Those experiences often have a substantial affective component. The emotional relationship we establish with the past is difficult to inscribe within traditional historical methodologies, but is no less transformational or profound in its impact on our personal process of making meaning than knowledge assembled through disciplined inquiry. To respond to Kavanagh's question: when a visitor has an experience

that is this profound, it is a signal to open collaborative learning opportunities. After all, that response of crying or laughing may point to a powerful meaning rooted in the visitor's organic knowledge of the past.

This organic knowledge of the past is a crucial resource for historical interpretation of the recent past. Its incomplete nature does not make it less valuable: we accept incomplete documentary evidence collections all the time as historians, and often invest them with substantial authority. The two are complimentary within a holistic approach to the human past, modifying each other as they interweave. For example, the original Pier 21 Society was founded in part on a vision of the site as a pilgrimage destination for those with personal connections. That understanding of the space can be transformed by disciplinary inquiry, from a space of nostalgic aura to a conflicted and challenging heritage space. However, the transformative power is equally impressive in the other direction, controverting or problematizing meaning built from use of the traditional historical canon.

Ausma Rowberry née Levalds came to Canada as a young girl in 1949, after fleeing with her family from Latvia in October of 1944. Prior to her arrival, she was selected by immigration officials to be the symbolic fifty-thousandth Displaced Person admitted to Canada. The press and public information on this event show a smiling eight year-old girl accepting a beautiful doll, a book of birds and a silver locket from the mayor of Halifax and an immigration inspector.[17] Setting aside questions regarding her selection to represent the movement of Displaced Persons after the Second World War, Rowberry's organic knowledge of the past troubles the implied narrative of the documentary sources. As she states of this photo opportunity, her tone sad and her cadence slow: "It was a frightening experience because – not really understanding enough to… Up to then most of us had found that if we received something, there was a price tag attached to it. And I guess in a child's mind, wondering, 'what is the price tag of this?'" [18]

The informative and transformative value of oral history and of personal experience is not a particularly new position in the historical profession. Asserting that the organic knowledge of the past that we treasure in our collaborators for oral history exists throughout the museum-going public seems to be rather less accepted. For sites delving in the recent past, the experience and expertise of visitors is a real and important resource that elevates participatory museum practices from advantageous to essential. The bulk of historical resources for these sites are likely to reside as intangibles or dispersed artefacts in the personal archives and internal canons – and access to these will most likely come only through strongly inclusive and participatory approaches to museum practice. Valuing and mobilizing the organic knowledge of the past carried in our publics requires deliberate cultural and methodological shifts by heritage organizations.

NOTES

1 Among other recent examples, the theme of the National Council on Public History's 2013 conference is "Knowing Your Public(s) – The Significance of Audience in Public History". As an example of the topics this theme is intended to develop, the Call for Proposals specifies examinations of "changing approaches to public participation, reciprocity and authority". Call for Proposals, 2013 Annual Meeting, National Council on Public History.

2 Michael Frisch's key work in this field opened a running conversation among historians that has spanned two decades and more. Michael Frisch, A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990).

3 Inquiries based in oral tradition may have longer reach. However, the experience of the Museum's oral history project bears up the specific observation by Thompson and Bauer that information in oral histories reaches back, generally, to the grandparents' generation. Paul Thompson and Elaine Bauer, "Recapturing Distant Caribbean Childhoods and Communities: The Shaping of Memories of Jamaican Migrants in Britain and North America", *Oral History*, 30(2) (Autumn 2002): 51.

4 Nina Simon, The Participatory Museum (Santa Cruz, California: Museum 2.0, 2010): 197.

5 Susan Crane, "Memory, Distortion and History in the Museum", *History and Theory*, 36(4) (December 1997): 48.

6 Simon, Participatory Museum: 195.

7 Michael Frisch and Dwight Pithcaithley, "Audience Expectations as Resource and Challenge: Ellis Island as a Case Study" in Frisch, A Shared Authority: 215-224.

8 Kathleen McLean, "Whose Questions, Whose Conversations?" in Bill Adair, Benjamin Filene and Laura Koloski, eds., Letting Go? Sharing Historical Authority in a User-Generated World (Philadelphia: The Pew Center for Arts & Heritage, 2011): 71.

9 Crane, "Memory, Distortion and History": 46.

10 For a useful introduction to theories of learning in the museum context, see George Hein, "The Constructivist Museum", *Journal for Education in Museums*, 16 (1995): 21-23.

11 Sophie Forgan, "Building the Museum: Knowledge, Conflict, and the Power of Place", *Isis*, 96(4) (December 2005): 579.

[12] Steven Schwinghamer, "'Altogether Unsatisfactory': Revisiting the Opening of the Immigration Facility at Halifax's Pier 21", *Journal of the Royal Nova Scotia Historical Society*, 15 (2012): 61-74.

[13] Doreen Massey, "Places and Their Pasts", *History Workshop Journal*, 39 (Spring 1995): 185-6.

[14] Michael Frisch, "From *A Shared Authority* to the Digital Kitchen, and Back" in Bill Adair, Benjamin Filene and Laura Koloski, eds., Letting Go? Sharing Historical Authority in a User-Generated World (Philadelphia: The Pew Centre for Arts & Heritage, 2011): 136.

[15] This concept is developed in Peter Fritzsche, "The Archive", *History And Memory*, 17(1-2) (Spring-Winter 2005): 22.

[16] Gaynor Kavanagh, Dream Spaces: Memory and the Museum (London: Leicester University Press, 2000): 5.

[17] See, for example, "50 000th DP scheduled to enter Canada", *The Globe and Mail*, 23 February 1949, 1, as well as coverage in the same paper on 17 and 26 February 1949. The event was covered elsewhere nationally and internationally, with the farthest-flung reference encountered thus far being "Latvian Girl For Canada", *The Canberra Times*, 19 February 1949: 2.

[18] Ausma Levalds Rowberry, interview with the author, 31 July 2002. Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21 Oral History Collection, 02.07.31ALR, 01:14:01. The author would like to thank Mrs Rowberry for her kind agreement to include her experience in this paper.

CANADA'S HISTORY WARS ARE GOLD FOR POPULARIZERS OF THE PAST

RANDY BOSWELL is a Carleton University journalism professor and a senior writer with Postmedia News. In 2003, he launched a national beat aimed at generating news stories with a historical focus. In 2006, he was shortlisted by Canada's History Society for the Pierre Berton Award for popularizing Canadian history.

ABSTRACT

Debates about how Canadian history should be written and presented to the public offer important opportunities for journalists and other "popularizers" to spread awareness that — regardless of scholarly conflicts or controversy over government policies — the country's past is brimming with compelling stories.

In recent years, the subject of Canadian history has often been discussed in terms of laments, critiques and even *cris du coeur*. We have forgotten it. We have abused it. We have even killed it, as historian Jack Granatstein famously alleged in his 1998 book about the shattering of Canada's life story into jagged shards of memory. The rise of "social history," to him, seemed to elevate the racist, imperialist and thuggish aspects of our national history above the traditional, unifying chronicle of a successful country's political, economic and social progress.

That debate has flared again within the past year on several new battlefronts. The federal Conservative government's robust remembrance of the War of 1812 has received tens of millions of dollars in funding, gained unprecedented public promotion through special coins, stamps and TV ads, and won the high-profile attention of Prime Minister Stephen Harper on numerous occasions.

But the bicentennial has also sparked opposition accusations that the ongoing commemoration of the three-year conflict is more about supporting a "warrior nation" rebranding of our national identity than educating Canadians about a largely forgotten fight for North America.

Meanwhile, the government has also announced — as a flagship project for the 150th anniversary of Confederation in 2017 — the planned transformation of the Canadian Museum of Civilization into the Canadian Museum of History. The initiative has won praise from some of the most prominent historians and history writers in the country — Granatstein and bestselling biographer Charlotte Gray among them — while fuelling fear at the Canadian Historical Association, the Canadian Association of University Teachers and elsewhere that there may be unspoken ideological motives lurking behind the changes.

Questioning the erasure from the museum's rewritten mandate the goal of fostering "critical understanding," the CHA issued a statement in December warning that "critical understanding *should* be a goal" of the revamped Gatineau, Quebec-based institution, "encouraging visitors to consider multiple perspectives, critical analysis, and texts and displays that challenge master narratives, rather than simply venerating national heroes."

The CHA has also warned the government away from a vision of history that "emphasizes dates, events, heroes, and narrative timelines," insisting that "the writing and teaching of Canadian history has moved decisively away from such a one-dimensional perspective on our past, mainly because it leaves out the experience of the great majority of the Canadian population."

Meanwhile, budget cuts and service reductions at Library and Archives Canada and Parks Canada have drawn fire from defenders of historical research, preservation and presentation. Those flashpoints have also fueled suspicion that a federal government keen to honour Canada's history in certain ways is simultaneously strangling key institutions that protect heritage sites and support groundbreaking scholarship.

Heritage Minister James Moore and other government voices have repeatedly rejected such accusations, insisting that national museums and other heritage agencies are merely being struck with the same budget axe as all other federal departments — and in some cases with fewer hits. The governing Conservatives, Moore has essentially insisted, are the biggest champions of Canadian history that Parliament Hill has ever seen — and the long list of momentous anniversaries on their radar, from the bicentennial of Macdonald's birth in 2015 to the upcoming 100th anniversary of the start of the First World War in 2014, are offered as proof of that commitment.

Harper himself is writing a book about the history of professional hockey, something that might impress certain scholars more if they weren't worried that great sporting moments from Canada's past will soon be elbowing out displays about 16th century Basque whalers or Winnipeg General Strike agitators in the future Canadian Museum of History.

In short, Canadian history remains, long after the publication of *Who Killed Canadian History?* 15 years ago, a controversial subject. It's not just the well-known points of contention in the content of the past that keep stirring up trouble — the European subjugation of Aboriginal Peoples; Louis Riel's execution; the bombing of German civilians in the Second World War, and so on. It's also the institutional and scholarly framework in which we learn about such troubling episodes — and all the rest of our great national saga — that continues to generate debate, discussion and dissent.

For a journalist with the somewhat eccentric goal of making Canadian history a subject of headline-grabbing news, all I can say is: "Bring it on."

When it comes to debates about the way Canadian history is *being* written about or taught — or whether it's even being taught in some provinces — the jousting among historians, educators, think-tanks and politicians proves fruitful from a journalistic point of view no matter what the outcome.

Conflict catches a reporter's attention the way a twitching mouse catches a cat's: we pounce. And then a whole range of possibilities comes into play as experts spar over what stories are worth telling and the public, potentially, gets engaged in the conversation/shouting match.

These debates create openings to remind citizens about — you name it — the Jay's Treaty of 1794, the 1812 Battle of Queenston Heights, Josiah Henson's 1830 escape to Canada via the Underground Railway, the 1914 refusal of the *Komagata Maru*, the 1945 bombing of Dresden, the 1982 patriation of the Constitution.

One of the ideas behind my 10-year-old mission to make news out of history was that Canadians might benefit from periodic reminders in the popular press about events and people and issues from Canadian history that they might have only fleetingly encountered in textbooks years or even decades earlier. But journalism — including the editors who uphold the profession's adherence to certain news values — demands the production of stories with contemporary relevance, with a capacity to attract public interest, with an edgy, new development. And along with such news "triggers" as major research discoveries and reinterpretations, battles over crumbling heritage sites, newly erected tributes to war heroes and the appearance of noteworthy historical objects at archeological sites or on auction blocks, the quarrelling that sometimes takes place among advocates, administrators and chroniclers of history helps justify media coverage. More broadly, such battles are a reminder that so many stories from the country's past are worth struggling to resurrect and to share.

Were there too many triumphant tributes to white guys with muttonchops before the social-history revolution shook things up, adding some texture – and colour – to the canvas? Perhaps.

Has there been too ardent an embrace of historical marginalia ever since, to the detriment of more coherent, chronological, encompassing national narratives? Perhaps.

Reporters don't need to decide. But what they do need — and what, in turn, the reading/watching/ listening/ surfing public needs — is for the principal stakeholders in the Great Canadian History Debate to keep caring deeply about their arguments, to keep presenting fresh stories about the past in support of this viewpoint or that, and to continue fighting to protect heritage, to search for shipwrecks, to shed light on lost tales, to celebrate big milestones, to rewrite the canon or to retell the classics — it's all good.

For history-minded citizens (including history-minded journalists like me) the chief effect of all the attacks and counter-attacks over how we *do* history is a heightened awareness that this country actually *has* a richly layered past, that it matters to the present and future nation, and that it can be at least as interesting and entertaining as reality television.

Contentious claims prompt contentious counterclaims, stoking much livelier exchanges about history than previous generations of Canadians might have enjoyed. And the stuff of those debates — whether we're talking too much about the Chinese Head Tax or too little; whether apologies for the wartime internments of Ukrainians or Italians are warranted or not — at least exposes Canadians to some cobwebbed corners of history that might otherwise have remained overlooked.

It's similar to when the Historica-Dominion Institute decries Canadians' tenuous grasp on basic facts about the country's past — including the name of its first PM (see answer, next paragraph). The institute's main point is that our school systems seem to be failing to teach certain fundamentals of Canadian history, but at least those forgotten facts get a momentary spotlight thanks to the release of the survey results.

More people, it seems safe to say, know more than they used to about the shame of the Acadian Expulsion, of the cold Canadian response in 1939 to the Jewish refugee ship *St. Louis*, of the Residential Schools and Bomber Command. And they know more, as well, about the heroism of Vimy Ridge, of the Franklin Expedition and the Korean War, of Louis Riel, Sir John A. Macdonald and — yes — of Bomber Command.

The valour, the horror, the whole nine yards.

Canadian history is more grown up now, better able to encompass the multiple and sometimes conflicting storylines it inspires. And it has proven, above all, to be full of compelling stories: glorious, tragic, surprising, disturbing, comforting, funny and — to be sure — complex.

MEMORY LAPSES: THE USE AND ABUSE OF HISTORY

HECTOR MACKENZIE is the Senior Departmental Historian of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade of Canada (a position he has held since 1991). Educated at the University of Toronto and Oxford University (from which he received his doctorate), he taught at the University of Toronto and the University of Western Ontario before joining the Department of External Affairs as a historian in 1989. He has edited two volumes in the series *Documents on Canadian External Relations* and he has published numerous articles and reviews on the history of Canada's international relations. Dr. Mackenzie is an Adjunct Research Professor in the Department of History of Carleton University, where he has taught courses on the history of Canada and its international relations.

ABSTRACT

Too often it is assumed by advocates and readers alike that certain facts, dates or events comprise a body of objective knowledge that can be tested precisely through true/false or multiple choice questions in order to ascertain the nation's grasp of history – what might be described as the national quiz or Trivial Pursuit approach to our past. On closer examination, however, the questions posed reveal much more about the attitudes of the examiners than they are likely to show about the awareness of the respondents. With different (and often contradictory) definitions and purposes, history seems to have survived its eulogists and accusers alike. If Canadians can survive the well-meaning but wrong-headed attempts to verify and then correct their ignorance of the past, as well as the multiple efforts to employ images from history, whether reliable or not, to shape their views of the present, they may just find that history has a lot to offer the curious, even it its "lessons" are often uncertain or ambiguous.

In the four decades since the founding of the Association for Canadian Studies, laments about the teaching and understanding of history in Canada have been persistent and, at times, prominent. Interwoven with this concern have been worries – and sometimes dire predictions – about the neglect or undervaluing of archives, libraries and other key custodians of our national heritage. Especially in times of fiscal restraint and preoccupations with current budgets at all levels of government, it is difficult for policy-makers to assign a priority to programmes or purposes whose impact is longer-term rather than immediate. Archivists and historians have always had to contend with contrary arguments about the relevance and the consequences of their work, contentions which are magnified when public funds seem scarce. For its part, ACS has been part of the solution, not the problem. Through its conferences and publications, as well as its surveys of public opinion, it has raised awareness of the diverse interpretations of Canadian history as well as its impact on education to contemporary public policy without overstating the need for remedial action.

From the perspective of a professional historian working in the federal public service, with numerous contacts in the academic community in Canada and abroad, it seems that some aspects of the perpetual crisis may be overblown, while some of the remedies (or, more accurately, actions proposed or taken in response to the expressed anxieties) may be problematic.

