

**Building Multiculturalism: The Contribution of the
Ukrainian-Canadian Community to a Re-Thinking of
Canadian Identity**

by

Daniel Jesse Westlake

B.A., Carleton University, 2009

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN THE PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

The Faculty of Graduate Studies

(Political Science)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
(Vancouver)

August 2010

© Daniel Jesse Westlake 2010

Abstract

This paper examines the role played by the Ukrainian-Canadian Community in the adoption of Canada's first multiculturalism policy in 1971. The first section of the paper looks at the political development of the Ukrainian-Canadian Community prior to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. The second looks at the impact that the community had on the Commission and the Report that it produced. The final section examines how the Commission's findings interacted with the broader political context at the time to lead to the adoption of multiculturalism. The paper argues that the Ukrainian-Canadian Community had a substantial amount of influence over the Royal Commission and that this influence, combined with political factors at the time, was important to the adoption of multiculturalism in Canada.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Dedication.....	v
1. Introduction.....	1
2. The Ukrainian Community Prior to the Royal Commission.....	3
3. The Ukrainian Community and the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.....	12
4. The Trudeau Government and the Acceptance of Multiculturalism.....	30
5. Conclusion.....	41
Bibliography.....	44

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Barbara Arneil and second reader Dr. Philip Resnick for all of their help and support in writing this thesis. They both played an important role in helping me to develop the ideas that went into this paper. In addition, I would like to acknowledge Kritee Ahmed and Aaron Pegg for their help in proof-reading early drafts of this thesis. Thank you to my colleagues and professors in the Political Science Department at the University of British Columbia for their support in my work in political science this year. Finally thank you to my family for all of their support in my pursuit of my interest in political science.

Dedication

For my parents and brother.

1. Introduction

In his article “Marketing Canadian Pluralism in the International Arena,” Will Kymlicka examines circumstances that led to the development of multiculturalism in Canada. He argues that factors unique to the country, including that the major advocates of multiculturalism included individuals and organizations from well-established mainly European communities, make it difficult to apply the Canadian case to other countries (Kymlicka, 2008, 106-107). The Ukrainian-Canadian Community in particular played an important role in the development of Canadian multiculturalism. Brought on by a broader debate about Canadian identity, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism became a rallying point for the Ukrainian as well as other ethnic minority¹ communities. This forum allowed them to raise concerns they had with the dualistic understanding of the country being advanced by many Canadian intellectuals and politicians. The political activism of the Ukrainian community, particularly with regards to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, was thus important to the adoption of Canada’s multicultural policy in 1971.

It is worth looking at the Ukrainian Community’s involvement in development of multiculturalism in three stages, which will guide this paper’s organization. The first section will examine the Ukrainian community over the half-century prior to the Royal Commission; its growing political importance, and the discourse that developed in favour of multiculturalism. The second will look at the

¹ The term ethnic minority will be used throughout this paper to refer to non-British non-French ethnic groups in Canada. Given immigration into Canada up until this point in time, this group of people would have largely been made up of Central and Eastern European immigrant as well as second and third generation ethnic communities. Particularly large and influential communities in Canada would have included the Ukrainian, German, Italian, Polish, and Scandinavian communities.

community's interaction and impact on the findings of the Royal Commission. The final section of the paper will examine the impact that the Royal Commission had on the Trudeau government's adoption of the Multiculturalism Policy.

2. The Ukrainian Community Prior to the Royal Commission

In the period between the 1920s and 1960s there was a significant change in the political and social position of Ukrainian-Canadians. The first Ukrainian-Canadian was elected to federal parliament in 1926 and by the end of the Second World War the number of Ukrainian-Canadians running for office was around 10 per election (March, 1980, 214-216). This number rose steadily, and by 1968 when eight Ukrainian-Canadians had been elected to federal parliament. In the 1974 election forty-two candidates were Ukrainian-Canadians (214-216).

In looking at the impact that the Ukrainian community had on major political parties, Roman March finds that John Diefenbaker was the first leader to make substantial in-roads with the Ukrainian community (217-218)². The Liberal party had some Ukrainian community support, electing 4 Ukrainian-Canadian MPs in 1968, but generally trailed the Conservatives (217-218). This growth of political influence was highlighted by an increase in appointments to important positions within the federal government. The Diefenbaker government appointed the first MP from an ethnic minority to cabinet; a member of the Ukrainian community named Michael Starr, and also made senate appointments from the community (John Hnatyshyn in 1959 and Paul Yuzyk in 1963) (Champion, 2006, 32). This growth in political presence would be important to establishing ethnic minority Canadians as an important community within Canadian politics.

The increasing importance of the Ukrainian community in federal politics is further demonstrated by the growing interest political parties had in building ties

² This occurred largely as a result of his support for a Bill of Rights and his association with ethnic minority communities.

with it. Christian Champion notes that Liberal insiders in the 1960s were starting to raise concerns about the strong ties that the Diefenbaker Conservatives had built within ethnic minority communities (30-31). As early as 1953 Liberal party organizer Andrew Thompson noted that the “ethnic vote” was shifting away from the Liberal party and towards the George Drew led Progressive Conservatives (28). After seeing the Conservatives gain votes in these communities the Pearson Liberals started to develop their own strategies targeted at winning them over, with Thompson taking the lead on such efforts. In 1963 Thompson put forward a report entitled “Ethnic Groups Programme of Advertising, Leaflets, and Press Information” that outlined Liberal strategies for connecting with different ethnic minority community organizations (34). The fact that both the Progressive Conservative and Liberal parties felt the need to compete over these specific communities demonstrates that the communities were politically significant to both of them. This is important when one starts to examine the community’s ability to lobby politicians on issues such as multiculturalism for it provided Ukrainian Canadians with leverage on federal politics.

Indeed, ethnic minority communities were starting to have an impact on government action even before the issue of multiculturalism developed. At the urging of the Ethnic Press Federation, the Pearson government appointed a Polish Canadian, Stanley Haidasz to cabinet as a representative of ethnic minorities (34-35). Further during the Flag Debates the Pearson government argued (among other

things) that the absence of British or French symbols from the Pearson Pennant³ incorporated a diverse population that included people from ethnic minority communities. Pearson stated that the proposed flag represented Canadians “new and old, native born and nationalized, of all racial stocks” (Pearson, 1964, 4320). Indeed Pearson’s efforts to sell the flag to ethnic minorities had some success, gaining the support of the German and Ukrainian language newspapers in Toronto among others. Support was not complete however, as both Senators Hnyatshyn and Yuzyk opposed the Pearson flag (Hnyatshyn, ironically, supported a flag design with both a Union Jack and a Fleur de Lys on it) (Champion, 1968, 35-36).

