

**ADIEU, QUEBEC ...**  
**AND GOOD RIDDANCE**

**Robert Sauvé**

This book is self-published by:

Robert Sauvé  
245 Augusta  
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada  
K1N 8C6

(613) 241-3442  
[rrjsauve@magma.ca](mailto:rrjsauve@magma.ca)  
[www.rsauve.com](http://www.rsauve.com)

First Edition, revised  
February, 2004

This polemic is dedicated to those Canadians who have had it up to here with Québec's excesses ... and would very much like to put an end to them.



## PREFACE

This treatise will, God willing, irritate smug *Québécois* secessionists and their soft-headed, politically correct, pan-Canadian fellow travelers. And, if the Almighty is especially kind, She might even inflict the occasional discomfort upon them. Nothing serious, mind you, perhaps something as trivial as recurring migraines and/or throbbing toothaches, both of which arise only in the middle of the night. On the other hand, it should gladden the hearts of many Canadians who have had it up to their wazoos with the Distinct Society. Although the litany of Québec's excesses and their consequences is crystal clear, infuriating and apparently insoluble, appropriate remedies, though difficult to implement, are not beyond our reach.

That said, to resolve a problem we must first admit there is one. And, if you think there is no problem, a serious national problem that demands resolution, then you need to become better informed ... by starting with this polemic.

If you are interested in any of the detail supporting the evidence and conclusions cited here, you should consult my book: "*The Québécois Élite: Patriots or Scoundrels?*" You can read it in either Official Language at no charge on the Internet at: [www.rsauve.com](http://www.rsauve.com)

Robert Sauvé  
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada  
December, 2003



# CONTENTS

<b>Preface</b>	9
<b>Caveat</b>	15
<b>The Issue</b>	23
<b>Compelling Evidence</b>	
Canada: A One Party State	25
Québec: A Fraudulent Society	27
Equalization Payments Support Secessionists	38
Québec On The Take	40
Corruption	41
Sponsorship Program	43
CF-18 Contract	47
Balkanization of Canada	48
Notwithstanding Clause	50
Language Legislation: Ottawa	51
CSIS	54
Jobs For Francophones	55
Military	57
Commissioner for Francophones	61
Multiculturalism	70
Second Class Citizens	76
Referendum Cheats	77
Referendum Consequences	80
Foreign Relations	81
Language Legislation: Québec	84
<b>Supporting Evidence</b>	
The Clarity Act	95
National Energy Program	99
Free Trade	100
Bombardier	102
Air Traffic Safety	103

<b>Other Evidence</b>	
Electricity	107
Kyoto	109
Gun Registry	110
Health Care	112
Religiosity	113
Abortion	115
Same-Sex Marriage	116
Chicken Little	119
Québec's Foreign Legations	122
Prime Ministers From Québec	122
Montfort	127
Québécois Culture	130
Gratuitous Insults	132
<b>Summaries</b>	137
<b>Conclusions and Remedies</b>	151
<b>About the Author</b>	157

---

## Tables

1. Demographics	28
2. Provincial Revenues	29
3. Provincial Expenditures	32
4. Educational Performance	36
5. Historical Demographics	90

---



## CAVEAT

You venture into turbulent waters whenever you confront *Québécois* with a critical though objective assessment of anything relating to them. The same applies to some of their cousins in the Rest of Canada (RoC). If you think I exaggerate, try discussing a Québec-related issue with a *Québécois*, any *Québécois*. With a very, very, very few you would be treated to a vigorous, rational discussion. However, given the unfortunate ability of the prevailing cultural climate to smother critical thought, you might find this wee cohort difficult to find. If you doubt my claim, just ask Denise Bombardier, the Radio Canada TV commentator. She insists that a rational debate on controversial political or social issues in Québec is impossible today.

In any event, don't waste your time looking for this miniscule cohort among Québec's academics, especially among the francophone variety. Like left-wing academics elsewhere, they resent evidence and argument that challenge their ideology, in this case chauvinistic Québec nationalism. Consider, for example, how my good friend Howard Roiter was treated when he attempted to expose some of his francophone fellow academics to the facts of life.

Howard is a professor of English Literature at L'Université de Montréal (U de M). In the early 1990s he participated in a French-language conference at the university where several writers and teachers dealt with the subject: *Montréal: L'invention Juive*. One of the participants, David Solway, an anglophone academic who thought kindly of Québec nationalism, later wrote: "Professor Roiter's deposition attacked some of the repressive features of current language legislation and

bemoaned the fact that the Jewish community was being decimated in the direction of Toronto, a profoundly undeserved fate.” Howard recalls that his talk was greeted by stunned silence, as if he had just announced that the use of French was henceforth to become an indictable offence!

Since the audience obviously took it for granted that Québec’s sacred language law ranked right up there with Newton’s Universal Law of Gravitation, they were stunned to hear anyone daring to criticize any element of it ... especially in French at the U de M where its gospel-like status is not questioned! During the question period, one of the stunned said something like: ”For all these years we have known Professor Roiter as a man of moderation, not realizing that he harboured such extremist views!” Attacking the “repressive features of their language legislation” is extremist? Another referred to Howard as “a saboteur of our national mission.” As I will argue later, the realization of their national mission (secession) required the ethnic cleansing of anglophones from Québec. Another called Howard “an intellectual terrorist” because he had the nerve to disagree with them! Still another insisted Howard was “an economic blackmailer,” whatever that meant

And, to add insult to injury, Howard’s talk was not even included in the official proceedings of the symposium. The editors said that “Roiter’s text was too weak stylistically to merit inclusion.” This was “patent nonsense” according to Solway.

So, if you are looking for a discussion where facts and logical argument trump ideology, don’t bother with *Québécois* academics. So driven are they by the noxious fumes from Québec’s cultural climate, they will shout you down, ignore you or consider you illegitimate, an intellectual leper. Ask Howard.

And, just in case you haven't been paying attention to Canada's national unity debate over the past half-century or so, the essence of this noxious cultural climate emanates from the self-pitying notion of victimhood in which *Québécois* bathe. According to this notion, *Québécois* misfortune is the result, not of their own failings but of oppression by outsiders. This usually means oppression by anglophone Quebecers on the one hand and the government of Canada on the other. Protestants and Jews are sometimes also included in this select group of oppressors.

So widespread is this notion that, if you try to point out to the man in the street that his misfortune was created within his own *Québécois* community, not imposed from outside, you are likely to be accused of culpable ignorance. After all, "everyone knows" that *Québécois* were excluded from decent jobs in the past, not because they were uneducated, but because anglophone bosses discriminated against them. For instance, a few years ago a 39-year old francophone law student at the University of Ottawa assured me that her father's inability to obtain a promotion in a paper mill in northern Ontario had everything to do with discrimination at the hands of his anglo bosses and nothing whatever to do with his grade six education! From a mature adult, a law student, yet!

Moreover, when you point out that uneducated *Québécois* workers are factually no better off now under *Québécois* bosses than they were in the past under the anglo variety, you will simply not be believed no matter how much evidence you advance to support your claim. Bad enough, I suppose, to acknowledge that the long cherished assumption of victimhood is nonsense; but to also be forced to accept the universally acknowledged correlation between poor pay and poor education, is to admit that Québec's vaunted education

system has failed them. And, no true *Québécois* will ever admit to that ... even when the evidence is as clear as the nose on your face. Like Flat Earth people!

Moreover, prepare for the worst if you point out that *Québécois*, as a whole, are relatively worse off today than ever before. For example, if you cite the following facts, you are likely to be flayed for slander. The facts are: (a) in 1961, year One of the sacred Quiet Revolution, average family income in Québec lagged behind Ontario by 11 percent, (b) in 1991, year 30 of said Revolution, average family income in Québec had worsened, sliding to a 21 percent deficit with Ontario, and (c) in 2001, the situation had not improved. Conclusion? The Quiet Revolution had obviously not done much for the average *Québécois*. Citing such “silly nonsense” is considered slanderous since “every one knows” that the Quiet Revolution solved all of Québec’s economic and social problems. Go figure!

Consequently, cautious people try to avoid such fruitless discussions, the result of which is an unchallenged environment where the noxious fumes of victimhood continue to poison *Québécois* culture.

Which brings us to a really venomous group, the arrogant, self-proclaimed true *Québécois*, the frothing-at-the-mouth firebrands who are largely responsible for the invention and propagation of the juvenile notion of victimhood. As you deal with these stalwarts, you will note that they have little respect for rational thought. They will, for instance, never concede a point at variance with their ideology, chauvinistic nationalism. Again, just like the Flat Earth people. Therefore, if you cannot avoid intellectual discourse with these stalwarts, you will probably shake your head in despair as they reject your attempts to introduce to the discussion the ordinary rules of logic. Moreover, they get particularly

upset, and claim you humiliate, not only them, but also all *Québécois*, whenever you demand that they stick to the point and refrain from dragging out red herrings.

Why such irrational behaviour, you ask? Because, according to their prevailing ideology, Québec is a Distinct Society that is beyond reproach. For example, they would claim (I exaggerate only slightly) that whatever they claim to be true is true, even when it is objectively false. For example, Statistics Canada reports regularly that Ottawa spends more money in Québec than it receives from that province in taxes. Notwithstanding this irrefutable datum, it is an article of faith among *Québécois* journalists, intellectuals and politicians that the reverse is true. They are completely immune to the facts that destroy their cherished assumptions. The Flat Earth syndrome again. Try dealing with that without resorting to strong drink!

An interesting example of this immunity to common sense was cited in the *National Post* by Paul Wells on April 16, 2003. Commenting on the recent provincial election where the Québec electorate had rejected the policies of the secessionist Parti Québécois, Mr. Wells said:

*(Liberal leader) Jean Charest won a solid electoral majority by promising to fix Québec's health care system, cut taxes, trim the public service, and reform public schooling.*

Notwithstanding this clear rejection of the constitutional wrangling that had poisoned Québec politics for the previous half-century, several respected *Québécois* commentators intoned solemnly that ...

*Obviously his (Charest's) first priority must be an overhaul of Canada's constitution.*

This drove Mr. Wells to suggest that ...

*If that's not obvious to you, you clearly don't have what it takes to be a political analyst in Québec.*

He went on to conclude sarcastically ...

*Shall I hold the window open for you or would you prefer to jump right through the pane?*

In other words, don't expect discussion on any matter in Québec to exclude its constitutional implications, even when there aren't any! Try chatting with these birds on, say, sun spots and see for yourself!

Finally, one of Québec's bottom-feeders stumbled recently onto my website, [www.rsauve.com](http://www.rsauve.com), and took exception to my criticism of *Québécois* religious and political leaders. I argued there that this self-serving élite had impoverished all *Québécois*. M. Anonyme's e-mail message to me is reproduced below. Get out your French-English dictionary and have a go at it (Hint: enulé has something to do with degenerate men having illicit sexual relations with little boys!).

*Espèce de sale porc ...*

*Espèce de canadian (sic?) enulé de merde*

...

*Maudit anti québécois de trou de cul*

*Je te méprise*

*Vive le québec libre*

*À bas le Canada ... pays de merdre*

*Ton site web cest (sic) de la merdre ...*

*comme celui de ton ami Howard Galagov*

*(sic) ... ce maudit juif à merdre ...*

*Va chier.*

*Arrête de cracher sur le peuple québécois.*

If you consult the book on my website that upset him so much (*The Québécois Élite: Patriots or Scoundrels?*), you will note that I argue there that, unless the people of Québec curb the destructive bent of their leaders, they will remain as disadvantaged in the independent Republic of Québec as they are currently in the Canadian province of Québec. Since that is heresy to a true *Québécois* like M. Anonyme, you can understand his apoplectic reaction. After all, “everyone knows” that an independent Québec will, by definition, provide all *Québécois* with increased health, wealth and happiness. My friend Noel calls it the anticipated benefits of “Legislated Joy” in a society where legislation is expected to resolve all problems. Unfortunately, neither the facts nor common sense support such a utopian hypothesis.

M. Anonyme followed up this diatribe with a message in English that is vintage victimhood:

*Why do you hate the québécois people so much?*

Note that, although my website was critical of *Québécois* leaders, M. Anonyme translated that closeley-targeted criticism into a broad criticism of all *Québécois*. So beware! If you have any adverse comments to make about, say, the weather in Québec, be prepared to see your remarks deliberately (mis)interpreted as an assault on the dignity of all *Québécois*.

And then of course there is M. Anonyme’s ultimate putdown.

*Why don't you change your name (from Robert Sauvé) to Bob Escape?*

His message? Since no true *Québécois* would ever criticize Québec, critics with French names are obviously anglophones disguised as *Québécois* and must be unmasked. Like Nazi Germany? He then concluded with the epithet so beloved of immature people with little class, small minds and limited vocabularies:

*Fuck you ...*

My response to people like this jerk is to invite them to first stuff it, and then to grow up. But, I have no illusions either will ever happen. Therefore, for as long as Québec remains in Canada, we will have to live with a steady diet of this vicious, juvenile nonsense.

Which brings us to the core question of this polemic: Is it in Canada's best interests to retain the Distinct Society within its borders or to tell it to take a hike and get lost? Read on and find out.



## THE ISSUE

Those of us who fought Québec separatists in the past did so because we assumed that Québec's secession would be disastrous for Canada, something we, true patriots all, would not countenance. It never occurred to us that Canada might in fact be better off if Québec did indeed take a permanent hike. This apparently improbable conclusion was brought home to me in a March 2003 article in the *National Post* by two Calgary academics, Barry Cooper and David Bercuson.

Professors Cooper and Bercuson claimed that the decision taken by the government of Canada in the spring of 2003 to not participate in the US-initiated war in Iraq, was a reflection, not of Canadian policy, but of Québec policy. They argued that Prime Minister Chrétien was simply reflecting the traditional Québec aversion to involvement in "someone else's" war. This attitude was certainly obvious in World Wars I and II when Québec's massive rejection of a military draft caused so much animosity in the RoC ... where support for the draft enjoyed majority, though not unanimous support.

The issue here is not that Québec was right or wrong in its opposition to the draft, for instance, but rather, that a province, with less than 25 percent of Canada's population, could impose its will on the majority in the RoC where a contrary view prevailed. But, this anomaly is easily explained: *Québec* is able to impose its minority view because it holds the balance of political power in Canada. The proof?

For at least the past hundred years, no political party has held power in Ottawa if its main opponent

controlled the majority of seats in Québec. In other words, the governing party must control the majority of seats in Québec. Although the secessionist Bloc *Québécois* controlled Québec in the early to mid-1990s, it was and remains a regional party with no chance of ever forming the government of Canada.

And, since Québec tends to vote massively for one party during federal elections, it is no wonder that all federal parties tend to always promote or support policies and practices that favour that province. This is further complicated by the fact that the leader of the governing party is invariably a native of Québec with traditional Québec biases and/or with personal political vulnerability in that province.

I will detail here a sample of these Québec-centred policies and practices that have been imposed on Canadians, or are likely to be imposed over time. I will also attempt to answer the question: “Are these Québec-centred policies and practices beneficial or detrimental to the interests of Canadians in the RoC?” Moreover, if we conclude that they are indeed detrimental, shouldn’t we start taking a much harder line with Québec and stop sucking up to it? Might this go as far as cutting our losses by expelling it from Canada? Think about it!

# COMPELLING EVIDENCE

## **Canada: A One Party State**

The historical record is clear: The political party that governs Canada always controls more seats in Québec than does the party with a chance of forming the next government. In other words, control Québec politically and you control Canada. This dictum holds true even though Québec's Bloc Québécois was the Official Opposition for a few years in the 1990s. However, as mentioned earlier, since the Bloc is a Québec separatist party, it obviously has no chance of ever forming the government of Canada. Hence, Québec's historical political leverage explains why all political parties vying for power in Ottawa always suck up to it.

As a result, Ottawa always seeks to reward the Distinct Society, especially via administrative measures that sidestep the booby-trapped constitutional amendment process. That is, why take the political risk of trying to amend the Constitution (e.g., via the Meech Lake Accord) when simple backroom administrative decisions will accomplish as much? For example, where it was once thought impossible to change the legal status (confessional) of schools in Québec and Newfoundland without a Constitutional amendment, Ottawa found an administrative way around that messy constitutional hurdle in the late 1990s.

But, there is more to this bias than backroom administrative manoeuvring. I would argue that it has also created a one-party state where the Liberal Party will apparently rule Canada forever. Consider the facts.

In 1984, Brian Mulroney led the Progressive Conservatives out of the political wilderness by making a deal with the devil: He convinced *Québécois* secessionists that his Progressive Conservative government, unlike that of the nasty Liberals, would look with favour on their “just constitutional demands.” This encouraged the secessionists to join the PCs in droves, many becoming PC candidates, victorious PC candidates, in the federal election of 1984. Since Mulroney was able to form majority governments in both 1984 and 1988, one must conclude that this deplorable strategy worked.

To show how appreciative he was of secessionist support, Mulroney placed some in his Cabinet. That they then used these positions to advance their secessionist agenda came as no surprise. Moreover, with the help of these Trojan horses, Mulroney set out to buy continued support in Québec (1) via failed attempts to amend the Constitution (Meech Lake and Charlettotown Accords), and (2) by transferring federal contracts from the RoC to Québec (e.g., CF-18 maintenance contract).

But, the devil eventually pulled his troops from this unsavory coalition to form the secessionist Bloc Québécois. Not surprisingly, the Canadian electorate, especially in the West, turned ugly when they realized that Brian Mulroney was buying political favour in Québec at their expense. Moreover, some felt that providing legitimacy to nation-destroying secessionists for the sake of votes in Québec, was contemptible. To make a long story short, in the 1993 election, the PCs were reduced to two seats because (1) the (anti-Québec?) Reform Party had risen in the West to displace them, and (2) disgusted PC voters elsewhere transferred their support to the Liberals.

So, as of late 2003, the only party with a national constituency is the Liberal Party ... since the ability of the Reform/Alliance/PC merger to attract a national constituency is still unproven.

*Summary: By courting the separatist vote in Québec, Brian Mulroney effectively transformed Canada into a one-party state. Beholden to, and doing the bidding of Québec, this Natural Governing Party (Liberals) will probably rule “forever.” And, judging by the disgraceful performance of the Chrétien Liberals during their 10-year reign, this augurs not at all well for Canada. To make matters worse, Chrétien’s successor, Paul Martin, exhibits a distinct, Mulroney-like Québec bias. Oh Canada!*

### **Québec: A Fraudulent Society**

Québec nationalists insist that Québec’s French language, its unique legal system, its status as an endangered minority in North America, and who knows how many other claims to victimhood, make it a Distinct Society. Although most observers might ignore this pretentious pap, they cannot ignore the one thing that indeed makes Québec distinct: It is a fiscal fraud.

In a recent report (2003), the Fraser Institute claimed, not that Québec was a fraud, but that it was a major economic disappointment. I will demonstrate later how this disappointment was the inevitable product of fiscal fraud by the Government of Québec. Fraser argued that “although Québec’s economic resources should make it one of the richest places on the whole planet, ... it has been a disappointment by almost every economic measure over the past 40 years.” By way of proof, it goes on to claim (1) “that Québec has the lowest level of prosperity ... of any

industrialized state or province in Canada or the United States, (2) that Québec has higher government spending than any American state or industrialized Canadian province, (3) that Québécois pay the highest taxes of any North American jurisdiction except for Alaska, (4) that Québec has the highest level of unionization in North America, (5) that Québec's level of corporate welfare spending was excessive (about \$2,000 annually per family), and in conclusion (6) that Québec policy makers for 40 years have made policy choices that limit economic potential, leaving the province with perennially higher unemployment and lower income than should be the case." Now, follow me through the numbers as I lay out why this disappointment was in fact a fiscal fraud.

**Table 1: Demographics 2001, 2003**

	Québec	Ontario
Population 000s	7,487.2	12,238.2
Families 000s	2,019.5	3,191.0
People Per Family	3.7	3.8
Median Annual Family Income	\$ 50,242	\$ 61,024

First, take note of some relevant demographic and economic data in Table 1, especially median annual family income where Québec lagged behind Ontario in 2003 by about 18 percent, or \$10,782 per family. By way of historical reference, average family income in Québec lagged behind Ontario by 11 percent in 1961, Year One of the Quiet Revolution, the seminal event that, among other things, was supposed to close the economic gap with Ontario. What went wrong?

First of all, this income gap cannot be attributed to lower wages in Québec. Although there was indeed a wage rate deficit of about 10 percent in Québec before

1940, the deficit narrowed substantially after 1945, to the point where wage rates were at effective parity as we entered the new millennium.

On the other hand, this family income deficit can be blamed, in large part, on higher unemployment rates in Québec. For example, between 1941 and 2001, this rate averaged about 9 percent in Québec versus 6 percent in Ontario. Stated another way, Québec's unemployment rate has been consistently half-again as high as Ontario's. Since the Québec secessionist movement, as well as its abusive language laws, discouraged job-creating business investment, it is obvious who is to blame.

	Québec	Ontario
	\$ Per Family	
Total Revenue	36,178	32,590
Income/Other Taxes	12,794	9,899
Premiums/Contributions	1,895	821
Consumption Taxes	6,502	6,917
Property Taxes	4,701	6,311
Sale of Goods/ Services	3,227	3,995
Equalization	2,308	
Other Transfers	2,624	3,107
Balance	2,127	1,540

Now, let's try and shed more light on Québec's financial situation by analyzing the 2003 financial statements of the governments of Québec and Ontario. Please note in Table 2 that, in terms of total revenue, Québec was more than competitive with Ontario, even after netting out the equalization payment (\$4.7 billion or \$2,308 per family) paid by Ottawa to Québec. This surprised me since I had always assumed that the

justification for this huge equalization payment was that, without it, Québec would be unable to provide its residents with services comparable to those provided in more prosperous provinces. But, these data prove that, even without benefit of equalization, Québec did in fact have the means to provide Ontario-level services to Québécois. That it did not do so cannot therefore be attributed to a revenue shortage. It can, however, be blamed on the way it managed its expenditures, about which more later. First, let's examine the individual revenue items in Table 2.

When we examine the unavoidable taxes and their equivalent (Income and Other Taxes plus Premiums and Contributions), we see the first hint of the fiscal fraud that defines Québec. That is, where the typical family earns 18 percent less in Québec than in Ontario, it pays 37 percent more in these taxes. Stated another way, the typical family pays 29 percent of its gross income in income taxes in Québec versus 18 percent in Ontario. Advantage Ontario.