Too often it is assumed by advocates and readers alike that certain facts, dates or events comprise a body of objective knowledge that can be tested precisely through true/false or multiple choice questions in order to ascertain the nation's grasp of history – what might be described as the national quiz or Trivial Pursuit approach to our past. On closer examination, however, the questions posed reveal much more about the attitudes of the examiners than they are likely to show about the awareness of the respondents. As well, failure to answer arbitrary and often value-laden questions correctly may not indicate a lack of understanding but perhaps instead an implicit rejection of the underlying assumptions about what matters most. Moreover, what are the implications or consequences of too many incorrect responses? What is the passing grade?

Where history and myth intersect, there is no shortage of pundits who are certain that Canadians need to know more about their favoured topic (and how it is understood by supposed experts) in order to be better citizens – rather than believe heroic legends or subscribe to outmoded beliefs. So much of the ink spilled or bytes consumed simply prove that history lacks the certainty or exactitude that so many would prefer it possessed.

Perhaps understandably, this employment of questions about the past as a civics test has been embraced by those in government who deal with immigration and citizenship. Questionnaires for new Canadians may be the ultimate expression of this belief that knowledge of specific details betokens a grasp of fundamental values and national experiences. Perhaps inevitably, the broader question of how to interpret Canada's history also appeals to various agencies and departments of government and their ministers, who may seek justification for current priorities and policies in precedents selectively drawn from what has come before. With or without elaborate programmes to this end, every government since Confederation has viewed history through the lens of current policy needs or biases. Commemorations and other memorials, including monuments as well as glossy publications for mass distribution (or, nowadays, web-based dissemination) again often have said more about contemporary priorities or stances than about Canadian history. However regrettable to historians, this tendency is neither exceptional nor especially objectionable. Every government understandably views the past through the lens of the present, as background, justification or precedent for its policies and programmes.

As recent polling by ACS has demonstrated, however, citizens do not always subscribe to the official views of the past or remember the appropriate "lessons" from the "communications products," even when the messages have been conveyed consistently and pervasively through a myriad of media. Canadians have many paths available to an understanding of history, with popular culture and inexactly recalled lessons from school likely more powerful influences than government programmes or campaigns (while these still have greater sway than academic scholarship). Moreover, when commerce intersects with history or myth, the combination frequently trumps other forms of public education. Thus, Laura Secord is still best known to Canadians as a confectionary brand rather than a celebrated heroine of historical vignettes on television or the dignified statue near the War Memorial in Ottawa, let alone as a real person in the past.

When markets are awash with undifferentiated products of uncertain comparative merits, some firms have discovered the commercial advantages of history as nostalgia or reassurance, with sepia-toned footage (anachronistically recording eras that pre-date motion pictures) of undoubtedly virtuous founders proclaiming the integrity of their goods before a narrator affirms that the company, however dubious the claim, still makes things the same way and upholds the same values. Clearly, in this reckoning, older is better. Even when confronting the habitually hyperbolic world of sports, this triumph of the brand over the historical figure is not unknown: after all, Tim Horton is undoubtedly better known today as a provider of coffee and doughnuts than as a skilled defenseman for the Toronto Maple Leafs, even though he played in that bygone age – certainly in the realm of myth for modern fans – when that team won the Stanley Cup.

As a counterpoint to complacent nostalgia, significant complaints have been raised over the years about the exclusion or marginalization of some groups from the dominant accounts of Canadian history, particularly those reproduced in school texts over the years. Governments have sometimes found history to be somewhat ungrateful for attention paid to it, as critical glances are cast at romantic or idealized versions of the past, with the resulting discussion providing ample evidence of unintended consequences. Indeed, the whole notion of what constitutes "evidence" or historical record has been justifiably challenged for its privileging of the approach and stances of the dominant groups in society. As the past has been reconsidered, governments have been obliged to apologize for past misdeeds, for which they bore no direct responsibility – though saying sorry sometimes generates political benefits for the apologisers.

Appeals to right past wrongs now invariably include a demand for an apology and usually a claim for compensation. All too often, grievances may be asserted and apologies made without regard for the circumstances in which the original action was taken and with the victims treated as definite martyrs, however much that characterisation may misrepresent their actual role or conduct as seen at the time. Politically, there is much to be gained from magnanimity and a great deal to be lost by questioning too closely and pointedly the validity of the complaints or the need for redress. For scholars, ambiguity or uncertainty may be commonplace and welcome, but for politicians doubt can be dangerous.

Of course, there are major cases involving justifiable condemnations of former conduct – in Canada, the most prominent examples have been the treatment of Canadians of Japanese descent during and immediately after the Second World War and the grotesque catalogue of abuses of First Nations' children in the residential school system, as well as the treatment of Canada's aboriginal peoples more generally. In the latter case, this has prompted a process, not unlike that which dealt with apartheid and its consequences in South Africa, aiming for "truth and reconciliation" – both worthy, if elusive, goals. Other aggrieved parties, with less convincing cases for remedial action, nonetheless treat the past as a repository of evidence for indictment, with contrary information and assessments treated as mean-spirited heresy or malicious falsehood. While this one-sided approach may be appropriate for litigation and lobbying, it should not be confused with an un-blinkered quest for historical understanding. Even so, this phenomenon does reflect an interest in the past that may prompt broader inquiry.

For some commentators about current events, minor short-term shifts in political allegiance or variations in responses to questions about values and beliefs – the daily bread of polling firms – may be transformed into major realignments with great and lasting significance. In this reckoning, a selective rendering of history becomes background or preamble, simply the stock onto which the vine of assertion is grafted.

Of course, another way in which Canadians relate to history is through the contemporary variation on ancestor worship, genealogy. If the space devoted to this pursuit at facilities such as the National Archives of the United Kingdom and the frequency of research inquiries at Library and Archives Canada are reliable measurements, then this pursuit of our forebears is certainly thriving, thus creating a major constituency in favour of the preservation of government records and the effective provision of access to them. Rather than scoff at their sometimes wayward and often naive stumbling through the undergrowth of our recorded past, historians and archivists would do well to enlist these keen amateurs as allies in the struggle to save our documentary heritage and make it available to all who may wish to consult it, whatever their motivation or training. After all, it seems likely that the genealogists are more numerous and probably also more influential than the professionals whose interests and advice are all too easily, and with little political cost, ignored by mandarins.

Thus, in various forms, with different (and often contradictory) definitions and purposes, history seems to have survived its eulogists and accusers alike. As the various endeavours of ACS demonstrate, history is not only a durable subject but also a remarkably diverse one. If Canadians can survive the well-meaning but wrong-headed attempts to verify and then correct their ignorance of the past, as well as the multiple efforts to employ images from history, whether reliable or not, to shape their views of the present, they may just find that history has a lot to offer the curious, even if its "lessons" are often uncertain or ambiguous.

There is certainly more than enough of it to keep the ACS busy and productive for another four decades – and more.

HISTORY TO EXPLAIN CULTURE OR WHY WE SHOULD NOT REPLACE HISTORY LESSONS WITH MATH LESSONS

CATHERINE DUQUETTE is Professor of Didactics of History at the Université du Québec à Chicoutimi. She earned her PhD in didactics of History at Université Laval, Québec. Member of the Centre de recherche interuniversitaire sur la formation et la profession enseignante (CRIFPE-UQ) and the The History Education Network (THEN-HiER), her research interests include how students – elementary and high school – learn historical thinking, the relationship between historical thinking and historical consciousness and the assessment of historical thinking. She has contributed to books on history education, published papers in both academic journals such as *Cartables de Clio* and professional journals such as *The Beaver*, *Traces*, and *Enjeux de l'univers social*.

ABSTRACT

History can be seen as a discipline that promotes dialogue between first and second cultures. History, in this sense, not only transfers cultural heritage, it also allows us to interpret this heritage and put it in perspective. School history should, according to this definition, help students build bridges between first and second cultures in order to develop historical consciousness. However, if you wish to promote the teaching of history to help maintain this dialogue, it seems necessary to better understand the elements constituting the primary culture of Québec students. How do students define culture, and what is, according to them, the relationship between culture and history? To answer this question, we conducted a qualitative empirical study with 50 Secondary V students from several urban centers in Québec. Participants were asked to answer a questionnaire on Québec culture and on the impact of immigration on the latter.

In 1996, the ministère de l'Éducation, du Sport et des Loisirs (MELS) published the États généraux sur le système d'éducation québécois[1]. This document highlights that there are significant gaps in secondary education, both in program requirements and at the level of pedagogy in the classroom. The book argues, unlike the Inchauspé[2] report, for the need for cultural enhancement of the programs coupled with a return to essential disciplines and concludes that it is imperative to "reconstitute the curriculum, particularly at the secondary level, to give more space for disciplines that can serve as the basis for the cultural enrichment sought."[3] In this perspective, the history lesson is required to play an important role because history is naturally understood as a carrier of culture[4]. That is to say that history allows the student to understand a part of the evolution of society and to develop openness to the world. In this context, history becomes an essential discipline for the development of the

student's collective identity, as it is from its study that the student will develop his sense of citizenship based on his knowledge and understanding of issues, past and present, facing the society to which he belongs.

The Lacoursière report[5] on the teaching of history abounds in the same direction by emphasizing the social literacy function of history. It is to the Lacoursière report[6], then, that we must turn to really understand the origin of the educational foundations of the new history curriculum competencies. Indeed, the document reinstates[7] the need to move away from the teaching of the discipline based on a single fixed narrative that denies the evolving and changing nature of history. Instead, school history, according to the authors of the report, should aim to develop critical thinking skills necessary for informed social participation, openness to the world and for building an understanding of the present based on the past[8].

However, changes in the teaching of history are not unanimously accepted and some researchers[9] advocate a return to the teaching of a single narrative for the transmission of Québec's cultural heritage. They explain that Québec's multiethnic background and the lack of social cohesion require a return to a more traditional learning of history whose aim is not to develop critical thinking but to transmit a common cultural heritage. This view calls into question the role of history in school. Should we focus on the teaching of history whose purpose is the transmission of a Québec culture or history education which helps develop students' critical thinking? What is the role of culture in the history course? To truly answer this question, we should first examine the concept of culture among history students. How do they conceive culture? More importantly, should we make changes to their conceptions? To try and answer these questions, we conducted a qualitative empirical research with Secondary V students (n = 50) from the province of Québec. This essay presents the results of this survey. Before discussing our results, we briefly outline our conception of culture and history and our research methodology.

CONCEPTIONS OF CULTURE AND HISTORY

Before going any further, we should clarify our understanding of culture and history. Defining the term culture is a complex process since, as pointed out by Forquin, the term culture is polysemous, meaning that the definition includes a number of complementary conceptions[10]. Forquin proposes a definition of culture divided into five concepts: the perfective conception, the acceptance or positive descriptive of social sciences, heritage culture, human culture and philosophical use[11]. However, in this survey, it seems preferable to focus on a general definition of culture. To this end, we use Geertz's definition of culture which states that it is "a system of meanings embodied in symbols transmitted over time through which humans communicate, perpetuate and develop their knowledge of life and their attitudes about them[12]."

This definition may be up for debate, but still has the advantage of emphasizing that culture is a wealth of symbols passed on voluntarily from one generation to another. History, according to this definition can be seen as a vehicle through which today's society transmits elements of culture to the next generation. However, this understanding of history seems incomplete. Indeed, history is not only the vehicle of culture; it is also the science that allows for a critical interpretation of the past. It is based on the work of historical thinking that we can examine and put into perspective the stories conveyed by collective memory[13]. In this sense, history as science plays a role in the development of critical thinking. How, in this case, can we reconcile history as a science with the definition we have given to culture?

To answer this question, we decided to expand our definition of culture to include the ideas of primary and secondary cultures proposed by Dumont[14]. Primary culture, according to Dumont is: "[...] a given. Men move within it in the familiarity of meanings, models and ideals agreed upon: patterns of action, customs, a network through which we spontaneously recognize ourselves in the world and at home." [15] Secondary culture, in turn, refers to a shift away from "a primary sense of the world disseminated in my own praxis of my group context and a secondary community where my historical community tries to give itself a consistent meaning of itself." [16] It is through dialogue between primary and secondary cultures that we can reconcile the roles attributed to history. The interpretive function of history "implies a distancing from the collective memory through the mediation of knowledge of secondary culture, to better understand and grasp its origins." [17]

Thus history can be seen as a discipline that promotes dialogue between primary and secondary cultures. History, in this sense, not only transfers cultural heritage, it also allows to interpret this legacy and puts it into perspective. School history should, according to this definition, help students build bridges between primary and secondary cultures to develop what Dumont calls historical consciousness.[18] However, if we wish to promote the teaching of history to help maintain this dialogue, it seems necessary to better understand the elements constituting the primary culture of Québec's students. How do the students see culture and, according to them, what is the relationship between culture and history?

METHODOLOGY

To answer this question, we conducted a qualitative empirical study with 50 Secondary V students from several urban centers in Québec (Montréal, Québec, Sherbrooke, and Nicolet to name a few). Participants were asked to answer a questionnaire on Québec's culture and on the impact of immigration on the latter. The questionnaire provided the following scenario:

> *"In 1995, during the last referendum on Québec sovereignty, the "no" side won a narrow victory with only 50.6% of the vote against 49.4% for the "yes" side. After the results were announced, Jacques Parizeau, the Premier of Québec at the time and head of the "yes" camp, said: "We were beaten, basically by what? By money and ethnic votes, essentially."*
>
> *This statement shocked the public, but for many Jacques Parizeau had simply dared saying what everyone thought quietly, that immigrants, regardless of the time they spend in Québec, will never become "real" Québecers. They can never be fully integrated into the Québec culture and will always cause tensions. Instead, they risk making us lose our values and traditions."*

Once the statement was read, students were asked two questions: the first was to take position in the debate and the second, which was more historical in nature, asked them to explain the causes and consequences of immigration on culture in Québec. We preferred placing the student in a situation that led him/her naturally to deal with culture rather than to ask directly the question: "What is Québec culture?" Indeed, our previous experiments[19] indicate that students have difficulty explaining their conception of culture. These are often just an enumeration of specifically regional culinary specialties. To avoid this problem, the questionnaire's scenario led students to compare their own culture with the culture of the Other[20]. This comparison had the advantage of allowing the emergence of a richer conception of Québec culture and its relationship with immigrant cultures. It is based on the analysis of this report that we can attempt to answer our research questions.

The collected data was analyzed using the NVivo 8 program. For the analysis, we proceeded by emerging categorization[21]. The data was grouped by theme first, and then these themes became the categories of meaning used throughout the analysis. This first step served to determine the conception of culture of the students in our sample. Then, in a second step, we were interested in the relation to the Other and the student's conception of the culture of the Other. The results of this analysis will be presented in sections 4 and 5 of this essay.

PATRIMONIAL CULTURE AND CIVIC CULTURE

The first part of our analysis was to clarify the concept of culture of Québec students. In this analysis, two incompatible conceptions of culture have emerged from reading the research data. Indeed, students in our sample offered either a patrimonial conception of culture or a civic sense of culture.

PATRIMONIAL CULTURE

For 80% of our participants, to call oneself a Québecer is to define oneself, to borrow Forquin's expression[22], through patrimonial culture. According to them, Québecers share a common culture inherited from the past that must be transmitted to future generations. Québec culture has two main characteristics: the French language and the Catholic religion: "Québec's culture is based on freedom, Christianity and family. This culture has always been very open." Colq005[23]. The French language is also the characteristic most

frequently mentioned when participants attempt to define Québec's culture (25% of respondents). It is, for some, the central pillar of Québecois culture: "As long as our language remains stable, I do not see a big change for our culture." Colq022. In this regard, 13% of students emphasize that it is essential for immigrants to learn French: "The only problem is that I dislike the idea of losing my French language. I think immigrants should at least learn to speak our French language, it's about respect for us." Colq014. In this sense, being a Québecer is first and foremost to speak French, hence the emphasis on the transmission of the French language to future generations as well as to newcomers to ensure their integration into Québec culture.