In provincial politics on the prairies the Ukrainian community, as well as other ethnic minority communities⁴, were playing an even more substantial role in politics. In Manitoba Ed Schreyer⁵ won the 1969 election with 17 of his 28 MLAs coming from non-British non-French backgrounds (Lupul, 2005, 126). The Schreyer government hosted the Manitoba Mosaic Congress, bringing together a large number of different actors interested in multiculturalism. Manoly Lupul, a Professor at the University of Alberta at the time and prominent Ukrainian Canadian political activist, estimated that the Ukrainian Canadian contingent was the largest ethnic group present at this conference (125-128). In 1971 in Alberta the Social Credit government under Harry Strom saw the Ukrainian community as a powerful enough political force to grant it policy concessions. The Strom government passed policies

³ The flag initially proposed by the Pearson government as the replacement for the Red Ensign featuring three red maple leaves between two blue bars. This flag would be amended later to reflect the current Canadian flag.

⁴ To a large extent this would have included German, Polish, and other Central and Eastern European communities that had large immigrant and second/third generation populations on the prairies.

⁵ Schreyer himself was of German background.

aiding the teaching of the Ukrainian language and sought to support minority cultural programs in an effort to win the votes of the Ukrainian and other ethnic minority communities (139-143). While the Social Credit government was unsuccessful at holding on to power, the effort to put forward policies that catered to the community demonstrates that it was having an impact on the actions of governments.

The growing receptiveness of political actors at the federal and provincial levels would allow the Ukrainian-Canadian Community to undertake an important effort lobbying the Royal Commission, as well as other political leaders, on issues relating to multiculturalism. Previous political experience allowed community organizations to make presentations to the Commission in a well-coordinated and effective manner. Further, when the Royal Commission made its report, the political presence of the community helped to emphasize the importance of its findings to politicians. The political strength of the community gave weight to the ideas that it was putting forward both during presentations to the Royal Commission, and after when the government was seeking to implement its recommendations⁶. This is underscored by the appointment of Jaroslav Rudnycky, a Ukrainian-Canadian linguist, to the Commission. Andre Laurendeau states in his diary⁷ that Rudnycky was appointed in order that there would be representation on the commission from

⁶ This should not be taken to mean that the political strength of the community was the sole or even most important factor in getting multiculturalism accepted by the federal government. Ideas regarding Canadian unity and Quebec separatism and the way that multiculturalism fit into those issue will be examined in the final section of the paper. The political strength of the community however was certainly a prerequisite to being taken as seriously as they were by members of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism and by the federal government.

⁷ Andre Laurendeau kept a diary while he was co-chair of the Royal Commission covering the work that he did.

an ethnic minority⁸ (Laurendeau, 1991, 24-25). Without the growing political importance of the ethnic minority communities, it is unlikely that the Pearson government would have been as concerned with ensuring that the Royal Commission had representation from this group.

It is worth examining the ideological approach of the Ukrainian community to multiculturalism during the period in history leading up to the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Three major themes within the Ukrainian's community's approach to multiculturalism are noteworthy. The first is the manner in which demands for recognition were supported by an examination of the demographic break-down of the country. A common argument in this respect was that the similarity in numbers between ethnic minority⁹ communities and the French community justified an equal degree of recognition. In 1964 Paul Yuzyk in his maiden speech in the Senate highlighted this, noting that the 1961 census placed the "third element" at 53% of the population of Saskatchewan, 49% of the population in Alberta, and 48% of the population in Manitoba (Yuzyk, 1965, 52). Yuzyk further noted that 26% of Canadians were from what he called the "third element" as compared to 30% of Canadians who identified as French (51). Isydore Hlynka, a columnist in the *Ukrainian Voice* and President of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee during the Royal Commission's preliminary hearings, wrote in 1974 that the "third element" in Canada outnumbered the French population that resides in

⁸ There would be another representative from this group appointed as well in order that there be equal representation between English and French ethnic minorities.

⁹ It should be noted that the appropriateness of thinking of the ethnic minority Canadians as a single group instead of multiple groups was a contentious issue in debates concerning Canadian identity at the time. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism came to the conclusion that ethnic minority Canadians could not be considered as a single cultural group, but rather that they were many cultural groups without strong links between them. This was not the position of many ethnic minority organizations.

Quebec by 1 million (his census data shows that French Canadians in total outnumber the “third element” by about 400 000) (Hlynka, 1981, 22). For Hlynka this became grounds to criticize the Official Languages Act, and he concluded this article by stating, “these are the facts and they cannot be legislated away, official languages act notwithstanding” (22). In a 1977 article Hlynka argued that the evaluation of multiculturalism in Canada could only be done with a strong understanding of the country’s ethno-cultural make-up. Here he emphasized that Ukrainians are the second largest ethnic group in Winnipeg and the third largest (the German community being slightly larger) in Manitoba as a whole (24). While Hlynka’s writings occurred after the announcement of the multiculturalism policy, they show that he was thinking of the community and its place in Canada in terms of its size. That an important member of the Ukrainian community¹⁰ thought in these terms was important in demonstrating a community that understood itself as a collective group within Canada.

Another theme that comes across in the work of the Ukrainian community regarding multiculturalism is support for language. That Hlynka ties his work on population and multiculturalism to language demonstrates that members within the Ukrainian community tended to associate the two. Manoly Lupul notes in his memoirs *The Politics of Multiculturalism; A Ukrainian-Canadian Memoir* that there were several efforts to build support for education in non-official languages. Lupul describes recommendations he made to the Alberta Ministry of Education that students be offered the option of becoming bilingual in French or with another

¹⁰ Isydore Hlynka was the first to speak on behalf of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee at the Royal Commission’s preliminary hearing.

language such as Ukrainian, or even trilingual with the education system helping students learn French and a language of their ethnic community such as Ukrainian (Lupul, 2005, 121-122). Language was an issue at the Manitoba Mosaic Congress in 1970 where the leadership of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee put forward the following resolution¹¹:

Whereas English and French are the official languages of Canada;
BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Mosaic Congress recommends that the Government of Manitoba study ways and means of preserving the multi-lingual and multi-cultural reality of the Manitoba Mosaic (127).

In addition the community had lobbied the Alberta government for support in Ukrainian language education (as was noted earlier) and would also raise language as a key issue when making submissions to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. This shows a strong emphasis within the Ukrainian community on language preservation as an element of multiculturalism.