That said, when we consider consumption taxes, where consumers are free to spend or not, the advantage seems to pass to Québec where the typical family pays about 6 percent less than in Ontario. However, that favourable deficit is probably due to the relatively poorer Québec family having to reduce its discretionary spending. On the other hand, it still means that the typical family spends 13 percent of its gross income on consumption taxes in Québec versus 11 percent in Ontario. Advantage Ontario.

A similar story emerges in property taxes where the typical family pays 25 percent less in Québec. This reflects: (1) the weaker real estate market in Québec



which produced relatively lower assessments, and (2) controlled rents in Québec's much larger rental market which kept a lid on property taxes. Advantage Québec? Only if you see some virtue in an economy whose assets are declining in value. If an industrial establishment exhibited the same characteristics, you would have every right to conclude that it was on its way out of business. Advantage Ontario.

*Summary: Québec is a society of declining wealth, low family income and very high taxes. These are the characteristics of an economy on the road to ruin. That said, Québec nevertheless generated proportionately more revenue than did Ontario, and hence was in a position to provide a competitive range of services to its residents ... even without benefit of equalization payments from Ottawa. Why, then, are equalization payments being paid to Québec? Why indeed?*

Now let us look at the expenditure side of this equation. In Table 3 are two groups of expenditures. In the upper

	Québec	Ontario
	\$ Per Family	
Total Expenditures	37,304	32,838
Social Services	7,600	4,796
Debt Charges	3,560	3,093
Transportation	2,422	1,869
Regional Development	1,745	733
Government Services	1,297	763
Culture	1,024	765
Labour + Immigration	277	26
Health	8,846	9,485
Education	7,164	7,414
Police	1,906	2,110
Environment	831	1,088
Housing	319	525
Balance	313	171

Cutting across all categories in the upper group are very highly paid employees in government departments where bloated staffs abound. This is particularly evident in the administration of the government of Québec where bureaucracies are, not only relatively but absolutely, larger than Ontario's. After all, you wouldn't expect a Distinct Society, one that insists on acting like an independent country, to have the bureaucracy of a mere province! And, since the public sector unions representing this bloated horde tend to support the government's secessionist agenda, it should come as no surprise that they were able to negotiate salaries for their bloated membership that were among the highest in Canada.

But, the piper eventually had to be paid. And, it fell to the recently elected (April 2003) Liberal government of Jean Charest to pay the piper by belling the cat: It proposed legislation to permit the contracting out of some government functions to the more efficient, and lower cost, private sector. The unions of course shrieked like offended virgins and reacted as is their wont by resorting to violence and thuggery. Among other atrocities, they trashed the offices of members of the National Assembly, spreading pig manure where

simple destruction was found wanting. And, in an attempt to de-legitimize the Charest initiative, they resorted to anglophobia, the most primitive of *Québécois* instincts. Union leaders reminded everyone that Jean Charest was baptized John James Charest by his anglophone mother. However, disgracing themselves in this way wasn't unprecedented. During the previous provincial election campaign, the *Parti Québécois*, and some of the more notable bottom feeders in the *Québécois* media, "exposed" Charest's baptismal record. Makes you want to take a bath, doesn't it?

In Transportation, public sector unions were able to hold various (provincial and municipal) governments to ransom (see above). As a result, contract negotiations invariably ended up with featherbedding and high salaries. I should point out that municipal unions, especially those representing Montréal's blue collar workers, were particularly adept at intimidating opponents into submission. For instance, during a recent dust-up (Dec. 2003), representatives of Montréal's municipal unions showed their displeasure by smashing the cameras of a TV news crew. They had previously punished a disrespectful city councilor by lathering his apartment door with fresh pig manure. Piggy poop must be plentiful these days!

Immigration is normally the responsibility of the federal government. However, in order to placate Québec nationalists, Ottawa allowed Québec to control immigration into that province ... and of course paid for the bureaucracy to administer it. The fact that an immigrant, who was refused entry to Canada in Montréal, but accepted in Toronto, could legally move to Montréal any time he chose, seemed not to faze

Ottawa. Madness? No, normal Ottawa-Québec relations!

Culture in this list basically refers to the cost of implementing Québec's language laws, laws whose justification I will show later had everything to do with secessionist politics and little to do with culture.

Regional Development is an exercise in futility. Following Québec's secessionist escapades, and the imposition of abusive language laws, job-creating business investment dried up in Québec, especially in Montréal, the historical engine of the provincial economy. To counter this economic disaster, the various governments of Québec threw money at potential investors to entice them to set up shop in the hinterland ... where they had no interest locating. That is, instead of correcting the *faux pas* that drove investors from Montréal in the first place, the government of Québec encouraged potential investors to invest instead in, say, economically obscure Matane ... in the interests of social equity! They might as well have thrown their money into a sewer for all the good it did.

It seems clear that the beneficiaries of the excessive expenditures in this upper group were those whose objective was to have Québec secede from Canada. In that group, Québec outspent Ontario by 50 percent. In the lower group, however, are those whose sacrifice was required to support those excesses, the people, the great unwashed. Here, Québec underspent Ontario by 8 percent. Can you smell the fiscal fraud?

The health care system, for instance, though arguably inadequate in both provinces, is in particular peril in

Québec where doctors and nurses earn at least 20 percent less than in Ontario. The news media is awash with stories of Québec's health care workers leaving for better opportunities elsewhere. In fact, those of us who have spent time in Ottawa hospitals can attest to, and be thankful for, the wonderful care we received from francophone nurses from Québec. They increased their incomes substantially by simply crossing the Ottawa River from a hospital in Gatineau, Québec to another in Ottawa, Ontario. For many, it was as easy to commute to one as to the other.

If there is one area where Québec should be outspending, not underspending, Ontario, it is in education. Although the Quiet Revolution was supposed to have rectified Québec's historical educational deficit, much remains to be done.

For instance, where there were proportionately more than twice as many Québécois as Ontarians without a high school diploma in 1961, reforms reduced this deficit to 18 percent in 2001 (245 versus 206 in Table 4). Although this trend is commendable, parity with Ontario is not possible unless something special is done to reduce Québec's horrendous high school dropout rate (at least twice Ontario's rate). And this will not happen without a massive injection of resources dedicated specifically to that end.

At the university level, improvement has been more modest. In 1961, for instance, there were 18 percent fewer people with university degrees in Québec. By 2001, this deficit had been reduced to 13 percent (216 versus 247). This modest improvement is difficult to understand since university fees in Québec are the lowest in Canada. Therefore, Québec's insistence on maintaining a low-fee schedule, though

politically correct, is not in fact encouraging Québécois, especially *Québécois*, to attend university.

**Table 4: Educational Performance 2001**

	Québec	Ontario
	People Per 1,000 over age 20	
Without High School Diploma	245	206
With High School Diploma	254	244
With Trades Diploma	126	110
With College Diploma	159	193
With University Degrees	216	247

In fact, as you go up the educational ladder, you find the anglophone and allophone shares increasing as the *Québécois* share declines. The evidence suggests that this has more to do with cultural expectations than with the relative wealth of the three groups. For instance, when surveyed in 1991, 33 percent of Québec anglophones, 20 percent of allophones and 16 percent of *Québécois* said they expected to get a university degree. And, there is no evidence that this distribution has changed.

Therefore, to increase *Québécois* attendance at university, the government of Québec must start dealing with the low expectations of *Québécois*. And that requires special and properly focused resources, resources focused on education of the people, not on the secessionist agenda of the elite.

Québec's 24 percent deficit in spending on the environment (831 versus 1,088) may be explained in part by the fact that, since Québec uses relatively more clean-hydro-electric energy, its environment should be cleaner than Ontario's. However, I would not want to

stretch that explanation too far. The fact still remains that Québec spends substantially less money on environmental protection than does Ontario. Thus, when Québec extols the virtues of the Kyoto Accord (see later), it is obviously indulging in smug hypocrisy.

Finally, Québec's 39 percent deficit in housing (319 versus 525) is the final straw on this camel's back. Although the secessionist destruction of the Québec real estate market may indeed have inadvertently converted some middle class homes into low cost housing, there still remained the residual need for low cost rental accommodation. I would argue that the great unwashed would have forgiven a cut in spending on, say, the language police, to fund the construction of a few more low rent apartments.

*Summary: The Government of Québec chooses to under-fund legitimate services for its citizens (8 percent lower per family than Ontario) to finance items that support its secessionist agenda (50 percent more than Ontario). If that isn't disgraceful and fraudulent, what is?*

### **Equalization Payments Support Secessionists**

Not all provinces have a tax base that permits them to provide their residents with a level of services comparable to those provided in more affluent jurisdictions. Ottawa recognizes this imbalance and provides equalization payments to the have-not provinces so they can indeed provide comparable services. The fundamental assumption is that, without equalization, the have-not province would be unable to generate, *from its own resources*, the revenue required to provide this comparable level of service. At present, all provinces save Ontario and Alberta "enjoy" have-

not status, British Columbia having just joined the have-not club. In 2002-03, of the \$9.7 billion in total equalization payments, Québec received \$4.7 billion or 48 percent. Manitoba was the next in line with 14 percent.

Ottawa calculates the level of equalization entitlement (1) by determining the tax base in each province, and (2) by applying to that tax base the average tax rate of the have-provinces. To simplify matters, assume that Québec had a tax base of \$100 per family, and the have-provinces an average tax rate of 40 percent. Ottawa would thus assume that Québec should have had “normal” revenue of \$40 per family. Therefore, if revenue averaged \$50 per family in the have-provinces, Ottawa would send Québec an equalization cheque of \$10 per family. Sounds fair, but there is a kicker.

The equalization entitlement is not affected by the actual tax rate in the have-not province. In our theoretical example, if Québec levied taxes sufficient to raise \$65 per family, \$15 more than the \$50 calculated by the equalization formula, it would still be entitled to equalization of \$10 per family. Seems strange, doesn't it? Why should a have-province (like Ontario) subsidize a have-not province that raises more revenue than the have-province? Why indeed! Now, let's look at some real numbers.

In 2002-03, provincial revenues totaled \$36,178 per family in Québec, \$32,590 in Ontario. Even when we net out the effect of equalization (\$2,308 per family in Québec), revenue was still \$1,280 per family higher in Québec. Therefore, Québec clearly had enough revenue from its own sources to provide its residents with a level of services fully comparable with those available in Ontario. But, Québec in fact provided an inferior level of services. Why?



Because, as noted earlier, Québec chooses to spend its money on secession-related matters ... at the expense of legitimate services to its over-taxed residents.

*Summary: The Government of Québec in effect uses Ottawa's annual equalization payment of almost \$5 billion to generate support for the secession of Québec from Canada. That is a fraudulent and treasonous misuse of funds provided by the have-provinces of Ontario and Alberta. Moreover, over-taxed Québécois are thus deprived of the services that the equalization system is meant to provide.*

*Since Québec generates proportionately more revenue from its own tax base than does Ontario, and since it is not reasonable to require Ontario and Alberta to support Québec's secessionist agenda, Ottawa must eliminate Québec's equalization entitlement. However, since there is no evidence to suggest that anyone in Ottawa has the courage to do this, Ontario and Alberta may just have to grit their teeth and accept the fact that they are funding treason. Unless, of course, some way is found to deprive Québec of these funds. Stay tuned.*

## **Québec On The Take**

Although some might argue that our votes always go to the highest bidder, their cynicism is arguably misplaced most of the time. In Québec, however, this dictum rings true. That is, given a choice (provincial elections), the historical evidence is clear: *Québécois* will instinctively select the nationalist option, or choose from among the available nationalist options. On the other hand, in the absence of a nationalist option (federal elections,

perhaps), *Québécois* votes can be bought. That, at least, appears to be the understanding of the Chrétien Liberals in Ottawa. Consider the facts.

During the Québec referenda of 1980 and 1995, when secession and federalism collided, secession was the preferred option of the majority of *Québécois*, even in ridings that had returned so-called federalist candidates in other elections. Ex-Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's riding of Baie Comeau, for instance, went secessionist in both referendums. It has also been represented by the secessionist Bloc Québécois since Mulroney's retirement in 1993. Moreover, in 1995, the secessionists actually carried Jean Charest's riding, even though he was the federalist hero of that referendum. And, to rub salt into the federalist wound, the secessionists also carried the day in 1995 in Prime Minister Chrétien's riding of St. Maurice, a riding he had represented for 25 years!

That "betrayal" should not have come as a surprise to Chrétien. When he retired temporarily from politics in 1988, a fellow Liberal was expected to replace him. However, the voters had other ideas. They rejected the Liberal candidate and, instead, chose the separatist candidate ... who was masquerading as a Mulroney Conservative.

Even though Jean Chrétien seems to have learned nothing from 1980, 1984 or 1988, he finally realized after Canada's near-death in 1995 that he could no longer ignore *Québécois* nationalists. His solution? To sell Canada to *Québécois* by appealing to their more noble instincts? Not a chance! He conceded that their hearts were wedded to secession. Therefore, he chose instead to appeal to their baser instincts by flooding Québec in general, and St. Maurice in particular, with gobs of federal money. For example, those attentive to the news of the day must have noticed that more federal

(patronage) money was spent in St. Maurice in 2002 than in all of Alberta! Moreover, if you again consult media reports, you will find Ottawa's expenditures were geared more to flying the flag than to dealing with fundamental issues. The outcome? *Québécois* held their nationalist noses as they accepted federal largesse ... and will continue to do so until the climate for secession improves, as it will.

*Summary: Ottawa believes and acts as if the Québec electorate is essentially secessionist and must be wooed, not with noble argument, but with generous doses of federal patronage. This federal largesse has so far not provided, and likely will never provide, Canada with very many long-term devotees in Québec.*

## **Corruption**

When you talk of corruption, you skate on very uncertain ice. For example, when we talk of the unique corruption of Québec under Duplessis, we forget, as one academic I know, is prone to retort, "Ontario under Leslie Frost was probably as bad." Perhaps, but internally generated provincial corruption is not my concern here. My focus is federal corruption that profited Québec, a province whose awesome political clout in Canadian federal politics is legendary.

Although much of the evidence described in this polemic can be classified as the product of corruption, I would like to focus here on a few examples of the less evident kind that often escapes our attention. Let's start with the old fashioned variety, showering one's riding with largesse to plant flowers, build fountains, and invest in other related, frivolous ventures. As mentioned earlier, Chrétien's riding of

Saint Maurice received more of this federal largesse in 2002 than did all of Alberta.

And that did not include Chrétien's previous misadventure in Shawinigan where the Prime Minister allegedly put pressure on the president of the Federal Development Bank to make a questionable loan to a struggling hotel adjoining an equally struggling golf course ... of which Chrétien was part owner! The bank is a crown corporation whose president was, ahem, a Chrétien appointee! The issue is now before the courts. Need I say more?

Nor does it include the conversion of an old Alcan smelter in Shawinigan into a satellite of Canada's National Art Gallery in Ottawa. Although I would like to be generous about exhibiting art treasures in the hinterland (and Shawinigan is in the hinterland), I would argue that this piece of patronage really smells. The occasional tourist who ends up in Shawinigan is there for fishing, camping and canoeing, not to visit an art museum. That said, I hope Chrétien was right and I am mistaken. However, I expect to read within the next year or so that the museum is closing its doors for lack of visitors.

And then there is the Export Development Bank, a crown corporation that finances the export of product from Canadian companies that are unable to obtain funding from conventional sources. Most of these (high risk) exporters are apparently from Québec.

Interesting, isn't it, that these Québec exporters would not be able to compete in export markets without a subsidy from Ottawa. And Québec bragged that it supported the Free Trade Agreement because it was not afraid to compete in the American market! Were it not for the support of the RoC that is implicit in this export financing, Québec's exporters

would be up the creek. And they, of course, miss no opportunity to thank the RoC for their valued assistance. Yeah, right!

*Summary: When it comes to old fashioned, bottom-of-the barrel, routine patronage, Québec is the major recipient of Ottawa's largesse.*

### **Sponsorship Program**

And then there was the \$250-million Sponsorship Program where the far-from-routine corruption bordered on the obscene. Following the near loss of Canada in the 1995 Québec referendum, Chrétien decided, as described earlier, to convert *Québécois* secessionists into federalists by waving the Canadian flag at them. I kid you not! His vehicle for this dubious endeavor was the Sponsorship Program, which, between 1997 and 2001, appeared to support financially every festival, celebration, sporting contest and cultural event in Québec. In return, the sponsor of the event was required to publicly acknowledge Ottawa's contribution. That, according to then-Prime Minister Chrétien, would stop Québec's secessionist movement in its tracks.

You would be on solid ground if you concluded that, if Chrétien really believed that nonsense, he must have been smoking an illegal substance. You would also be justified in concluding that \$250-million was a lot to spend for such a trivial return. Then again, some might insist that it was simply a huge waste of time and money. Or that there was a hidden agenda. Stay tuned.

To manage this program, Chrétien's lap-dog, confidant and Québec lieutenant, Alfonso Gagliano, set up a small group of 12-15 people in the Department of

Public Works under the direct supervision of the Minister of Public Works, Alfonso himself. Since this group (Gagliano's gang) got away with apparently breaking every administrative rule in the book (re the Auditor General), it would be reasonable to conclude that they must have done so secure in the knowledge that they were acting under the direction of their boss, Gagliano with the approval of his boss, Jean Chrétien. Otherwise, why would Ottawa's rules-obsessed federal administrators have allowed Gagliano's gang of relatively junior officials to flout the rules and spend so much money without proper authorization? Believe me, these expenditures must have been approved by Gagliano, and Alfonso would not have acted without Chrétien's approval. Let's face it, the evidence simply does not permit any another conclusion.

Consistent with their arrogant disregard of elementary administrative imperatives was their naked and obscene abuse of public funds. Consider the evidence.

Since the Sponsorship Program was essentially an advertising campaign, Gagliano's gang disbursed the money through advertising agencies ... agencies in Québec, of course. And, since these agencies typically charge commissions on the money they manage, part of this \$250-million was retained by them as fees or commissions. Not the normal 10-15 percent commission, mind you, but a whopping 40 percent. In other words, they charged \$100-million to purchase \$150-million of services! How, you might ask, did they get away with these extravagant commissions? Could it be because Gagliano's gang had other things on their minds than the efficient administration of public funds, or the conversion of Québec secessionists into federalists? Bingo!

In some cases, the extravagant commissions did not derive from excessive rates but from the fact that the commission was paid twice for the same project, in some cases for work that was never done! In others, a commission was charged for money transferred to a Crown Corporation such as Canada Post and then again on the same money used by Canada Post to advertise whatever it was advertising. Not exactly kosher, in my view. Moreover, the government of Canada normally transfers money to Crown Corporations without benefit of middlemen like advertising agencies. Other Crown Corporations and federal agencies similarly implicated were the RCMP, Via Rail, the Port of Montreal and the Business Development Bank.

If you feel that none of these organizations had the right to funding from the Sponsorship Program, you would be absolutely correct. After all, since the RCMP, for instance, is required, by definition, to fly the Canadian flag at its celebrations, why would the Sponsorship Program find it necessary to fund any RCMP celebration? Unless, of course ....!

When the Auditor General tabled her audit of the Sponsorship Program in February 2004, she suggested that the only logical reason for transferring money the way they did was because Gagliano's gang wanted to get commissions into the hands of these advertising agencies. Why? Well, these agencies are all closely associated with the Chrétien Liberals by virtue of their financial support of the Liberals in the past. Starting to smell?

Some would argue that the Sponsorship Program was obviously an elaborate money-laundering scheme to line Liberal Party pockets from the public purse. And, as any informed adult knows, money

laundering is illegal, as is the use of the public purse to enrich political parties.

I should mention, en passant, that the Auditor General also analyzed about \$800-million of other federal advertising expenditures between 1998 and 2003. Her finding? That that \$800-million was no better managed than the \$250-million Sponsorship Program. Makes your blood curdle, doesn't it.

Paul Martin cancelled the Sponsorship Program the day he became Prime Minister. He also called for a judicial inquiry of the program the day the Auditor General tabled the results of her audit. Political careers and reputations will be destroyed by this inquiry. Ottawa's habitual concessions to Québec will come under closer scrutiny. The Liberal Party may suffer considerable damage, which, of course, would be wonderful for Canada. As you wait for these good things to happen, please grease the wheels of justice by keeping this issue alive with your neighbour, MP, local newspaper, radio and TV stations. Above all, remember this obscenity in future federal elections.

*Summary: The Sponsorship Program was the vehicle for an obscene fraud. Although its objective may theoretically have been to wave the flag in Québec, its effect appears to have been the illegal transfer of millions from the public purse to the coffers of the Liberal Party and its principal supporters.*

### **CF-18 Contract**

And then of course there was the infamous CF-18 contract, the classic poke in the eye of western Canada by Ottawa in order to suck up to Québec. For those who have short memories, the CF-18 was the jet fighter-bomber of the Royal Canadian Air Force. Since these



planes required expensive maintenance, the government of Brian Mulroney called for tenders for this service in the early 1980s. The clear winner, in technical and financial terms, was a Winnipeg firm. However, the contract was awarded to Canadair, a struggling Montreal firm bought (just before the awarding of this contract?) by Bombardier (see later). The predictable and very legitimate howls of protest from the West were ignored. Some would argue that this slap-in-the-face fueled the formation of the Reform Party very soon thereafter, which in turn caused the near eradication of the Progressive Conservative Party in the 1993 election.

*Summary: When federal government contracts are up for grabs (CF-18 contract, for instance), Ottawa is prepared to over-rule due process and elementary notions of fair play and sound economics to pursue a Québec-first policy ... no matter what it costs the Canadian taxpayer.*

### **Balkanization of Canada**

A politically correct but dangerously erroneous assumption that pervades Canadian political thinking is that national unity was preserved first with the defeat of Québec's two secessionist referenda in 1980 and 1995, then with the rejection of Brian Mulroney's two attempts to balkanize Canada (Meech Lake and Charlottetown Accords), and finally with Prime Minister Chrétien's Clarity Act in the late 1990s.

Although the taste for secession in Québec may be dormant, I would argue that it is certainly not dead. After all, the secessionist Parti Québécois, though currently out of office, will certainly return to power some day and threaten once again to take Québec out of Canada. Moreover, even the so-called federalist,

Liberal governments of Québec have traditionally used the threat of a referendum on secession to blackmail Ottawa into concessions. Furthermore, although the terms of Chrétien's Clarity Act make it almost impossible for Québec to secede legally in the future, it still considers secession legal, something admitted by no other sovereign nation on earth. Therefore, we can look forward to an eternity of legal secessionist threats from Québec with all the social and economic disruptions they imply ... because the government of Canada does not have the courage to declare secession a treasonous act.