Besides the French language, Québec is also distinguished by the Catholic religion (13% of participants). The recurrence of religion in our data is surprising, especially when considering the small percentage of Québecers who say they are practicing[24]. However, our data was collected in Fall 2008 and Winter 2009, at the moment debates surrounding the new course on ethics and religious culture were taking place. Perhaps this controversy has had an impact on the importance of religion as part of culture. In fact, many students associate the possibility of losing Québec's culture to the disappearance of the Catholic religion. They say: "It (the culture) is lost because immigrants bring new beliefs, then Christianity is left aside and we do not know too many who believe" Colq005. In our data, the Catholic religion is an integral part of the cultural heritage that must be protected and transmitted.

In general, students who seem to understand the notion "Québec culture" from a patrimonial sense of culture see it as an amalgam of values, traditions and customs. Culture is patrimonial, as its components are rooted in the past. Indeed, French language and Catholic religion refer to a conception of Québecers as descendants of French settlers. Associated with this patrimonial sense of culture is the importance of transmitting this heritage to future generations in order to ensure their integration into society. History, in this sense, becomes for these students an efficient way to transmit the cultural heritage of Québec.

CIVIC CULTURE

The patrimonial sense of culture is not shared by all of our participants. In contrast, 20% of them associate Québec culture to Québec citizenship. In other words, the term 'real' Québecer is not addressed by the participants in a patrimonial sense, but in a civic sense. Thus, culture refers to a civic belonging: "No, I think that an immigrant can be a true Québecer from the moment he has his citizenship" Colq008. Obtaining Canadian (or Québec) citizenship is accompanied, according to these students, with social participation: "In accepting them in our society, as citizens, we accept that they have their opinions on our discussions, otherwise we should stop accepting immigrants." Colm072. History loses its function of transmitting a common heritage. Indeed, the discipline serves rather to form a critical citizen capable of thoughtful participation in public debates: "Yes, I agree, because if you vote without knowing the background of the story, yours is a vote of ignorance." Colb127. In short, to be a Québecer, according to these participants, is to share a set of rights and responsibilities related to citizenship.

A SUPERFICIAL UNDERSTANDING OF CULTURE

Forquin[25] and Goyer[26] highlight the polysemy of the term culture and identify at least five major senses whose complementarity enables us to understand the complexity and richness of the term. There is the perfective sense, the anthropological sense, the patrimonial sense, human culture sense and the philosophical sense. In our sample, the patrimonial and citizenship senses[27] are the only two meanings found. In addition, students who prefer a patrimonial sense tend to reject the meaning of citizenship and vice versa. These results suggest that high school students have a superficial understanding of culture, because students do not address all the meanings of culture and because they stick to the elements from their primary culture.

Indeed, students identify the elements of culture that are familiar to them without questioning their meaning. For example, the participants stressed the importance of French in Québec culture but without

wondering about it. Why is French so important in Québec? How is this importance reflected in society? This kind of thinking is completely absent from our data. This leads us to believe that our participants may have difficulty maintaining the dialogue between their primary and secondary cultures. Because they do not interpret their primary culture, students only present a conception of culture borrowed from society. Thus, the concept of culture found at home, at school and in the media would be accepted en bloc by the student without him/her wondering about its value. This situation weakens culture, in our opinion, because students do not have the tools to take a step back from the culture of the moment. The MELS wishes to form critical citizens capable of thoughtful participation in social debates[28]. However, how can the future citizens participate in social debates if they have not learned to question their primary culture? More importantly, how can schools help students overcome their culture of the moment?

ON THE ABSENCE OF HISTORY

One objective of this survey was to better understand the concept of culture of history students in the course of history. In this sense, we wanted to investigate the influence of historical thinking on the students' understanding of culture. Following the data analysis, it is clear that history is frequently absent from students' responses. The majority of responses collected focus more often than not on recent events or events which took place only a few years ago at most. Few students make connections between the events of the past and those of the present. For example, participants seem to forget the many waves of immigration that have punctuated the province's history. Some students refer to the arrival of the first French settlers, but these remain marginal elements in our sample (less than 4% of participants). In general, immigration is not considered as a historical phenomenon. Culture, when understood in its patrimonial sense, has a special relationship with history. For students who support a conception of patrimonial culture, there does not appear to be a distance between the past and the present. Culture, in this sense, is frozen in time. Participants who offer a conception of culture as heritage in transition tend to use history to emphasize the cultural changes that occurred over the years. However, this use of history seems to steer away from the discipline's main function, that of interpreting the past to identify elements of continuity and change in order to better understand the present. Our analysis suggests that very few students are able to truly understand the role of history. How, then, can we help them develop their understanding of history and its relationship to culture?

HISTORY AND THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY CULTURE

At the beginning of this study, we asked about the role of history as a school subject. We formulated the following question: should school history promote a legacy of heritage or the development of critical thinking? The results of this study lead us to believe that these two functions are in fact inseparable since they work together to ensure that learning history is meaningful for the student. Indeed, the traditional role of a legacy of heritage responds to the student's need to form a collective identity. However, we must not make the mistake of simply passing on this legacy; we must engage students in questioning it. That is why it is important to examine the heritage stories[29] from a critical historical thinking perspective and develop students' historical consciousness. It is from this awareness that students, liberated from a thought processes confined to the present, can enter into dialogue with the culture of the Other because "now, to read in the history of humanity's traditions is to promote as much as to accept them." [30]

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we propose to answer our original question: should we change the students' conception of culture? Following our investigation, it seems important to help students deepen their understanding of culture for two reasons: first, to meet the demands of the education program and, second, to help them develop a sense of openess to the world and to the idea of difference. The education program by competencies seeks the cultural development of youths and hopes to see them become interpreters of culture[31]. One of the tasks of the school is, therefore, to help students establish a dialogue between their primary and secondary cultures[32]. However, to meet these expectations, it is necessary to promote, in class,

a less compartmentalized culture. That is to say that we must get students to understand that culture is not limited to its patrimonial or civic sense but rather is composed of several meanings that allow them to understand the complexity of the world in which they live[33]. We are not saying that young people should reject their patrimonial or civic sense of culture but that they should add to their model other aspects of culture. History is an excellent way to help them do so because the discipline encourages students to examine their conceptions of culture based on the study of society. In this sense, the study of history allows the student to become a true interpreter of culture.

Québec society is increasingly multiethnic. Faced with this reality, the school should teach students to be open to difference and to relativize their own culture. To achieve this, it is important that students understand their respective cultures and that they open themselves to the knowledge of differences[34]. According to our data, there are serious shortcomings in this area since students seem to know little about their culture and have difficulty opening to the culture of the Other. Again, the teaching of history appears as a possible solution to this problem. Indeed, as shown in Segal, the study of history helps in the development of tolerance as "the historical attention reveals the genesis of societies, it explains the outcomes in manners, attitudes, institutions, and conditions for change"[35]. Thus, history provides students with both a better understanding of their own culture and an openness to the culture of the Other. However, despite the benefits associated with the teaching of history, the latter is often challenged in school curricula. Recently, the French government expressed its willingness to withdraw history classes from high schools scientific programs, thereby leaving more room for mathematics and other scientific disciplines[36]. This decision would, we believe, deprive students of a discipline that is the spokesman of culture in the sense that history can expand the dialogue between primary and secondary cultures provide a better understanding of their own culture and promote openness to the Other and to difference. Because of this, we should not replace history with mathematics.

NOTES

1 The elementary cycle is not taken into account in the États généraux de 1996; Gouvernement du Québec (1996). Les États généraux sur l'éducation 1995-1996. Rénover notre système d'éducation : dix chantiers prioritaires. Québec : Ministère de l'Éducation.

2 Rapport Inchauspé, (1996), [online] http://www.mels.gouv.qc.ca/REFORME/curricu/ecole.htm visited on 03/03/13.

3 Les États généraux de l'éducation, [online] http://www.uQuébec.ca/menu/chap3.htm#QUESTION visited on 03/03/2013.

4 *Ibid.,* visited on 03/03/2013.

5 Lacoursière, Québec, Rapport du groupe de travail sur l'enseignement de l'histoire. (1996). *Se souvenir et devenir*, Québec, Ministère de l'éducation, 80p.

6 *Ibid.*

7 Requests for reconciliation between school history and what may be called 'scientific' history are not specific to the competencies program. Instead, this request has been repeated since the introduction of the framework programs in 1967.

8 Lacoursière, 1996, *op. cit*: 1-6.

9 Comeau, R. and J. Rouillard, (2007). « La réforme de l'enseignement de l'histoire et la marginalisation de l'histoire politique dans les universités francophones », *Bulletin d'histoire politique*, 15(3), printemps : 173-180.

10 Forquin, J.-C. (1989). *École et culture. Le point de vue des sociologues britanniques.* Bruxelles : De Boeck. This idea is also considered by Goyer in: Goyer, C. (2002). « La polyphonie des registres culturels, une question de rapports à la culture. L'enseignant comme passeur, médiateur, lieur » *Revue des sciences de l'éducation*. 28(1) : 216.

11 Forquin, *Ibid.*

12 Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures – selected essays –* New York, Basic Books, 417p.

13 Collective memory will be included in the text as a collection of more or less mythical stories common to a particular society. For example, the story of the British conquest is part of the collective memory of Québecers.

14 Dumont, F. (1968). *Le lieu de l'homme. La culture comme distance et mémoire.* Montréal, HMH.

15 *Ibid.*: 51

16 *Ibid.*: 41

17 Duquette C. et H. Côté. (2007). « Comment penser l'initiation culturelle des élèves dans les classes d'histoire au secondaire ? L'approche culturelle dans l'enseignement de l'histoire ». *Le cartable de Clio* (7) : 217.

[18] Dumont F. (1995). *L'avenir de la mémoire*, Nuit blanche éditeur, Montréal : 79.

[19] This experiment is based on a study conducted by 38 students in education in the course « Approches culturelles en classe d'histoire (INT-200) » given in the Winter 2009 semester at Université de Sherbrooke. The students were interviewing high school students on their understanding of culture.

[20] In this text, the term "Other" refers to the groups and individuals who are not part of the student's socio-cultural group.

[21] Paillé, P and A. Muchielli, 2003, *L'analyse qualitative en sciences humaines et sociales*, Paris, Colin, 211p.

[22] Forquin, 1989, *op. cit.*: 9

[23] This is the code used to identify participants.

[24] In 2005, according to Statistics Canada, only 15.7% of people aged between 25 and 44 years old go to Mass once a week while 36.0% said they never attend. [online] http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-630-x/2008001/c-g/10650/5201030-fra.htm last accessed on 01/03/2013.

[25] Forquin, 1989, *op. cit.*: 9

[26] Goyer, 2002, *loc. cit.*: 216

[27] Note that the Forquin's meanings of culture are not exclusive and that the author mentions only the most common. That is why we take the liberty to add a citizenship sense to culture to this definition.

[28] Ministère de l'éducation, du sport et des loisirs du Québec (MELS), (2004) *L'école, tout un programme, programme de formation au premier cycle du secondaire* (7) : 337.

[29] The term heritage narrative refers to accounts on which a society bases its identity in time.

[30] Dumont, 1995, *op.cit.*: 80

[31] MELS, 2004, *op. cit.*: 7

[32] *Ibid.*

[33] Duquette and Côté, *loc. cit.*: 216-217

[34] Martineau, 2005, *loc. cit.*: 228

[35] Ségal, A. 2005. « L'histoire, la culture et le civisme à l'école » in Simard and Mellouki, *L'enseignement, Profession intellectuelle*, Québec, PUL : 145.

[36] Piedalet, P. 2009, « Supprimer l'histoire en terminale scientifique, un choix politique », *Le Monde.fr* article available online [online] http://www.lemonde.fr/opinions/chronique/2009/12/09/supprimer-l-histoire-en-terminal-scientifique-un-choix-politique_1277800_3232.html last accessed on 01/03/13.

REFERENCES

Comeau, R. and J. Rouillard, (2007). « La réforme de l'enseignement de l'histoire et la marginalisation de l'histoire politique dans les universités francophones », *Bulletin d'histoire politique*, 15(3), spring: 173-180.

Dumont F. (1995). *L'avenir de la mémoire*, Montréal, Nuit blanche éditeur.

Dumont, F. (1968). *Le lieu de l'homme. La culture comme distance et mémoire.* Montréal, HMH.

Duquette C. and H. Côté. (2007). « Comment penser l'initiation culturelle des élèves dans les classes d'histoire au secondaire ? L'approche culturelle dans l'enseignement de l'histoire ». *Le cartable de Clio* (7) : 208-219.

Forquin, J.-C. (1989). *École et culture. Le point de vue des sociologues britanniques.* Bruxelles : De Boeck.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures – selected essays –* New York, Basic Books.

Gouvernement du Québec (1997). *L'école tout un programme*, Québec, Gouvernement du Québec.

Gouvernement du Québec (1996). Les États généraux sur l'éducation 1995-1996. Rénover notre système d'éducation : dix chantiers prioritaires. Québec : Ministère de l'Éducation.

Goyer, C. (2002). « La polyphonie des registres culturels, une question de rapports à la culture. L'enseignant comme passeur, médiateur, lieur » *Revue des sciences de l'éducation*. 28(1) : 215-236.

Inchauspé, P. (1997). *Réaffirmer l'école*, Québec, Gouvernement du Québec.

Lacousière, (1996). *Se souvenir et devenir* Rapport du groupe de travail sur l'enseignement de l'histoire, Québec, Gouvernement du Québec.

Martineau, S. (2005). « L'éducation interculturelle : problématique, fondements et principes » dans Simard et Mellouki, *L'enseignement, Profession intellectuelle*, Québec, PUL : 207-236.

Ministère de l'éducation, du sport et des loisirs du Québec (MELS), (2004). *L'école, tout un programme, programme de formation au premier cycle du secondaire*, Québec, Gouvernement du Québec.

Paillé, P and A. Muchielli. (2003). *L'analyse qualitative en sciences humaines et sociales*, Paris, Colin.

Piedalet, P. (2009). « Supprimer l'histoire en terminale scientifique, un choix politique », *Le Monde.fr* article available online at: http://www.lemonde.fr/opinions/chronique/2009/12/09/supprimer-l-histoire-en-terminal-scientifique-un-choix-politique_1277800_3232.html last visited on 14/12/09.

Ségal, A. (2005). « L'histoire, la culture et le civisme à l'école » in Simard and Mellouki, *L'enseignement, Profession intellectuelle*, Québec, PUL : 135-151.

CLIO IN THE CURRICULUM: VINDICATED AT LAST

PENNEY CLARK is a professor in the faculty of education at the University of British Columbia and Director of The History Education Network/Histoire et éducation en réseau (THEN/HiER). She recently published the edited collection, *New Possibilities for the Past: Shaping History Education in Canada* (UBC Press, 2011).

ABSTRACT

This article traces the changes in the focus of history education in Canada over the 40-year period, 1973 to 2013. It also looks at cultural influences, prominent critiques, and varied responses over time. It includes discussion of the current initiatives which aim to transform history education.

Since this article is a review of the history curriculum in Canada over the past 40 years, I thought it appropriate to choose a title that is reminiscent of one I used for an earlier article with a similar purpose. I called a 1998 article in the journal *Canadian Social Studies* "Clio in the Curriculum: The Jury is Out."[1] This was a reference to a comment made by curriculum scholar, David Pratt in 1983: "School history is in the dock, and the judge must decide between execution and rehabilitation."[2] In the present article, I contend that the place of history in the school curriculum has become increasingly secure, following precarious times.[3]

A 1973 SNAPSHOT OF HISTORY EDUCATION

The establishment of the Association for Canadian Studies took place amid rising nationalism, accompanied by related concerns about American cultural influences. Canadians were still basking in the euphoria of the late 1960s. In 1967, they had experienced a surge of nationalistic pride, as they engaged in centenary celebrations and welcomed the world to Expo '67 in Montreal. In 1968, they voted in a charismatic prime minister, who, at least for a time, was a refreshing change from his stodgy predecessors. While these events buoyed the confidence of Canadians, the 1970 October Crisis in Québec convinced them that the country could use some timely rescue efforts.