A final theme is the representation and recognition that the community received from government. Paul Yuzyk objected strongly in his Senate speech in 1964 to the statements made by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration that the Speakers of the House of Commons and Senate should come from the two “most important ethnic groups in the country” (Yuzyk, 1965, 56). Yuzyk’s concern was that Canadians were represented and recognized as either French or English without an understanding that many Canadians, such as the Ukrainian community, identified with neither. As a result, Yuzyk felt that such groups were not recognized for their full contribution to the country. The concern for representation comes

¹¹ This was passed by the plenary session of the Congress.

through in the Ethnic Press Federation's argument to the Pearson government that ethnic minorities should be given representation in cabinet (Champion, 2006, 34-35). In both cases recognition and representation are emphasized in the Ukrainian community's interaction with the federal government. Multiculturalism to the community was not just about the cultural development of individuals, but rather focused on creating an understanding of Canadian identity that put ethnic minority communities on the same level as British and French communities.

A common thread that runs through the themes discussed above is the emphasis that Ukrainian Canadians place on community recognition. That the Ukrainian community's argumentation was based on its size (as well as the size of other ethnic minority communities) demonstrates an understanding of the multiculturalism issue in community terms. Their arguments are not that the individual needs the protection of multiculturalism in order to have an equal place in society but rather that the communities that they are part of are large enough that they deserve recognition for their place within the country. The case for language is expounded through a communitarian context and is consequently not developed through an individual rights discourse. Languages are useless unless other individuals with whom one wants to communicate share them. The fact that activists in the Ukrainian community make arguments regarding language suggest that they are looking for support for things that help build and tie the community together. One does not build up a minority language so that one can interact with the broader society, but rather so that one can build stronger bonds within cultural linguistic groups.

Emphasis placed on recognition and representation underlines the collectivist understanding of multiculturalism demonstrated by the Ukrainian community. Interest in representation shows a concern for the recognition and political position of the community as opposed to just the individual, making the community the point of emphasis with regards to the policy demands being sought. The arguments made in favour of the recognition of Canada as multicultural instead of bicultural are arguments that there are other cultural groups that contribute to the country and do not fit within a dualistic framework proposed by many Canadian politicians and intellectuals. The claim is not that this dualistic framework is stifling to individuals, but rather that it ignores that multiplicity of communities and of groups within the country. Thus the multiculturalism being advocated for by the Ukrainian community (as well as other communities) has a definite community-centred element to it. This stands in contrast to the more individualistic justifications and interpretation of multiculturalism presented by Trudeau, and philosophers like Will Kymlicka, that will be discussed in the third section of the paper.

Thus the Ukrainian community through the 1960s and into the 1970s was an important political force. It was well mobilized, having an impact in both federal and provincial politics. Community and political leaders also articulated strong views on multiculturalism that emphasized cultural and language support and the recognition of the contribution of diverse communities to a country as a whole. To a large extent, this is the vision that the Ukrainian-Canadian organizations would present to Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

3. The Ukrainian Community and the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism

The Ukrainian community expressed concern over the manner in which the Royal Commission on Bilingualism conceived of Canadian identity. As early as its preliminary hearings, community organizations made presentations to the Commission highlighting problems that they had with a dualistic understanding of Canada. Isydore Hlynka, President of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, addressed the Commission at the preliminary hearings and argued that language such as biculturalism failed to represent all Canadians. He claimed it failed to consider 5 million Canadians of different and culturally distinct ethnic minorities (Hlynka, 1963, 82-83). Hlynka commented that the terms of reference (particularly the use of the term biculturalism) divided Canadians into “two categories, or as the saying goes, into first and second-class Canadians” (84) and that they elevated the status of French and British above all others¹². Speaking on behalf of the Ukrainian Professionals and Businessmen’s Club, B.M Belash maintained that “Canadian Ukrainian citizens feel that they are too a founding race since to a large extent it was the Ukrainians that did the work building the railways, and it was the Ukrainians who found these settlements in the most inaccessible parts of Western Canada” (Belash, 1963, 219). Belash went on to argue that the dynamic nature of the country’s founding and identity made the idea of two founding races erroneous

¹² It is important to make two careful distinctions here. The first is that while the Royal Commission’s terms of reference was not silent on the need to consider the place of other ethnic groups in addition to the French and English, that there was a clear understanding of the particular importance of the French and English communities given their focus on biculturalism instead of something more all encompassing. The second distinction is that even with the inclusion of clauses in the terms of reference referring to ethnic minorities, there was a clear perception on the part of organizations such as the Ukrainian Canadian Committee that these clauses were not sufficient to ensure their fair consideration by the Commission.

(220). These comments at the preliminary hearings demonstrate an objection to the mandate of the Royal Commission even before more detailed policy proposals and recommendations were starting to be discussed.

Submissions by Ukrainian-Canadian organizations to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism on Canadian identity reflect a multiplicity of different viewpoints but can be broadly categorized into two distinct camps. The first sought recognition and cultural support within a bilingual and bicultural framework, while the second looked to have ethnic minorities recognized alongside the British and French within a multilingual, multicultural framework. The bicultural approach came through in submissions made by the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians, its executive branch, and a separate statement made by the Association's Manitoba branch. This organization advocated for an approach to culture that recognized French and English duality, but also that demonstrated a realization that Canadian diversity and cultural support should not be limited to these two groups. In its submission the executive branch even accepted a non-territorial aspect to language in Canada that has a striking resemblance to the ideology of the Trudeau government¹³. The executive argues that English cannot be seen as the "language of the Canadian nation while French is seen as the "language of the province of Quebec" (National Executive of the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians, 1968, 5). Linking language to culture, they even accepted biculturalism stating that Canadians "should regard one or the other national cultures as their basis for cultural expression" (6). The Executive does argue in

¹³ This is the opposite of what many other Ukrainian organizations and also Quebecois intellectuals would propose.

favour of the support of other cultural groups as well, though it recognizes that such groups should not be equated to the English or French language or cultural groups (6-7). While the submissions from the Association as a whole and the Manitoba branch were less comprehensive than the National Executive's submission, they followed similar themes; recommending that the government support a diversity of cultural groups while recognizing the fundamentally bicultural character of the country.

These submissions are important because of their recommendations fit within the terms of reference of the Commission and the conclusions that it drew; showing that there was interest in cultural and linguistic support within the bicultural framework that the Commission would end up recommending. They further demonstrated to the Commission that many of the substantial demands for cultural supports, which will be discussed later in this section, could be distinguished from the demands that the community was making in terms of national cultural recognition (via multiculturalism or regional cultural recognition). Thus the adoption of biculturalism would not mean that the Commission had to reject a recommendation such as the accreditation of unofficial modern languages in grade schools and universities. Finally, the unity in terms of demanding cultural support despite disagreement over how to recognize cultural diversity is significant in showing the importance of that cultural support to a variety of actors within the Ukrainian community.