Moreover, remember the Meech Lake and Charlottetown Accords? Those proposals to amend the Constitution were defeated because the people of Canada rejected the advice of their leaders and refused to balkanize Canada to assuage Québec's secessionist whims. But that was not the end of it. Unable to balkanize Canada via constitutional amendments, Ottawa has proceeded toward the same objective using administrative measures instead. Thus, for example, Québec is given control over immigration to that province. Now Ontario is making demands for similar concessions from Ottawa. Also, taking their cue from Québec, Alberta and British Columbia are now making secessionist noises.

And, Paul Martin, the new Liberal Prime Minister-in-waiting is promising to implement the essence of the two rejected constitutional amendments (Meech Lake and Charlottetown Accords) by administratively transferring various powers from Ottawa to the provinces. If history is any guide, it is clear that politicians do not willingly divest themselves of power unless it is either "the right thing to do" or politically advantageous. Although there is some evidence for political support of the first option, there is

even more for the second. So, we will see the continued balkanization of Canada because it is the only way to get provinces in the RoC to agree to Québec's secessionist agenda.

So, in this disintegrating Canada, many problems that cry for resolution will go unresolved just as others will be created. In the first instance, for example, because of Québec's political bent, provinces will continue to find it easier to trade with the United States than with each other. In addition, although we desperately need national supervision of the securities industry, it won't happen because Québec refuses to cooperate. And, in the second? Remember what happened when the Canadian Red Cross was relieved of its responsibilities in the field of blood collection? A new national organization was set up to carry out this essential service ... except in Québec where a separate and independent service was created. And on and on and on and on .... because Ottawa prefers to suck up to Québec than to stand up for Canada!

*Summary: It seems inevitable that Canada will become increasingly balkanized as Ottawa devolves more and more power to the provinces in an attempt to do the impossible, mollify Québec.*

### **Notwithstanding Clause**

When Trudeau tabled Canada's new Constitution in 1982, it contained two unforeseen flaws. The first was in the Charter of Rights: It appeared to grant primacy to an appointed judiciary over the will of the elected Members of Parliament. Countering this flaw led to the second, the Notwithstanding Clause. The provinces insisted that this clause be inserted in the Constitution

just in case it was really necessary to over-ride “inappropriate” judicial decisions.

Well, the first and only time the Notwithstanding Clause was used was in Québec by the Liberal and allegedly federalist Premier, Robert Bourassa. He invoked the Clause to nullify a decision of the Supreme Court to declare unconstitutional a portion of Québec’s sign law. This use of the Notwithstanding Clause was considered so odious and illegitimate that it foreclosed its later use for legitimate purposes by anyone.

*Summary: Ever since Québec used the Notwithstanding Clause to maintain its odious sign law, the very legitimacy of the Clause has been called into question. As a result, politicians in the RoC are loath to use it for the purpose for which it was intended, controlling judicial activism. Consequently, our laws are increasingly being forged in the courts, not in our legislatures.*

### **Language Legislation: Ottawa**

Québec’s language laws (about which more later), as well as its secessionist movement, are well on the way to ethnically cleansing that province of anglophones. They have also undermined Montreal’s economy and that of the RoC. And Ottawa did, and is doing, nothing about them... except to make matters worse!

For instance, instead of squelching the secessionists, it ignored them, thereby allowing them to come within a whisker of destroying Canada in 1995. Also, instead of disallowing their repugnant language legislation, Ottawa sowed discord in the RoC with its own Official Languages Act ... in an attempt to demonstrate that francophones could deal with the

federal government in French in the RoC as easily as they do in Québec. Very noble, except for one thing: Its implementation was taken over by opportunists and their fellow travelers. These scoundrels transformed a noble service-oriented program into an ignoble job-grab for francophones. More later on this.

Quite clearly, the negative economic and social impacts--across Canada--of Québec's terrible twins can be ascribed to Ottawa's reluctance to deal decisively with the excesses of the Distinct Society. And Ottawa's Official Languages Act converted this terrible duo into a potential strike three for Canada. With the Official Languages Act, Ottawa required that services at all federal institutions be provided in French and English, a policy to which no one of good will could object. However, instead of leaving the provision of these services up to local managers, someone in Ottawa took advantage of the situation to turn it into a job-grab for francophones (See Jobs For Francophones)

But, let's put into perspective bilingualism in the federal public service. First, the environment in which we live forces francophones to become bilingual, just as it permits anglophones (unfairly, according to some know-nothings) to remain unilingual. But let's be clear: We are dealing here with life as it is here and now, not as it might be in Utopia.

Second, the number of bilingual positions in the federal bureaucracy far exceeds the number required to provide legitimate bilingual services. In fact, over the past 30 years or so, positions at all levels have routinely been declared bilingual-imperative, not as a matter of need, but as a matter of fashion. As a result, francophones, representing about 24 percent of Canada's population, now occupy most of the bilingual positions in the federal public service: 38 percent

nationally, 63 percent in the National Capital Region. In Québec, where francophones represent 81 percent of the population, they represent 92 percent of the federal public service!

Third, in an attempt to convert unilingual anglophones into bilingual managers, Ottawa provided them with very expensive language training ... and failed. Since we do not live in Utopia, as soon as these newly “bilingualized” anglophones returned to their jobs, they ran smack up against the facts of life. That is, their francophone staff, by having worked in an anglophone sea, perfected their command of English and hence preferred to speak to their boss in effortless English. Having to suffer through the boss’ fractured French was just not practical. As a result, the manager quickly lost his fragile competence in his newly acquired second language. Therefore, the majority of truly bilingual workers in the federal public service will, over time, necessarily be francophone.

Fourth, under the guise of cutting costs, Lucienne Robillard, President of the Treasury Board, announced a plan, the consequence of which will be to transform the management of the federal public service into a francophone enclave. The Robillard plan is detailed in the next section.

*Summary: Under the guise of providing legitimate bilingual services to Canadians, Ottawa used the Official Languages Act to carry out a job-grab for francophones. Anglophone Canadians, especially those in the RoC, should be offended and alarmed by this since it will become increasingly difficult for them to even qualify for a clerk’s position at their local Post Office!*

I should report in passing that the European Union (the United States of Europe) is about to emulate Ottawa's failed language policy ... because English is whomping French within the Union, and France doesn't like it! The Union currently requires that its employees speak one European language other than their own. Recognizing the worldwide importance of English, most chose English as their second language. As a result, 83 percent of the Union's employees speak English, 24 percent French. The 7 percent who apparently speak both English and French are probably mostly French.

Since France in Europe, like Québec in Canada, exerts considerable political clout, its demand to shore up the use of French is being heeded. How? Get ready! The Union will provide its employees with French-language training. Canada should warn them that it doesn't work. France, like Québec, simply has to face the fact that legislation cannot make water run uphill.

## CSIS

I was astonished to read recently in a book by Norman Spector that the agency charged with protecting Canada against foreign subversion (CSIS, aka Canada Security and Intelligence Service) still requires that its employees be competent in both official languages even though they may be deficient in the languages of those evil doers intent on doing Canada harm. Heaven forbid that an Urdu- or Arabic-speaker be not also competent in French and English!

*Summary: I wonder how many, let's say, Urdu-imperative counter-terrorist positions are currently vacant at CSIS because no bilingual (English and*

*French) candidate could be found. Better, I suppose, to risk being blown up by terrorists than hire someone who was not able to communicate in both of Canada's official languages. If you try to figure out the logic of this last sentence, you'll go mad!*

## **Jobs For Francophones**

Oh what a tangled web we weave when we set out to deceive! And, Ottawa's Official Languages Act is both a deception and a fraud. As mentioned previously, unilingual, anglophone managers are required to take expensive training courses to learn French ... so they can then supervise their francophone subordinates in French. Although proponents of this program insist that it is meant to improve the quality of management, their claim cannot resist close scrutiny.

In the past, anglophone managers apparently did a competent job directing their wonderfully bilingual, francophone staffs right alongside their absolutely unilingual, anglophone colleagues. Since the new program simply transfers the bilingual imperative from subordinate to boss, it obviously has more to do with politics than anything else. And, for those who have the nerve to use the "human rights card," I ask, whose human rights, those of the employee or of the boss? In fact, if human rights, a moral absolute, was indeed an issue, the boss would be required to speak the language of every "ethnic" on his staff. Since that is clearly absurd, it should be obvious that human rights are not an issue.

Also, as described earlier, when these "bilingualized" anglophones return to their jobs, their



newly acquired facility in French evaporates because their francophone subordinates, having picked up English on the job, prefer to speak English. It is clearly a deception to pretend that bilingual, anglophone managers will ever be permitted by their francophone staffs to supervise in French. Thus, requiring unilingual, anglophone managers to take French-language training, is obviously a fraudulent waste of time and money. Hence, Lucienne Robillard, President of the Treasury Board, and one of Chrétien's leading mediocrities, had two options. The first was to resolve the fraud by recognizing that there was in fact no practical need for anglophone managers to speak French. The second was to abolish French-language training and insist that all applicants for bilingual-imperative positions be bilingual from the get-go. She chose the second option. Since, according to Ms. Robillard, only 10 percent of anglophones, versus 70 percent of francophones currently meet these language requirements, it follows that about seven-eighths, or over 85 percent, of applicants for these bilingual positions will, over time, likely be francophone. However, if you use other data provided by Ms. Robillard (30 percent of bilingual candidates are anglophone, 70 percent francophone), the forecast of 85 percent francophone drops to 70 percent. Although I am inclined to accept the first data set, the conclusion is the same: in either case: Over time, the management of the federal public service must necessarily become massively francophone.

Furthermore, given the internal logic of the Official Languages Act, it is clear that the vast majority of management positions will eventually be designated bilingual-imperative. It follows therefore that, since the management of the Federal Public Service will become overwhelmingly francophone, anglophones, like Catholics in Ulster, need not apply. Also, you can bet

the farm that Ms. Robillard's new policy will be as welcome as a skunk at a garden party in, say, Calgary!

If Ottawa wants to avoid a disastrous backlash in non-francophone Canada, it must scrap Ms. Robillard's ridiculous new staffing policy ... and sack her for mischievous incompetence.

When Paul Martin took over from Jean Chrétien, he replaced Lucienne Robillard, a *Québécoise*, with Reg Alcock, a non-Québecer. He almost immediately announced his intention to review Ms. Robillard's proposal ... with a view to making it more sensitive to the West! Sanity may yet prevail.

*Summary: Ottawa's latest contribution to national disunity came from Lucienne Robillard, President of the Treasury Board. She announced, in effect, that the bilingual demands of Ottawa's Official Languages Act will eventually convert the federal public service into a francophone enclave, especially at management levels. Like a skunk at a garden party, this will not be well received in non-francophone Canada. And it wasn't!*

*The demands of national unity require that this policy be scrapped, and that Ms. Robillard be sacked. Ms. Robillard's replacement has since hinted that the new policy will indeed be scrapped, or at least modified substantially. Robillard's sacking may follow the next election.*

## **Military**

Not even if you go back a century or more will you find a single case where Québec supported the RoC in a decision to wage war. Moreover, when the federal government decided to unify the armed services in the 1960s, and thereby eradicate their British symbols, it did so over objections of the RoC ... but with Québec's

implicit approval. This eventually led to drastic cuts in our military budget because Québec's implicit support always carried the day. Over time, this support was assumed every time a military-related policy was considered. In fact, it eventually became an unrecognized constraint on the formation of Canadian military and foreign policy. Consider, for example, the current (2003) state of affairs.

Most knowledgeable commentators agree that our armed forces are an international embarrassment. For instance, Navy and Air Force helicopters are so old they endanger the lives of those flying in them. Remember that, when Chrétien came to power in 1993, the first thing he did was to cancel a contract (let previously by Progressive Conservative Prime Minister Mulroney) to replace this aging fleet. Chrétien said they were too expensive. However, after paying contract-cancellation fines approaching \$500 million, Chrétien, in 2003, faced the embarrassment of having to select the same helicopter he rejected in 1993. Not surprisingly, to avoid this embarrassment, he dragged his feet so much that this contract had not been awarded by the time he retired in December 2003. Although this received an outpouring of outrage in the RoC, it was greeted with indifferent yawns in Québec.

Just in case there was any lingering doubt about the inadequacy of the existing fleet, it was dispelled in early 2003 when we sent a small naval force to the Persian Gulf. When the helicopter on one vessel crashed en route during a routine training operation, Québec shrugged as the RoC grimaced. Please note in passing that, within a week of succeeding Chrétien, Prime Minister Paul Martin announced that these helicopters would be purchased without delay.

Says a lot about Chrétien, doesn't it, and none of it very flattering.

Moreover, the army unit we later sent to Afghanistan was so poorly equipped that its jeeps were breaking down from day one. Later, two Canadian soldiers were killed in the same theatre when a mine destroyed their lightly armoured jeep. Although it is unclear whether a more robust vehicle would have protected them, it is revealing that more heavily armoured vehicles were quickly dispatched to Afghanistan.

While we are dealing with Afghanistan, we might well ask, en passant, why Chrétien dispatched troops to Afghanistan for "peacekeeping" rather than to Iraq to support the American war effort. When you strip away the fluff, the answer is clear: Where Québec will support "peacekeeping," it doesn't want to become involved in someone else's war! The Prime Minister obviously considered the angering of the United States a less costly political gesture than upsetting the Québec electorate. Exporters and the RoC may, of course, be horrified by that trade-off.

Moreover, instead of increasing military spending to reverse decades of neglect, the Chrétien Liberals called for cuts ... in order to cover "emergency" expenditures in other areas. One "emergency" included an apparently unwarranted expenditure of \$100 million from the military budget for the purchase of two new civilian passenger jets (Challengers) for the Prime Minister. Unwarranted? You bet. At least that was the opinion of the Auditor General, the Prime Minister's senior advisors, and the Department of National Defense which operates the government's fleet of passenger jets.

Responding to the torrent of criticism in the RoC at this arrogant misuse of the Defense budget,

Chrétien in effect said: “No matter what the experts said, I say we need the planes. Besides, they will create jobs.” What he did not say was that these jobs would be created at the Bombardier facility in Montreal (about which more later)! Québec wins every time, non?

In general, Chrétien justified cuts to the military budget by claiming that they were supported by public opinion. What he was referring to was public opinion in Québec. Plus ça change!

*Summary: Since military policy reflects Québec's traditional isolationism, the more outward-looking views of the RoC are often ignored. Also, this Québec-centred attitude has the effect of underfunding the military, which puts at risk the lives of Canadian military personnel.*

Moreover, in line with the federal government's decision to make the Canadian public service more francophone, being bilingual became imperative for promotion within the armed forces. And, since francophones are more likely than anglophones to be bilingual, our military hierarchy tended to become francophone. Although this seems innocent enough, when you start to nose about, you begin to smell a rat.

If competence in French is so vital, why do most francophone officers speak such impeccable English? Because they acquired this expertise within the anglophone environment that has always dominated the modern North American military ... and always will. Therefore, the need for French within our armed forces is clearly suspect. In fact, as noted earlier, the francization of our military responds to political imperatives, not to management issues or the ultimate red herring, human rights. Moreover, it should be clear that equally qualified, or more qualified, anglophone

candidates must have been passed over in order to provide employment for francophones ... to the obvious dismay of the RoC.

*Summary: Current staffing policy in the military favours francophones over anglophones. Therefore, our military leaders are not necessarily selected from among the most qualified candidates.*

To add insult to injury, a memorial was erected 59 years after the fact on Juno Beach, Normandy where Canadian forces came ashore during the 1944 D-Day invasion of Europe. Since Ottawa's contribution to the memorial was miniscule, it had to be financed privately. If there had been any interest in this project in Québec, you can bet the farm that it would have received generous federal support years ago!

### **Commissioner for Francophones**

To monitor implementation of the Official Languages Act, Ottawa set up the office of the Commissioner of Official Languages. Since the Commissioner spends virtually all of his/her time on matters related to French, the incumbent should really be called the Commissioner for Francophones. In fact, as I recall, the only time the Commissioner had the temerity to admit that Québec anglophones were being unfairly treated under Québec's language laws, he was roundly condemned by all political parties in both Ottawa and Québec City. It is simply considered bad manners to subject Québec's language policies to critical scrutiny ... even when they are clearly abusive.

Given the explosive nature of language issues in Canada, you would think that the Commissioner would

be prudent. For example, it should be obvious to any fair-minded person that, even under perfect conditions, French will have a hard time surviving, let alone thriving, outside Québec. And, since conditions are never perfect, the Commissioner has to decide whether to deal with the myriad of trivial “problems” that inevitably arise, or concentrate on important, strategic issues. Unfortunately, it would appear that the Commissioner prefers to pour fuel on the linguistic fires by favouring the trivial. For instance, she took exception to the inability of an Air Canada stewardess to understand a customer’s request for a Seven Up, a request delivered in French by a fluently bilingual francophone. He was obviously an ignorant jerk, more interested in picking a fight with a defenseless stewardess than in ordering a drink.

Contrast her concern for a trivial “affront” to a mischievous francophone jerk, to the real problem faced by a unilingual anglophone in Cantley, Québec (near Hull, now Gatineau). According to the Ottawa Citizen (September 19, 2003), 85-year old anglophone Ed Quipp had been charged with breaking a municipal regulation. When he appeared in court to defend himself, he found that the court neither provided him with an English version of the French-language charge, nor permitted him to cross-examine anyone in English. The court would, however, provide him with an English version of his conviction or acquittal!

Since Ontario provides trials in French under similar circumstances, as well as translation services in many languages, you would have thought that the Commissioner of Official Languages would have intervened on Mr. Quipp’s behalf. Not a chance. There wasn’t even a spark of interest, let alone a murmur of protest, from her office. As I said earlier, the

Commissioner of Official Languages is concerned only with French issues.

This reminds me of the early years of Québec's odious Bill 101 when the health of elderly Chinese patients was subordinated to the mean-spirited dictates of Québec's language law. In order to provide proper medical services to its elderly patients, who spoke and understood Chinese only, Montreal's Chinese Hospital sought a Chinese-speaking nurse to replace the retiring incumbent. That's fine, said Québec's language police, as long as the new nurse also speaks French. When all was said and done, the hospital had to hire a francophone nurse who spoke no Chinese! Here again, I do not recall any protests from Ottawa's Commissioner of Official Languages. Too busy, I suppose, dealing with the hurt feelings of small minded, mean spirited francophone bottom feeders.

In the summer of 2003, the Commissioner continued her interest in the trivial when she became very agitated by the complaints of two under-employed members of the august Senate of Canada. Having nothing better to do, they set out to ensure that menus in restaurants in Ottawa (especially those in buildings rented from the federal government) were bilingual. Not surprisingly, they found that most were delinquent. With great fanfare they called a press conference to voice their outrage over this matter of little interest to anyone but themselves. The Commissioner chipped in with her "great concern" and vowed to do something about it.

However, when asked why they (Senators and Commissioner) weren't equally outraged by unilingual French menus in similar restaurants in Ottawa's sister city, Hull, Québec, they either ignored the query or harrumped that "it wasn't the same." This is the type of



nonsense that federal language policies have led to ... naked hypocrisy in an attempt to do the impossible, mollify Québec.

Not content with the conversion of molehills into mountains, the current Commissioner decided to meddle in areas beyond her jurisdiction. She wants the federal government to enact constitutional changes to force the province of Ontario and the city of Ottawa to become officially bilingual! She also wanted the federal government to prevent the closure of an obscure francophone hospital in Ottawa (see Montfort), a clear intrusion into provincial jurisdiction. And she insulted everyone by ignoring the hypocrisy that supported both.

For instance, although a case can be made for Ontario adopting bilingual status, Québec unilingualism notwithstanding, one would expect the Commissioner to at least admit that Québec's stance is reprehensible. No such luck, the Commissioner has nothing but kind words for Québec. And she wonders why she infuriates so many of us!

Moreover, even though Ottawa provides a full range of services in French, it would nevertheless be wonderful if the nation's capital was, in fact, officially bilingual. That would be "the right thing to do" ... if it was possible. But it isn't. The National Capital Region includes Ottawa and its sister city of Hull (Gatineau) in Québec ... which is officially, unilingually French. But the Commissioner simply ignored the Hull conundrum by demanding bilingual status for Ottawa, not for the National Capital Region. Anglophones in Ottawa, including those who would welcome bilingual status for the National Capital Region, were predictably offended by this simplistic descent into hypocrisy.

In a related field, if past experience is any guide, I would have expected the Commissioner to expose the

technically bilingual anglophones in the federal public service who are in fact not bilingual ... and hence not in a position to provide the French-language services required by their job descriptions. As shown previously, these bilingual anglophones are competent in limited French for a very short period following their expensive stays at government sponsored language school. Thus, when the president of the Treasury Board reported in early 2003 that “81 percent of all federal civil servants with supervisory duties were sufficiently bilingual,” she was being generous (disingenuous?) in the use of the word sufficiently. That said, I wondered then why demagogues like the Commissioner had not made an issue of this. And there is an issue to be exploited. Do the math and see for yourself.

If the 81 percent who are “sufficiently” bilingual include every francophone (27 percent of all civil servants), and if the remaining 19 percent (100-81) are unilingual anglophones, both of which assumptions are likely, the remaining 54 percent (81-27) must be bilingual anglophones. And, as cited above, if Ms. Robillard starts to get tough with those who are not in fact “sufficiently” bilingual, the most vulnerable to her cleansing broom: are (1) unilingual anglophones (19 percent of all civil servants), and, (2) those anglophones currently classified as “sufficiently” bilingual (54 percent of all civil servants) who are in fact “insufficiently” bilingual. Hence, the Robillard plan, so apparently noble and virtuous, could easily cleanse a host of anglophones from the federal public service, and in the process probably triple the current francophone share of 27 percent! At least that is what we can infer from Ms. Robilliard’s statistics.

Well, my bewilderment at why the Commissioner was not raising a fuss over these bogus “bilingual” anglophones, was resolved when Ms. Robillard tabled

her final staffing policy for the federal public service in late 2003 (See Jobs For Francophones). As seen in the following letter from the Commissioner that appeared in the National Post on Dec. 12, 2003, she had simply been biding her time. I have underlined the most egregious sections.