Concerns about American cultural influences naturally included education, and there was a particularly harsh spotlight on the history curriculum and textbooks. Members of the public and educators alike, expected textbooks, and history textbooks in particular, to represent a Canadian viewpoint. Branch plants of American publishers,

located in Toronto, had used a strategy of Canadianizing American textbooks for years. This involved inexpensive alterations such as changing spelling, exchanging American flags for Canadian, and inserting Canadian locations. The Ontario Royal Commission on Books and Book Publishing released its findings in 1973, encouraging the publishing of Canadian textbooks for Canadian students.[4]

Educational policy-makers were committed to responding to the findings of a recent spate of studies of the content of provincially authorized textbooks.[5] These studies, which began in the late 1960s, were predominantly sponsored by provincial human rights commissions, departments of education, and aboriginal groups, and included two federal government royal commissions. A 1970 study sponsored by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism concluded that after 1760 [history] texts "do not even seem to be talking about the same country! The English-speaking authors do their best to give an overall history of Canada, while the French authors … hardly talk about anything but the history of Quebec and its expansion beyond its borders."[6] The 1970 Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada examined elementary reading, social studies, mathematics and guidance texts, concluding: "This analysis of sex role imagery … clearly indicates that a woman's creative and intellectual potential is either underplayed or ignored in the education of children from their earliest years."[7]

There were a number of royal commissions on education in the late 1960s and early '70s. The two most prominent were the 1968 Hall-Dennis Report in Ontario and the 1972 Worth Report in Alberta; both of which called for change in a neo-progressive direction. The result was a de-emphasis on history and a movement toward a focus on contemporary issues. The Canadian Critical Issues Series (also known as the Public Issues Program), which was used predominantly in Ontario, but also elsewhere, published secondary school curriculum materials between 1972 and 1981.[8] Its purpose was: "to enable students to gain an understanding of the society in which they live through the active discussion of its major social conflicts [and] to enable students to acquire those skills necessary for the analysis, discussion, and resolution of such conflicts or issues."[9] *Native Survival, On Strike* and *The Right to Live and Die* were three 1973 publications in this series.[10] Other publications examined the roles of women in Canadian society, the issue of foreign ownership, and the challenges of cultural diversity.

The establishment of the Canada Studies Foundation in 1970 was a logical consequence of the report of the National History Project, which had investigated the quality of history and civics teaching in 850 classrooms in 247 schools in 20 cities across the country. This study, under the direction of A.B. Hodgetts, a teacher and textbook author, published its findings in *What Culture? What Heritage?* (1968). The study concluded that "we are teaching a bland, unrealistic consensus version of our past: a dry-as-dust chronological story of uninterrupted political and economic progress told without the controversy that is an inherent part of history."[11] Hodgetts called for a national Canada Studies Consortium which would be interprovincial, and free of political influence. Until its demise in 1986, the Foundation produced teaching materials developed by teachers for teachers. The irony is that, like the Public Issues Program, these materials neglected history in favour of a decidedly contemporary focus.

INCREASING CONCERNS

There were increasing concerns about history education during the 1980s and '90s.[12] These decades witnessed continued momentum away from history courses taught with a content focus, and an increasing emphasis on critical thinking and skill development.[13] This move was greeted by considerable opposition on the part of historians, history curriculum scholars, and some teachers.[14] In my 1998 article, "Clio in the Curriculum: The Jury is Out," I remarked that "I write this article amid a climate of grave concern over the fate of school history."[15] In an earlier issue, historian and history educator Ken Osborne lamented that, in Manitoba, "social studies, history, geography, and the arts and humanities in general, are ignored or downgraded."[16] He concluded that this was neither "an aberration nor an accident. It is part of a wider move to sweep the very idea of democratic citizenship aside."[17]

In 1997, the Dominion Institute, an organization with the mandate of promoting history and citizenship goals in curricula, was formed. It immediately began to administer tests of Canadian history knowledge to young Canadians and publicize the results. These results captured the attention of the media, and increased the concern of the public about inadequate history education.

By 1998, when York University historian, J.L. Granatstein, published his slim, provocatively titled, and polemical, volume, *Who Killed Canadian History?* he captured the attention of Canadians because many were already deeply worried that young people were not learning enough about their country to develop a sense of allegiance to it. Granatstein declared that Canadian history was dead and implicated various assassins in its demise. These included: academic historians, who had become fixated on specific questions and had lost sight of the "big picture"; interest groups who had lobbied to get themselves into the curriculum; and provincial departments of education that had implemented the interdisciplinary school subject of social studies. The little history that was being taught was "that of the grievers among us."[18]

A NEW TRAJECTORY AND REVITALIZED SUPPORT FOR HISTORY EDUCATION

As it happened, other developments had already begun to overtake the trends identified by Granatstein. Two ground breaking publications appeared in 1996. The "Lacoursière Report,"[19] the findings of a task force on the teaching of history in Québec, led to the development of a new history curriculum with an innovative inquiry-oriented approach.[20] The other event was the publication of "Conceptualizing Growth in Historical Understanding," a chapter written by Peter Seixas of the University of British Columbia and published in *The Handbook of Education and Human Development.*[21] In it, Seixas laid out a framework for the field of history education based on six historical thinking concepts: significance, epistemology and evidence, continuity and change, progress and decline, empathy (perspective taking) and moral judgment, and agency.

The "Giving the Past a Future" Conference, which took place in January, 1999, was another significant event. Sponsored by the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada, this conference was significant in three ways. First, it brought together key stakeholders in history education, including historians, history education scholars, museum professionals, teachers, and representatives of organizations such as the National Film Board of Canada, Veterans Affairs Canada, and Canada's National History Society, publisher of the *Beaver Magazine* (now called *Canada's History*). Second, it provided a forum for discussion of the national standards debate. Third, it was the venue where businessman, Red Wilson, announced that he would contribute $500,000 of his personal funds to establish Historica. Until its 2009 merger with the Dominion-Institute this organization sponsored summer institutes for secondary teachers and Heritage Fairs for upper elementary and middle school students, and produced the Canadian *Encyclopedia Online*. It also produced the *Historica Minutes*, an iteration of the Bronfmann Foundation's popular *Heritage Minutes*, as well as lesson plans to accompany them.

The "Future" conference was followed two years later by the establishment of the Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness at UBC by historian and educator Peter Seixas, and then the establishment, in 2006, of The Historical Thinking Project.[22] The conceptual framework which is being disseminated through the Historical Thinking Project is beginning to be evident in provincial curricula, school textbooks and other resources, as well as in the textbooks used in teacher education programs.[23] Two other thriving research centres are exploring new possibilities for the use of technology in history education. These are *Virtual Historian*, under the direction of Stéphane Lévesque at the University of Ottawa and the *Simulating History* project, directed by Kevin Kee at Brock University.[24]

There has been a proliferation of organizations in the public domain with a mandate to enrich history education in schools. The Association for Canadian Studies is one of these. It has offered annual conferences on history education, often partnering with provincial teacher associations. Canada's History Society, formed in 1993, offers annual awards to exemplary teachers, and makes their instructional plans available to other educators. Historica and the Dominion Institute merged in 2009. The new organization offers a range of popular educational programs, including Encounters with Canada, which brings over 100 students to Ottawa each week to engage in activities related to Canadian history and identity. Unfortunately, Historica's Fairs were discontinued, but others have stepped into the breach, and they have been maintained in many provinces. *Canada: A People's History*, a 17-episode, 30 hour television production by the CBC and Radio-Canada, traces Canadian history from pre-history to 1990. It has been widely used in schools.

The final event I will discuss was the establishment of The History Education Network/Histoire et éducation en réseau (THEN/HiER), with Penney Clark as Director.[25] This pan-Canadian endeavour has been in place since 2005, but received a major impetus in 2008 with a generous grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. The network is intended to provide opportunities for school history and social studies teachers; academic historians; history education scholars; public historians, including those in museums, archives, and historic sites; provincial curriculum developers; textbook authors and publishers; and members of the public to engage in ways that will promote research-informed teaching, and pedagogically informed historical practice in various venues. It has an ambitious scholarly publishing program in process. Its first book, *New Possibilities for the Past: Shaping History Education in Canada* (UBC Press, 2011), reviews the current state of history education research and addresses the ways in which history is taught at all levels. This book also examines aboriginal perspectives on history education, how students' ethnic identities affect the ways they interact with history; the relationship between history education and citizenship education; and the state of the new history and citizenship curriculum in Québec. Contributors also look at how history is represented in museum settings, in virtual environments, and public institutional settings. The other five books in the THEN/HiER series will examine the use of technology in history education, the preparation and ongoing professional development of history teachers, museums as sites of historical consciousness, the assessment of students' historical thinking, and relationships between history education and the arts.

A 2013 SNAPSHOT OF HISTORY EDUCATION

History education in Canada, which seemed on its way out in 1973, has been revitalized. One might even say that it has risen from the grave. I will identify key ways in which it is different in 2013. The first is the availability of a coherent conceptual framework which is being taken up by provincial curriculum developers, textbook publishers, classroom teachers, and researchers. Second, The History Education Network and The Historical Thinking Project are working, not only to find out how students learn history, and how their progress can be assessed, but also how this new research information can find its way into classrooms and influence the way history is taught, as well as the resources used to teach it. These pan-Canadian initiatives disseminate research findings; provide opportunities for researchers and practitioners to collaborate, including interactive websites, workshops, symposia, larger conferences; and develop both published teacher materials and scholarly books. The third is the availability of new resources, including the vast number of digitized artifacts and documents available to students which enable them to do their own historical investigations. The fourth is the involvement of historians in Kindergarten to Grade 12 history education. Jocelyn Létourneau at Laval, John Lutz at the University of Victoria, Kevin Kee at Brock, and Margaret Conrad, who is retired from the University of New Brunswick, are examples of historians who work tirelessly on behalf of history education at all levels. The fifth is the array of public history organizations which bridge the public and education realms. It is striking how diverse the array of forces, people, and events is that has come together to create this renewed vitality It seems that history education's time has arrived.

NOTES

1 Penney Clark, "Clio in the Curriculum: The Jury is Out," *Canadian Social Studies* 32(2) (Winter 1998): 45-48, 60.

2 David Pratt, "History in Schools: Reflections on Curriculum Priorities." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association, 1983.

3 I note that Canada has never had a national history curriculum. Education is under provincial and territorial jurisdiction, a responsibility which has been guarded jealously since the Constitution Act of 1867. Nonetheless, it is possible to make some generalizations about the history curriculum in Canada, while also acknowledging exceptions. There have been calls for one national history curriculum from time to time.

4 Ontario Royal Commission on Book Publishing, *Canadian Publishers and Canadian Publishing* (Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario, 1973).

5 For a discussion of textbook controversies in Canada, see Penney Clark, "'The Most Fundamental of All Learning Tools': An Historical Investigation of Textbook Controversies in English Canada," in *Auf der Suche nach der wahren Art von Textbüchern*, ed. Angelo van Gorp and Marc Depaepe (Bad Heilbrunn, Germany: Klinkhardt, 2009): 123-42.

6 Marcel Trudel and Genevieve Jain, *Canadian History Textbooks: A Comparative Study*, Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Staff Study (5) (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970): 124.

7 Canada, *Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada* (Ottawa: Information Canada, 1970): 175.

8 John Eisenberg and Malcolm Levin, eds., *Canadian Critical Issues Series* (Toronto: OISE, 1972-1981).

[9] Paula Bourne and John Eisenberg, "The Canadian Public Issues Program: Learning to Deal with Social Controversy," *Orbit 6* (December 1975): 16-18.

[10] John Eisenberg and Harold Troper, *Native Survival* (Toronto: OISE, 1973); Christine Sylvester and Marion Harris, *On Strike!* (Toronto: OISE, 1973); John Eisenberg and Paula Bourne, *The Right to Live and Die* (Toronto: OISE, 1973).

[11] A.B. Hodgetts, *What Culture? What Heritage? A Study of Civic Education in Canada* (Toronto: OISE, 1968): 24.

[12] Curriculum offerings vary from one province to another. Ontario and Québec have history curricula. Other provinces and territories tend to offer social studies, with additional courses in social sciences, history, geography, and Canadian Studies. Social studies is an interdisciplinary subject which includes history, geography, and civics education, and to a lesser extent, other social sciences. In British Columbia, for example, there is a mandatory social studies curriculum from Kindergarten to grade eleven, followed by elective courses in history and geography in grade twelve. Click on www.thenhier.ca/en/content/curriculum-documents for provincial and territorial history and social studies curriculum documents.

[13] Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, *Social Studies: Survey of Provincial Curricula at the Elementary and Secondary Levels* (Toronto: Author, 1982).

[14] See Bob Davis, *Whatever Happened to High School History: Burying the Political Memory of Youth, Ontario: 1945-1995* (Toronto: James Lorimer, 1995); and Davis, *Skills Mania: Snake Oil in Our Schools* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000).

[15] "Clio,": 45.

[16] Ken Osborne, "The Changing Status of Canadian History in Manitoba," *Canadian Social Studies* 31(1) (Fall 1996): 28.

[17] Ibid.: 30.

[18] J.L. Granatstein, *Who Killed Canadian History?* (Toronto: HarperCollins, 1998).

[19] *Learning from the Past: Report of the Task Force on the Teaching of History* (Québec: Ministry of Education, 1996).

[20] See Jean François Cardin, "Pour un enseignement intellectuellement 'riche' de l'histoire ; un discours de longue date," *Canadian Diversity* 7(1) (Winter 2009): 31-36. See Christian Laville and Michelle Dagenais, "Le naufrage du projet de programme d'histoire 'nationale' : retour sur une occasion manquée," *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, 60(4) (2007) : 517-550 for a discussion of the impact of the reform on Québec nationalists and the traditional master-narrative of 'la survivance' in Québec.

[21] Peter Seixas, "Conceptualizing the Growth of Historical Understanding," in *Handbook of Education and Human Development: New Models of Learning, Teaching, and Schooling*, ed. David Olson and Nancy Torrance, 765-83 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996).

[22] It was called Benchmarks of Historical Thinking Project until 2011.

[23] The framework was modified in 2006 to: significance, evidence, continuity and change, cause and consequence, historical perspectives, ethical dimension. At present, aspects of historical thinking have been incorporated into provincial curricula: Manitoba, Grade 11, Canadian History; Nova Scotia, Grade 6, World History; Northwest Territories, Grade 5, Canadian History; New Brunswick, Grade 11, Modern History; and Ontario, Grades 1-8, History, Geography and Social Studies; and Ontario, Grades 9-12, Canadian and World Studies (DRAFT); and Newfoundland and Labrador Studies. A wide array of textbooks and other teaching resources have also incorporated historical thinking concepts and language. See Peter Seixas and Jill Colyer, *Assessment of Historical Thinking: A Report on the National Meeting of The Historical Thinking Project, January 18-20, 2012, February 2012*: 6. They are also found in the teacher education program textbooks, Roland Case and Penney Clark, eds., *The Anthology of Social Studies: Issues and Strategies for Elementary Teachers* (Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press, 2012) and *The Anthology of Social Studies: Issues and Strategies for Secondary Teachers* (2008).

[24] For other recent discussions of history curriculum in Canada, see: Penney Clark, Ruth Sandwell, and Stéphane Lévesque, "Dialogue Across Chasms: History and History Education in Canada," in *Studying History Teaching – Experiences and Impulses of the Discourse Around the Innovation. History Education International* Series, eds., Elisabeth Erdmann and W. Hasberg (Schwalbach/Ts: Wochenschau Verlag, in press) and Penney Clark, "Introduction," in *New Possibilities for the Past: Shaping History Education in Canada*, ed., Penney Clark (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2011): 1(30).

[25] See www.thenhier.ca.

TEACHING QUÉBEC: WHY QUÉBEC'S HISTORY MATTERS TO ENGLISH CANADA

ALAN GORDON teaches Canadian History at the University of Guelph. He has written on the public uses of history and is the author of *Making Public Pasts: The Contested Terrain of Montreal's Public Memories* and more recently *The Hero and the Historians: Historiography and the Uses of Jacques Cartier.*

ABSTRACT

In an era when university administrators are increasingly eyeing "efficiencies" (one crude measure of which might be class size), offering a course where interest has been slight in recent years can be dangerous. A cursory glance through the course calendars of Canada's universities points to a sharp decline over the past few decades of opportunities to study Québec's fascinating history. I will suggest three strategies that might reinvigorate the teaching of Québec and French Canada to students at English language universities. The first of these involves internationalizing the content of the course so that Québec – and indeed Canada – are seen as part of global historical themes. A second strategy is to consider Québec and French Canada as a foil for the examination of North American history. Incorporating such an approach into the teaching of Canadian identity might illuminate the similarities and differences in how the American context has affected Canada's and Québec's histories. Finally, to take into account the "fact" of the Canadian constitution, the construction of political and legal institutions, and interactions with Anglophone Canadians, which have all influenced developments in francophone Québec since Confederation, and indeed before.