The more multicultural submissions within the Ukrainian community rejected the idea of biculturalism, and to a degree bilingualism, as not recognizing the important role that ethnic minorities played in Canada. Ukrainian organization

submissions that are important in this respect include ones by the St. John's Institute¹⁴ and the Lakehead branch of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee. In addition to this, a submission by the Canadian Mennonite Association is notable for expressing the hope that bilingualism and biculturalism could eventually evolve into multilingualism and multiculturalism (Canadian Mennonite Association, 1968, 3). The St. John's Institute attacked the idea that Canada has two founding races, arguing that such a viewpoint ignores the contribution of ethnic minorities to the country (St. John's Institute, 1968, 3). To them, the diversity of ethnic groups is something that is central to Canadian identity. Their submission argued:

That the multi-cultural nature of Canadian culture be encouraged insofar as it tends to decelerate the process of "Americanization" of Canadian culture and helps to preserve what is still distinctly and uniquely Canadian (4).

The Institute went further to reinterpret bilingualism to include "the English language¹⁵ and any other language-French, German, Ukrainian, etc" (4-5). It finally insisted that efforts to build and preserve the French language in Alberta should be equitable to efforts to build and preserve the Ukrainian language (5). The Lakehead branch of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee expressed a great deal of concern at the idea of biculturalism, suggesting that it would

infer that almost one-third of Canada's population- and almost half of Lakehead's population- composed of many, some quite sizable groups of neither Anglo-Saxon nor French ethnic origin- are devoid of any semblance of culture, an erroneous impression which existed decades ago (Ukrainian Canadian Committee Lakehead Branch, 1968, 2).

¹⁴ This is an organization eventually attached to the University of Alberta to provide educational, cultural, and religious support to Ukrainians and Ukrainian-Canadians in Alberta.

¹⁵ It is interesting that a reference is made to English and any other language but not to French and any other language. This perhaps demonstrates an understanding of Canada as primarily English on the part of the St. John's institute, and further shows that they see Ukrainian-Canadians as having a cultural significance equal to that of French-Canadians.

Both of these organizations made strong claims about the problems of a bicultural understanding of Canada.

The Preliminary Report of the Commission and work by its members, such as Andre Laurendeau, demonstrate that the rejection of a dualistic approach to Canadian identity by ethnic minorities, particularly by the Ukrainian community, was well noted. In his diary, Laurendeau describes a strong degree of resistance to bilingualism and biculturalism on the Prairies. He recounts being subject to a "veritable assault of multiculturalism" at a dinner in Winnipeg after being seated between an Icelandic doctor and a Ukrainian war hero (Laurendeau, 1991, 35). A later entry, after a meeting in Edmonton in which the business community expressed its own concerns with biculturalism and bilingualism, led Laurendeau to make an observation that the Prairies were significantly different from the rest of Canada, that

These provinces have had delicate problems to resolve because they were built by very different ethnic groups; they have managed to work out some kind of balance; they're afraid biculturalism will threaten that balance (35).

Later, Laurendeau notes that the biggest objection in the West that the Commission had faced came from ethnic minorities, particularly Ukrainians, who felt that the recognition of a unique place for French-Canadians took something away from their own place in Canada (47). That the French co-chair of the Commission was making such observations demonstrates that the stronger views being presented by the Ukrainian community were heard by the Commission. The reference to the Ukrainian community in particular shows both that they were instrumental in bringing these concerns forward, and that the actors within it who rejected

bilingualism and biculturalism were seen as representative of the community's views.

The 1965 preliminary report issued by the Commission shows that the Commission as a whole had heard the concerns expressed by communities such as the Ukrainian-Canadian Community. The report observes that the compact theory, which saw Canada as an agreement between French and English Canadians, was received with a large degree of scepticism in English Canada (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1965, 46-47). The Commission was reminded throughout their meetings of the role that a variety of ethnic minorities played in settling the West, and of the strong sense of community and cultural identity that persisted amongst them (50-51). Special mention is made of linguistic recognition. Here the Report indicates that many groups sought to gain ethnic minority languages recognition without being given official status. In addition it discusses a couple of groups that sought to shift the definition of bilingualism to include those that spoke English or French and their mother-tongue (52). It is particularly interesting that a reference to this suggestion made it into the preliminary report because of its presence in the St. John's Institute's submission. This further shows the impact such groups were having on the Commission's findings.

There are competing bicultural and multicultural threads that run through the Royal Commission's final report. The preface to the report casts the recognition of ethnic minorities within the context of a bicultural society. Here the Commission argues that Canada is made up of a diverse group of communities, but that they exist within a dualistic framework. The language of "two societies" and "two majorities" indicates that this part of the report accepted the primacy of English and French

language and cultural groups while recognizing that there was some diversity within them. This is demonstrated in the preface statement that:

In the course of this Report we shall examine various aspects of the crisis and shall propose some remedies. We shall examine the theme of *two societies* and of *the two majorities* in succeeding Books and from various points of view (italics from within the report) (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1967, xvii).

The contribution of ethnic minorities is referred to in the preface, and indeed the argument is made that these groups deserve support from the government. That support though is cast both in terms of the well-being of individuals and in terms of the relationship that ethnic minorities and their communities had to Canada's French and English speaking societies. It is argued that their

freedom to participate fully in Canadian life will be real only on two conditions: that both societies, the French-speaking as well as the English-speaking, accept the newcomers much more readily than they have done in the past; and that the two societies willingly allow other groups to preserve and enrich, if they so desire, the cultural values they prize. We believe that they should go further. For this reason we shall examine, in the Book concerning the other ethnic groups, the kind of aid the two societies should offer, particularly in the fields of education, the mass media, and the creative arts (xxv).

There are two contrasting conceptions of diversity in Canada that come through in this section. In a nod to what would become multiculturalism, the support of ethnic minorities is pointed out as important to the building of a country in which all Canadian can take part. However, the language of the "two societies" and the primary role of English and French groups culturally is not gone from this section either. While it shows an acceptance of the principles that would become Canadian multiculturalism, it does not reject the biculturalism that many in the Ukrainian

community (and, as will be discussed later, Trudeau government) found deeply problematic.

It is important that the argument made in the preface is made largely in favour of support for individuals as opposed to communities as collective units. The support of other cultures here is cast as an instrument aimed at the integration of individuals from diverse backgrounds into the country. It is a clear alternative to assimilation into an exclusively dualistic Canada, but it is not the kind of collective recognition desired by the Ukrainian organizations supportive of multiculturalism. These groups are denied an elevation of their cultural status to that of the English and French. By considering Canadian diversity within two “majorities” or “societies” the Commission accepted many of the principles of multiculturalism without casting aside the dualistic framework that had dominated approaches to Canadian identity up until this point. Recognition of individual groups as central to defining Canadian identity¹⁶ is thus reserved for the English and French “majorities.” Indeed Manoly Lupul would note his and the Ukrainian community’s concern over the report’s dualism in his memoirs writing that the

rejection of the “third force” argument and its embrace of the “fundamental duality of Canada,” requiring members of all cultural groups to “choose between Francophone and Anglophone societies” during the process of integration...” ...The crucial issue, [he] thought, was not integration but whether the suggested cultural dualism was to extend from coast to coast and, if so, how viable cultural aspects of other groups were to be accommodated within the new dualistic nature of Canada (Lupul, 2005, 112).