*There have (sic) been a number of misperceptions about new Treasury Board rules regarding staffing of bilingual public service positions and what impact this will have on the West.*

*First, the new policy does not increase the number of positions that are designated bilingual. It simply means that bilingual positions must be staffed by individuals who meet the language requirements of those positions. This is perfectly logical, just as it would be to hire individuals with accounting credentials to do accounting work*

*Given their responsibilities, it is particularly important for managers in regions that are designated bilingual, such as in the National Capital Region, to meet the language requirements of their position (sic). These senior public servants are responsible for creating a workplace that is conducive to the use of English and French and for offering quality services in both official languages*

*There is also a false perception that the new policy will somehow disadvantage westerners from gaining access to public service jobs. There are in fact no regions that are designated bilingual for language of work purposes in our four western provinces, and as a result, only 4 percent of positions there are bilingual .*

*What's more, by making language training more accessible and integrated as part of career*

development, the new policy will actually make bilingual positions more accessible to all public servants, including those from the West. This is an important aspect of the new policy that has largely been overlooked in the media. The idea is to give unilingual public servants, regardless of where they come from, the language skills they need to obtain bilingual positions, if that's what they aspire to do .

This new policy is another positive step toward achieving an exemplary public service with regard to official languages. This will benefit Canadians by ensuring quality service in both official languages, while giving public servants equal opportunity to fulfill their career aspirations .

*I urge the new government to more (sic) forward with the implementation of this policy.*

*Dyane Adam  
Commissioner of Official Languages  
Ottawa*

The arrogant, misinformed posturing of the Commissioner is really breathtaking. My retort to Ms. Adam appeared in the National Post the following day. It follows here.

*Ms. Adam, claims that the new Treasury Board policy regarding the staffing of bilingual positions "does not increase the number of positions that are designated bilingual." True, but disingenuous. The new staffing policy will not increase the number of bilingual positions because it doesn't have to. It has become the fashion to designate most management positions as bilingual-imperative as a matter of course. Ms. Adam should have known that from her own statistics.*

*Moreover, she completely ignores the statistics presented by the President of Treasury Board. Since at least 75 percent of bilingual candidates for bilingual management positions are francophones, and since candidates must be bilingual from the get-go, doesn't it follow that, over time, the management of the federal public service must become massively francophone? Let's face it, the new staffing policy cannot be good for non-francophones.*

*Robert Sauvé  
Ottawa*

Moreover, it was mischievous of Ms. Adam to claim that hiring bilingual people for bilingual positions is the same as hiring accountants to do accounting. Although we normally do not hire more accountants than we need, we do indeed carry a surplus of bilingual positions. Therefore, it follows, doesn't it, that there is no need to staff every bilingual position with a bilingual candidate.

She then displays her culpable ignorance by inferring that only bilingual managers can manage a bilingual workplace. As mentioned earlier, this assumes that the manager must speak the language of the employee. Well, the reverse has obtained for years with anglophone managers directing their very bilingual francophone subordinates alongside their unilingually anglophone confreres. Clearly, requiring that managers be bilingual has everything to do with politics and nothing to do with management. Nor, as argued earlier, does it have anything to do with human rights.

Moreover, how she could claim that the new staffing policy will not disadvantage westerners is beyond comprehension. If most westerners do not currently qualify for bilingual positions, and they do not, how can they not be disadvantaged by the new policy? The new Martin-appointed President of the Treasury Board, Reg Alcock, appears to share my view. He intends to review the new

policy to ensure that it does not discriminate against Westerners. This is consistent with Paul Martin's intent to improve relations with the West. Ms. Adam might wish to revise her position before Mr. Alcock gets to her.

Furthermore, to claim that language training will be more accessible (to Westerners) than in the past is a real stretch. First, language training is currently accessible enough... and fails to do the job. Second, when the bilingualized Westerner returns to his job, he will quickly lose his fragile, newly acquired French if he works in the West where French is seldom spoken, as he will in Ottawa where his bilingual, francophone staff will continue to work in English. Therefore, Ms. Adam's language training will be as useless in the future as it has been in the past.

*Summary: By focusing on the trivial, and by not recognizing that seeking perfection in the provision of French-language services is objectively not feasible, the Commissioner of Official Languages has disgraced herself by fomenting linguistic discord in Canada. Moreover, by supporting a program whose net effect will be to transform the management of the federal public service into a massive francophone enclave, the current Commissioner is threatening national unity for the sake of providing jobs for francophones. She should be sacked and the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages abolished.*

## **Multiculturalism**

Some are of the view that Prime Minister Trudeau pushed the notion of multiculturalism to sell his party's bilingualism program. And, as we all know, the

multiculturalism program was more than a simple recognition of Canada's multicultural mosaic. It was a promise to immigrants that, though they came here assuming they would assimilate into the Canadian mainstream, they were encouraged instead to remain who they were. This in essence encouraged immigrants to recreate here the culture they had just abandoned. Since this appeared to provide them with a relatively painless introduction to their new homeland, Trudeau became a hero to immigrants, an important datum since this important voting block was indifferent to the potential problems imbedded in Trudeau's bilingualism program.

The multiculturalism program also encouraged immigrants to bring over their relatives (many of whom were too old to work and support themselves), as long as they agreed to financially support their indigent kin. However, most reneged, the consequence of which was the dumping of these indigents onto provincial welfare rolls. And, of course, anyone who questioned this boondoggle was assailed as a racist deserving tar and feathers. Cowtowing to the immigrant lobby thus became imperative for all political parties, especially the post-Trudeau Liberals under Jean Chrétien.

This may explain why a radio license was granted in July 2003 to a multi-cultural radio station in Toronto despite its alleged links to the World Tamil Movement, a Sri Lankan terrorist organization. Toronto's several immigrant communities were grateful for this gesture from the Chrétien Liberals.

Prime Minister Chrétien had previously intervened with the Prime Minister of Pakistan on behalf of a Muslim Canadian then being held in a Pakistani jail on terrorist charges. That really pleased Canada's Muslim communities. Media coverage later

showed conclusively that this “persecuted” individual was in fact a leading fund-raiser for al Qaeda, the terrorist organization responsible for 9/11. He is currently either dead on the run. His two sons are in American custody at Guantanamo Bay.

In September 2002, Maher Arar, a Canadian citizen who also held a Syrian passport, was arrested when his plane, in transit from Europe to Toronto, landed in New York. After a routine check, American officials, seeing his name on a list of people suspected of being associated with al Qaeda, deported him to Syria where he was jailed without charge. This caused Chrétien and company to cry rape and demand Arar’s return to Canada ... despite the fact that Chrétien must have known that Canadian officials had cooperated with the Americans in this case. Arar was freed and returned to Canada in October 2003 where he was treated as a persecuted hero. Was he? Consider the evidence.

Arar’s name appeared on a list of suspected international bad guys presumably because it was put there by either Canadian or American police. Since he had spent most of his adult life in Canada, it must have been by Canadian police. In fact, media reports and police testimony before a parliamentary committee later implied that the RCMP and/or CSIS had been in contact with American authorities on the Arar file. Although this is pure conjecture, I would argue that the RCMP likely asked their American counterparts to deport Arar to Syria rather than to Canada. They probably felt that, while their evidence might not stand up in a Canadian court, Syrian authorities would not be similarly constrained in dealing with an al Qaeda operative. And, they weren’t. They subjected Arar to considerable discomfort, i.e., torture. In any event, Arar is back in Canada, a free man, even though his name is still on the



list of suspected al Qaeda operatives. Canada's Muslim community is nevertheless very thankful to the Liberal government of Jean Chrétien for his kind thoughts and good intentions.

Whether Arar is eventually proven a hero or a threat to national security, the fact remains that Jean Chrétien chose to publicly proclaim Arar's innocence when his own RCMP was of the view that Arar was a suspected al Qaeda operative.

Because Canada has become an international soft touch for illegal immigrants and bogus refugees, most informed commentators feel that a tightening of the immigration and refugee systems is long overdue. But, anyone at all attentive to the news of the day knows (1) that no politician has the cojones to tighten our porous systems, and (2) that once in Canada, illegal immigrants and phony refugees are almost impossible to deport. One Palestinian deportee has been in court for over twenty years fighting his deportation!

It took 9/11 to bring into the open another serious potential problem with our multiculturalism program, the threat of militant Islam. Even though Muslims were responsible for the atrocities of 9/11, Chrétien and company were quick to assure everyone that the Muslims responsible for these horrible deeds were not representative of Canadian Muslims. Perhaps, but how did he know so soon after the event? Furthermore, this feel-good attitude prevailed even when Canadian Muslims were loath to condemn their murderous co-religionists. Some insist to this day that Jews, not Muslims were responsible!

Fast forward to late 2003 and we find these same Muslim notables now calling for a change to Canadian law that would permit Canadian Muslims to

have their civil cases decided, not in Canadian courts, but in Muslim courts ... according to Shariah Law. If you imagine this to be ground breaking, think again. Canadian aboriginals found guilty of some crimes now have their sentences determined by aboriginal sentencing circles according to aboriginal custom. Although sentencing circles are flawed (How does the system handle a case where two men are to be sentenced, one aboriginal and one not?), I can see some use for them in all sentencing procedures throughout our criminal-justice system. Within the system, mind you, not separate and distinct from it.

That said, I see no place for Shariah Law in Canada. In fact, it would be an abomination. How else would you consider a law that, among its other ignoble features, calls for amputation to settle crimes of theft? Or for the flogging of sodomites? Or for the stoning of adulterous women? Or for the death of anyone at all critical of the Koran? I hope our politicians have the courage to reject this request out of hand. Next on the Muslim wish list will no doubt be a request for government funding for madressas, their religious schools of international disrepute that preach hatred of Infidels like me.

And, do you know how they will justify their demand? Since Catholic, Protestant and Jewish schools receive some funding from the state, why shouldn't theirs? Very persuasive ... if you are illiterate or unable to distinguish between your nose and your left ear. Let's be clear. There is no evidence to suggest that Catholic, Protestant or Jewish religious schools are calling for bad things to happen to devotees of religions other than theirs. But, there is a mountain of evidence to prove that madressas are fountains of intolerance and hatred toward every religion but their own, one consequence of which was 9/11!

It is clearly unfortunate, in my view, that Muslim religious schools are even permitted in Canada. But, it would be a disgrace if they succeeded in obtaining state funding! It must not happen. However, since we are given to “being more Catholic than the Pope” in such matters, get ready for the inevitable: Canadian Muslims, having been denied funding for madressas, will call upon the government to also deny funding to Catholic, Protestant and Jewish religious schools ... in the interests of fairness and equity, of course! I would argue that the only thing preventing Canada’s Muslim leaders from making such a logical but intolerable demand, will be their realization that the violent reaction from fed-up Canadians might be too high a price to pay for their so-called equity.

Lest anyone feel I am picking on Muslims, let me assure everyone that I am equally critical of other immigrants who continue in this country a heinous practice from their countries of origin. I refer, *inter alia*, to clitorrectomy, the mutilation of women. Imagine if we were required by the Canada Health Act to fund this outrageous procedure! I am equally intolerant of my cousins from Ulster who try to import their hateful sectarian ideology into Canada.

Finally, the federal Liberals are lusting so much for ethnic support that immigrant communities currently dominate several Liberal riding associations in British Columbia, Ontario and Québec. This concerns some influential Liberals who see it as a divisive social issue that would be better avoided. Since these voting blocks will also extend into the more diverse general electorate, it will create similar tensions there.

*Summary: Some analysts argue that Trudeau saddled us with the federal multiculturalism program to find*

*allies within the immigrant (ethnic) communities to offset anglophone resistance to his plan to bilingualize federal institutions. Since criticism of the Official Languages Act has become politically incorrect, I guess he succeeded. There have, however, been some unfortunate side effects.*

*First, the thrust of the multiculturalism program interferes with the normal integration of immigrants into the Canadian mainstream. Second, it tends to create monolithic, ethnic voting blocks that are thus often at odds with politically more diverse non-immigrant communities. Third, although we desperately need to put more discipline into our immigration and refugee systems, fear of alienating these voting blocks has discouraged most attempts at reform.*

*One might argue that Canadian politics is developing an unfortunate bipolar imperative: The historic need to find majority support in Québec, with the growing need to find similar support among ethnic communities in the RoC.*

## **Second Class Citizens**

It is curious how some very important issues fail to flash on our personal radar screens. One of these is the federal Official Languages Support Program, which doles out a total of about \$33 million annually (\$27 million directly) to various official-language minority groups in Québec (anglophones) and the RoC (francophones). The program's objective is to help each group defend its interests against majority pressures. At the last census, there were 572,000 anglophones in

Québec and 953,000 francophones in the RoC (494,000 in Ontario, 237,000 in New Brunswick, 42,000 in the other Atlantic provinces, and 180,000 in the West). The financial support accorded these minority groups averaged about \$24 per head for francophones in the RoC versus a little over \$6 per Québec anglophone. Although this appears to be egregiously unfair, let me suggest a better comparison: Anglophones in Québec at \$6 per head versus francophones in New Brunswick and Ontario at \$11 per head. Now, we can ask a pointed question: Why do these francophones receive almost double the rate paid to anglophones?

Is it because some Canadians are more equal than others? Appears that way..

Is it because francophones in the RoC need more help resisting assimilationist pressures than do Québec anglophones? Probably. However, no amount of federal money can hold back the assimilating wave facing francophones in the RoC.

Is it because discrimination at the hands of the majority is a greater problem in the RoC than in Québec? Hardly, where Québec has legislated discrimination against anglophones, the RoC is free of an equivalent obscenity. Moreover, where this discrimination contributed to the ethnic cleansing of anglophones in Québec, francophones in the RoC have not been similarly afflicted.

Is it because generous funding of francophones in the RoC, and niggardly support of Québec anglophones, plays well in Québec political circles? Bingo!

*Summary: Anglophone-support organizations that were set up in Québec following the passage of language laws targeting them, receive niggardly financial support from Ottawa. Since a more equitable level of*

*support would offend Québec's secessionist political class, Ottawa steers clear of any measures that might displease them. On the other hand, it provides gobs of money to francophone organizations in the RoC, where francophones face no known legislated discrimination.*

## **Referendum Cheats**

So far, there have been two referenda on secession in Québec. In the first (1980), the secessionist option was rejected by a substantial margin, 60 percent to 40. The second (1995), however, was a squeaker with the secessionists losing by about 50,000 votes, less than 1 percent of the votes cast..

Since, the province-wide popular vote is the only tally that counts in a referendum, a ballot cast in a riding in Montreal is no less important than one cast in, say, Chicoutimi. This represented a strategic difference from normal elections where winning ridings is crucial, and the popular vote is interesting but irrelevant. That is, winning a riding by 10,000 votes (federalists in Montreal) was no more important than winning by 1,000 votes (secessionists in Chicoutimi), since each riding sends one Député to the National Assembly. In a province-wide referendum, on the other hand, there is only one riding. Therefore, the lopsided federalist majorities in Montreal became a concern for secessionists. Enter the referendum scrutineers.

Each polling station had three scrutineers, one to represent the secessionists, one the anti-secessionists, and one the theoretically neutral government of Québec. Sounds good, but that is not the way it worked. Since the neutral official had been appointed by the secessionist government of the day, it follows that secessionist-minded scrutineers controlled every poll. Further, the evidence shows that their job was to

declare invalid as many anti-secessionist ballots as possible. And, where better to do this than in heavily anti-secessionist Montreal!

In the 1980 Referendum, my wife, an anti-secessionist scrutineer in Montreal West, was moved to tears by the thuggery of her two colleagues. They used every excuse possible to reject anti-secessionist ballots. The “X” in the appointed circle was too dark; or it was not dark enough; or it did not fill the circle; or it overlapped the circle; or they just felt like rejecting it. Nothing much was heard of this since the anti-secessionist side, having won a convincing victory, saw no advantage in pursuing the issue. That was a big mistake since the thugs returned with a vengeance in the 1995 referendum.

Even though the anti-secessionist side won again, the winning margin was so small that the undisguised thuggery of these scrutineers could not be ignored. In fact, some have calculated that, if these thugs had been able to invalidate a few more ballots in “anglophone” polls, the secessionist side would have carried the day. When compared to the record of spoiled ballots in normal elections (about 10,000), the rejected-ballot record of the 1995 referendum (over 65,000) was indeed awesome. At a subsequent inquiry, a judge slapped the wrists of a few minor officials, noting that the ultimate responsibility for their illegal activities was obviously to be found higher up the secessionist food chain. At the present time (December 2003, in the ninth year after the fact!), this matter is before the Courts in Québec where the major litigant is attempting to prove that the orders for this electoral fraud originated in or near the office of the Premier of Québec!

I might point out in passing that raising this issue is not celebrated by *Québécois*. And bringing it to court is viewed as an unseemly attempt by anglophones to humiliate *Québécois*. After all, although the secessionist scrutineers may have acted improperly, they did have their hearts in the right place in support of a good cause, the sovereignty of Québec! The fact that these were illegal acts seems not to interest them.

*Summary: Both of Québec's referenda on secession were marked by electoral fraud, possibly under the direction of the Government of Québec. The fraud consisted in arbitrarily rejecting valid, anti-secessionist ballots. This permitted the secessionist side to come within a whisker of winning the 1995 referendum ... which would have thrown Canada into political disarray.*

*Moreover, Québécois resent being reminded of this crime. They prefer to think of it as a simple misadventure of no particular import, a family matter of no concern to anyone outside the family, especially to non-Québécois, anglophone Québécois! I guess Québec really is a Distinct Society after all!*

## **Referendum Consequences**

Some argue that the Clarity Act put an end to the disruptive effect on the RoC of Québec's secessionist movement. Would that that were so! Dig a little and you will see that many of the concessions to Québec described here owe their existence to post-referendum attempts by Ottawa to curry favour in that province. The only difference with the pre-referendum period is that futile constitutional amendments have been abandoned in favor of back door administrative arrangements.



In addition, the failure of Ottawa to drive a stake through the heart of the secessionist movement means that businessmen will continue to resist making job-creating investments in Québec and the RoC. As a result, we will have to resort increasingly to burdensome subsidies to bribe businessmen to invest in Canada rather than in more stable regimes. This is the inevitable consequence of allowing uncertainty to define our political climate. So, the next time someone complains that Canada's standard of living continues to fall behind that of the United States, remember that the deficit can in part be blamed on the threat of Québec's never-ending referenda on secession.

*Summary: Job-killing political uncertainty is the product of Ottawa's reluctance to deal a fatal blow to Québec's secessionist movement. And, until that fatal blow is delivered, Canada's standard of living relative to the United States will continue to deteriorate.*

## **Foreign Relations**

Before Pierre Trudeau, Canada's relations with other countries, especially with Great Britain and the United States, were generally amicable. To be sure, though our evolution from British colony to autonomous nation was sometimes stressful, it never deteriorated into serious hostility. In any event, Canada developed a respected international reputation. Remember that our Lester Pearson won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1958 for his work in resolving a conflict in the Middle East. Canada subsequently became a world leader in UN peacekeeping operations. Let us not be modest, in those days, Canada was an international somebody.

Now, however, not only has Canada become an international nobody, it has deliberately alienated

our best friend and neighbour, the United States. This turn in our fortunes can be traced back to Pierre Elliot Trudeau. Strong on matters of national unity, he was, I would argue, a foreign relations disaster. For instance, he annoyed the United States, first by reducing substantially Canada's contributions to NATO, then by cozying up to the world's socialist losers, especially Fidel Castro who was loathed by the Americans. Where the first gesture (NATO) could be ascribed to a simple matter of priorities, Trudeau's dalliance with Castro et al. was seen in Washington as an unnecessary and gratuitous provocation. And Trudeau of course missed few opportunities to subtly bad-mouth the United States.

Mulroney, on the other hand, bent over backward to get along with the United States. He did, after all, conclude the Free Trade Agreement with them, something that would have been unthinkable under Trudeau. Paul Martin also appears to want to establish good relations with the Americans.

Jean Chrétien, on the other hand, seemed to enjoy poking his finger in the American eye ... apparently to appeal to Canada's fashionable, knuckle-dragging, anti-American subculture. For example, when he suggested after 9/11 that the destruction of the World Trade Center by Islamic terrorists may have been fair retribution for excessive American greed, he was obviously and egregiously off-base. Not unlike those who (still) insist that 9/11 was the fault of the Jews, not peace-loving Muslims!

Moreover, when he sat on the fence throughout the debate on Canada's possible participation in the American-initiated war with Iraq, he succeeded only in sowing discord among Canadians, and in alienating Canada from its protector and biggest customer. As suggested earlier, some commentators

claim Chrétien was reluctant to send troops to Iraq lest that gesture alienate voters in the forthcoming provincial election in Québec. That was not unlikely, given Québec's historical antipathy to foreign wars. He also shamelessly embarrassed Canada by claiming that our world-leading peacekeeping operations prevented us from contributing to the American effort. A bald lie! Although once a world-leader in peacekeeping, we now stand about 35<sup>th</sup>, well behind countries such as Bangladesh ... and the United States!

Moreover, when he chose not to discipline one of his senior advisors who had publicly referred to President Bush as a moron, he gave the impression that he agreed with her. Not exactly the smart way to treat an important ally! He left the same impression when he ignored the fuss caused by a member of his Ontario caucus who had referred to all Americans as bastards. Not surprisingly, our relations with the United States are not great.

And, of course, Chrétien showed political carelessness and lack of courage in international matters on at least three occasions that I recall. The first was in Lebanon when he did not know that the man sitting directly in front of his podium was the religious leader of Hezbollah, a terrorist organization according to Chrétien's own Department of External Affairs. The second was in Jerusalem when he joked that he did not understand the relevance of distinguishing between east and west Jerusalem, between the Arab and Jewish quarters of the city. Having had personal experience trying to brief Chrétien, I can see what probably happened in these two cases. He simply paid no attention to the briefing, preferring instead to wing it. Although winging it, and committing the odd gaff, may not be significant in Canada, it is clearly inappropriate in foreign relations. The third was at an international

meeting which had to deal with the possible expulsion from the Commonwealth of Robert Mugabe, the racist dictator of Zimbabwe. Rather than deal with a situation where Mugabe's expulsion was clearly justified, Chrétien preferred to drag his feet by awaiting the results of the forthcoming elections in Zimbabwe ... where a fixed ballot was expected.