It may seem a strange thing to do, but this summer, as happens roughly every second summer, I plan to spend a few days thinking about how to teach Québec's history to mostly unilingual, Anglophone university students. It is a task that presents obvious challenges. Perhaps the most obvious is the search for suitable, up to date readings to assign. Textbooks are not an easy solution, for there are few textbooks on Québec history both written in English and suitable for undergraduate courses. Another challenge is a palpable lack of interest among many undergraduates. In an era when university administrators are increasingly eyeing "efficiencies" (one crude measure of which might be class size), offering a course where interest has been slight in recent years can be dangerous. It wasn't always this way. In the 1970s and 1980s, university History Departments packed courses with materials to help English-speaking students understand their francophone compatriots in Québec. Issues surrounding the Conquest, the agricultural crisis, the abolition of seigneurial tenure, conscription, and the rise of separatism were issues that captured the attentions of professors and students. As an undergraduate in the 1980s, I took two separate Québec courses and at the institution where I now teach, three were on the

books. But this largesse is no more. A cursory glance through the course calendars of Canada's universities points to a sharp decline over the past few decades of opportunities to study Québec's fascinating history. Some Canadian universities offer no courses on Québec at all. My own institution now lists only one, called "Québec and French Canada," tentatively scheduled for every other year.

Of course, courses dedicated to the history of Québec are not the only way to teach the history of French Canada. Québec materials are also incorporated into broader Canadian or survey courses. At the university level, introductory Canadian History courses tend to be given in the first or second year. Typically, these courses are split into two halves: the first usually deals with Canada before Confederation; the second normally covers the period after the passing of the British North America Act in 1867. But, there is a tendency in these courses to cover French Canadian history in a certain pattern. Most will focus on the period of New France, dealing with the arrival of the explorers, trade and conflict with aboriginal peoples, the settling of the St. Lawrence Valley and the seigneurial system, as well as growing conflict with the British colonies to the south. But following the British victory at the Battle of the Plains of Abraham, these courses shift focus to the arrival of English settlers, while francophone Canadians blend into the background, popping up again only when they become a problem for national unity. This is perhaps an unfair generalization born of the limited space available here, and recent editions of survey textbooks as well as individual instructors have tried to correct the problem. Nevertheless, given the nature of survey courses and their imperative to include ever more aspects of Canada's past, it is inevitable that French Canadians will fade into the background in this way, even if only by comparison.

Any decline of Québec history at universities also reflects a shift away from an older, regional approach to explaining Canadian history. No longer do Canadian scholars divide history into regional components, but instead focus on particular social or cultural themes of the national past. There is no reason why Québec materials would not appear in these courses. *Poutine* might well figure in a course on food history, but to be anything more than tokenism it must be contextualized, perhaps in a unit on Québec's foodways. And this seems unlikely. Indeed, there has been an implicit "separatism" in the teaching of Canadian history that itself reflects these developments in recent scholarship. Diverging traditions of inquiry between English- and French-speaking academic communities have generated different traditions and approaches to scholarship. Poststructuralist analysis, for instance, has had little impact on French-language historians, who have instead embraced social science methodologies and in particular quantitative methods. The result is that English- and French-language historiographies simply do not speak to one another. But more strikingly, Anglophone and Francophone scholars have simply become less interested in pursuing research that crosses the linguistic line. In a recent essay dedicated to this problem, Magda Fahrni laments the paucity of Québec coverage in Canada's "national" academic journals, but more importantly points the finger at scholarly monographs produced by professional historians.[1] Indeed, many of the books published in the past twenty years proclaiming to be about Canada's history are really only about English Canada, despite their titles. This is a troubling development for a number of reasons, but in the context of this article it suggests a lack of professorial comfort with French language contexts. In the remainder of this article, I will suggest three strategies that can be aligned with these developments and that might reinvigorate the teaching of Québec and French Canada to students at English language universities.

The first of these strategies involves internationalizing the content of the course so that Québec – and indeed Canada – are seen as part of global historical themes. This is precisely the approach taken up by Michel Ducharme in his award-winning book *Le concept de liberté au Canada à l'époque des révolutions atlantiques.*[2] Ducharme takes up the challenge, laid down by Allan Greer in 1995, to find a way to bridge the "yawning chasm" between studies of Upper Canada and Lower Canada, in particular in dealing with the Rebellions of 1837. Greer challenged scholars to find the linkages between events in the two colonies in order to better grasp the "essential nature" of the crisis as a whole.[3] Ducharme argues that both rebellions ought to be seen in the context of the Atlantic Revolutions that overturned old regime political structures in Europe and the Americas. Driven by the pursuit of "liberty", (which Ducharme admits is complex and not easy to define) followers of William Lyon Mackenzie and Louis-Joseph Papineau took up arms against a colonial administration

they believed was depriving them of their inalienable rights. Seen in this context, the rebellions become the last in a line of revolutionary movements beginning in 1776 and linking together the American and French Revolutions, as well as the South American wars of independence against Spain in the first decades of the 19th century. The fact that the Canadian "revolutions" failed, Ducharme opines, makes them no less revolutionary in intent.

There is much promise in this globalizing approach. Along similar lines, the history of Catholic nationalism in the 1920s can be linked to similar movements in other Catholic states. Equally, the Quiet Revolution and the rise of separatism might be linked to postwar decolonization movements in Africa and Asia, or the revolutionary struggles in Latin America and around the globe. That at least two FLQ members are believed to have trained with the Palestinian Liberation Organization in Jordan is some evidence of the link.[4] But the Quiet Revolution is more directly connected to the American civil rights movement, as some Québec nationalists pointed out themselves. After all, Pierre Vallières, the intellectual leader of the FLQ, entitled his autobiography *White Niggers of America* in 1968.[5]

The linkage between the civil rights movement and separatist nationalism in Québec suggests another avenue for the teaching of Québec history to English Canadian students. Québec and French Canada might serve as a foil for the examination of North American history. The cultural hegemony of the United States – the dominance of its film, broadcast and print media, diet, fashions, and consumer goods – certainly contributed to Québec's Americanization. But Americanization, or more properly "Americanicity," also implies Québec be seen as another model for being American. Americanicity in this context refers to the consciousness of being a New World nation, in the same way that Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico are American nations. Perhaps the most striking statement of this Americanicity appears in Gérard Bouchard's *Genèse des nations et cultures du Nouveau Monde*.[6] Bouchard employs a comparative approach to understanding the development of New World or settler societies and concludes that the American milieu (its geography, climate, environment, and cultural appropriation of indigenous peoples) sets New World societies apart from those of the Old World.[7] By emphasizing the Americanicity of Québec, historians can understand its development as a new nation in the context of a settler society. In some ways, Bouchard's invocation of the dual model of rupture and continuity with the Old World harkens back to the 1950s work on settler society ideologies conducted around the American political scientist Louis Hartz. But Bouchard pushes further, using a broader comparative methodology to understand the emergence of New World national identities and cultural practices. It is an approach that resonates with the teaching of Québec history in Québec's universities and the long embrace of the idea of l'*Amérique française.* Incorporating such an approach into the teaching of Canadian identity might illuminate the similarities and differences in how the American context has affected Canada's and Québec's histories.

Perhaps the strongest rationale for re-emphasizing the history of Québec, or of French Canada more broadly, in the teaching of Canadian history emerges from a rebuttal to Bouchard's argument. In 2001 Damien-Claude Bélanger used Bouchard's *Genèse des nations* as a springboard for a broader critique of what he saw as a fundamental weakness in Québécois historiography.[8] Like many historians in Québec, Bélanger argued, Bouchard denied the "Canadianicity" of Québec while celebrating its Americanicity. As Bélanger suggested, Canadianicity captures two fundamental elements of Québec's historical development: its constitutional link to Canada through Confederation, and the embedding of francophone Québec in a cultural community that spills over its borders into "French Canada." The "fact" of the Canadian constitution, the construction of political and legal institutions, and interactions with Anglophone Canadians have all influenced developments in francophone Québec since Confederation, and indeed before. Moreover, French culture in northern North America is not restricted to the territory within the present boundaries of Québec. And there has been a historic connection between francophone Québécois and French and Catholic minorities elsewhere in the Dominion of Canada. This is a principle I explain to students as "double minority." Historical interactions between English and French-speaking Canada reflect a strained acknowledgement that Francophones are a minority in Canada, but Anglophones are also a minority in Québec.

But if the history of Québec must include its Canadianicity, surely the inverse is also true. The

symbiotic connection between the histories of English- and French-speaking Canada suggests that Canada's history must recognize its own "Québec-icity." Inserting Québec or French Canada more directly into the teaching of Canadian history in this way need not be a political act. It need not imply a return to the language of "two solitudes." It is, rather, an act of the recovery of knowledge. Simply put, Canada's Québec-icity recognizes that the processes by which many of this country's unique features developed were shaped by compromises intended to accommodate the values of two majority communities. And this recognition need not be invoked only in discussions of national unity. It explains the persistence of publicly-funded separate school systems for Catholic minorities, a policy secured by the support of Québec's politicians for their coreligionists in Ontario in the 1860s. Québec-icity also explains the rise of modern values, such as multiculturalism, which emerged from volume four of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Canada's political, cultural, and social institutions are run through with what an earlier generation of scholars, using a dated terminology, dubbed Canadian "duality." The entrenchment of principles of cultural difference in Canadian federalism, termed by Samuel LaSelva its "moral foundation," emerged from political compromises in central Canada in the 1840s and 1850s and extended outwards after Confederation.[9] Certainly historians can debate the implications and essential meanings of those compromises, but their existence suggests the importance of teaching today's students about Canada's Québec-icity. And Canada's history might well be richer and more distinct because of it.

NOTES

1 Magda Fahrni, "Reflections on the Place of Québec in Historical Writing on Canada," in Christopher Dummitt and Michael Dawson (eds) *Contesting Clio's Craft: New Directions and Debates in Canadian History* (London: Institute for the Study of the Americas, 2009): 10-12.

2 Michel Ducharme, *Le concept de liberté au Canada à l'époque des révolutions atlantiques* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010).

3 Allan Greer, "1837-38: Rebellion Reconsidered," *Canadian Historical Review* 76(1) (March 1995): 11.

4 David Charters, "The Amateur Revolutionaries: A Reassessment of the FLQ," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 9(1) (Spring 1997): 137.

5 Pierre Vallières, *Nègres blancs d'Amérique: autobiographie précoce d'un "terroriste" Québécois* (Montréal: Éditions Parti Pris, 1968) translated as *White Niggers of America* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1971).

6 Gérard Bouchard, *Genèse des nations et cultures du Nouveau Monde: essai d'histoire comparée* (Montréal : Boréal, 2001).

7 Bouchard includes South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand in this category, much as John Weaver does in his fascinating comparative study of the same terrain and time, *The Great Land Rush and the Making of the Modern World, 1650-1900* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003).

8 Damien-Claude Bélanger, "Les historiens révisionnistes et le rejet de la "Canadianité" du Québec: Réflexions en marge de la *Genèse des nations et cultures du Nouveau Monde* de Gérard Bouchard," *Mens* 2(1) (Automne 2001): 105-12.

9 Samuel V. LaSelva, *Moral Foundations of Canadian Federalism: Paradoxes, Achievements, and Tragedies of Nationhood* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996).

TEACHING HISTORY BY THINKING ABOUT THE CONCEPT OF NATION

MARC-ANDRÉ ÉTHIER and **DAVID LEFRANÇOIS** are researchers in the Groupe de recherche sur l'éducation à la citoyenneté et l'enseignement de l'histoire (GRECEH) and at the Centre de recherche interuniversitaire sur la formation et la profession enseignante (CRIFPE) in Québec. Over the last four years, their research focused on four main themes: critical analysis of programs in Quebec history and citizenship education in elementary and secondary education levels; the development of critical thinking in history; the transfer of learning into community practice and policy; and democratic deliberation in history class and its problems. More recently, they have examined the content and activities of one of the learning tools available to students, the textbook, to see if these can be seen as offering favorable or unfavorable conditions for learning sociohistorical and critical thinking. They presented some of their findings to teachers, co-facilitated training workshops for teachers, co-chaired seminars for counselors and co-edited two books published recently: *Enseigner et apprendre l'histoire : manuels, enseignants et élèves*. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval. *Contenus et idées pour enseigner l'univers social au primaire.* Montréal : Éditions du Renouveau Pédagogique Inc. Marc-André is spokesman for the Association québécoise pour la didactique de l'histoire et de la géographie and director of the Département de didactique at Université de Montréal. For about a decade, David's work has lied at the intersection of ethical and political philosophy, and the teaching of social sciences and humanities. The Conseil supérieur de l'éducation du Québec has recently appointed David to the Commission de l'enseignement et de la recherche universitaires.

ABSTRACT

In many debates about the way history is thought, two things are often set in opposition: on one hand, there is the way historical thinking and the processes involved in the creation of scholarly knowledge are being thought in school, which are often set against, on the other hand, their outcome, and especially, the narrative discourse about the nation. We need to accustom students to use social and comparative history tools in order for them to examine the narratives that are going around about a nation they are asked to identify with or against. In time, learning "the" method for studying history can lead students to research and process relevant information so they can take an informed stand the socioeconomic or sociopolitical debates (e.g. in relation to employment insurance, to the war) were only arguments that can be substantiated should matter.

In many debates about the way history is thought, two things are often set in opposition: on one hand, there is the way historical thinking and the processes involved in the creation of scholarly knowledge are being thought in school, which are often set against, on the other hand, their outcome, and especially, the narrative discourse about the nation. In this context, should we nevertheless teach, for example, the history of Quebec (or of Canada) in schools located in Quebec (or in schools in other provinces)?

In order to help students make informed decisions about whether they want to take part in collectively changing the world, so as to make it more fair, history curriculums should, in our opinion, enable them to inquire about their origins, the causes and results of social, political and economic struggles and debates that have affected, are affecting and will continue affecting Quebec and the rest of the world. In order to do so, we believe these programs should put a greater emphasis on the study of the Canadian and the Québécois national discourse that has emerged throughout history.

Indeed, we believe that deconstructing narrative, informative and other types of discourses (whether it is a discourse held by its protagonists, its witnesses or its analysts, which should include, and perhaps give precedence even more so, to the discourses of contemporary politicians reported on internet platforms) that emerge around concepts like 'the nation' increases the educational value of such concepts since it allows students to conduct their own research while drawing on knowledge that is valid, consistent, enduring and related to attitudes, heuristics and abilities associated with history: being able to define problems, analyse, summarize, criticise and argue in an independent and disciplined manner.

With time, this approach in teaching history could enable students to learn to identify, analyse and explain the factors associated with the birth of a nation and its evolution, the different public discourses which it has generated, including the contemporary Québécois narratives of remembrance (e.g. the Québécois narrative of civic and territorial remembrance (Bouchard), the French-Canadian ethnic narrative of remembrance (Courtois) or the Canadian civic and territorial narrative of remembrance (Létourneau)) and the cultural, economic, social and political consequences of past discriminations on its victims and perpetrators. Many studies show that students, even very young ones, possess the intellectual skills necessary for such an exercise (see Demers and al, 2010).

Admittedly this is a bold strategy, one that would entail that teachers, who despite their inadequate work conditions, would find the means to expose their students to issues that concern them and that are real and significant, as well as to a wide variety of relevant documents from which teenagers could practice their hand at the intended techniques and could schematize valid concepts and generalisations.

Because, in order to help students reach this objective, they need to be faced with some obstacles and we need to provide them with the necessary materials to overcome these obstacles (explanations of content and methods, instructions, documents, work procedures, etc.), especially by creating models and by practicing problem-definition, investigation and conceptualisation.