¹⁶ This occurs in the sense that the British and French (as well as First Nations later in Canadian history) get recognition as “founding peoples” amongst other terms.

While the first vestiges of multiculturalism started to come through in the report, and it still reserved a degree of collective recognition exclusively for British and French societies. This is not surprising given the strong dualistic understandings of many of the Commissions' key members such as Andre Laurendeau and Jean Marchand. Highlighting this is a section in the fourth book, *The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups*, that frames its recommendations in terms of fostering the cultural support of individuals from ethnically diverse groups within English and French societies.

Every Canadian should be able to enjoy all his natural and civil rights, *within one of the two societies*. Those of neither French nor British origin should have the same opportunities as citizens who belong to the two societies by birth. In keeping with the spirit of our times, the process of integration should be equally beneficial to the receiving society and to the individual joining it. The individual must have complete freedom of choice in his integration; the receiving society must, through its institutions, assure him equal opportunities for personal fulfilment (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1969, 5).

It is significant that the force of the submissions and other interactions between the Commission and the Ukrainian community had such a high profile within the Commission's work. That Laurendeau, a staunch advocate of a dualistic vision of Canada while he was the editor-in-chief of *Le Devoir*, understood the unique role of ethnic minority communities is a significant breakthrough for them. The strength of the submissions and lobbying of the Ukrainian and other ethnic minorities became important in two respects. The representation of the size of these communities across the country, and particularly on the Prairies, played a role in convincing the Commission to put together the fourth book on ethnic minorities

in Canada¹⁷. Moreover, the strength of the presentations of the community contributed to the understanding of the various ethnic groups having a unique place as active and vibrant communities in the country. Since the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism had already given a place to ethnic minorities within a bicultural society, multiculturalism would be less of a leap for a Trudeau government interested in avoiding the division of Canada into two distinct societies suggested by biculturalism.

The Ukrainian community had the greatest degree of success in influencing the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism with regards to specific recommendations made for government support of diverse cultural groups. Here, despite their different feelings towards biculturalism, there were a large number of similarities between Ukrainian organizations. In general recommendations focused on language support, advocating in favour of the recognition of non-official languages such as Ukrainian within educational institutions, as well as pushing for government investment in a variety of cultural programs designed to preserve and promote ethnic minority cultures. Finally, something that comes across in a number of the submissions by Ukrainian groups is the desire to have the Ukrainian community recognized for its role in Canadian history, in particular for its importance in pioneering and settling the Prairies.

The National Executive of the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians, the Ukrainian Canadian Committee (Lakehead Branch), and the St. John's Institute have a few similar sets of recommendations. In terms of language and education the

¹⁷ This book would in turn be important to ensuring many of the more substantive recommendations regarding language and cultural support became part of government policy.

Association of United Ukrainian Canadians recommends that the languages of the “national groups¹⁸” be taught as optional courses where a reasonable number of people desire it to be so, and also that an “objective history of Canada be made available to all schools in Canada” (National Executive of the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians, 1968, 1). This is echoed by the Ukrainian Canadian Committee in Lakehead who advocated that assistance should be given to organizing mother tongue language classes where there is demand for them (Ukrainian Canadian Committee Lakehead Branch, 1968, 5), and by the St. John’s Institute who argued that “any aid or encouragement given by the Federal authorities on behalf of the French language in Alberta be extended on an equitable basis to the Ukrainian language as well” (St. John’s Institute, 1968, 5). The Institute agreed with the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians in advocating in favour of the development of a history curriculum that includes the contribution of ethnic minorities (5). To add to this, the Friends of the Children’s Public Library of Sudbury, a group of mothers of Ukrainian descent seeking to encourage reading in both the English and Ukrainian languages, advocated for the teaching of Ukrainian as an accredited (presumably optional) modern language in high school (Friends of the Children’s Public Library in Sudbury, 1968, 5). A common trend in favour the teaching of Ukrainian and other non-official languages comes across in all of these submissions.

Two other areas in which there was substantial consensus across the recommendations made by multiple Ukrainian community organizations involves the funding of cultural programs and improving access of ethnic minority

¹⁸ Noted as separate from the French and the English.

communities to the media, particularly with regards to nationally owned media organizations such as the CBC or National Film Board. The Association of United Ukrainian Canadians made reference to both cultural program funding and access ethnic minority access to media (National Executive of the Association of the United Ukrainian Canadians, 1968, 2). The Ukrainian Canadian Committee Lakehead Branch submission recommended that the government, through the CBC, National Film Board, and Canada Council, support the increased communication of the contribution of ethnic minority communities and the increase in the availability of said groups artistic works (Ukrainian Canadian Committee Lakehead Branch, 1968, 4-5). The St. John's Institute also made specific recommendations aimed at opening up the French and English media to make "the multicultural nature of Canada evident to all Canadians" (St. John's Institute, 1968, 4). Here again the Ukrainian community did well to make clear the areas in which the government could assist them in preserving their culture.

The impact of the Ukrainian Canadian Community comes through in the fourth book released by the Royal Commission concerning the contributions of ethnic minorities. Pointing out that the issue of non-official languages is particularly important to the Ukrainian community, the fourth book notes that a unique aspect of the community as compared to other ethnic minorities is its ability to maintain their language even amongst those that are second and third generation immigrants (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1969, 132-133). On the issue of teaching ethnic minority languages at the elementary and high school levels the Commission recommended that optional courses be offered where numbers are sufficient to warrant it (this falls under recommendation 3 at the elementary school

level recommendation 5 at the high school level) (141, 145). The Commission notes that the recommendation of providing language courses at the elementary level was in response to briefs advocating for such a recommendation (141), undoubtedly including the submissions that were discussed above. In addition, while examining language issues at the high school level, the Report notes that the only language being taught in large numbers across the country is German, and that Ukrainian can be seen as comparable to German on the Prairies (it is pointed out that in Ontario Italian is also taught where there are significant Italian immigrant communities) (144). The Ukrainian community is finally recognized as having “a strong interest in maintaining their ancestral language” (144). The Commission included a recommendation (recommendation 6) that suggested “universities broaden their practices in giving standing or credits for studies in modern languages other than French or English both for admission and degrees” (161). Even where recommendations do not reference or mirror those made in submission to the Commission, it notes that the Ukrainian community is a major target population affected by them. This further suggests that the work of Ukrainian organizations, among others, were in the minds of Commissioners when they developed these recommendations.