And, of course, Chrétien's refusal to do the "right thing" at the United Nations by opposing the shameful anti-Semitism of the UN General Assembly is another reminder of his lack of moral compass.

*Summary: The performance of Prime Ministers from Québec in foreign affairs is mixed. Where Trudeau postured and Chrétien shamed us, Mulroney (and Martin?) attempted to do the "right thing." The fashionable anti-Americanism so prevalent in Canada today among the chattering classes can be traced to Trudeau. The performance of these prime ministers appears to have a linguistic dimension. Coincidence?*

### **Language Legislation: Québec**

In the 1960s, various Québec intellectuals, whiners and similarly oppressed misfits convinced the government of Québec that the French language was at risk because the francophone share of Québec's population was in decline. Some later went on to produce a TV documentary (funded by the Canada Council!) called "Disparaître". It warned all and sundry that the sky was indeed falling on French in Québec. That there was absolutely no evidence to support such an hysterical hypothesis mattered not at all. In any event, the solution legislated was to suppress English. This odious legislation thus made Québec a truly Distinct Society: It became the only jurisdiction in the modern western

world to permit the majority not only to legislate second-class status for its minority, but also to subject it to ethnic cleansing.

And, Québec's political leaders justified all this by claiming that, only by using their legislative power, could *Québécois* protect their language and culture from drowning in the anglophone sea that surrounded them. To sell this deplorable crock, they glossed over an important section of the White Paper that preceded adoption of the Charter of the French Language. The White Paper declared that the Charter would be the first step in the "reconquest of Québec." That is, the Charter was going to reverse the British conquest of New France in 1760! Whether this datum was to be taken literally or figuratively, the fact remains that the primary intent of the Charter was obviously political, not cultural. While Ottawa ignored this political focus, it swallowed whole the nonsense about "the French language needing protection." And the RoC also distinguished itself by turning a blind eye. By these acts of political cowardice, Ottawa and the RoC transformed themselves into classical cuckolds! They also placed Canada among the few modern nations (Zimbabwe comes to mind) that permit legislated ethnic cleansing within their borders. Makes one proud to be Canadian, non?

In summary, permit me to conclude that "protecting French" was not the real intent of Québec's language laws. The evidence suggests that their real purpose was to reduce the electoral weight of non-francophones, those tiresome people who almost always oppose the secessionist bent of the government of Québec. Consider the evidence.

First, an overview.

That a modern society like Québec would waste scarce resources on a problem that does not exist (French at risk) instead of dealing with real problems (unemployment) is incredible. Nevertheless, Québec's leaders would have us believe that being poor but French is better than putting French at risk by pursuing wealth. However, the historical record is clear: Given a choice, *Québécois* have in fact always been motivated by the hypothesis rejected by their leaders! How else would you explain the fact that the original French settlers have as many descendants in the United States today as in Québec?

Moreover, since most of Québec's unilingual francophones have always lived and worked in French, how can one reasonably conclude that their language is at risk? And the same doubt can be raised for those bilingual francophones who work in English but live in French.

In any event, if "protecting" French was indeed the intent of Québec's legislators, they would have increased substantially the money spent in the province's public schools. Since they did not, you should conclude that "protecting" French could not have been their true objective.

A more honest concern would have been the real poverty of *Québécois* relative to that of Québec anglos. But, when poverty as an issue did arise, it was blamed—predictably--on anglo discrimination. It thus became one more justification for restricting English! However, since Québec anglos are relatively well educated, and *Québécois* are not, their relative economic status is predictable with certainty. Here again, the discrimination myth triumphed over fact. After all, one does not permit the truth to displace a profitable and handy scapegoat!

Moreover, requiring companies to transact more of their internal operations in French—as is required by these language laws—simply makes matters worse for the average *Québécois*. Clearly, this francization dictum notwithstanding, unless the schools produce a greater number of better educated francophones, employers will tend to locate where better educated staff are available. Since the most current statistics indicate clearly that the historical educational deficit between *Québécois* and Ontarians has not narrowed substantially, it is not surprising that Ontario attracts proportionately more business investment than does Québec. Couple this with the head office exodus from Montreal following the first secessionist scare in 1976 and you will see why the unnecessary language burden imposed on business could not produce more jobs for relatively uneducated *Québécois*. As my mother used to say: “You cannot make a silk purse from a sow’s ear.”

Because the language laws intervened massively in the schools, immigrants (allophones in Québec) were required to attend French schools instead of the English institutions they preferred. This was to help offset the declining birth rate among *Québécoises*. Since this birth rate continues to decline, it is obvious that the forced francization of allophones, even if successful, cannot compensate for the continued reluctance of *Québécoises* to follow in the more fertile footsteps of their ancestors. Moreover, one might argue that forcing allophones into French schools in fact backfired: Although they did indeed learn French in school, they also acquired English from their TV sets and on the street. As a result, although allophones are now fluent in French, most nevertheless consider English their common public language.

Since this source of new *Québécois* must have been suspect from the get-go, one must ask why Québec's leaders pursued this socially disruptive option with such vigour? Might it have been because depriving English schools of immigrants represented a major threat to the survival of the English school system? You bet! Faced with a declining school system, might Québec anglos not consider exodus a necessary survival option? You bet! Similarly, might anglos from elsewhere not think twice before moving their families to Québec? You bet! Wouldn't this reduce the number of anti-secessionist voters in Québec? You bet! Wouldn't this also increase job opportunities for *Québécois*? You bet!

As further proof that these language laws were meant more to demean and insult anglos than to "protect French," consider the following.

To require that English lettering on signs be no more than half the size of French script on the same sign serves no purpose other than to insult fellow citizens. Moreover, to pursue and prosecute merchants with "delinquent" signs in massively anglophone areas (Shawville, for instance) is particularly odious. That serves no other purpose than to "put anglos in their place," and assuage the tender egos of insecure *Québécois* who have swallowed whole the myth of their victimization by "les autres." Sadly, it would appear that the majority of *Québécois* have been persuaded that this is sound public policy, the type required to "protect French," which, as I argued above, is nonsense. When you consider that this hateful legislation is now accepted as legitimate by federal politicians as well as by Ottawa's Commissioner of Official Languages, you can see the power of a well promoted lie. Goebbels would have been impressed.



So much for the overview. Now let's see how the historical record supports this overview. Consider first the census data for 1901-2001 in Table 5. Take particular note of the population shares from 1901 to 1961 in Section-B of this table. That was the historical record with which Québec's political classes were familiar when they first considered the need for language legislation in the 1960s. As any statistician will confirm, that 60-year share-trend for francophones was relatively stable, arguably not in decline. Hence, it was not reasonable to conclude from these data that French was at risk in Québec! I should point out in passing that the 1960s were the formative years of the Quiet Revolution, a period driven by the anti-anglophone, political slogan "Maîtres chez nous."

Now fast forward from the 1960s to 1976 when the secessionist Parti Québécois came to power and gave birth within a year to the language laws we know today. Even though the declared objective of the legislators was to protect French, the latest census data available to them (1971) did not support their claim: The francophone share-trend was still stable. What then was their true objective, you say? Well, as I reported earlier, it was to "permit a re-conquest of Québec ....!" Their objective was obviously political and hence had nothing to do with culture and language!

However, the official *Québécois* mantra ever since has been that, without the protection of the language laws, French would have declined precipitously in Québec ... evidence to the contrary notwithstanding. Sadly, rather than be guided by the facts, Ottawa and the RoC, of course, allowed themselves to be sucked in by political opportunists, by scoundrels!

Now consider the *absolute* anglo population trend in Section-A. Between 1901 and 1976, there was clearly no interruption in this upward trend. However, with the election of the *Parti Québécois* in 1976, the environment for anglos changed for the worse. Because of the PQ threat to secede from Canada, because of its restrictive and mean spirited language laws, and because of its generally hostile attitude toward business and anglos, anglos knew they were no longer welcome in Québec.

The subsequent anglo exodus produced the absolute population decline after 1976 shown in Section-A of Table 5: A decline of 12 percent between 1976 and 1981, 25 percent in the decade ending in 1986 (not shown). To put this level of ethnic cleansing into perspective, match it up against Hitler's early years (1933-1938) when 25 percent of Germany's Jews fled the Third Reich. Although I will not argue that the Québec exodus was in any way comparable to the pre-Holocaust cleansing of Jews from Germany, I ask you, what else can you conclude from these data but that anglos left Québec suddenly and in droves after 1976! Moreover, an elementary examination of the historical record will show that this exodus was not voluntary. In my view, an involuntary exodus is a working definition

Table 5: Historical Demographics, Québec

Census Year	A = Population, 000s			B = Population Share, %		
	Francos	Anglos	Allos	Francos	Anglos	Allos
2001	5,789	572	709	82	8	10
1991	5,745	617	532	83	9	8
1981	5,307	708	425	82	11	7
1976	4,989	801	444	80	13	7
1971	4,866	789	373	81	13	6
1961	4,270	697	292	81	13	6
1951	3,342	558	150	82	14	4
1941	2,717	469	146	82	14	4
1931	2,292	430	152	80	15	5
1921	1,889	357	115	80	15	5
1911	1,605	316	84	80	16	4
1901	1,322	290	37	80	18	2

Had they not been driven from Québec, anglos would have numbered about 930,000 in 2001, 63 percent higher than the 572,000 actually recorded in the Census of that year. Stated another way, the current anglo population is about 360,000 souls, or 39 percent below what it should be. Take particular note of those data.

Now, let's pretend, for the sake of argument, that the secessionist legislators who gave birth to the Charter of the French Language, had a good demographic forecaster who warned them of this anglo trend ... if not interrupted. That potential demographic, over 90 percent anti-secessionist, must have horrified them. Since a growing anglophone population would certainly frustrate their dream of creating an independent Québec, they had to do something. But what?

Their favourite demographer would have provided them with the answer. This theoretical anglophone population would have increased the anglo population share in 2001 from its actual 8 percent to a theoretical 12 percent. Since that would have concurrently caused the franco share to drop from 82 to 78 percent, the secessionists had their excuse for acting: Use the (potential) decline in francophone share to enact legislation whose officially intended effect would be to protect French, but whose known "unintended" side effect would be the ethnic cleansing from Québec of troublesome, anti-secessionist anglos.

Whether the Charter in fact flowed from this theoretical analysis or from pure anglophobia, I know

not. What I do know, however, is that they did indeed succeed in cleansing from Québec a very large number of anti-secessionist anglophones.

However, had Québec's legislators wished to stabilize the francophone population share without resorting to this ethnic cleansing, they could have done so. Consider the evidence.

The francophone population of Québec increased by 69 percent between 1911 and 1941; by 79 percent between 1941 and 1971; but by only 19 percent between 1971 and 2001. The higher growth rates in the first two 30-year periods coincided with the "fertile period" of Québec history when families were large. By the same token, the most recent period coincides almost exactly with the period when family size in Québec plummeted. In little more than one generation family size in Québec went from Canada's highest to its lowest. Therefore, the declining francophone population share had more to do with francophone bedroom behaviour than with the "reluctance" of allophones to become francophones. In fact, even if the conversion of allophones had succeeded, which it did not, the allophone population was too small to compensate for the very large drop in the *Québécois* birth rate. Consider the numbers.

Had the Québec birth rate declined by only 38 percent instead of the 76 percent suggested by these data, the French population would have reached 6,812,000 in 2001 instead of the 5,789,000 recorded in the Census. That would have maintained in 2001 the 1971 French share of 81 percent. But, since *Québécoises* decided that they had better things to do than produce children "for the glory of Québec," the francophone population share had to decline ... unless the political establishment found a way to remove a proportionate number of non-francophones from the

equation. And they did, the ethnic cleansing detailed above.

And, Québec's leaders were well aware of the consequences of a low birth rate. The promotion of the famous "revenge of the cradle" was the Church's contribution to improving the demographic position of French in Québec. In the 1980s, the Bourassa government tried—unsuccessfully—to address the issue by providing bonuses for larger families. In the early 1990s, Premier Bouchard bemoaned the fact that the birthrate in Québec had become the lowest "in the white world." So, faced with these facts, the various governments of Québec had two options. Given the decisions of *Québécoises* to reject the childbearing culture of their mothers and grandmothers, they could (a) have lived gracefully with the demographic consequences of this democratic choice, or (b) have chosen the ignoble path of ethnic cleansing described above. They chose the ignoble.

But what about Montréal where *Québécois* are in fact underrepresented, wail our nationalist friends? This is a really dishonest red herring. Since most anglos and allos live in Montreal, and most francos live outside the metropolis, francos must necessarily have a lower population share in Montreal. But what really agitated the nationalists was the fact that the relatively low Franco share in Montreal was also declining. Their solution? Arrest the decline by further restricting allophone access to English schools! Got that?

But, when you look at the facts, and perform a simple arithmetic manoeuvre, you find, *mirabile dictu*, that keeping immigrants out of English schools will not increase the francophone share of Montreal's population. The reason that there is a francophone-share problem in Montreal is because francophones from the

countryside have slowed their traditional migration into Montreal ... because better paying jobs are now available at home in the hinterland. And why is this so? Because *Québécois* nationalists destroyed Montreal's economy with their abusive language laws and their constant threat to secede from Canada! The obvious solution to the francophone-share problem in Montreal is, not to keep immigrants out of English schools, but to persuade more francophones in the countryside to move to Montreal ... by providing better economic opportunities for them in Montreal. However, since there is more political mileage in scapegoating immigrants, it is clear why the government of Québec is more interested in resorting to useless red herrings than in dealing with the real issue, the economy for which it alone is responsible.

*Summary: Although there is in fact evidence to support the notion that Québecois are indeed in demographic danger in Québec, there is no evidence to suggest that the threat derives from external sources. However, there is ample evidence to prove that it derives from infertile coupling in their own bedrooms as well as from destructive economic policies for which Québec itself is responsible. Hence, to pretend that ethnic cleansing and insulting fellow citizens are honorable alternatives to larger French families and proper economic policy is preposterous.*

*Thus, I would conclude: (1) that the proponents of Québec's language laws simply lied about the need for such legislation since there was no objective evidence to suggest that French was at risk from external sources, and (2) that the intent of Québec's language laws was not to protect French but to reduce the political influence of non-secessionist anglophones by driving them from Québec.*

*Sadly, that dishonorable intent seems to appeal to the majority in the Distinct Society, and to be condoned by so many bleeding hearts and politicians across Canada. And that is disgraceful!*

## SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

### The Clarity Act

When the Chrétien Liberals replaced the discredited Progressive Conservatives in 1993, the biggest problem facing them was the Québec referendum on secession in 1995. That was the referendum where Prime Minister Jean Chrétien agreed to *not* campaign for the federalist, pro-Canada forces. After all, the federalist option was riding high in the polls, and Chrétien was seen as an Uncle Tom in Québec. But, when Bloc leader Lucien Bouchard entered the fray, the federalist lead in the polls evaporated, and the secessionists came within a whisker of winning. However, the point to remember is not only that the secessionists almost won, but also that the fight was seen to be a family squabble that would be resolved among *Québécois in Québec*. Imagine that, active federal participation in a matter of national unity was considered illegitimate!

In any event, that near-death experience propelled Chrétien into action. To enact legislation that declared secession a treasonous act? Nay, that would have required a degree of political courage that has never afflicted politicians seeking votes in Québec. He, instead, asked the Supreme Court if Québec indeed had the legal right to secede unilaterally. In 1998, the Court declared that, although Québec did not have the constitutional right to secede unilaterally, the RoC would have to negotiate Québec's secession if Québec obtained a clear majority in a referendum on a clear question favouring secession. Since the court left it up to Ottawa to decide if the secessionist majority and referendum question were clear enough, it appeared to



give Ottawa an enormous advantage in this process. I would argue, on the other hand, that the advantage was more chimeric than real.

In 1999 Prime Minister Chrétien introduced the Clarity Act for parliamentary consideration. It mirrored the Supreme Court decision, and, as I recall, was opposed by (1) all Opposition Parties save the Canadian Alliance, and (2) all members of Chrétien's own Québec caucus save, initially, the Prime Minister and Stéphan Dion. Even Paul Martin, then Prime Minister-in-waiting, ran for cover and refused initially to even comment on the Act. Chrétien's Québec caucus was unimpressed by the overwhelming support for the Act in the RoC because it was terrified of offending Québec. Challenging the prevailing orthodoxy in Québec was not seen as a sound career move. After all, "every one knew" that Québec alone had the right to decide if its referendum question was legitimate, and if the results were sufficient to justify its secession. Here again, this reluctance to offend Québec is consistent with the historical political leverage enjoyed by that province. However, Chrétien eventually got his caucus onside, and the Act received final approval in 2000. Since the appeal of secession in Québec plunged shortly thereafter, some ascribe its decline to the effects of the Clarity Act. Maybe, maybe not.

Although I was initially an ardent supporter of the Clarity Act, I am no longer so sure. First, what other democratic country enshrines the right to secession in its Constitution? None! In fact, they all consider secession a treasonous act meriting appropriate punishment.

Second, although the Act sets out conditions that, for all practical purposes, appear to make it

impossible for Québec to secede legally, it nevertheless makes secession legally possible.

Third, I doubt if Ottawa has the political will (aka cojones) to “argue” with Québec about the status of the next referendum (and there will be one!) if Québec decides the results satisfy the Supreme Court conditions and hence permit it to initiate negotiations with the RoC.

Fourth, if, during these negotiations, Québec (1) accuses the RoC of negotiating in bad faith, and (2) claims that as justification for a legal unilateral secession, what then? Chaos, obviously!

Fifth, since businessmen have already shown their reluctance to invest in Canada (especially in Québec) because of the never-ending threat of another referendum, and since the Clarity Act allows this adverse business climate to continue, we can look forward to a continued dearth of job-creating business investment in Canada. Those who believe that the decline in our productivity, and the accompanying drop in our standard of living, were brought about by other than a decline in business investment, are obviously not very well informed.

Sixth, the factors that will someday permit Québec to legally secede unilaterally are already in place. Consider the facts.

In the 1995 referendum, about 5 percent of non-francophones and 60 percent of francophones in Québec voted for secession (non-francophones account for about 18 percent of the population of Québec). This produced the 49.9 percent secessionist vote in that referendum. Clearly, if non-francophones can be encouraged to continue their exodus from Québec, there will be fewer of them around in future referendums to dilute the expected majority francophone vote in favour

of secession. Thus, it is in the interests of *Québécois* secessionists to accentuate the policies that, in the past 40 years or so, have driven from Québec over 25-percent of its non-francophone population. Thus, since the proportion of francophones supporting secession is likely to increase, the secessionist option will necessarily carry the day in the future. The Clarity Act has simply postponed the inevitable, the legal and unilateral secession of Québec from Canada.

Had Chrétien been more interested in fixing this political and economic problem than in hiding it under the carpet like a time-bomb awaiting some future Prime Minister, he had two options. The first was to enact legislation forbidding secession; the second to initiate an Ottawa-directed referendum in Québec where Ottawa would decide the question and the margin required to legitimate secession. Where the first would have placed Canada in the international mainstream, the second would have been similar to the terms of the Clarity Act ... with one exception. Where the Clarity Act provides Québec with the long-term advantage and thus discourages business investment, the Ottawa-sponsored referendum would maintain long-term control in federal hands and hence encourage business investment. It would also allow Ottawa to choose the date of the referendum, like right now when secessionist fortunes are in retreat.

But, as mentioned previously, Chrétien had not the courage to impose either option on Québec, the province upon which his Party depends for electoral success.

*Summary: The Clarity Act makes it difficult, but not impossible, for Québec to legally secede unilaterally from Canada. Moreover, the elements are already in place that will permit Québec to do exactly that ...*

*some day. These elements include the continued elimination of non-secessionist voters from Québec's electoral rolls via the ethnic cleansing of non-francophones. In addition, since investors abhor political uncertainty, we can look forward to a continued dearth of job-creating business investment across Canada, but especially in Québec. As a result, our standard of living will continue to fall relative to that of our American cousins. Finally, it was clearly the fear of an adverse reaction from Québec voters that dissuaded Prime Minister Chrétien from taking the more stringent measures needed to deal secessionists a fatal blow. Here again, Québec's interests trumped Canada's.*

### **National Energy Program**

When it comes to petroleum, Québec was and is blessed because, with its deep-water ports open to international trade, it has ready access to oil from international markets. On the other hand, during the pre-1973 period when Québec benefited from low cost offshore oil, Ontario was required to use higher cost product from Alberta. As a result, Québec consumers enjoyed the lowest cost petroleum products in Canada ... until the OPEC shock of 1973 drove international oil prices through the roof. However, not all Canadians suffered from this shock.

Oil producers in western Canada, especially those in Alberta, were delighted. They quickly raised their prices to the higher international levels. Almost on cue, Québec and Ontario cried rape and demanded that the federal government protect them from these "Canadian and international gougers." Ever attentive to the call of the electorate, Trudeau brought in the

National Energy Program (NEP) to control oil prices from western Canada and subsidize oil imports into Eastern Canada, especially Québec. In other words, not only was Alberta deprived of higher oil prices, it was required to subsidize imports into the East! Not surprisingly, Alberta was outraged and claimed—quite correctly--that the West was being robbed to subsidize the East. However, Ottawa shrugged and proceeded to protect Ontario and Québec at the expense of Alberta.

I cannot imagine Ottawa shrugging if Québec instead of Alberta had been the oil producer. Moreover, quite apart from alienating the oil-producing West, the NEP also removed from the East any incentive to mend its oil-profligate ways.

*Summary: With the NEP, Ottawa in fact robbed the west to subsidize the east, especially Québec and Ontario. Had Québec instead of Alberta been the oil producer, a similar transfer of wealth to the RoC would have been unthinkable.*

## **Free Trade**

Remember when Prime Minister Mulroney was promoting free trade with the United States? When Québec was all in favour of free trade, and opinion in the RoC was split? Remember how *Québécois* politicians and their fellow-travelling media loved to contrast Québec's entrepreneurial spirit with the timidity of the RoC? When they promised that the vaunted Québec Inc. would show the RoC how to trade profitably with the Americans? Their vanity and boastfulness was awesome ... and a monumental fraud. There was nothing in the record, or in the structure of the Québec economy, to suggest that Québec was better placed than any other Canadian jurisdiction to do

business with the Americans. In fact, its vaunted Québec Inc., the “invincible” partnership between government and the private sector, produced little more than empty rhetoric. Let’s face it, Québec’s pro-free-trade stance was simply a political gesture intended to distinguish itself from the RoC, to demonstrate to its own electorate that Québec was indeed a Distinct Society deserving sovereign status.