In our opinion, we thus need to accustom students to use social and comparative history tools in order for them to examine the narratives that are going around about a nation they are asked to identify with or against. Here are some examples of the questions which students (interested in the history of Quebec, regardless of their ethnic origin or place of residency) should come to ask themselves by the end of their high school education; these questions compare the history of Quebec (or of Canada) to the history of other nations of the world:

- How to reconcile, for example, the role our nation has played in wars, in imperialism and in fascism as well as in national liberation movements that occurred in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean after 1945?
- How to interpret the contributions – which are disproportionately greater than their numbers – of black workers throughout their social and political struggles in the United States, from the civil war up to today? In what sense is this phenomenon similar to the experience of French-Canadian, and then to the experience of Quebecois citizens and workers during the 19th and 20th century?
- In what manner and to the advantage of whom did the power of the state and the international social and economic system perpetuate forms of oppression and exploitation inherited from production methods that prevailed previously in class society?
- Who pocketed the gains extorted by mining companies and by Canadian banks abroad or from the lands taken from Aboriginal people, who gained from the wage gaps between immigrant or francophone workers and other workers? Who extracted wage concessions by speaking of lower wages abroad? Who relied on identity-related prejudices (sexist or chauvinistic) in order to divide and conquer? Who had to fight against all forms of national oppression and for solidarity and human dignity?

Such a process would imply not giving in to hermeneutics or the intellectual biography of politicians, but to focus on the socioeconomic and sociopolitical analysis of all the details surrounding debates about the nation, on the differences in the discourses and actions of individual and collective stakeholders, witnesses, commentators, etc. There is no unique scientific approach that can be applied mechanically to every case in the same way as there is no unconditional moral truth, inherently good behavior, origin without a cause, or unique way to periodize history: the validity of each depends on its relevance and integrity in relation to the question being researched and the desired outcome. But first, students have to come to genuinely inquire about the world around them, a process which is neither automatic nor simple to attain…

In order to reach that goal, history classes require scientific rigor, which in turn requires that teachers avoid imposing on their students their sociopolitical views, but instead that they help them develop a more profound interest towards the world, so they can transform the common-knowledge representations they have (about the nation, for example) into concepts (e.g. nationalism) that are rational and can be validated within the discipline. In time, learning "the" method for studying history can lead students to research and process relevant information so they can take an informed stance on the socioeconomic or sociopolitical debates (e.g. in relation to employment insurance, to the war) where only arguments that can be substantiated should matter.

REFERENCES

Bouchard, G. (2000). Construire la nation québécoise. Manifeste pour une coalition nationale. Dans M. Venne (dir.), *Penser la nation québécoise* : 49-68. Montréal : Québec Amérique.

Courtois, C. P. (2009). Pour un rééquilibrage de l'historiographie et de la représentation de la Nouvelle-France dans l'enseignement de l'histoire, *Bulletin d'histoire politique*, 18(1): 19-36.

Demers, S., Lefrançois, D. & Éthier, M.-A. (2010). Un aperçu des écrits publiés en français et en anglais depuis 1990 à propos de recherches en didactique sur le développement de la pensée historique au primaire. In Cardin, J.-F., Éthier, M.-A & Meunier, A. (Dir.), *Histoire, musées et éducation à la citoyenneté : recherches récentes* : 213-245. Montréal : MultiMondes.

Létourneau, J. (2000). *Passer à l'avenir. Histoire, mémoire, identité dans le Québec d'aujourd'hui*. Montréal, Boréal, 194 p.

CANADA'S SOLITUDES, OLD AND NEW

DONALD J. SAVOIE holds the Canada Research Chair in Public Administration and Governance at the Université de Moncton. He has published numerous books on public policy, public administration and governance and his work has won prizes in Canada, the United States and Europe. He was elected Fellow of Canada's National Academy and awarded several honorary degrees from Canadian universities. He was elected a Fellow of All Souls College in 2006 and his latest book is *Whatever Happened to the Music Teacher? How Government Decides and Why.*

ABSTRACT

Nearly 80 years after appearing in the writings of Hugh MacLennan, the phrase "Canada's two solitudes" continues to resonate today.[1] One can even say that new solitudes were added, making Canada more complex to manage. The national political and administrative institutions in Canada remain ill-equipped to accommodate solitudes, both old and new. Moreover, it may well be that the institutions themselves have contributed to the development or strengthening of those solitudes. The solitudes are not rooted only in language issues. New solitudes have emerged and are the product of divergent or contradictory regional economic interests. This chapter aims to provide an update on the situation of these Canadian solitudes, old and new.

OLD SOLITUDES

Hugh MacLennan's novel clearly depicted the kind of interactions that existed between Anglophone and Francophone Canadians in 1945. Everybody, including French-speaking Quebecers, converged then around the idea that a French-Canada existed and was composed of the people living in Quebec and of about one million Canadians living throughout the nine other provinces. At that time, the Catholic Church was a unifying force that bound French Canadians together in a community of shared interests.

Religion, politics and business were essential parts of a unique whole where religion was the dominant force. The Catholic Church's survival ensured the survival of French-Canada, and not many French Canadians would have had any doubt in 1945 as to the survival of the church for another thousand years.

Communication between French Canada and English Canada was very limited. The means by which we communicated then were not as elaborate as they are today, but that was not the sole factor explaining this situation. One only has to read MacLennan's novel in order to understand why those two communities had so little in common and hence why communication between the two solitudes was limited.

To the extent to which communication took place, it often happened in Ottawa, where communicating was necessary in order to ensure that the government was functioning properly. However, aside from parliament proceedings, the language spoken by the government was English.

Today, the Catholic Church has lost a lot of ground, and few people, if any, would associate the survival of French Canada to the Catholic Church. French Canada has lost its unifying force. When the Church lost its dominance, French Canadians turned to the state in order to ensure their survival. However, Quebecers and French Canadians living outside of Quebec could not turn to the same government. Before long, those two communities had defined their priorities, which were different if not completely contrary. We have reached the point – or are on the verge of reaching it – where two solitudes have developed within French Canada.

Quebec envisions its survival in quite a different manner than do French Canadians outside of Quebec. We do not hear Quebecers speak of French Canada anymore. They have come to consider their survival independently from the French Canadian community outside of its borders. A recent study shows how Radio Canada stresses issues related to Quebec while barely addressing questions related to Canada and to francophones living outside of Quebec. Increasingly, Radio Canada, a federally funded institution, has been accused of becoming a quebecocentric mouthpiece. Over the last few months, a scientific study has been backing up these accusations[2].

English Canada seems two have lost interest in Quebec and in issues of national unity. In an opinion letter published in *La Presse* and the *Globe and Mail* on the 29th of June of 2012, I asked: who will step in to speak for Canada if ever Quebec pushes Canada back into a crisis of national unity? My answer: support towards unity will be much less strong and far-reaching than it was during the Quebec referendum in 1995. One recalls that all of Ontario's available coach buses were made available to drive down to Quebec and that 75 full buses left New Brunswick in order to participate in a love-in in Montreal so as to show Quebecers that Canada cared deeply about Quebec and wanted it to maintain its place amid the Canadian family. A great number of fellow citizens flew in or came by train or car from Western Canada, Ontario and Atlantic Canada in order to join in on the love-in[3].

Times have changed. Western Canada is much more self-confident than it was in 1995. Ontario seems to have lost interest toward national unity. In fact, the message that Ontario's provincial government and focus groups are constantly sending is that Ontario has not been getting its due piece of the federal government spending pie. A good number of citizens from Atlantic Canada echo other Canadians in saying: "Go on Quebec, it's up to you to decide whether you stay or you go".

In short, the two old solitudes still exist. In fact, they are withdrawing more and more from each other, preoccupied by their own challenges, which are mostly economic in nature. The only difference is that one of the solitudes has split in two new solitudes; the two new French Canadas are now pursuing very different goals.

Globalization, the advent of new means of communication, largely stimulated by innovations having emerged from the English-speaking world (the internet and social media) and the competitiveness of the new economy makes English-speaking Canada focus on economic issues. As a result, English-Canada has split and new solitudes in the Canadian English-speaking world is taking form.

NEW SOLITUDES ARE EMERGING AS THE NATIONAL ECONOMY COLLAPSES

Canada has never ceased trying to adapt its political and administrative institutions, which were designed for a unified state, so that they can suit the needs of a federal system. Due to globalization, cracks in the system are starting to become more noticeable now more than when national economies were more self-reliant.

Canadian political writers and observers of Canadian federalism did not pay enough attention to John A. Macdonald's wish to apply a British model of political institutions to the Canadian federal state. The impact of such an aspiration can be felt from the outset of Confederation. The movement towards confederation emerged through Ontario's and, to a lesser degree, Quebec's leadership. Ontario saw economic advantages in the union of the Canadas, which would then be joined by the Maritime Provinces. John Ibbitson writes that national political institutions purposefully advantaged Ontario's economic interests and made Ontario "the one and only imperial province. The clearest, and most

overwhelmingly so, demonstration of this imperialism was the National Policy"[4].

Canada's National Policy's intent was to promote the country's manufacturing sector, which, incidentally, advantaged the Windsor-Quebec corridor. Policymakers coming from areas around the corridor came to the conclusion that this was simply what had to be done in order to build a national economy. Without an Upper House to represent the other parts of the country at parliament, the most populated central region of the country had the better end of the deal when it came to policy making, and they still do. Furthermore, the National Policy had very little to offer to the West and the Maritimes. Because of economic protectionism and the National Policy, manufacturers from the Maritimes had to ship their products toward central Canada via train at high cost instead of shipping them by boat to their usual export markets in New England and elsewhere.

But this overview is far from being complete. An inherent bias running throughout national political and administrative institutions can be seen every time Ottawa takes an important economic decision. For example, 32 state companies where created in order to support the war effort between the end of the 1930s and the beginning of the 1940s. All of those 32 companies were established in the two most inhabited provinces: Ontario and Quebec[5]. In turn, to a great degree, Canada's modern manufacturing sector's origins can be traced back to those companies.

However, again, these facts do not offer a complete portrait of the situation. The Auto Pact, an agreement entered into by the U.S. and Canada in 1965, established a viable manufacturing industry in southern Ontario. The Auto Pact had an instant impact on southern Ontario. In 1964, only 7% of cars build in Canada were sold in the United States; in 1968, this number rose to 60%. The automotive industry provides nearly 100 000 Canadians with a job, nearly 90% of which are in Ontario[6]. Many other similar examples can be given.

Canada's public service is loyal to the political party in power, and the Constitution does not attribute any kind of distinctive personality to it, as least in theory[7]. It also forms an administrative institution which is strongly centralized. Almost every senior position in politics and the majority of top-level positions are held by individuals in the National Capital Region.

Globalisation, regional free trade agreements and the importance of the energy sector have serious repercussions on the national economy. It is no mere accident that Ontario's government and citizens were vigorously opposed to the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the United States, while Quebec and New-Brunswick's leaders and citizens were supportive of it.[8]

The day Ontario became affected by payments of equalization, a wave of discontent flew throughout the Canadian federation. The energy sector, demographic growth and the increasing political power of western Canada are in the process of redefining Canadian regions and the relationship between the provinces. Western Canada is profusely selling oil and other natural resources to foreign markets, thus strengthening the value of the Canadian dollar. The manufacturing industry in central Canada can no longer rely on the National Policy and high custom taxes in order to protect its local businesses.

Western Canada remains convinced that its strong economic growth is due to its natural resources and entrepreneurial skills. No credit is attributed to the federal government. Indeed, for a great number of Western Canadians, the memory of the disastrous impact the National Energy Program (NEP) had on the regional economy in the beginning of the 1980s is still fresh. This example goes to show that Canada's regions are focusing on their own needs or turning towards foreign markets in order to define the new economic route they plan on taking. The shortcomings of our national political and administrative institutions are undermining the unity of this country.

Canada is a country formed by regions and, apart from Ontario, those regions are coming to the realization that the national political institutions in place are unable to deal adequately with their socioeconomic interests. In the past few years, Ontario has started echoing other Canadian regions by stating that federal policies are detrimental to provincial interests. The Ontario government insists that Ottawa's policies on transfer payments, immigration and Senate reform, amongst others, are not consistent with Ontario's political platform and its efforts to develop economic growth.[9]

David McGuinty, a liberal Member of Parliament representing Ottawa in the House of Commons, alluded to history and Ontario's role in the Confederation when

he made a remark that federal MPs from Alberta should go back to Alberta and run for provincial legislature or for municipal office because they are "unable" to hold a "national vision"[10]. For many Western Canadians or Atlantic Canadians, however, the term "national" is a code word referring to Ontario's economic interests.[11]

The Aboriginal communities of Canada are also another one of Canada's solitudes. They demand that their voices be heard during constitutional debates. They are trying to find a way to coexist amidst the Canadian family while trying to demonstrate that our national political institutions are not suited to address their aspirations.[12]

CASTING A GLANCE AT THE FUTURE

Unless Canada's political and administrative institutions undergo a reform that will acknowledge the socioeconomic particularities of every region, old and new solitudes will continue to shape Canada's political debates. It is urgent that our institutions recognize that Canada is a country of regions. The term "national" only resonates in Ontario, but even Ontario cannot hold the pretence anymore of speaking for the common interest. Changes in the economic situation redefine the relationships between the Canadian regions, creating new solitudes and reinforcing old ones. Our institutions have to be readjusted so that these solitudes do not become irreconcilable.

NOTES

1 Hugh MacLennan, *Two Solitudes*, Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 2008.

2 Bruce Cheadle, « Étude : La SRC serait trop centrée sur le Québec et ne remplirait pas son mandat », *La Presse Canadienne*, October 14, 2012, www.huffingtonpost.ca.

3 « Vers une tempête parfaite », *La Presse*, June 29, 2012; and « Who will speak for Canada », *Globe and Mail*, June 29, 2012.

4 John Ibbitson, *Loyal No More: Ontario's Struggle for a Separate Destiny*, Toronto, HarperCollins, 2001) : 4-5.

5 See Donald J. Savoie, *Visiting Grandchildren: Economic Development in the Maritimes*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2006 : 30-31.

6 See Canada, Statistics Canada, « Nombre d'emplois manufacturiers – Véhicules automobiles et pièces de véhicules automobiles », table 2180024.

7 Donald J. Savoie, *Court Government and the Collapse of Accountability in Canada and the United Kingdom*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2008.

8 See « Canada-US Free Trade: Signed on the dotted line », *CBC Digital Archives*, n.d., www.cbc.ca/archives.

9 Mathew Mandelson et al, *Canada: The State of the Federalism, 2010: Shifting Power: The New Ontario and What it Means for Canada*, Montréal, McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013, coll. « Queen's Policy Studies ».

10 « MP McGuinty drops critic role over "go back to Alberta, gibe" », www.theglobeandmail.com, November 21, 2012.

11 See Savoie, *Visiting Grandchildren*.

12 Alan Cairns, *First Nations and the Canadian State: In Search of Coexistence*, Kingston, Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 2002.

OF HOCKEY, MEDICARE AND CANADIAN DREAMS

STEPHEN J. TOOPE is President and Vice-Chancellor, the University of British Columbia. A former President of the Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation, and Dean of Law, McGill University, Professor Toope also served as Law Clerk to the Rt. Hon. Brian Dickson, of the Supreme Court of Canada. He publishes in leading international journals on international dispute resolution, international environmental law, human rights, the use of force, and international legal theory. His most recent book with Jutta Brunnée, *Legitimacy and Legality in International Law: An Interactional Account.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2010) won the American Society of International Law's 2011 Certificate of Merit for Creative Scholarship.

ABSTRACT

As Canada approaches its 150th anniversary, Canadians need to decide what we want to be when we grow up. Our national sport and Medicare alone will not define us. Understanding our strengths and facing our problems squarely, what visions could Canadians be dreaming of as we face a stormy future?*

Hockey is a great, fast-paced sport, and it has served well as an emblem for Canadians' sense of self. Set in winter snows, demanding agility and fortitude in the face of harsh conditions, and requiring a robust competitive spirit, hockey speaks both to what Canadians have inherited from a frontier history and to what we hope to be.

It is too bad that the national game is dominated by an NHL that seems greedier, insensitive to the expectations of fans and dominated by the need to satisfy a US market. And the increasingly obvious risks associated with out-of-control violence may one day bring the current hockey regime to account.