At the grade school level the impact of the Ukrainian community is further noted in the discussion of the history curriculum. Here the report includes a

recommendation¹⁹ made in a presentation by the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, which reads as follows:

an extensive revision of the school textbooks for public schools should take place in which the Ministers of Citizenship and Immigration together with provincial Ministers of Education examine their contents and exclude discriminatory material and give the students an unbiased social studies material, referring to the different ethnic groups, their origin, history, culture, literature, and their accomplishments for the benefit of this country (146).

The other ethnic community that was particularly noted as commenting on this issue was the German community through a German-language newspaper. While the fourth book does not contain an explicit recommendation on this issue, it does include a couple of paragraphs noting that educational curriculums should be adjusted to reflect the contribution of ethnic minorities:

our public schools should give due weight to the role of those of all ethnic origins in our country's development and to the cultures and languages of all Canadians. All Canadian children can benefit from an awareness of our country's cultural diversity and a better knowledge of the contributions of the different cultural groups to Canada's growth (148).

The Royal Commission finally made a number of recommendations regarding broadcasting that concerned issues raised by the Ukrainian community²⁰. Here the Report notes restrictions on broadcasting in languages other than English and French that guide CBC policy (183) and regulations drawn up in 1962 that set Canada's languages for broadcasting purposes as "English, French, Indian, and Eskimo" (184-185). In response the Commission's recommendations 8 through 11

¹⁹ That is to say that this is a recommendation made by the Ukrainian Canadian Committee and not the Royal Commission itself. It is used by the Royal Commission as an example of the concern that ethnic minorities had with portrayal of Canadian history in elementary and high schools.

²⁰ There is very little reference to Ukrainian community in this section though.

advocated for opening up Canadian broadcasting to languages other than English and French, advocating for the lifting of restrictions against private organizations broadcasting in non-official languages, and encouraged the CBC to do so as well. Further they suggested that the CRTC study the ways that the broadcast media could contribute to non-official language maintenance and the portrayal of ethnic minorities in the media (190-193). In terms of the National Film Board, there is little reference to actual submissions and statements by ethnic minority organizations, but there are two recommendations advocating in favour of working with these groups in developing films, as well as working to develop films that contribute to the communication of Canada's diversity (196). While this section of the report lacks references to Ukrainian and other ethnic minority organizations' submission and statements, it does reflect some of the recommendations made in submissions by Ukrainian organizations, indicating a further area of influence for them.

The argument here is certainly not that the Ukrainian community was the only one advocating for the recommendations regarding cultural support adopted by the Commission, nor is it that these recommendations can be solely attributed to the work of community organizations. Indeed it must be remembered that there were two Commissioners who themselves came from ethnic minority communities and that indeed one, Jaroslav Rudnyckyj came from the Ukrainian community. These members, along with others, would have brought their own ideas regarding the need for cultural and community recognition and support and would have made an important contribution to the final recommendations. It cannot be ignored however that the recommendations made by the Royal Commission's fourth book

fell in line with many of the concerns raised by Ukrainian community organizations in their submissions to it. In the case of grade school language education, that the Commission's report makes references to concerns raised by Ukrainian and other community organizations shows that they were being understood by the Commission and suggests that recommendations made by it were at least in part a response to them.

Within a broader context the discussion above is important to multiculturalism because of the role that the fourth book played in directing the policies that would eventually be implemented by the Trudeau government. Even if Trudeau was largely concerned with his own Canadian national project (something that will be discussed in greater detail in the next section), he introduced multiculturalism to Canada by accepting many of the Commission's recommendations arising from this fourth volume. As a result, they served as the framework for the initial multiculturalism policy introduced to Canada, having an important role in shaping the direction of the policy. Thus, even though the Ukrainian community did not get the multicultural recognition that many of its members were looking for from the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, it was important that it got many of its substantial recommendations accepted by it.

Before moving on to look at Trudeau and the introduction of multiculturalism at the legislative level, it is worth noting of the proposition on regional languages that was put forward by some of the Ukrainian as well as other communities but not accepted by the full Commission. This particular recommendation is important because Commissioner Rudnycky supported it enough to include a separate

statement on the subject in the first book of the Report. Echoing arguments for the recognition of the multilingual nature of the country presented by the Ukrainian community through forums such as the Manitoba Mosaic Congress, he proposed recognition of regional languages. Rudnyckyj's position, as noted by Julia Lalande, was that any language group containing 10% of the population in an administrative district should be recognized as a regional language for that district (Lalande, 2006, 50-51). In practice his statement argues that this would make German and Ukrainian regional languages for a corridor of the prairies stretching from South-Eastern Manitoba to North-Western Alberta, as well as opening up the door to recognition of Aboriginal languages in the Northwest Territories and Yukon and Italian in Montreal and Toronto (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1967, 158). Rudnyckyj envisioned regional languages receiving recognition as important in a variety of areas including education, use in mass media, internal organization and institutional life of respective groups, and in functions that the government might approve in accordance with popular demand (158).

Even though the Commission did not accept this multilingual approach, it demonstrates a further impact that the Ukrainian-Canadians were able to have upon the Commission. The fact that Commissioner Rudnyckyj, a member of the Ukrainian Canadian community advocated on behalf of such a proposal indicates an interest on his part in pushing for things in the interest of the Ukrainian community. One can assume that if he was willing and able to write a separate statement advocating on behalf of the Ukrainian community (as well as other ethnic minority communities) on this issue, that he also played a significant role in pushing for other issues that

were presented by the community, such as the substantial recommendations noted in Book 4. Furthermore Rudnycky's statement makes extensive reference to information submitted to the Commission by the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, quoting a page worth of survey data in support of special status for the Ukrainian language (166-167). That this became an important part of the statement shows that Ukrainian organizations were able to make connections with Commission members, and that their work and recommendations were accepted by at least some members of the Commission as important enough to drive substantial propositions within the Report.

4. The Trudeau Government and the Acceptance of Multiculturalism

On October 8, 1971 Pierre Trudeau announced the adoption of a policy of Multiculturalism within a Bilingual framework in Canada. Trudeau's announcement was made on a Friday morning in the House of Commons, and the policy was adopted with support from all of the parties in Parliament. The multiculturalism policy had four key principles, three of which were oriented towards the integration of immigrants into Canadian society. The principles are noted here as they were announced in the policy.

First, resources permitting, the government will seek to assist all Canadian cultural groups that have demonstrated a desire and effort to continue to develop a capacity to grow and contribute to Canada, and a clear need for assistance, the small and weak groups no less than the strong and highly organized.

Second, the government will assist members of all cultural groups to overcome barriers to full participation in Canadian society.

Third, the government will promote creative encounters and interchange among all Canadian cultural groups in the interest of national unity.

Fourth, the government will continue to assist immigrants to acquire at least one of Canada's official languages in order to become full participants in Canadian society (Trudeau, 1971, 8546).