Proof that trade was not in itself a major issue in *Québécois* nationalist thinking can be found in Québec’s traditional opposition to the notion of free inter-provincial trade in Canada. Although Québec was not alone in opposing freer inter-provincial trade, it was its major opponent. How often in the past several years have Ontarians been exposed to news items detailing how construction workers from Québec make a fine living working in Ontario while their Ontario counterparts are not permitted to work in Québec. Moreover, it seems to me that, every time Québec is threatened with some form of retaliation by Ontario, the government of Québec promises to rectify matters, but never does. Then Québec gets lucky. Ontario’s economy picks up, its out-of-work construction workers find jobs in Ontario, the need to retaliate against Québec evaporates, and the matter is dropped ... for another day.

Anyone needing other examples of Québec’s isolationism need only consult the newspaper of his/her choice.

*Summary: Québec’s support of international free trade is nothing more than meaningless posturing meant (1) to annoy the RoC where support for free trade is not monolithic, and (2) to appeal to its own electorate with a nationalistic boast which it cannot fulfill. If Québec felt so confident about its ability to compete with the*

*Americans, why does it continue to resist freer inter-provincial trade in Canada? Because Québec sees no political advantage in cooperating with the RoC ... on anything.*

## **Bombardier**

Bombardier was (is?) a Québec success story. Starting as the inventor and manufacturer of the Skidoo snowmobile, it became a major manufacturer and exporter of a whole range of transportation equipment such as, trains, locomotives and aircraft. Because Bombardier had the “good fortune” to buy troubled Canadair when it did (see CF-18 Contract), it was rewarded almost immediately with a higher stock price. That said, I am not alleging that Bombardier had been forewarned of the imminent awarding of the CF-18 contract to Canadair. That would have been the equivalent of illegal insider trading. All I am saying is that Bombardier suffered a fortuitous stroke of good luck in this particular case.

Moreover, anyone at all attuned to the news of the day cannot be unaware of the fact that Bombardier has benefited considerably from federal government largesse over the past few decades. This was particularly evident in the subsidies that supported Bombardier’s venture into the export market. As result, its Challenger jets, subway cars, locomotives and other railway rolling stock are now seen around the world. Subsidies to provide jobs in Québec.

Although those who argue that the same subsidies would have been required to support a similar manufacturer in, say, Saskatoon, have a point, they surely would not argue that Ottawa’s interventions

would have been as egregious. I doubt very much, for instance, that Prime Minister Chrétien would have so cavalierly ordered the expenditure of \$100 million on unnecessary Challenger built in Saskatoon! Since there was no political reason for him to do so, he would not have done it. Period. Full stop!

*Summary: Given a choice, Ottawa's subsidies will be awarded first to firms in Québec, firms such as Bombardier.*

### **Air Traffic Safety**

Remember when English was the universal language of air traffic controllers in Canada? That was before French was forced into the federal air traffic system in the late-1970s by the government of Québec. The Québec media referred to the furor surrounding this episode as “l'affaire des gens de l'air.”

Let me remind the reader that English is the official worldwide language in use between air traffic controllers and pilots of international flights. Thus, a Chinese aircraft approaching Paris will deal with the French controllers in English. Although some of these conversations are probably tortured at times, experience shows that it is much safer communicating this way than to expect a French controller to communicate in Mandarin ... and in every other language spoken by international pilots landing in France. In the same fashion, it is also more reasonable to expect Chinese pilots, for instance, to speak only one foreign language, English, than have them learn the language of every country into which they fly. Moreover, other pilots flying in the vicinity of any such conversation can listen in and determine if they can safely ignore it, or take



action based on the overheard conversation. The system lumbers, but it works.

However, when the government of Québec objected to the pilots of its planes having to speak English to controllers in Québec, French was permitted for local traffic, thereby compromising air traffic safety. As a result, air traffic controllers in Québec would continue to provide direction in English for international flights, and in French for local traffic demanding it. Thus, an American flying a small Piper Cub in Québec air space would receive directions in English. However, if a local pilot was warning air traffic control in French that that small Piper Cub was in the path of a Jumbo Jet, the unilingual-anglophone American pilot wouldn't be able to avoid disaster because the translated warning would be too late getting to him. Moreover, *Québécois* pilots who crossed the border into Vermont, for instance, would have to revert to English, the official language for international air traffic control.

So, let's summarize. Despite having air traffic control services available in French in Québec, *Québécois* pilots still have to be able to handle the same services in English. All that happened was that safety in the air was compromised in Québec for purely symbolic reasons.

And, how long do you think it will be before the federal government succumbs to pressure from Québec to provide these unnecessary French-language services at all airports across Canada?

*Summary: Air safety has been compromised in Québec, and potentially across Canada, to provide services that are neither necessary nor useful, ... all to satisfy nationalist egos in Québec.*



## OTHER EVIDENCE

### Electricity

The distribution of electricity represents a threat to our national well being that lurks just below the surface of our consciousness. Some background.

In the 1960s, Newfoundland faced a bitter choice: Close down its Churchill Falls hydro-electric plant, or sell its output at bargain basement prices to Hydro Québec. Since Hydro Québec then resold this power into the adjacent American market, which was desperate for power at any price, it made a lot of money on the deal. In fact, if you strip from its balance sheet the profit realized from the Churchill Falls deal, you will find that Hydro Québec's financial statement doesn't look very good ... and never did. That said, it is nevertheless an article of faith among *Québécois* that Hydro Québec is a *huge* economic success, contrary evidence notwithstanding. It is only in recent years that *Québécois* journalists have mustered the courage to question the performance of this sacred cow. But that is a story for another day.

And, why couldn't Newfoundland sell its surplus power directly into the American market? Because Québec would not allow it to transport the power to the Americans "over Québec roads!" And why did Ottawa not intervene to "convince" Québec to allow Newfoundland transit-access to its power distribution grid? Because it did not and still does not have the political will to do so.

Furthermore, why wasn't Hydro Québec part of a national or international electricity distribution

grid? Because (1) its frequent blackouts made it an unreliable participant, and (2) it was not in the interests of secessionist Québec to rely in any way on foreign suppliers of electricity, which of course, includes Ontario.

And, why didn't Ottawa "encourage" Québec to upgrade its electrical distribution system and thus make it attractive to neighbouring grids in Ontario and the United States? Because it did not have the cojones to suggest that Québec's sacred cow wasn't measuring up to modern standards.

Had Québec and Newfoundland been part of a cooperative electrical distribution grid, Newfoundland could have sold its power directly to the Americans. In fact, it could have sold it to almost any American state since those states in the American northeast and midwest are all on one interconnected grid. The individual American states do this because grids provide low cost and generally reliable electricity. But that type of interdependence certainly did not suit secessionist-minded Québec. So we have a situation where Ontario works cooperatively with an American grid but not with Québec.

Imagine for a moment if Québec needed to transport electricity through Ontario to, say, Michigan. Can you imagine Ottawa standing aside as Ontario told Québec to take a hike or come across with a bargain basement price? Not a chance! What I can imagine is Québec crying rape and threatening, once again, to secede, Ottawa putting pressure on Ontario to "be reasonable, etc." There would be hell to pay. But then, Québec has considerable political clout and Newfoundland has little.

*Summary: Québec's refusal to allow Newfoundland reasonable transit-access to the Québec transmission*

*grid prevented Newfoundland from exporting power directly to non-contiguous jurisdictions such as other provinces or the United States. Thus, instead of getting a decent price from the Americans for its electricity, it had to settle for a much lower offer from Hydro Québec ... which turned around and sold the same power at higher prices to Americans! This necessarily impeded Newfoundland's economic development. Moreover, as long as Québec holds land-locked Newfoundland to ransom, economic development in that Atlantic province will continue to be constrained. Moreover, the absence of a national, or at least regional grid will inevitably produce higher-than-necessary electricity prices for all Canadians.*

*Finally, in the event of a grid failure in Ontario, for instance, Ontarians will have the pleasure of suffering alone because Québec chose to remain aloof from a mutually beneficial cooperative venture ... because that venture might be seen as a constraint on its "independence." On the other hand, Québec will accept, nay demand, its annual equalization tribute (a total of about \$5 billions) from these same Ontarians. About which more later.*

## **Kyoto**

It is now accepted orthodoxy that the earth's atmosphere will resemble a sewer unless we reduce the level of greenhouse gases produced by the burning of fossil fuels. The Kyoto Accord is an attempt by international Chicken Littles to reduce the world-wide consumption of fossil fuels. Countries such as the United States and Russia have respectively declined to sign on to the Kyoto timetable. Although the Parliament of Canada has ratified Canada's participation, there is lack of regional unanimity. Québec, which depends

largely on clean, hydro-generated electricity, is a Kyoto booster. Alberta, on the other hand, whose economy relies heavily on the production of fossil fuels, sees Kyoto as a major threat to its economic well-being.

*Summary: Because Kyoto makes few demands on Québec, it is an ardent supporter of that international accord ... despite the fact that Kyoto may wreck economic havoc on other provinces. Clearly, Ottawa's decision to ratify Kyoto reflects Québec's interests, not those of the RoC.*

## **Gun Registry**

Remember the Montreal Massacre? Wasn't it in 1989 when a seriously disturbed young man entered École Polytechnique in Montreal, shot and killed fourteen female engineering students, and then turned his rifle on himself? The details, so vivid then, fade from memory. However, still with us is one unfortunate legacy of that atrocity, federal long-gun (rifle) registry legislation.

So unpopular is that legislation that seven provinces and two territories have announced that they will refuse to prosecute those who do not register their weapons. So, why was such unpopular legislation enacted to begin with?

First of all, the massacre was so awful that it dominated media attention for weeks. I can still see vividly the TV shot of one victim slumped over a cafeteria chair. The media coverage was compelling. So also were the demands of the families of the victims for some type of gun control legislation. The *Québécois* media backed the families, and kept the pressure on

Ottawa. As a result, Ottawa finally came up with the controversial Gun Registry Law.

Even though certainly political incorrect, many commentators have pointed out that this Registry would not have kept the murder weapon out of the hands of the Polytechnique gunman. Nor would it prevent anyone from stealing a registered weapon to commit a crime. Nor would it provide the authorities with any more information that isn't already available in other federal control systems. Nor would it address the problem of handguns, the weapons responsible for most crimes of violence. So, why did they proceed with a Gun Registry that would not fulfill the objectives set out for it?

First, because of pressure from Québec, and second, because it wasn't expensive to develop, only \$2 million. Well, its estimated development cost in 2002 was \$1 billion (500-times the original estimate). According to Radio Canada, the development cost is now (2004) estimated to be about \$2-billion (1,000-times the original estimate)! Moreover, seven provinces and two Territories have declared that they will not prosecute those charged under this law. Their concern arises from the fact that this law could very well convert law-abiding hunters and farmers into criminals.

*Summary: To satisfy pressure from Québec, Ottawa has foisted on all of Canada a Gun Registry Law that: (a) will not keep guns out of the hands of criminals, (b) will likely cost about \$2-billion to develop, 1,000-times its original estimate, (c) is very unpopular in Western Canada and the North, and (d) has been rejected by nine provincial and Territorial attorneys-general, the people who are supposed to prosecute people who*

*violate federal laws. Another useless and expensive mess imposed on the RoC to mollify Québec!*

## **Health Care**

According to Canada's cultural nationalists, our universal, publicly funded health care system makes Canada unique and particularly blessed throughout the world. All kidding aside, among the system's many favourable attributes is the provision of medical services at no fee anywhere in Canada. That is, if you are from Newfoundland and get sick in Alberta, you present your Newfoundland medical card in Alberta and that is the end of it. Alberta bills Newfoundland at the Alberta rate and Newfoundland pays the bill. The patient is not inconvenienced.

Except if you are from Québec.

I first came upon the Québec anomaly a few years ago when my sister, a Montréal resident, had to consult a doctor in Ottawa. To her astonishment, the doctor refused her Québec medical card, and instead demanded payment in cash. Why? Because Québec, unlike other provinces, refuses to pay the normally higher rate in effect in the province providing the service. For example, where Ontario pays its hospitals in Ottawa \$1,100 a day for general services rendered, Québec pays its hospital across the river in Gatineau, Québec \$450 for the same service.

The difference, about \$650 per day, is either absorbed by the hospital or doctor providing the service, or is passed on to the patient. In my sister's case, she had to pay. Although her financial discomfort was relatively minor, it wasn't painless for the 500-or-so Gatineau residents who were treated in 2002 at The



Ottawa General Hospital ... because the services were not available at the Gatineau hospital. Since Québec refuses to honour its obligations under the Canada Health Act, and since Ottawa refuses to enforce the Act, these unfortunate Québécois were liable for the extra charges of about \$2,000,000, or \$4,000 per patient. Equally liable are the 5,000 or so Québécois from Gatineau who chose to be treated in Ottawa because the equivalent services offered in Gatineau were considered inadequate.

*Summary: The mobility of Québécois is severely restricted (1) because Québec refuses to meet its obligations under the Canada Health Act, and (2) because Ottawa has not the political will to require Québec to honour its obligations.*

## **Religiosity**

It seems to me that modern societies should ideally be driven by a reasonable balance of religiosity and critical thought. That is, where the first provides society's basic moral tone, the second ensures that Caesar's work gets done without undue meddling from the ayatollas. Unfortunately, I am at a loss to name any societies where this ideal balance obtains perfectly. For example, most western societies are driven by an absence of one or the other. In no cases am I aware of any where critical thought rules the roost. In a few cases, the first is dominant. Included in this latter group are most Islamic societies today ... and Québec before the Quiet Revolution of the 1960s.

Before the early 1960s, the Catholic Church effectively ran Québec, and in the process provided it with a moral tone that was clear and unambiguous. Totalitarian and

wrong-headed, perhaps, but clear and unambiguous nevertheless. For example, some bishops claimed that your time was better spent memorizing catechism than the multiplication tables. In addition, abortion and divorce were simply forbidden; and so on. And, since Canadian politics were driven by Québec imperatives, one must conclude that the Catholic Church necessarily played a strategic role in setting Canada's moral tone. For a more extensive review of the Church's contribution to the social, political and economic life of Québec, you should consult my book entitled: *The Québécois Élite: Patriots or Scoundrels?* You can read it at no cost on my website [www.rsauve.com](http://www.rsauve.com).

But times have changed. The Church no longer exercises much social or political influence in Québec ... or the RoC. The Church's clear and unambiguous moral tone has been replaced by a moral vacuum into which scoundrels and nihilists have rushed; what once was forbidden is now a matter of amoral choice and fashion. There is not much doubt that, if the Church was still top dog in Québec, Canada would still have an anti-abortion law; the use of contraceptives, even if legal, would not be encouraged; Sunday shopping would likely still be illegal; divorce would still be very difficult to obtain; the notion of same-sex marriage would be unthinkable; and so on.

Although some would applaud this previous state of affairs, others would be appalled. However, though these changes in public policy may have derived from the decline in the Church's influence, they may also have reflected other political and social imperatives. Who knows?

*Summary: Because the Catholic Church once dominated the moral, social, political and legal mosaic in Québec, it necessarily had a related effect on the RoC. However, now that the Church no longer*

*exercises any significant leadership in Québec, the influence of traditional Judeo-Christian values in the Roc has also waned. Whether Québec should be praised, or blamed for this change is open to debate. Reader's choice.*

## **Abortion**

At one time not so long ago, abortion was illegal in Canada. In those days, any person helping a woman terminate her pregnancy before term was called an abortionist, scum, a contemptible murderer. But, after several juries in Québec refused (in the 1980s?) to convict Dr. Henry Morgentaler, an admitted abortionist, Ottawa had no choice but to scrap its anti-abortion law. Doctors, who once were called murderers of unborn children, became known as providers of legal and respectable abortion services. Today, Canada is bereft of anti-abortion legislation because of the refusal of Québec juries to convict people charged under that legislation. Whether juries in other provinces would have behaved as they did in Québec is arguable.

Had Morgentaler been charged in the 1950s, he would have been convicted in a minute by any number of juries in Québec. But that was when the Catholic Church was riding high, when everyone was guided in moral (abortion) and political (elections) matters by the dictates of the Church.

I recommend in passing that we all offer a small prayer of thanks to the Almighty now that the Church no longer has much say in the selection of our members of parliament. It is bad enough that so many of Canada's national policies are Québec-centred, just imagine if these policies were also Church-centred! Horrors! But I digress.

Times have changed ... for good or ill, depending on your point of view. Since the influence of the Church in Québec is virtually non-existent today, abortion is no longer viewed with horror. As a result, it was an easy step for juries to refuse to convict where they once convicted without question.

*Summary: Whether we celebrate or regret it, Canada no longer has a law prohibiting abortion because Québec juries would not convict an admitted abortionist.*

### **Same-Sex Marriage**

Since the Superior Courts in Ontario and British Columbia ruled that marriage is a legal status that must be extended to same-sex (homosexual) couples, their rulings became the law of the land ... unless, of course, they are overturned by the Supreme Court of Canada, or nullified by the government of Canada's use of the constitutional notwithstanding clause. However, since the government of Québec used that constitutional provision to override challenges to its odious sign law (see Language Legislation: Québec), politicians outside Québec, including Prime Minister Chrétien, have not been keen to use it. Hence, the Prime Minister had two options: (1) he could do nothing and allow these court decisions to override the current law that defines marriage as a legal union between a man and a woman, or (2) he could appeal their judgments to the Supreme Court of Canada in the hope of overturning them.

Well, Chrétien, being Chrétien, did neither. He decided instead to submit to Parliament legislation reflecting these lower court decisions. That Chrétien's legislation was clearly unnecessary should be obvious to even the most obtuse: Judicial decisions do not require legislated

confirmation! Alors, unless overturned as described above, the law is what the courts say it is, and the courts have spoken!

But, undeterred by this legal detail, the mischievous Chrétien, has asked the Supreme Court of Canada to rule on its constitutionality. The brazenness of the man is breathtaking! What if the Supreme Court refuses to review his proposed legislation because it adds nothing to what the courts have already decided? What then? In any event, the Court is not likely to consider Chrétien's request until after he retires in December 2003. It will then be up to his successor, Paul Martin, to pick up the pieces and sort out the mess ... and it will be a mess!

If Chrétien had done nothing, he would have avoided having to fend off charges of hypocrisy. Although he now says allowing homosexuals to adopt this heterosexual symbol is a matter of human rights, this noble sentiment did not concern him in 1999 when Parliament confirmed (216-55) the millennia-old notion that marriage was the union of a man and a woman! Had he chosen then to legislate an appropriate but different status for same-sex unions, the courts might very well have gone along with it. However, Chrétien's political cowardice foreclosed that option.

I would argue that Chrétien chose the path described above for the following reasons. First, by legislating to confirm a court decision, he shifted the blame for this controversial legislation onto the courts. Second, this approach would certainly cause his successor, Paul Martin, no end of grief ... and having to deal with charges of hypocrisy was a small price to pay for this "gift" to Mr. Martin! Third, the grief visited upon Paul Martin would not harm the Liberal Party because Québec was onside.

In an opinion poll conducted in early September 2003, 60 percent of respondents in Québec approved of same-sex marriages, as did 51 percent in British Columbia, but less than 45 percent in every other province. Thus, the majority of the RoC disapproved of same-sex marriages while the majority in Québec approved. And, as Chantelle Hébert concluded very smugly on the CBC National News, the few seats the Liberals may lose in Ontario over this issue will be more than made up in Québec!

This political fact of life was confirmed in September 2003 when Parliament was called upon by the Official Opposition to reconfirm its 1999 vote to declare marriage a heterosexual institution. Since then, however, the judicial events described above had intervened. Thus, with Chrétien leading the pack, Parliament reversed itself and defeated the Opposition motion 137-132 with 30 abstentions. Thus, 82 percent of Québec's MPs who voted to reject the motion overrode the 58 percent of MPs in the RoC who supported the motion. Québec trumps the RoC every time!

By the way, if the abstainers had voted instead of hiding, they would almost certainly have voted to support the motion. Thus, instead of being defeated 137 to 132, the motion would have been approved by 162 to 137. And what a mess that would have created! It would have reinstated a law that the Courts had already declared unconstitutional! I suppose that one reason Chrétien did not ensure passage of the motion was that it would have created a problem that he would have had to deal with. Had it been possible to make this a post-retirement gift to Paul Martin, be assured he would have done so.

*Summary: Like it or not, same-sex marriage is the law of the land because: (a) Prime Minister Chrétien refused to legislate an alternative status for same-sex unions before the courts were forced to act, and (b) because the majority of voters in Québec favor it, notwithstanding majority opposition to it in the RoC.*

## **Chicken Little**

Chicken Little is the cartoon character who sees disaster around every corner. If joy reigned, she would wail that things should be better; a minor inconvenience would be seen as proof that the sky was falling. Not surprisingly, *Québécois* nationalists, the people who perfected the notion of their victimhood, are stereotypical Chicken Littles. In this role, they range from the hilarious to the disreputable. Consider a few examples.

In the late-1970s (or thereabout), a French-language documentary (financed no doubt by Ottawa's Canada Council) dealt with the notion then hysterically popular among Québec's chattering classes, the "fragile" status of French. It was entitled "Disparaître" and starred anglophone sociologist Gary Caldwell and former PQ cabinet minister Lise Payette. Its theme was the imminent disappearance of French in Québec if language laws were not enacted to protect it. The unctuous Ms. Payette played the foil to her earnest colleague as he set out the sociological and demographic justifications for Québec's language laws. Unfortunately, the facts did not, and still do not, support their ridiculous thesis. Nevertheless, "Disparaître" was, as I recall, treated at the time with great reverence by the *Québécois* media. On the other hand, it was so obviously just one more preposterous exaggeration in

the pantheon of linguistic whoppers that I would have thought that the allegedly high-minded *Québécois* media would not have been taken in by such obvious baloney. But they were ... because they wanted to believe it, of course. Makes you want to laugh or cry, doesn't it! Try laughing ... scornfully.

Now, fast-forward to 2004 when the ghost of "Disparaître" re-appeared, this time in a report prepared for the *Commission scolaire de Montréal*. by PQ activist Robert Cadotte. To make a long story short, M. Cadotte found that francophone teenagers in Montréal were much more interested in anglophone American entertainers and their music than in the home-grown francophone variety. His conclusion? Unless the school board did something to make *Québécois* entertainers more popular, "The risk of seeing the French language and culture disappear within 50 years is real." Cadotte's naivety is breathtaking! How in the world can a school board be expected to prevent its students from watching American television or from playing American music? Much better if it spent more time teaching its students proper French!