Medicare is a great social policy achievement, and it has served well as an emblem for Canadians' sense of self. Emerging from the wide plains of Saskatchewan, and reflecting a desire to protect the vulnerable amongst us, Medicare speaks to an open spirit and an aspiration towards social equality.

Too bad the system underperforms less costly systems in Europe and fails to produce health outcomes that an advanced society should expect to see. The costs keep rising, crowding out other social expenditures of both federal and provincial governments. And access seems to depend too often on who you know.

Is this the best we can do as Canadians? Are hockey and Medicare our defining features? Do they best represent who we are and what we hope to become? As Canada approaches its 150th anniversary, we Canadians need to push ourselves a little to figure out what we want to be when we grow up.

It may seem strange to say that we aren't grown up yet, for we are among a handful of countries that has managed democratic rule for so long. Yet our democracy has, for much of its history, been a dependent one, first on the United Kingdom and then on the United States. It was only after the First World War that Canada began to develop an independent set of relationships with foreign states, and only in 1931, with the passing of the Statute of Westminster, that the Canadian Parliament was accorded status equal to the Parliament of the UK. Our economic policy was long constrained by our absolute dependence upon the United States in foreign trade. From the 1960s through to the early 2000s, the share of Canadian trade with the US rose from roughly 60 per cent of total trade to over 80. With more attention to Asia in the last few years, the concentration of trade with the US has fallen, but remains over 70 per cent. For much of our history in the twentieth century, Canada hid behind the US on major matters of foreign policy as well. Although we liked to think of ourselves as "honest brokers," much of the world saw us merely as somewhat gentler versions of Americans.

These hard-sounding comments should not be mistaken for self-loathing. Canadians have much to be proud of, as our country has evolved through the last century. We have created a society marked by relative openness to immigration, especially in comparison with most of Europe. Our ability to attract large numbers of people from foreign shores, respecting and even borrowing from many of their traditions, while encouraging social integration, is enviable. It is practically unmatched in other liberal democracies. It is a truism, for example, that Vancouver is now the largest Asian city outside Asia, but what is truly remarkable is the ability of immigrants from China, Korea and elsewhere to build lives that are still connected to their histories and to have other Canadians acknowledge that history. UBC has the largest Mandarin-language programme in North America, and many of its students are Anglo-Canadian, of Korean and Japanese origin, or foreign students from around the world.

Canadians should also be proud of our history of social mobility. Today, when many influential Americans, like Nobel Prize-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz, worry that the US is no longer a "land of opportunity," Canada is out-performing the US as a place where it is possible to rise from distinctly modest backgrounds to find economic security. A major reason for that continuing mobility is that education is publicly financed to a large extent, from day care right through to doctoral programmes. University and college education is still relatively affordable in Canada, opening up worlds of opportunity for new generations of students, from here and from around the globe.

On the cultural front, Canada has also seen an explosion of talent and global recognition over the last few years. Canadian authors like Atwood, Gallant, Hagi, Huston, Laferrière, Martel, Munro, and Ondaatje are international best-sellers and prize winners. Canadian actors star in major Hollywood films. Although English-Canadian cinema is not in its strongest period, Quebec cinema continues to produce inventive and influential films, including three nominated for best foreign-film Oscars in the last three years. In pop music, airwaves and IPods around the world are filled with the likes of Drake, Justin Bieber, Celine Dion, Carly Rae Jepsen, and Leonard Cohen. The Vancouver school of conceptual and post-conceptual photography is globally influential, with artists like Jeff Wall offered retrospectives at major galleries world-wide.

Canadians have lots to celebrate, aside from hockey and Medicare, though we tend not to celebrate very loudly. How many Canadians even know that Nancy Huston, a Calgarian by origin but writing in French, won France's prestigious Prix Fémina, or that Canadian composer, Howard Shore, has won three Oscars, three Golden Globes and four Grammies for his film scores? Just last year, Canadians could have celebrated the thirtieth anniversary of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, a constitutional text that has influenced legal systems around the world, in part through direct borrowing and in part through the work of the Canadian Supreme Court which, since the advent of the *Charter*, has proven to be one of the most internationally cited courts in the world. Small-minded politics out of Ottawa precluded much attention to this anniversary.

But amidst the many reasons that we should celebrate, there are also reasons to worry. While we continue to target for roughly 250,000 new immigrants each year, their integration into our economy has faltered, even though they are better educated than ever before. Between 2000 and 2005, according to Statistics Canada, the income gap between Canadian-born workers and recent immigrants with university degrees widened significantly. Our productivity as a nation has also stagnated. Over the last thirty years, the productivity gap between Canadian and US workers has increased to almost $10,000 a person per year. This is not because Canadians don't work hard, but because our business performance in innovation is tepid at best. The Jenkins Panel on Canadian innovation reported to the federal government in 2010 that the expenditure of Canadian business on research and development had fallen since 2006, declining to the level of 2000, when Canada was already merely at the average of Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries.

Consider also what has happened to real wages over the last thirty years. Statistics Canada reports that average real wage rates increased by only 14 percent in Canada from 1981 to 2011, failing to match the rising cost of living. Even though social mobility is better than in the United States, it is less robust than in many European countries, which have traditionally been seen as bastions of privilege. The Conference Board of Canada laments that from 1990 to 2013, the wealthiest Canadians have significantly increased their proportion of total national income, while the poorest, and even middle-income groups, have lost ground.

Like the inhabitants of many other advanced economies, Canadians may live through a slow-moving demographic train wreck over the next few years. Not only are there likely to be too few working people to support the social safety net for the Boomer generation, but even now a growing gulf is opening between generations, with younger Canadians worrying that they won't ever find meaningful jobs or be able to afford their own homes. UBC's Professor Paul Kershaw demonstrates that the average household income for young Canadian couples has stagnated since the mid-1970s, adjusting for inflation, while average housing prices in Canada have skyrocketed by 76%. Culturally, many of our once-treasured institutions and organizations are in perilous straits. In 2012 to 2013, funding cuts to arts organizations kicked in at the federal and provincial levels. The Playhouse Theatre in Vancouver closed, The Toronto Symphony operated in deficit, one of the last major Canadian independent publishers, Douglas & McIntyre, filed for bankruptcy protection, and the National Gallery of Canada cut staff to address a budget crunch.

Incanting the names of Sidney Crosby, Roberto Luongo and Carey Price just won't be good enough to protect Canadians from the storms to come, or to ground a rich sense of identity. Nor will Medicare alone be our sure port. Understanding our strengths and facing our problems squarely, Canadians need to figure out who we are, now that we really are quite close to grown up. What visions could Canadians be dreaming to as we face a stormy future? What might a robust sense of Canadian-ness, of pride in our society, look like 50 years or so from now, at the 200th anniversary of Confederation?

The social inclusion that we have offered to generations and generations of immigrants will continue, and be buttressed by better economic integration. That inclusive spirit will finally be matched by a respect for the traditions of the First Nations and other aboriginal Canadians, and society-wide efforts to help ensure their economic, social and cultural vitality. We will have re-captured our fundamental, if demanding, connections to the land and the landscape, defined so clearly in Margaret Atwood's *Survival* or Margaret Laurence's *The Stone Angel*. Those connections will imply a profound commitment to understanding and upholding the delicate balancing required in the exploitation of resources and treasuring the natural environment.

Canadians will have re-imagined our place in the world, recognizing that our social and economic links to Asia are an important trade strength, but that the greatest source of long-term opportunity might well be in Africa. We will admit that we cannot secure our future through military adventures because we will never have the staying power required to deal with internal conflicts and guerrilla-style war on foreign shores. Our focus, instead, will be on entrepreneurial social, cultural and economic engagement around the world, matched with military training missions and limited participation in collective security efforts designed to protect vulnerable populations. We will finally have cracked the code on Canadian-style social and economic innovation, innovation that draws on the diverse talents of an

astonishingly intercultural and multilingual society with deep family, social, cultural and economic connections that span the globe. To spur that innovation in all fields of endeavour, Canadians will have found the will to risk for the great, rather than settling for the good.

And yes, hockey will still matter, but a hockey that has re-found its connection to people more than dollars, and a hockey that doesn't sacrifice the well-being of players in an attempt to mimic ultimate fighting. Canadians will have employed our new-found social innovation mojo to re-engineer Medicare to ensure its fiscal sustainability and improve health outcomes.

Canadians' dreams will be about hockey, healthy kids and pensioners, friends from all parts of the world, gorgeous natural vistas and culturally rich urban neighbourhoods, and work in far-away places where Canadians are welcomed as partners in creative social and economic initiatives. Adult dreams.

NOTE

* The views expressed are personal and should not be attributed to the University of British Columbia.

TO EXCEED OURSELVES: TOWARDS A SMARTER, MORE CARING CANADA

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE DAVID JOHNSTON began his professional career as an assistant professor in the Faculty of Law at Queen's University in 1966, moving to the Law Faculty at the University of Toronto in 1968. He became dean of the Faculty of Law at the University of Western Ontario in 1974. In 1979, he was named principal and vice-chancellor of McGill University, and in July 1994, he returned to the McGill Faculty of Law as a full-time professor. In June 1999, he became the fifth president of the University of Waterloo.

Mr. Johnston holds an LL.B. from Queen's University (1966), an LL.B. from the University of Cambridge (1965), and an AB from Harvard University (1963). While at Harvard, he was twice selected for the All-American hockey team and is a member of Harvard's Athletic Hall of Fame. His academic specializations include securities regulation, information technology and corporate law.

Sworn in on October 1, 2010, His Excellency the Right Honourable David Johnston is the 28th governor general since Confederation.

ABSTRACT

Just as Thomas Symons urged us to "know ourselves" as Canadians, my wife, Sharon, and I have concentrated our efforts on fostering a smarter, more caring Canada as we approach our nation's 150th anniversary. How are we doing in our efforts to build a better smarter, more caring communities and a better country? *To exceed ourselves.* Let that be our goal as learners and innovators, as volunteers and philanthropists, as members of healthy and strong families and smart, caring communities.

A couple of years ago, shortly after my installation as governor general, I travelled to Charlottetown to deliver the Symons Lecture on the State of Confederation. It was an honour to do so, for several reasons.

The first reason is that the lecture is named after Thomas Symons, a good friend whom I have long greatly admired and who has devoted so much of his life to the study and teaching of all things Canadian. (As this special edition of *Canadian Issues* commemorates, it was Thomas Symons who, 40 years ago, exhorted us "to know ourselves" through a greater understanding and appreciation of Canadian studies—a call to action which remains relevant to this day.)

Second, the Symons Lecture gave me a wonderful opportunity to talk about Canada and to elaborate upon my vision for this country as we approach our 150th birthday in 2017. And finally, it was of course particularly fitting to do so in Charlottetown, where the project of a united Canada was first embraced with enthusiasm.

The Charlottetown Conference of 1864 reminds us that Confederation was a shared effort—the result of many years of planning, negotiation and compromise. As the editors of *Canada's Founding Debates* point out, "Rome wasn't built in a day, and Confederation doesn't happen in a year!" Rather, it was the result of a great deal of debate and deliberation in the colonial parliaments of the day and, more fundamentally, in the homes and gathering places of ordinary people.

All were bent on answering a single overarching question: Canada, yes or no?

TOWARDS A SMARTER, MORE CARING CANADA

In the event, my lecture in Charlottetown was an elaboration of sorts on the ideas I had presented a month earlier during my installation address, entitled *A Smart and Caring Nation: A Call to Service.*

I like to think of that address as the blueprint for my mandate as governor general. Just as Thomas Symons urged us to "know ourselves" as Canadians, my wife, Sharon, and I have concentrated our efforts on fostering a smarter, more caring Canada as we approach our nation's 150th anniversary. And just as the primary question asked in the years prior to Confederation could be summed up as "Canada, yes or no?", I would suggest that the essential question we must ask ourselves today is: "A smarter, more caring Canada, yes or no?"

Or, to put it in temporal and physical terms: keener minds and kinder hearts—are these the organic transformations we envisage for the species *Canadensis* in the years ahead?

Of course, those descriptors—smart and caring, keener and kinder—can mean different things to different people, but surely the challenges faced by those who brokered the compromises and agreements of Confederation were no less. If anything, we are more aware today of what we have in common as Canadians—and indeed as human beings—than ever before in our history.

Students of Canadian history also know, however, that Confederation was no mere utopian project. The leaders of the day had very specific goals and aims. As historian Richard Gwyn writes in his recent biography of John A. Macdonald, our first prime minister understood that Confederation was above all a means to an end. That end was an independent North American nation with enough "will and nerve" to survive alongside the great powers of Britain and the United States.

We had no choice but to be an ambitious country. That's why our constitution included a pledge to start work on a trans-Canada railway within six months of Confederation, and ultimately to extend our borders all the way to the Pacific.

Today, I believe we must be equally bold in seeking new horizons—only this time, our challenge is to build a smarter, more caring nation in a rapidly changing global context.

TO EXCEED OURSELVES

All of which brings me back to our vision for 2017 and beyond. How are we doing in our efforts to build a better smarter, more caring communities and a better country? What have Sharon and I observed during the past two-and-a-half years?

While it is impossible to be comprehensive in such a short space, let me begin by stating with conviction how truly fortunate we are to call Canada home. I have always felt a deep love for this country, but never more so than now, having seen so much of it and having had the opportunity to meet so many kind-hearted, talented and energetic Canadians. Canada is in many ways the envy of the world—and with good reason.

And yet, we all know there is so much more that we can, and must, do if we are to consider ourselves a truly smart and caring nation. One of the dangers facing Canada today—and indeed any country so fortunate—is the risk of complacency. And it is a growing danger, because the pace of change is accelerating. We must continually strive to improve our learning, to extend our giving and to strengthen our communities.

With this rapidly changing global context in mind, I therefore invite all Canadians to seek new ways to exceed ourselves as we approach our 150th birthday in 2017. Let us guard against complacency, because success today rests upon our ability and willingness to continuously strive for excellence in recognizing and adjusting to new realities.

To put it another way, to succeed we must exceed ourselves.

Throughout the first half of my mandate, Sharon and I have focused our efforts on a number of key priorities that we view as essential to the Canada of which we dream: learning and innovation; volunteerism and philanthropy; and families and children. Let me focus my observations and hopes for Canada through the lens of these pillars.

LEARNING AND INNOVATION

Canada is blessed with a wealth of minerals, timber and fresh water, as well as the world's longest coastline, but our greatest resource is our ability to learn and apply our collective ingenuity. How do we best use learning and innovation to enhance our lives and strengthen our society?

One important means of creating a civic and prosperous society is to ensure a quality high school education for all Canadians. Today, there are a great many wonderful initiatives underway in Canada, focused on student success.

One of these we encountered on a memorable visit to Sherbrooke in Quebec's Eastern Townships. This community is home to a successful experiment aimed at reducing the high school dropout rate, which had reached alarming levels in recent years. Rather than focusing on their studies, many students—particularly boys—were working more and longer part-time hours. Their grades were suffering. Many eventually gave up on school altogether and dropped out in order to work full-time.

The people of Sherbrooke came together to take on this problem. Through a partnership between the business community, the school board, the city and students, a contract was drawn up to ensure that students who work part-time maintain good grades. They also cannot work more than 15 hours per week. This contract is signed by the student and the employer, based on the understanding that education is critical to individual success and to the wellbeing of the community.

In the decade that this innovative program has existed, the high school dropout rate in Sherbrooke dropped from 34 percent to 25 percent. This remarkable progress was made possible through collaboration and a willingness to look for new solutions, and by a shared belief that the success of our young people is the responsibility of the entire community, and not just the school system.

As we approach 2017, can we find ways to improve high school graduation rates for all Canadians, including people in Aboriginal communities?

At the post-secondary level, can we increase the number of Canadians who spend at least one term studying abroad, practising the diplomacy of knowledge?

And when it comes to helping students transition from school to the workforce, can we be a world leader in finding ways to apply skills-to-jobs?

Can we exceed ourselves as nation of learners and innovators?

PHILANTHROPY AND VOLUNTEERISM

One of the highlights to date in my mandate as governor general came in April 2012, when I reintroduced a very special award for volunteer and community service: the Caring Canadian Award. This award recognizes people who give their time and energy to help others, without expectation of reward or recognition. These people are a community's 'unsung' heroes. We have met so many deserving recipients over the past two-and-a-half years, but to illustrate the great compassion and generosity characteristics of these recipients I will focus on just one: 75-year-old Evelyn Florendo.