There are both collectivist and individual liberal aspects to the principles that Trudeau articulated in the policy. The first principle speaks to the building of communities in such a manner that suggests support for communities as a whole while the third notes the place of such communities in a broader Canadian society. Both of these principles speak to the needs of different cultural groups as single entities, thus implying a certain degree of collective importance to them. In contrast to this, the second and fourth principles deal with the integration of individuals into

society in a manner in which culture does not become a disadvantage. These principles focus on the benefits that multiculturalism can have to individuals. There is thus space in the policy for both collectivist and individual liberal approaches to multiculturalism. The defence and implementation of the policy however, would emphasize the role of multiculturalism in terms of the benefits that it brought to individuals of different ethnic backgrounds.

In justifying the policy, Trudeau chose to emphasize its individual liberal components. Rather than commenting extensively on the contributions to the country made by ethnic minority communities, Trudeau focused on how the exclusive support of the cultural development of only English, French and Aboriginal communities stifled the development of other Canadians and therefore did not treat those individuals equally. He raised concerns about the inequality of something like biculturalism declaring that “although there are two official languages, there is no official culture, nor does any ethnic group take precedence over any other” (8545). Finally, Trudeau spoke in terms of individual rights arguing, “The individual’s freedom would be hampered if he were locked within a particular cultural compartment by birth or language” (8545). It is notable that it was not Trudeau, but NDP leader David Lewis that mentioned the contributions of ethnic groups by community, making reference to Italian, German, and West Indian Canadians specifically (Lewis, 1971, 8547). While the multiculturalism program might have been important symbolically to Trudeau, the budget that it initially received was relatively small at \$5 million and was not administered under a cabinet portfolio²¹ but rather by a minister of state (Hawkins, 1972, 390-391). This is important in

²¹ It is current part of the portfolio of the Minister for Citizenship, Immigration, and Multiculturalism.

distinguishing a collectivist from an individual liberal approach to multiculturalism because collectivist aspects of the policy such as non-official language education or support for cultural community events are elements that are highly affected by funding levels. The emphasis on multiculturalism as an individual liberal program aimed largely at ensuring that ethnic minorities can integrate into the country without giving up their cultural practices fits with Trudeau's political ideology. This emphasized the importance of liberal rights and the creation of a broad Canadian identity to which every person could feel a part of.

Trudeau's emphasis on the individualistic aspects of his policy, its limited support, and Trudeau's political ideology demonstrate a clear contrast between the aspects of multiculturalism that the more multicultural Ukrainian organizations sought and the multiculturalism that was introduced by Trudeau. Of primary importance to many Ukrainian groups was government support in the building of stronger ethnic minority communities through investment things such as non-official language education, cultural programs and community events, and recognition of the role of ethnic minorities in the country. While there were certainly aspects of this that come through in Trudeau's policy, collective community support was not at its forefront. Trudeau's multiculturalism is much more individual than the multiculturalism advocated by ethnic minorities in that it emphasizes multiculturalism as a way of ensuring that individuals from ethnic minorities are subject to similar treatment as ethnically British and French Canadians. In spite of the first principle announcing government support for ethnic minority cultural development, Trudeau sold the policy not as a way to build ethnic minority communities in Canada but rather as a way to ensure that ethnic minorities

are not at a disadvantage compared to British and French ethnic groups. Furthermore, there is limited recognition of the place of ethnic minorities (either specific communities or the “third element” as a whole) alongside British and French communities in terms of their contribution to building the country. The foundations of a policy emphasizing the role of ethnic minorities in Canada is present here, but the government falls short of the multiculturalism that was being advocated by many Ukrainian-Canadians²².

Trudeau’s writings both before and after his time in government suggest that multiculturalism was not an intrinsic goal for him, but rather that it fit within a broader political context. In his memoirs, Trudeau makes no mention of multiculturalism but rather focuses on his government’s achievements at building bilingualism particularly in developing bilingualism within the federal government. When Trudeau considers problems with equating territory and language, he examines Quebec and Ontario and English and French minorities within those two provinces, but does not refer to the ethnic minority languages present in the Prairies. In *Federalism and the French Canadians* he makes reference to parts of Ontario and New Brunswick that would belong in a French-Canadian nationalist state and refers to the potential to turn Westmount into “the Danzig of the New World” in order illustrate the problems of linguistic and cultural nationalism in Canada (Trudeau, 1968, 159). Trudeau’s support of multiculturalism needs to be understood in terms of the politics of the time. The Liberal government at the time was dealing with a substantial threat in the form of a growing separatist movement

²² Even organizations that accepted biculturalism such as the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians emphasized community support projects such as non-official language education in arguing for greater government support of ethnic minorities.

in Quebec and an Anglophone dominated public service serving under a Prime Minister who was a strong advocate of the increase of the profile of bilingualism within the higher bureaucratic and economic echelons in the country. Trudeau was attempting to build a single national identity that included all Canadians. The introduction of the multiculturalism policy became an important part of this.

Pierre Trudeau rejected the idea of biculturalism, but not for the same reasons as the ethnic minority communities who felt that it did not represent their place within the country. He sought to create a country with a single national identity and thus had problems with the compact theory perspective common in Quebec, which saw the country was an agreement between French and English Canadians. This perspective was indeed something that troubled many Quebecois intellectuals and even Anglophone political leaders such as Prime Minister Lester Pearson. Andre Laurendeau comments in his diary that Jean Marchand²³ expressed concern that Trudeau not counsel Pearson on issues relating to Quebec because he felt that Trudeau did not understand the importance of biculturalism to the province (Laurendeau, 1991, 154-155). Laurendeau further noted that Trudeau was involved in writing a strong critique of the support of biculturalism expressed by the Royal Commission that appeared in *Cite Libre*. Though he did not sign the document for political reasons, Laurendeau notes that Gerard Pelletier (another associate of

²³ Who was a prominent Liberal insider, and member of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism until he was elected to parliament.

Trudeau's²⁴) confirmed that Trudeau had played an important role in its development (154-155).

It is important to understand the adoption of multiculturalism as it relates to other national identity policies. McRoberts and Russell both situate Trudeau's drive to create a Canadian identity as encompassing a variety of different policies. McRoberts argues that the Prime Minister's approach to bilingualism, rather than seeking to strengthen the French language in Quebec, had the goal of increasing bilingualism across the country (McRoberts, 1997, 85-86). He looks at multiculturalism in this light, and argues that it was a way for the Trudeau government to avoid recognizing Quebec as unique, and provided an alternative to the biculturalism Trudeau was concerned with (McRoberts, 1995, 6-7). McRoberts continues by claiming that Trudeau's work here did not rest simply with bilingualism and multiculturalism, but included policies to strengthen the federal government and the presence of federal programs in Canada (McRoberts, 1997, 140-141), attempts to limit to ability of Quebec to opt-out of federal programs (and thus to claim a unique place amongst the provinces) (142), and even the patriation of the Constitution as a Canadian document with a Charter of Rights that individuals claimed as citizens of Canada (176-177). Russell goes so far as to suggest that in addition to these programs, equalization was part of this broader strategy of national unity (Russell, 1991, 103-104). This frames multiculturalism not as an intrinsic goal of the Trudeau government, but rather an instrumental one serving his purposes with respect to Quebec.