In December 2003, Paul Martin's new cabinet was sworn in with two unilingual anglophones from Western Canada in the top two positions. Most media dealt, as you might expect, with the ability of each to fulfill the functions assigned to them. But not Québec's media. They were aghast that neither could speak French! Bilingual mediocrities, on the other hand, would have been quite acceptable to them. These two politicians will now spend time they cannot spare learning a few words of French that they will never use. Such is the influence of the Distinct Society!

How often have we read about other Chicken Littles whining about trivial matters? Remember when one perfectly bilingual jerk complained to the



Commissioner of Official Languages that he was not served in French when he ordered a Seven Up on an Air Canada flight? Or when someone had to wait for service in French at the Saskatoon office (or was it Calgary?) of Revenue Canada? And on and on! Doing the best you can will never satisfy these Chicken Littles. They insist on perfection, which is neither possible nor reasonable.

But, Chicken Little stooped to new lows in Ottawa during the dispute over the closing of Hôpital Montfort (see below). Instead of dealing objectively with the issue, Ottawa's francophone leaders resorted to misinformation and "race." According to this lot, the decision by the government of Ontario to close this hospital had little to do with objective criteria, but more with the government's historic insensitivity toward Franco-Ontarians. If the rest of the RoC has not yet been blessed with this sort of blackmail, get ready for it. Unless the francophone leaders in your community show more class than in Ottawa, you will probably be similarly blessed some day.

*Summary: Québécois nationalists will flirt with social ridicule to advance their linguistic cum secessionist agendas. With the film "Disparaître" in the 1970s, and its sequel in 2004, they preserved for all time the proof of how far this flirtation with ridicule will go. Moreover, no matter how hard you try to provide service in French across Canada, it will never be good enough for these Chicken Littles because it isn't perfect. Others will play the "race" card when logic fails them. Those Chicken Littles we can do without.*

## **Québec's Foreign Legations**

Even though many provinces have trade-promotion offices in foreign lands, they pale in comparison to Québec. Moreover, since Québec's legations are more political than commercial, they are in effect embassies that promote Québec, not as a province of Canada, but as a sovereign country. And, as noted elsewhere, this pretentious enterprise is funded at the expense of over-taxed Québécois. See "Equalization Payments" for more detail.

*Summary: Québec's foreign legations promote Québec as a sovereign country and are funded by equalization payments from Ottawa and the RoC, as well as by excessive taxes levied on the taxpayers of Québec. As a result, services such as health, education and housing are starved of legitimate support in the Distinct Society.*

### **Prime Ministers From Québec**

During its first 81 years (1867-1948), Canada had only one prime minister from Québec, Sir Wilfrid Laurier at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. However, in the next 55 years there were six: St. Laurent, Trudeau, Turner, Mulroney, Chrétien and Martin. In the same period, the RoC came up with four: Diefenbaker, Pearson, Clarke and Campbell, all from different provinces. One obvious conclusion leaps from these data: The RoC dominated before 1945, and Québec ever since. In other words, Québec, with less than 25 percent of Canada's population, has supplied 6 of the last 10 prime ministers, 5 of the last 7. And, based on current political imperatives, this Québec dominance is not likely to decline any time soon ... if ever.

If you were to claim that Québec had little influence in national affairs in the first period, you would be making a strong argument. In fact, apart from the conscription crises in 1914-18 and 1939-45, I cannot offhand recall when Québec's voice was either heard or heeded. I will, however, bow to superior wisdom on this matter.

Since 1948, on the other hand, Québec's voice has been heard and heeded ... *ad nauseam*. The paeans to Québec described in the balance of this polemic attest to that. Here, however, I will deal with strategic contributions to this change of each of the last six prime ministers from Québec.

According to my informants, Louis St. Laurent's contribution to this change was negligible. Not so, however, with Pierre Elliot Trudeau who was responsible for introducing "French Power" to Ottawa and federal politics. His strategy was to blunt the appeal of *Québécois* separatists by opening up all of Canada to francophones. As shown elsewhere, Trudeau's francization programs appeared to succeed ... unfortunately, often by alienating much of the RoC.

Trudeau's successor, John Turner, wasn't in office long enough to even be noticed. Brian Mulroney ate him alive during the 1984 election campaign.

While Trudeau's strategy was to open up all of Canada to francophones, Mulroney's was to sell his soul, and put the country at risk, by courting the secessionist vote in Québec. He legitimized these scoundrels by bringing them into his government, into his Cabinet, where they pursued their secessionist agenda with impunity. As shown earlier, Mulroney's deal with the devil backfired when his secessionist protégés showed their gratitude by abandoning him to form the secessionist Bloc Québécois. The Canadian

electorate finished the job in 1993 when they reduced the once mighty Progressive Conservatives to two lonely seats in the House of Commons.

Enter Jean Chrétien, arguably Canada's worst (or unarguably its most embarrassing) Prime Minister. He came within a whisker of losing the country in the Québec referendum of 1995. His reaction to that near-death experience was to effectively sweep it under the carpet with the Clarity Act (see Clarity Act). Although better than the alternative, which was to allow Québec to set the terms and conditions of the next referendum, the Act was simply not good enough. In other areas he introduced a level of mean-spirited hubris, corruption and Québec-centred bias that took your breath away. Apart from the examples described in the balance of this polemic, six examples of his mean-spiritedness come to mind.

First, when Conrad Black was offered a British title, Chrétien vetoed it, claiming that Canadian law forbade Canadian citizens from accepting such honours. The fact that the same law was not applied to other Canadians accepting similar honours from France did not appear hypocritical or embarrassing to Mr. Chrétien. The man has no shame.

Second, when the Liberals took over from the disgraced Progressive Conservatives in 1993, Chrétien's first (or second?) act was to cancel a contract for desperately needed military helicopters ... because, said he, they were too expensive ... but really because the contract had been let by Brian Mulroney. This spiteful cancellation cost the taxpayers of Canada some \$500 million in penalties. For the next ten years, Chrétien attempted, without success, to find a suitable replacement, during which time the lives of Canadian helicopter pilots and their passengers were put at

considerable risk. In fact, several helicopters did indeed crash with loss of life. For about the last two years of his reign, Chrétien was fighting desperately to avoid having to approve the purchase of the same helicopter he had rejected ten years earlier! He succeeded. When he retired in December 2003, the issue was still unresolved.

Third, Chrétien's second (or first?) act in 1993 was to cancel another contract let by Mulroney, one having to do with refurbishing Toronto's Pearson International Airport ... again for the same reasons cited above. This cancellation cost another \$500 million in cancellation penalties. Satisfying Chrétien's monumental ego is obviously not without considerable cost to the taxpayer.

Fourth, Chrétien called an election he could not lose in 2000 (a disorganized opposition guaranteed a Liberal victory), only three years into his five-year mandate, not because he had an issue that required the attention of the electorate, but simply because he wanted to frustrate the will his party ... which wanted him to step down in favour of Paul Martin. The man's ego is awesome.

Fifth, when Herb Gray announced his retirement from politics, everyone expected him to leave on the occasion of his 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary in Parliament. A life-long Liberal, he had served in the cabinets of Trudeau, Turner and Chrétien. Although he served without much distinction, he was nevertheless seen as an honest man and a loyal Liberal. He did, however, enjoy distinction in two areas. The first was his love of Rock and Roll; the second his ability in Question Period to smother a bothersome question with his famous fog. It is said that some members of the Opposition asked him a question simply to see this master evader at work.

Well, Chrétien wasn't about to let anyone usurp his own objective: To be the first member of Parliament to retire with 40 years of service. So, just before Gray's 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary, Chrétien appointed him to a plum patronage position. Although Herb Gray, a loyal Liberal, accepted meekly, most observers acknowledged that Chrétien had indeed acted like a mean-spirited, ignorant jerk.

Sixth, during the 1993 election campaign, Chrétien promised to appoint an ethics commissioner who would report to Parliament. This was his way of dealing with the "untrammled" corruption of the preceding Mulroney regime. Well, he did appoint an ethics commissioner ... who reported, not to Parliament, but to him. Moreover, it was revealed after Chrétien retired that he, Chrétien, vetted every report prepared by the Commissioner before it was submitted officially to him, the Prime Minister. This was Prime Ministerial arrogance bordering on contempt ... for all Canadians.

Although Chrétien did arguably abuse the power of his office, he nevertheless did it legally. How? First, the Canadian parliamentary system unfortunately provides the party in power, especially the office of the Prime Minister, with near-dictatorial power; second, since Canada has become a one-party state with the Liberals becoming Canada's natural governing party. (See *Canada: A One Party State*); this dictatorial power has become vested (permanently?) in the Liberal Party; third, any prime minister willing to take unfair advantage of these dictatorial powers can do so ... if he has no shame. And Jean Chrétien is certainly shameless. Many of the abuses cited here originated with this mean-spirited, arrogant mediocrity.

Since Paul Martin has not yet assumed the reins of power (three weeks still to go), we can only speculate about his contribution to this pantheon. However, based on his past positions, one has the impression that his attitude toward Québec mirrors Mulroney's. I hope he won't go so far as Mulroney by selling us out for a few secessionist votes in Québec.

*Summary: From Trudeau on, Canada's prime ministers from Québec, irrespective of party affiliation or language, have pursued a Québec-first policy. Moreover, Mulroney and Chrétien put Canada at considerable political risk in the process, the former by design, the latter by arrogant incompetence and political indifference.*

## **Montfort**

Hôpital Montfort was built by Ottawa's francophone community to satisfy its special needs within anglophone-dominated Ottawa. Because of this historical symbolism, I have argued, and still do, that the government of Ontario should not have ordered it closed. To be sure, it was not the only hospital whose closure was ordered in a consolidation of Ottawa's hospital network. That said, however, it does not justify the disgraceful opposition to the closing fomented by Ottawa's francophone leaders.

They started off by calling attention to "one more example of insensitivity by the government of Ontario toward francophones," or words to that effect. It was the same old poor-me refrain so popular among "oppressed" people. The fact that the charge had no basis in fact cut no ice with these stalwarts. They intended to shame (aka blackmail) the government of Ontario into caving in to its "just demands." Failing

that, there was always the federal government, which loved to intervene outside its jurisdiction in matters of real or imagined concern to *francophones hors Québec*.

Although the government of Ontario decided to maintain the status quo, the feds did muscle in. Undaunted by constitutional niceties, Prime Minister Chrétien and his Québec caucus brought pressure to bear on the government of Ontario. So did the Commissioner of Official Languages who also had no jurisdiction in the matter. In any event, Montfort is not only still open, it is preparing to expand its physical plant to accommodate the needs of the Department of National Defense ... which is closing its old military hospital to move to Montfort. Connections!

Federal intervention in the Montfort file must be contrasted with federal indifference when Québec closed the anglophone, Lakeshore General Hospital in Montréal. What explains the difference? Political arrogance in one case and cowardice in the other? Bingo!

While Montfort's supporters were playing the "poor us" game, they were ascribing to Montfort a status and mission it simply did not possess. For instance, they claimed that Montfort, a nice little hospital, was actually a teaching hospital, the "only one available to Ontario francophones." Nonsense! Montfort could not have been a teaching hospital since it is unable, for instance, to handle other than routine maternity cases. Moreover, teaching hospitals are not described routinely by doctors as operating in "sub-optimum conditions." Finally, francophone medical students have always been trained at the bilingual General Campus of the Ottawa Hospital, not at Montfort. Therefore, to claim that Montfort is a teaching hospital for francophones is disingenuous and an obvious crock. Moreover, I would make a small



wager that the General Campus of the Ottawa Hospital is more francophone than Montfort.

Also, when Montfort's promoters insist that it provides essential services for francophones, they are really out to lunch. The facts suggest that most francophones in Ottawa receive hospital services, not at Montfort, but at the bilingual General Campus and other "anglophone" hospitals in the area. Montfort's promoters have tellingly avoided providing statistical evidence to sustain their claims. Wonder why?

It would also appear that many of Montfort's patients are residents of Québec. Since that province has a well developed network of hospitals, Québécois really do not need to seek hospital services in Ontario. That they do, however, is an obvious benefit to marginal hospitals like Montfort. That very practical matter may explain why Ottawa's francophone establishment soft-peddles this issue. Quite clearly, without this Québec patronage, Montfort's patient load may be too small to sustain it.

*Summary: Ottawa's francophone establishment used the race card, exaggeration and misinformation to prevent the closure of the marginal Hôpital Montfort. Although there may have been some political merit in keeping that hospital open, the process followed by Ottawa's francophone leaders produced linguistic stress that we could have done without. But, to paraphrase Samuel Johnson, in the absence of a sound argument, the use of the race card, though disgraceful, can nevertheless be very effective.*

*In addition, the federal government disgraced itself by intervening on Montfort's behalf while it almost concurrently chose not to protest when the government of Québec decided to close an anglophone*

*hospital in Montréal. In Canada, some human rights are obviously more deserving of respect than others.*

## **Québécois Culture**

Remember when Premier Lucien Bouchard announced solemnly that the RoC was a cultural wasteland compared to culturally superior Québec? Although clearly a gratuitous insult, a tasteless political comment of no other significance, something that should have been dismissed out of hand with the contempt it deserved, I often wondered what element of *Québécois* culture made this ignoramus so proud.

It could not have been the relatively poor scholastic record of Québécois; or Québec's pitiful network of public libraries; or its niggardly record in charitable donations; or the absence in Québec of anything resembling the culturally advanced Shaw and Stratford theatre festivals in Ontario.

Perhaps he was referring to the annual rodeo in St. Thecle that celebrates Québec's cowboy history (yes, cowboy!); or to the various balloon and fireworks festivals that invade Québec every summer; or to the annual comedy and jazz festivals that showcase American entertainers; or to Formula something-or-other car races; or to other similar events, all of which must be bailed out with government subsidies because *Québécois* are unable or unwilling to support them financially.

Or, he may have been thinking of the *Québécois* love affair with French TV, specifically with programming produced in Québec that deals with Québec-related subjects. *Québécois* love to watch French-language TV programs that tell them about themselves ... just as they loved to listen to related radio programs in the past. As I recall, they tended to be

conventional soap operas. To be fair, *Québécois* do indeed outstrip the RoC in their fidelity to home-grown TV. The CRTC (Canadian Radio and Television Commission) reported recently (December 2003) that close to 50 percent of *Québécois* watch TV produced in Québec. Contrast that with the mere 10-percent or so of non-francophone Canadians who patronize Canadian-produced programs. Thus, while *Québécois* are benefiting culturally from locally produced programs, the rest of us are being culturally deprived because we watch the same soap operas from the United States! Got that? It seems to me like a distinction without a difference.

Seriously, although these data may please Québec-based artists, they also have a dark side. If you spend your time watching yourself on television, are you not going to minimize your exposure to the outside world? And, if you do this, are your horizons not going to be restricted? And, are restricted horizons not one hallmark of a backward society?

And, if you apply the same analytical rigor to the 90-percent of non-francophone Canadians who do not patronize Canadian-produced programming, you necessarily come to the opposite conclusion: That, since non-francophones are more outward looking than francophones, they necessarily enjoy wider horizons, which suggest they belong to a more advanced society. Over to you, M. Bouchard!

*Summary: When Premier Bouchard claimed that Québec culture was superior to that of the RoC, he was obviously misinformed since the facts suggest the exact opposite. But then, insensitive hyperbole has always been a special hallmark of the Distinct Society.*

## **Gratuitous Insults**

When I refer to insults, I mean those that are gratuitous and wounding, not those that, though perhaps humorous, are simply tasteless or out of place. In the gratuitous category are statements such as “Canada is a country without a distinctive culture” which drip occasionally from the maws of leading Québec secessionists. Among the simply tasteless are so-called “Newfie” and ethnic jokes. In this section, I will list those gratuitous insults that demonstrate the graceless, mean-spirited mind-set of so many *Québécois* bottom feeders.

The biggest insult was the expectation that neither Ottawa nor the RoC would care enough about the mistreatment of anglophones by Québec’s language laws to do anything about it. Unfortunately, insult notwithstanding, Québec was right. Both Ottawa and the RoC sat back and did nothing as Québec proved that it was indeed a Distinct Society ... like Zimbabwe.

Remember when Premier Lucien Bouchard proclaimed that the RoC had no culture, at least not in the way Québec had a distinctive culture? He then followed up this piece of idiocy with the conclusion that Canada hence did not deserve to be called a country the way Québec deserved that appellation.

Although some Canadians are died-in-the-wool royalists, most are politely indifferent to that institution. They are also prepared to tolerate this harmless reminder of another time until time and tide wash it away. But not in Québec where gratuitous antipathy to the institution is so strong that Royal visits routinely avoid Québec.

When Prime Minister Pearson was considering options for the new Canadian flag, he examined variations on the then-current ensign, a flag that featured the (British) Union Jack. But, that option was apparently rejected out of hand since it would not be accepted in Québec. That is not to say that the current flag (maple leaf et al.) is in fact accepted in the Distinct Society. For instance, the mayor of Québec City, Jean Paul Lallier, once a minister in Bourassa's "federalist" cabinet, refused to fly Canada's flag in front of his city hall. He went so far as to pull it down every time it was hoisted by local veterans of Canada's military. The Premier of Québec, Bernard Landry, once referred to it as "un chiffon rouge," a red rag. Various nationalist thugs routinely desecrate it by wiping their feet on it before burning it. Imagine how these stalwarts would have treated a flag containing the Union Jack!

And who can forget the journalistic musings of Josée Legault. She wrote in French in *Le Devoir* that the plethora of Canadian flags in Ottawa on Canada Day outdid even the Nazis at Nuremberg in the 1930s! Her column was headlined EIN VOLK, EIN REICH, EIN FLAG. And, to compound the insult, her hate-filled missives appear regularly in the English media ... who seem to love her.

Remember when May 1 was the official moving day in Québec? One may wonder, of course, why there has to be one official moving day. With all leases ending on the same day, wouldn't that have the effect of driving up rents? That, at least, is what some economists suggest. Oh well, if you live in a *dirigist* state, why would they allow tenants to move when they and their landlords decided it was opportune to do so? In any event, the powers-that-be decided that the May 1 moving day interfered with the educational system and

thus should be moved to the end of the school year. Fair enough. But why did they choose July 1, the day on which Canada celebrates its nationhood? They could have chosen any day between the end of the school year in June and the beginning of the next school year in September, but no, it had to be July 1. That this coincided with Canada's national holiday was of course only coincidence. Yeah, right! If you believe that, you'd also believe that the moon is made of salami!

And, of course, we've all experienced the arrogant putdown, "You speak French very well ... even though you have an accent." Or the unthinking "How can you be an anglophone if you have a French family name?"

It seems to escape the narrowly focused dolts of every language that, since everyone speaks with an accent, accents must be irrelevant descriptors of competence in a language. For instance, believe it or not, there are more English-speakers in India than in England. Therefore, speaking English with an Indian accent tells us where that anglophone is from, not that he/she speaks with an accent.

*De même* with francophones whose accents show considerable variation. For instance, those in France, Belgium, Senegal and Québec are all unique ... and legitimate. So are the French accents of anglophone Australians, Jamaicans, Peruvians and Canadians who have acquired French as a second language. Therefore, *Québécois* who sneer at the accent of French-speaking anglophones are more to be pitied than scorned. How else would you treat those who display such abysmal ignorance? On the other hand, I must remind the next *Québécois* snob I meet that his attitude toward accent is very British. That should please them!

And then there are the knuckle-draggers who are mystified by people with French family names who

speak no French, but not by those with Irish names who speak no English. This dichotomy takes on hilarious tones when the francophone Ryans berate the anglophone Ryans for having “mistreated” them since 1760! They see their currently different mother tongues as more relevant than their shared heritage in Ireland. Go figure. I must admit, however, that this is more annoyance than insult. A tiresome annoyance, mind you.

Then there were the municipal mergers. These attempts at creating larger, more efficient and lower cost amalgamations took on a linguistic dimension in Québec. Imbedded within that province’s language laws is the status of a bilingual municipality. That is, cities with a certain proportion of anglophones are “permitted” to administer themselves in English. However, if, via amalgamation, a bilingual municipality is swallowed up by a massively francophone neighbour, the bilingual status of the former is lost in the merger. Many knowledgeable observers are convinced that the secessionist government of Québec used this tactic to submerge the bilingual municipalities on the Island of Montréal into the larger francophone City of Montréal. As it turned out, it appears that the better organized anglophone councilors from the formerly bilingual suburbs are currently dominating the amalgamated city council! Revenge can be so sweet.

This linguistic dimension was evident in the Outaouais where the smaller municipalities surrounding Hull were amalgamated into Hull. But the amalgamated city was not called Hull. The then premier of Québec, the anglophobic Bernard Landry, would not permit a major Québec municipality to bear an English name. Even though amalgamated units traditionally bear the name of the largest city in the amalgamation, the

amalgamated unit was called Gatineau, the name of one of the smaller municipalities in the amalgamation. Sounds petty, but anglophobia is imperative in Québec.

*Summary: Sticks and stones etc notwithstanding, the gratuitous insults visited upon Canada by Québec have been exasperating. Although normally associated with immature juveniles, these insults have built up like straws that finally weigh heavy upon the camel.*



## SUMMARIES

Before attempting to draw some general conclusions, let us first refresh our memories with the individual conclusions derived so far.