In November 1984, Evelyn, a Vancouver resident, read a news story about young offenders at the Burnaby Youth Services Custody Centre who were attempting to harm themselves. Some of them were cutting themselves, others had even attempted suicide. Wanting to do something to ease their pain and add a little joy to their lives, Evelyn contacted the director of the centre to see how she could help.

The result was a Christmas dinner for over a hundred teenagers, which she has organized and prepared for the past 28 years with help from women from the area Catholic Women's League and the local archbishop. Each Christmas, residents of the centre, who range from 12 to 19 years of age, enjoy a big meal, followed by an open house in which the teens' parents are invited, as well as guest speakers and politicians. Some of the kids at the Centre are in for serious crimes, others for lesser offences, but Mrs. Florendo only shows kindness. She hugs them and tells them that she loves them: "Many of the kids laugh or smile and respond in kind: I love you, too."

The annual Christmas dinner is a small but significant event in the calendar of these kids' lives. Those who work and volunteer at the Centre point out that this kind of compassion means a great deal. "Sometimes when kids are that age, a lot of people turn their backs on them," said another volunteer at the Centre, Roger Bissoondatt. The hope Evelyn Florendo is working to inspire in these young offenders is the hope that they can turn their lives around, and that they are precious and important individuals who can contribute to society in meaningful ways.

As governor general, it was a privilege to present Evelyn with the Caring Canadian Award—and I feel the same way about all recipients. When it comes to philanthropy and volunteerism, Canadians have much to be proud of. Every year, an estimated 12.5 million Canadians formally volunteer with an agency or organization, putting us among the world's top donors of time and talent. Canadians also show great generosity, making charitable donations of $10.6 billion in 2010.

We have done much, but we must do more. Can we widen the circle of giving in this country by integrating volunteerism into the daily lives of all Canadians, including young people, new Canadians and those who don't consider themselves to be givers?

Can we establish benchmarks to help us measure and improve our performance in volunteerism and philanthropy in comparison with other countries?

Can we exceed ourselves as a nation of volunteers and philanthropists?

FAMILIES AND CHILDREN

Canadians are dedicated to supporting their families, children and communities. Our country's success is built upon strong foundations of family and community, and Canadians agree the well-being of children is a priority for a smart and caring society.

One area of growing concern for Canadian families and communities is mental health. According to the Canadian Mental Health Association, one in five Canadians will be personally affected by mental illness during their lifetime, whether through a family member, friend or colleague. Mental illness does not discriminate by age, income, educational level or culture, and the negative impacts on our lives and society are significant.

Over the past few years, Sharon and I have been working to try to remove the stigma that still too often surrounds mental illness, and to raise awareness about the growing body of research and treatments available. Through our efforts, we have come into contact with some remarkable individuals.

For example, late last year we met with Mike Kerrigan, who raised awareness of mental illness in rural communities by organizing a run from Strathroy, Ontario to Miramichi, New Brunswick. Mike decided to initiate the run after his 16-year old son, Jacob, was accused of being a drug addict because of his erratic behavior. He was later diagnosed with bipolar disorder and given appropriate medication to deal with his condition.

We have also seen a number of important success stories in dealing with mental illness. One is known as the Algoma Model for youth with mental health problems, developed in Sault Ste. Marie—Sharon's and my hometown. The Algoma Model is a collaborative, school- and community-based approach to addressing child and youth problem behavior and mental health issues. Through broad community partnerships, this approach aims to support young people by preventing and identifying problems before they develop, followed by targeted interventions, specialized treatment and crisis services when needed. In a wonderful example of learning and collaboration, this approach to ensuring no child or young person falls through the cracks has been adopted by a number of other Ontario communities.

A complex mixture of factors influences and causes mental illness, and we still have much to learn. The pervasiveness of this issue in Canada today makes it so important that we remove the stigma around mental illness and confront it head on as a public health matter that affects families, children and all Canadians. And because of the dramatic advances in science, particularly in our understanding of the brain in the past two decades, there is so much hope. Can we extend our caring to include those dealing with mental illness as we approach 2017?

And on another important health issue, can we renew our commitment to supporting our children's physical health and well-being through fitness and sporting activities?

Can we make ourselves a truly caring nation by making the placement of foster children in supportive and loving families a priority for all Canadians when we currently place only 10%?

Can we exceed ourselves as a nation that prioritizes the well-being of families, friends and children?

To exceed ourselves. Let that be our goal as learners and innovators, as volunteers and philanthropists, as members of healthy and strong families and smart, caring communities. To exceed ourselves as students of Canada and of the world, and indeed in each endeavour we undertake collectively and as individuals. Let excellence be our aim for Canada for 2017, not for the sake of it, but rather for reasons just as practical as were those behind Confederation in 1867—because for all that has changed since then, we once again have no choice but to be an ambitious country.

Let us exceed ourselves because we can, and because we must.

THE GREATEST LESSON OF OUR HISTORY

THE HONOURABLE STÉPHANE DION, was Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs between 1996 and 2003, longer than any other Canadian since Confederation. In that capacity, he was instrumental in bringing countless federal-provincial negotiations to fruition and played a major role in the promotion of Canadian unity. As Minister also responsible for Official Languages, he crafted a renewal plan that was very well received in the community.

As Minister of the Environment from 2004 to 2005, he secured one of the greenest budgets in the history of Canada and contributed to the rescue of the Kyoto Protocol while chairing the UN Conference on Climate Change, held in Montreal in 2005.

In 2006, having been elected as Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada and having become Leader of the Official Opposition in the House of Commons, he proposed a visionary plan to make Canada richer, fairer and greener. Following the 2008 election, he retained his seat as Member of Parliament for Saint-Laurent-Cartierville, a seat he has won seven times in a row since 1996.

Before entering politics, Stéphane Dion taught Political Science, first at Université de Moncton in 1984, then at Université de Montréal from 1984 to 1995. He has authored many publications.

Born in Quebec City, he studied at Université Laval before obtaining a Doctorate in Sociology from the Institut d'études politiques in Paris, France. He was also awarded an Honorary Doctorate by the Carlos III University of Madrid. He was the recipient of the 2011 Couchiching Award for Public Policy Leadership and sits on the External Advisory Board of the *Yale Climate and Energy Institute*.

At the present time, he chairs the Liberal Caucus Legislative Committee and acts as Liberal Critic for Intergovernmental Affairs, the Queen's Privy Council of Canada, Democratic Reform, Official Languagues and La Francophonie. Additionally, he is the Liberal Representative on the Sub-Committee on Private Members Business.

As we celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Association for Canadian Studies and prepare for the 150th anniversary of Confederation, it is good to remember – as this book does – that Canadian history deserves to be known and taught and that this calls for the "active dialogue" proposed by Steven Schwinghamer. No, the history of Canada does not end here; as Randy Boswell says, it will survive the doomsayers who announce its death. To conclude, I will insist on what I think is the main reason for studying this history and examining it closely from every angle.

Our history is neither the most illustrious nor glittery – if by that, we mean pump, conquest and power. But at the risk of sounding provocative, I will argue that there are few histories closer to the democratic ideal than Canada's. Even with its failures and darker moments, which this book mentions, and its never-ending regional squabbles, echoed by Donald J. Savoie, the history of Canada compares favourably with that of

other countries in terms of the values associated with liberal democracy. If only for that reason, it must be known because it carries a wealth of lessons for the future.

March 11, 1998 marked the 150th anniversary of responsible government in Canada. On this occasion, historian and University of Edinburgh professor Ged Martin wrote:

> *"In the crucial combination of mass participation, human rights and self-government, Canada's history is second to none in the world."* [1]

I can think of no achievement of which a country could be prouder. If we were fully aware of this, we would certainly have celebrated the 150th anniversary of responsible government in Canada with as much fanfare as the French rightly celebrated, also in 1998, the 100th anniversary of Émile Zola's article *"J'accuse"*. In 2012, we would have done more than barely mention the thirtieth anniversary of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. And we would not have let the government of Canada stop, for all intents and purposes, supporting Canadian studies abroad; as Thomas H.B. Symons writes in this book, that was a "great mistake". We would also put more emphasis on celebrating the memory of John Peters Humphrey who, as Stuart Murray reminds us, was the principal author of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

We must understand the extent to which parliamentary democracy is a very recent – and still incomplete – victory for humankind. When I was a university student in the late 1970s, Eastern Europe, almost all of South America, a large part of the Mediterranean region and Asia all lived under authoritarian or totalitarian regimes. Even in the democracies of the time, parties and ideologies advocating the dictatorship of the proletariat and other theories hostile to parliamentary democracy found a wide audience in labour movements, universities and ballot boxes.

The democratization wave that has swept through the last two decades of the 20th century is one of the most extraordinary phenomena in human history. Millions of human beings now enjoy the kind of democratic rights that Canada was fortunate to gain much earlier.

In fact, Canada is a pioneer of democracy. It is true that elected assemblies were established in Virginia in 1619 and in Massachusetts in 1634; but we were quick to follow, with Nova Scotia in 1758, Prince Edward Island in 1773, New Brunswick in 1785 and Lower and Upper Canada in 1792. It is an exceptional and admirable fact that, since 1792, our country has almost always been governed by a political regime comprising an elected assembly.

Those assemblies were elected by limited suffrage, through rather rudimentary procedures. Expanding voting rights and cleaning up electoral practices turned out to be difficult achievements for all fledgling democracies. There again, 19th century Canada was a leader.

Census-based suffrage was established in Canada following essentially the same rules as in Great Britain, but because our social structure was more egalitarian and property less concentrated, suffrage was in fact less restricted in Canada.

The powers of the first elected assemblies were much more limited than those of parliaments today. Here again, Canada was at the forefront of reform. As I said earlier, the system of responsible government in Canada is now 165 years old, one of the oldest in the world. Specifically, it was on March 11, 1848, that Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine became the first Prime Minister of Canada – which was then known as the Province of Canada – after the coalition of reformer parliamentarians in the two Canadas that he led with Robert Baldwin convinced the Governor General to appoint a Cabinet that had the support of the majority of the assembly. From that moment onward, a real link between government and governed was established. Responsible government had also been established in Nova Scotia a few weeks earlier. Those elected assemblies had powers that were quite extensive for that period, especially since, because we have never had a real aristocracy, our non-elected upper chambers did not have the same influence as those in Great Britain.

It would have been far preferable if the colonial authorities had consented to responsible government without a single drop of blood being spilt, that is, without the rebellions that were put down in Lower and Upper Canada (as Quebec and Ontario were then known). On the whole, however, the victory of democracy was achieved here under much more peaceful conditions than elsewhere, without the need for bloody revolution

to abolish royal despotism or civil war to abolish slavery. As noted by Allan Gordon, we should keep this comparison in mind when studying the rebellions that took place in Canada.

As well as their democratic dimension, the rebellions of 1837-38 in Lower Canada had a national dimension, to which the Durham Report's advocacy of the assimilation of French-Canadians reacted. But it must also be realized that the emerging liberal democracies of the 19th century considered active homogenization of their populations and linguistic assimilation to be the standard to follow, notably by means of a one-size-fits-all public education system. In the words of linguist Jacques Leclerc: *"The centralizing authoritarianism which consists of unilaterally imposing a single language throughout a territory and ignoring linguistic pluralism [...] was standard practice in the 19th century."* [translation] [2]

Today, we tend to forget just how recently the recognition of linguistic and cultural pluralism has become a value in democracies. True, this oversight is the hallmark of nationalists, whose ideology Marc-André Éthier and David Lefrançois invite us to examine more closely. But even the liberal and progressive thinkers of the last century tended to see assimilation as a necessary condition for equal opportunity for individuals. Durham, for example, while certainly a staunch imperialist, a narrow-minded advocate of assimilation, a *"mange-Canadiens",* was also, and here is the paradox, a liberal enamoured of equal opportunity, who was nicknamed 'Radical Jack' at home and supported the right to vote, public education and land reform. His report recommended that responsible government be established in Canada. In the same era as Durham, Tocqueville, one of the great thinkers in the history of liberalism, sought the means to assimilate Algerians into French civilization.

What is exceptional in Canada is not that assimilation was sought, but that it was not achieved. The union of the two Canadas, by which Durham hoped to assimilate French-Canadians, instead paved the way for the Baldwin-Lafontaine alliance. The English Protestant and French Catholic populations laid the foundations for agreement, rather than fighting as they had done hitherto too often wherever historical circumstances brought them together. Without that agreement, who knows what would have become of the French fact in Canada? There have been – and still are – too many Francophone Canadians who have lost their language, but it would be difficult to find a country with a better counterbalance to the forces of assimilation in today's world where, for the first time in human history, the number of languages spoken is decreasing rather than increasing.

This cohabitation experience between British and French populations has prepared them to give newcomers of all origins a better welcome and to build a kind of federalism that has been described as an original form of fraternity.[3]

As Hector MacKenzie rightly points out, we must always place ourselves in the context of the time. For example, one might feel that it would have been better if the Constitution of 1867 had been put to a referendum, rather than simply being approved by the Parliament of the Union. But the fact remains that the parliamentary system that prevailed in the province of Canada in the 1860s *"was in some respects in advance of any other in the world at that time".*[4] Even today, there are too few countries that, like Canada, were born in their modern form out of an act of Parliament rather than an act of violence.

In fact, Canada was born long before 1867. It was born out of the relentless pursuit of a dream: that of Samuel de Champlain, superbly narrated in David Hackett Fisher's book, *Champlain's Dream*.[5] Hackett Fisher shows to what extent the project Champlain wished to associate with Canada's genesis was one of harmony between peoples, of a warless world where Aboriginal and European nations would learn from one another and together, build something larger than the sum of its parts. Granted, the history of Canada did not live up to that ideal, did not fulfil that dream; but it is good to know that what inspired the Canadian project, right from the start, was the harmonious coming together of different peoples.

It is this history that, despite its errors and stumbles, made Canada a reputable and respected nation, a country that never built an empire, fought bravely in two world wars and sent troops abroad only to defend justice and democracy, a country that was able to bring diverse populations together to achieve common goals, combining overall cohesion with great diversity. Canada is also: provinces and territories with mutually-reinforcing strengths, two official languages that are international

languages, two legal systems – common law and civil law – that allow us to speak the same legal language as the majority of countries, a geographical location that gives us access to Europe, Asia and the Americas, a multicultural population that gives us influence on all the continents. Clearly, we have managed to turn our diversity, democracy, federalism and humanism into a strength for which we will have more and more need as our population becomes even more diverse, as pointed out by Catherine Duquette speaking of Quebec.

Let us reject complacency; let us be ambitious for Canada: this is what our Governor General, the right Honourable David Johnston, is urging us to do. Let us realize that our country's true greatness lies in that ability to give tangible expression to universal values. That is my response to Penney Clark when she wonders how we can raise the interest of new generations of Canadians in their nation's history. From our history, with its errors and successes, let us draw the lessons that will help us pursue the objectives identified by Stephen J. Toope: a prosperous country with one of the world's strongest levels of social mobility, a welcoming country that takes full advantage of its population's cultural diversity, a country that reaps its resources while protecting the environment, a Canada that helps humankind find the path towards peace, justice and sustainable development.

What is most admirable about Canada has less to do with what is particular to it, such as its oft-sung vastness, than with what is universal. The Canadian ideal is that of a country where human beings have the best chance to be considered as human beings. Let us always strive to live up to that ideal. And for this, an essential condition of success is knowledge of our history.

NOTES

1 This quote can be found in: Stéphane Dion, "Respect for Democracy in Canada", notes for an address to the Faculty of Law, Université de Montréal, March 18,1998. This text is based on that address which can be found in: Stéphane Dion, *Straight Talk: Speeches and Writings on Canadian Unity*, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.

2 Jacques Leclerc, *Langue et société*, Laval, Mondia Éditeurs, 1986.

3 Samuel V. LaSelva, *The Moral Foundations of Canadian Federalism : Paradoxes, Achievements, and tragedies of Nationhood,* McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.

4 S. J. R. Noël, *Patrons, Clients, Brokers*, University of Toronto Press, 1996.

5 David Hackett Fisher, *Champlain's Dream*, Knopf, 2008.