### STRATEGIC EVIDENCE

#### **Canada: A One Party State**

*By courting the separatist vote in Québec, Brian Mulroney effectively transformed Canada into a one-party state. Beholden to, and doing the bidding of Québec, this Natural Governing Party (Liberals) will probably rule “forever.” And, judging by the disgraceful performance of the Chrétien Liberals during their 10-year reign, this augurs not at all well for Canada. To make matters worse, Chrétien’s successor, Paul Martin, exhibits a distinct, Mulroney-like Québec bias. Oh Canada!*

#### **Québec: A Fraudulent Society**

*The Government of Québec chooses to under-fund legitimate services for its citizens (8 percent lower per family than Ontario) to finance items that support its secessionist agenda (50 percent more than Ontario). If that isn’t disgraceful and fraudulent, what is?*

#### **Equalization Payments Support Secessionists**

*The Government of Québec in effect uses Ottawa’s annual equalization payment of almost \$5 billion to generate support for the secession of Québec from*

*Canada. That is a fraudulent and treasonous misuse of funds provided by the have-provinces of Ontario and Alberta. Moreover, over-taxed Québécois are thus deprived of the services that the equalization system is meant to provide.*

*Since Québec generates proportionately more revenue from its own tax base than does Ontario, and since it is not reasonable to require Ontario and Alberta to support Québec's secessionist agenda, Ottawa must eliminate the Distinct Society's equalization entitlement. However, since there is no evidence to suggest that anyone in Ottawa has the courage to do this, Ontario and Alberta may just have to grit their teeth and accept the fact that they are funding treason. Unless, of course, some way is found to deprive Québec of these funds. Stay tuned.*

### **Québec On The Take**

*Ottawa believes and acts as if the Québec electorate is essentially secessionist and must be wooed, not with noble argument, but with generous doses of federal patronage. This federal largesse has so far not provided, and likely will never provide, Canada with very many long-term devotees in Québec.*

### **Corruption**

*When it comes to old fashioned, bottom-of-the barrel, routine patronage, Québec is the major recipient of Ottawa's largesse.*

### **Sponsorship Program**

*The Sponsorship Program was the vehicle for an obscene fraud. Although its objective may theoretically have been to wave the flag in Québec, its effect appears to have been the illegal transfer of millions from the public purse to the coffers of the Liberal Party and its principal supporters.*

### **CF-18 Contract**

*When federal government contracts are up for grabs (CF-18 contract, for instance), Ottawa is prepared to over-rule due process and elementary notions of fair play and sound economics to pursue a Québec-first policy ... no matter what it costs the Canadian taxpayer.*

### **Balkanization of Canada**

*It seems inevitable that Canada will become increasingly balkanized as Ottawa devolves more and more power to the provinces in an attempt to do the impossible, mollify Québec.*

### **Notwithstanding Clause**

*Ever since Québec used the Notwithstanding Clause to maintain its odious sign law, the very legitimacy of the Clause has been called into question. As a result, politicians in the RoC are loath to use it for the purpose for which it was intended, controlling judicial activism. Consequently, our laws are increasingly being forged in the courts, not in our legislatures.*

### **Language Legislation: Ottawa**

*Under the guise of providing legitimate bilingual services to Canadians, Ottawa used the Official Languages Act to carry out a job-grab for francophones. Anglophone Canadians, especially those in the RoC, should be offended and alarmed by this since it will become increasingly difficult for them to even qualify for a clerk's position at their local Post Office!*

## **CSIS**

*I wonder how many, let's say, Urdu-imperative counter-terrorist positions are currently vacant at CSIS because no bilingual (English and French) candidate could be found. Better, I suppose, to risk being blown up by terrorists than hire someone who was not able to communicate in both of Canada's official languages. If you try to figure out the logic of this last sentence, you'll go mad!*

## **Jobs For Francophones**

*Ottawa's latest contribution to national disunity came from Lucienne Robillard, President of the Treasury Board. She announced, in effect, that the bilingual demands of Ottawa's Official Languages Act will eventually convert the federal public service into a francophone enclave, especially at management levels. Like a skunk at a garden party, this will not be well received in non-francophone Canada. It wasn't!*

*The demands of national unity require that this policy be scrapped, and that Ms. Robillard be sacked. Ms. Robillard's replacement has since hinted that the new policy will indeed be scrapped, or at least modified substantially. Robillard's sacking may follow the next election.*

## **Military**

*Since military policy reflects Québec's traditional isolationism, the more outward-looking views of the RoC are often ignored. Also, this Québec-centred attitude has the effect of underfunding the military, which puts at risk the lives of Canadian military personnel.*

*Current staffing policy in the military favours francophones over anglophones. Therefore, our military leaders are not necessarily selected from among the most qualified candidates.*

*To add insult to injury, a memorial was erected 59 years after the fact on Juno Beach, Normandy where Canadian forces came ashore during the 1944 D-Day invasion of Europe. Since Ottawa's contribution to the memorial was miniscule, it had to be financed privately. If there had been any interest in this project in Québec, you can bet the farm that it would have received generous federal support years ago!*

## **Commissioner For Francophones**

*By focusing on the trivial, and by not recognizing that seeking perfection in the provision of French-language services is objectively not feasible, the Commissioner of Official Languages has disgraced herself by fomenting linguistic discord in Canada. Moreover, by supporting a program whose net effect will be to transform the management of the federal public service into a massive francophone enclave, the current Commissioner is threatening national unity for the sake of providing jobs for francophones. She should be*

*sacked and the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages abolished.*

## **Multiculturalism**

*Some analysts argue that Trudeau saddled us with the federal multiculturalism program to find allies within the immigrant (ethnic) communities to offset anglophone resistance to his plan to bilingualize federal institutions. Since criticism of the Official Languages Act has become politically incorrect, I guess he succeeded. There have, however, been some unfortunate side effects.*

*First, the thrust of the multiculturalism program interferes with the normal integration of immigrants into the Canadian mainstream. Second, it tends to create monolithic, ethnic voting blocks that are thus often at odds with politically more diverse non-immigrant communities. Third, although we desperately need to put more discipline into our immigration and refugee systems, fear of alienating these voting blocks has discouraged most attempts at reform.*

*One might argue that Canadian politics is developing an unfortunate bipolar imperative: The historic need to find majority support in Québec, with the growing need to find similar support among ethnic communities in the RoC.*

## **Second Class Citizens**

*Anglophone-support organizations that were set up in Québec following the passage of language laws targeting them, receive niggardly financial support from Ottawa. Since a more equitable level of support would offend Québec's secessionist political class,*

*Ottawa steers clear of any measures that might displease them. On the other hand, it provides gobs of money to francophone organizations in the RoC, where francophones face no known legislated discrimination.*

### **Referendum Cheats**

*Both of Québec's referenda on secession were marked by electoral fraud, possibly under the direction of the Government of Québec. The fraud consisted in arbitrarily rejecting valid, anti-secessionist ballots. This permitted the secessionist side to come within a whisker of winning the 1995 referendum ...which would have thrown Canada into political disarray.*

*Moreover, Québécois resent being reminded of this crime. They prefer to think of it as a simple misadventure of no particular import, a family matter of no concern to anyone outside the family, especially to non-Québécois, anglophone Québecers! I guess Québec really is a Distinct Society after all!*

### **Referendum Consequences**

*Job-killing political uncertainty is the product of Ottawa's reluctance to deal a fatal blow to Québec's secessionist movement. And, until that fatal blow is delivered, Canada's standard of living relative to the United States will continue to deteriorate.*

### **Foreign Relations**

*The performance of Prime Ministers from Québec in foreign affairs is mixed. Where Trudeau postured and Chrétien shamed us, Mulroney (and Martin?) attempted to do the "right thing." The fashionable anti-Americanism so prevalent in Canada today among the*

*chattering classes can be traced to Trudeau. The performance of these prime ministers appears to have a linguistic dimension. Coincidence?*

### **Language Legislation: Québec**

*Although there is in fact evidence to support the notion that Québécois are indeed in demographic danger in Québec, there is no evidence to suggest that the threat derives from external sources. However, there is ample evidence to prove that it derives from infertile coupling in their own bedrooms as well as from destructive economic policies for which Québec itself is responsible. Hence, to pretend that ethnic cleansing and insulting fellow citizens are honorable alternatives to larger French families and proper economic policy is preposterous.*

*Thus, I would conclude: (1) that the proponents of Québec's language laws simply lied about the need for such legislation since there was no objective evidence to suggest that French was at risk from external sources, and (2) that the intent of Québec's language laws was not to protect French but to reduce the political influence of non-secessionist anglophones by driving them from Québec.*

*Sadly, that dishonorable intent seems to appeal to the majority in the Distinct Society, and to be condoned by so many bleeding hearts and politicians across Canada. And that is disgraceful!*

## **SUPPORTING EVIDENCE**

### **The Clarity Act**



*The Clarity Act makes it difficult, but not impossible, for Québec to legally secede unilaterally from Canada. Moreover, the elements are already in place that will permit Québec to do exactly that ... some day. These elements include the continued elimination of non-secessionist voters from Québec's electoral rolls via the ethnic cleansing of non-francophones. In addition, since investors abhor political uncertainty, we can look forward to a continued dearth of job-creating business investment across Canada, but especially in Québec. As a result, our standard of living will continue to fall relative to that of our American cousins. Finally, it was clearly the fear of an adverse reaction from Québec voters that dissuaded Prime Minister Chrétien from taking the more stringent measures needed to deal secessionists a fatal blow. Here again, Québec's interests trumped Canada's.*

### **National Energy Program**

*With the NEP, Ottawa in fact robbed the west to subsidize the east, especially Québec and Ontario. Had Québec instead of Alberta been the oil producer, a similar transfer of wealth to the RoC would have been unthinkable.*

### **Free Trade**

*Québec's support of international free trade is nothing more than meaningless posturing meant (1) to annoy the RoC where support for free trade is not monolithic, and (2) to appeal to its own electorate with a nationalistic boast which it cannot fulfill. If Québec felt so confident about its ability to compete with the Americans, why does it continue to resist freer inter-*

*provincial trade in Canada? Because Québec sees no political advantage in cooperating with the RoC ... on anything.*

### **Bombardier**

*Given a choice, Ottawa's subsidies will be awarded first to firms in Québec, firms such as Bombardier.*

### **Air Traffic Safety**

*Air safety has been compromised in Québec, and potentially across Canada, to provide services that are neither necessary nor useful, ... all to satisfy nationalist egos in Québec.*

## **OTHER EVIDENCE**

### **Electricity**

*Québec's refusal to allow Newfoundland reasonable transit-access to the Québec transmission grid prevented Newfoundland from exporting power directly to non-contiguous jurisdictions such as other provinces or the United States. Thus, instead of getting a decent price from the Americans for its electricity, it had to settle for a much lower offer from Hydro Québec ... which turned around and sold the same power at higher prices to Americans! This necessarily impeded Newfoundland's economic development. Moreover, as long as Québec holds land-locked Newfoundland to ransom, economic development in that Atlantic province will continue to be constrained. Moreover, the absence of a national, or at least regional grid will*

*inevitably produce higher-than-necessary electricity prices for all Canadians.*

*Finally, in the event of a grid failure in Ontario, for instance, Ontarians will have the pleasure of suffering alone because Québec chose to remain aloof from a mutually beneficial cooperative venture ... because that venture might be seen as a constraint on its “independence.” On the other hand, Québec will accept, nay demand, its annual equalization tribute (a total of about \$5 billions) from these same Ontarians. About which more later.*

## **Kyoto**

*Because Kyoto makes few demands on Québec, it is an ardent supporter of that international accord ... despite the fact that Kyoto may wreck economic havoc on other provinces. Clearly, Ottawa’s decision to ratify Kyoto reflects Québec’s interests, not those of the RoC.*

## **Gun Registry**

*To satisfy pressure from Québec, Ottawa has foisted on all of Canada a Gun Registry Law that: (a) will not keep guns out of the hands of criminals, (b) will likely cost about \$2-billion to develop, 1,000-times its original estimate, (c) is very unpopular in Western Canada and the North, and (d) has been rejected by nine provincial and Territorial attorneys-general, the people who are supposed to prosecute people who violate federal laws. Another useless and expensive mess imposed on the RoC to mollify Québec!*

## **Health Care**

*The mobility of Québecers is severely restricted (1) because Québec refuses to meet its obligations under the Canada Health Act, and (2) because Ottawa has not the political will to require Québec to honour its obligations.*

### **Religiosity**

*Because the Catholic Church once dominated the moral, social, political and legal mosaic in Québec, it necessarily had a related effect on the RoC. However, now that the Church no longer exercises any significant leadership in Québec, the influence of traditional Judeo-Christian values in the Roc has also waned. Whether Québec should be praised, or blamed for this change is open to debate. Reader's choice.*

### **Abortion**

*Whether we celebrate or regret it, Canada no longer has a law prohibiting abortion because Québec juries would not convict an admitted abortionist.*

### **Same-Sex Marriage**

*Like it or not, same-sex marriage is the law of the land because: (a) Prime Minister Chrétien refused to legislate an alternative status for same-sex unions before the courts were forced to act, and (b) because the majority of voters in Québec favor it, notwithstanding majority opposition to it in the RoC.*

### **Chicken Little**

*Québécois nationalists will flirt with social ridicule to advance their linguistic cum secessionist agendas. With*

*the film “Disparaître” in the 1970s, and its sequel in 2004, they preserved for all time the proof of how far this flirtation with ridicule will go. Moreover, no matter how hard you try to provide service in French across Canada, it will never be good enough for these Chicken Littles because it isn’t perfect. Others will play the “race” card when logic fails them. Those Chicken Littles we can do without.*

### **Québec’s Foreign Legations**

*Québec’s foreign legations promote Québec as a sovereign country and are funded by equalization payments from Ottawa and the RoC, as well as by excessive taxes levied on the taxpayers of Québec. As a result, services such as health, education and housing are starved of legitimate support in the Distinct Society.*

### **Prime Ministers From Québec**

*From Trudeau on, Canada’s prime ministers from Québec, irrespective of party affiliation or language, have pursued a Québec-first policy. Moreover, Mulroney and Chrétien put Canada at considerable political risk in the process, the former by design, the latter by arrogant incompetence and political indifference.*

### **Montfort**

*Ottawa’s francophone establishment used the race card, exaggeration and misinformation to prevent the closure of the marginal Hôpital Montfort. Although there may have been some political merit in keeping that hospital open, the process followed by Ottawa’s*

*francophone leaders produced linguistic stress that we could have done without. But, to paraphrase Samuel Johnson, in the absence of a sound argument, the use of the race card, though disgraceful, can nevertheless be very effective.*

*In addition, the federal government disgraced itself by intervening on Montfort's behalf while it almost concurrently chose not to protest when the government of Québec decided to close an anglophone hospital in Montréal. In Canada, some human rights are obviously more deserving of respect than others.*

### **Québécois Culture**

*When Premier Bouchard claimed that Québec culture was superior to that of the RoC, he was obviously misinformed since the facts suggest the exact opposite. But then, insensitive hyperbole has always been a special hallmark of the Distinct Society.*

### **Gratuitous Insults**

*Sticks and stones etc notwithstanding, the gratuitous insults visited upon Canada by Québec have been exasperating. Although normally associated with immature juveniles, these insults have built up like straws that finally weigh heavy upon the camel.*

## CONCLUSIONS AND REMEDIES

Based on the evidence presented here, I find it reasonable to conclude that:

1. Québec, with about 25 percent of Canada's population, is able to, and does indeed hold the RoC to political and economic ransom.
2. Politically, this means that the party in, or seeking power in Ottawa will always be beholden to Québec, and hence favour it over the RoC. As a result of this bias, Canada's public policy and legislative agendas necessarily reflect Québec interests ... interests that are often at odds with those of the RoC.
3. In addition, this bias produced a language-based class system in Canada. For instance, it is responsible for the excessive and unwarranted francization of federal and other institutions. This not only deprives non-francophones of jobs, it also seems not to satisfy many francophones in the RoC. These Chicken Littles whine that French-language services are inadequate because they are not perfect! The best you can do is obviously not good enough for these louts.

To add insult to injury, federal funding to language minorities favours francophones in the RoC over anglophones in Québec.

4. Also a product of this bias is Ottawa's Commissioner of Official Languages (aka Commissioner For Francophones) whose objective

seems to be the advancement of francophone interests at the expense of anglophones in both Québec and the RoC.

5. Although the RoC is not in the habit of tolerating criminal behaviour within its own borders, both it and Ottawa in fact turned blind eyes to such behaviour when Québec set out to ethnically cleanse itself of anglophones. The secessionist governments of the Distinct Society chose this criminal reminder of the Nazi era and Third World barbarism to rid Québec of non-secessionists.
6. Canada's poor international reputation reflects Québec's isolationist bias rather than the more open-minded attitudes of the RoC.
7. Québec's secessionist movement has had, and will continue to have an adverse economic impact on all of Canada.
8. The economic ransom takes the form of excessive transfers of federal funds from the RoC to Québec. Moreover, these funds are used, not to provide vital services to *Québécois*, but to advance Québec's secessionist agenda.

At this point, readers should decide where they stand. *Québécois* will probably see nothing untoward in this litany. Similarly, some non-*Québécois* may simply shrug their shoulders in despair because they consider this litany an unfortunate but necessary constant in Canada's political mosaic. Others, the culpably uninformed, may also shrug their shoulders in bemused ignorance. For these three groups, there is no need to read any further. They should, however, steel



themselves for the continued balkanization and impoverishment of our country. If, on the other hand, you find the current situation intolerable, you will support corrective measures. But which ones?

Although expelling Québec from Canada is certainly a reasonable option, it should not be the first. Our first call is for Ottawa to take some minimal corrective action. I would argue that, by doing the minimum, Ottawa may foreclose the need to expel Québec from Canada. Remember that I say “may foreclose,” not “would foreclose.” On the other hand, if Ottawa refuses to do the minimum, it would make inevitable the eventual demand for Québec’s expulsion. These minimum demands are:

1. The implementation of Ottawa’s Official Languages Act must revert to its initial objective, to provide services in English and French. Its use as a job grab for francophones can no longer be tolerated.
2. The Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages must be recognized for what it is, Ottawa’s hypocritical attempt to advance the cause of francophones at the expense of anglophones. The Office must be abolished.
3. Ottawa’s funding of linguistic minorities must become more equitable. At present, francophones in the RoC receive proportionately much more from Ottawa than do anglophones in Québec. So Ottawa has three options: (1) to increase funding to Québec anglos, or (2) to decrease funding to francos in the RoC, or (3) to cancel all funding to both. Current practice suggests it will adopt the coward’s stance and do nothing.

4. Ottawa must find an alternative to the current Equalization formula. Even though Québec generates as much revenue as Ontario from its own internal sources, it still receives annual Equalization subsidies of about \$5 billion from the have-provinces of Ontario and Alberta. Moreover, instead of using its Equalization entitlement to provide Québécois with essential services, Québec uses the money to support its secessionist agenda. That is intolerable. Québec's Equalization entitlement must be reduced to zero.

If Ottawa does not adopt these minimal measures, it will signal the continued balkanization of Canada and the eventual, exasperated call from the RoC to rid Canada of this cancer called Québec. If, on the other hand, Ottawa adopts these measures, it can take the next step and use its bully pulpit to put Québec on notice.

Ottawa should in effect warn Québec's political classes: (1) that it no longer accepts Québec's bogus claim that protection of French requires depriving non-francophones of their linguistic rights; (2) that it will henceforth use the power of the federal government to protect those and other rights; (3) that it will no longer tolerate cheating by the government of Québec during sovereignty referenda; and (4) that Ottawa is prepared to initiate its own national referendum to answer the question: "Should Québec be expelled from Canada?"

Since Ottawa will probably ignore these minimal demands, it will also allow its bully pulpit to remain silent. Therefore, we will have to continue with the *status quo* and look forward to the inevitable next step.

The intolerable cost to Canada of being held eternal hostage to Québec must sooner or later cause the RoC to scream “Enough!” Since these “fed-up” Canadians will soon realize that our federal politicians have neither the integrity nor the guts to resist Québec’s eternal blackmail, they will eventually take matters into their own hands and call for the expulsion of Québec from Canada. Since this will certainly appeal to secessionists in Québec, and since the Clarity Act makes secession possible, “fed-up” Canadians and secessionists will pursue their common interest and thus make Québec’s “secession” probable.

Therefore, Ottawa’s options are: (1) to keep control of the agenda by carrying out the reforms suggested above, or (2) to lose control by doing nothing, thus allowing the continued balkanization of Canada where Québec will continue to hold the RoC to ransom. This will inevitably generate a political revolt in the RoC calling for the expulsion of Québec from Canada. In either case, the ultimate result will permit us to say “Adieu, Québec ... and good riddance!”

---



## About The Author


Robert Sauvé was born in 1934 and brought up in Saint Henri, a working class district of Montréal. As a young man, he received his secondary education from the Jesuits, a science degree from Loyola College and an engineering degree from McGill University. In his later-middle years he obtained two degrees in history from the University of Ottawa. He spent most of his professional career in the energy sector. Before the electors made him come to his senses, he was also active in Québec politics. In 2003, he and Lois Gallagher celebrated 45 years of married life together. They have four accomplished children and two fine grandchildren.

The first Sauvé in New France was married near Montréal in 1693. Some of his progeny married local Indian maidens, others wed Europeans. It is not certain from which wing of that family the author issued. The first of Mr. Sauvé's mother's ancestors, the Irish-speaking Stantons and O'Reillys, arrived in Canada in the 1850s. When two Stanton sisters married into the Sauvé family in the 1920s, the anglophone wing of the Sauvés was born. According to some *Québécois* nationalists, anglophones should abstain from voting in referenda on Québec sovereignty since, by not being true *Québécois*, they have no right to be concerned with such matters! Got that? Since Mr. Sauvé is an accomplished curmudgeon, he responds to such arrogance with, what else, Trudeau's Salmon Arm salute!

When he is not busy trying to wipe political correctness from the face of the earth, or commenting on matters political and social, Mr. Sauvé plays a great deal of golf.

**ADIEU QUÉBEC ...  
AND GOOD RIDDANCE**

**Robert Sauvé**



**Québec, with less than 25 percent of the population, nevertheless holds the balance of political power in Canada. It, therefore, can and does hold the Rest of Canada to ransom. For example:**

- 1. By discouraging job-creating business investment across Canada, Québec's secessionist agenda has had, and will continue to have an adverse effect on our standard of living.**
- 2. Québec's equalization payment from Ottawa should be zero, not the \$5 billion per year it currently receives. Québec uses this money to finance its secessionist agenda.**
- 3. Canada's foreign and military policies are driven more by Québec's isolationist attitudes than by the more open views of the RoC. As a result, relations with our most important ally are put at risk to cater to the whims of the Québec electorate.**
- 4. Québec forced Ottawa and the RoC to turn blind eyes to the ethnic cleansing of anglophones from Québec. It also forced Ottawa to treat anglophones across Canada as second-class citizens.**
- 5. In an attempt to purchase the allegiance of the Québec electorate, Ottawa announced plans to convert the federal public service into a job-grab for francophones ... at the expense of non-francophones. Ottawa also inundated Québec with obscene amounts of federal patronage ... at the expense of the RoC.**

**This Distinct Society we can do without.**