²⁴ Pierre Trudeau, Jean Marchand, and Gerard Pelletier were referred to as the "three wise men," Quebecois intellectuals who knew each other well, and who were lured to Ottawa by the Liberal party.

There are two key aspects to this argument that are important. The first is that multiculturalism is accepted as part of a broader strategy to deal with the need to fight Quebec nationalism and separatism. From a positive perspective, the policy became useful in that it gave Canadians a way to understand their national identity as a single entity without conceding the distinct place of various diverse groups. There is no way that Canada could be understood as culturally uniform given the presence of strong English and French communities that were clearly culturally distinct. By rejecting the idea of culture as something that could frame national identity, Trudeau was able to avoid having to deal with those distinct differences when crafting an idea of national identity that he could sell to all Canadians²⁵. Multiculturalism became a way of doing this in a manner that allowed the state to recognize the fact that culture was important to individuals, while avoiding recognition of a divide between French and English Canadians.

From a negative perspective, multiculturalism gave the Trudeau government a way to avoid the bicultural recognition advocated by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in one volume by embracing the embryonic multiculturalism in another. The recognition of Quebec and biculturalism that was recommended by the Commission was not an option for a Trudeau government seeking to re-cast Canada as a nation of individuals as opposed to a compact between two nations. It was thus impossible to accept the bicultural threads that came through in the Report. The fourth book recognizing the importance of other ethnic groups to Canada presented the government with a way to accept many of

²⁵ Whether all Canadians bought in to the national identity that Trudeau was selling is an issue for a different debate.

the detailed recommendations of the Commission, while rebranding the cultural understanding of the country in a way that avoided problems that the government had with biculturalism. The government thus accepted the recommendations made by the Royal Commission in the fourth book, but cast them in a multicultural instead of bicultural framework.

In both cases, the Ukrainian and other ethnic minority organizations become important because it was their lobbying and submissions that drove the creation of the fourth book and because they were key players in shaping many of the recommendations that would allow the government to re-frame its policy as multiculturalism. It was not that they created political circumstances that made multiculturalism inevitable, but rather that political circumstances in the country were such that the positions they were advocating were useful to the government. Without the national unity crises, and a Trudeau government committed to a single national identity as a solution to it, there may not have been the political capital necessary for multiculturalism to become government policy. Multiculturalism thus becomes not just a product of the efforts of ethnic minority communities in lobbying the government, but also of a broader national identity debate that opened up the door for it as a proposal. At the same time however, without the work of ethnic minority communities such as the Ukrainian community, the proposals and advocacy likely would not have existed and multiculturalism (at least in the form that it was adopted) would likely have not been seen as alternative to biculturalism.

This is not to say that there were no other political motivations involved with multiculturalism. The day after the announcement of the multiculturalism policy in the House of Commons Trudeau made a speech to the Ukrainian Canadian Congress

meeting in Winnipeg in which he called the policy as important as any decision that his government had made (Malling, 1971, 1). That Trudeau did this, as well as conceded to a demand to discuss Ukrainian political prisoners with the Premier of the Soviet Union (1), suggests a political interest in the Ukrainian community in particular. This can further be taken in the context of a growing political concern on the part of the Liberal party through the 1960s and 1970s to appeal to win votes amongst different ethnic groups as was noted in the first section of the paper. Finally Hawkins notes that the Liberals were approaching Quebec politically with a nervous eye towards the rise of separatism and the impact that might have on their ability to gain votes in Quebec. As a result she argues that the Liberals would have been looking to appeal to ethnic minority communities as a way of covering for that potential loss in Quebec while hopefully making gains in the West (Hawkins, 1972, 389-390). Multiculturalism (along with changes to the immigration policy and perhaps even the adoption of a flag without British or French symbols) would have been a way to appeal to these different blocs of voters.

While this is not unimportant to explaining the adoption of multiculturalism, there are limitations to this as a primary explanation of the policy's adoption. The first lies in the limited scope of the policy and the way that it was introduced. As noted earlier, the policy was not very big with respect to either funding or profile within the government. To add to this its announcement on Friday morning prior to Question Period and its introduction as a statement by the government instead of a piece of legislation limits its capacity to be used as a major show-piece for a Liberal government. Indeed in *The Edmonton Journal* only a day after The Policy's announcement, the manager of the Edmonton office of the Ukrainian National

Federation, Nick Pritz, expressed concern that the policy would not lead to Ukrainians getting the same kind of cultural support from the government as French Canadians (The Edmonton Journal, 1971, 21), suggesting that some communities did not see this policy as necessarily serving their interests.

While the multicultural policy certainly increased the potential for Liberals to make gains in ethnic minority communities, particularly in Western Canada, there were limits to what it could do. As already noted above, the small amount of funding that was extended to the policy led many groups to feel that this was not an adequate response to the concerns that they had regarding biculturalism²⁶. The adoption of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework contributed to this as Official Bilingualism rejected the regional language structure that had been important to many of the organizations within the Ukrainian community. The potential for electoral gains in many ethnic minority communities, particularly those on the Prairies, through multiculturalism need to be considered in the context of other political issues. The Progressive Conservatives (and to a far lesser extent the New Democratic Party) had built a great deal of political support through policies catering to a variety of social and economic issues favoured on the prairies, and would have maintained those advantages over the Liberals in this region. As a result, while multiculturalism certainly did not hurt Liberal attempts to break into the West, it had a limited ability to facilitate a major breakthrough in the region.

It is finally worth looking at the impact that Trudeau had on the ideology behind multiculturalism. As was discussed in the first section, the approach that the

²⁶ It is important to consider here that while multiculturalism would become a central part of Canadian identity, it was far from clear that this would happen when the policy was introduced.

Ukrainian community took towards multiculturalism, and the kind of things that they wanted government support for, were oriented towards the collective recognition of a diverse groups within Canada and their contribution to the country. This was something that was generally accepted by the Royal Commission as it sought to give those groups a place within two broader communities (which indeed it was also recognizing as collectives). While Trudeau accepted the recommendations of the Commission, he did not frame multiculturalism in terms of community recognition but largely in terms of liberal individualism (with perhaps a limited recognition of community as important to individual well being). This comes through in the statements noted in his speech to the House of Commons where he talks about the value of multiculturalism for the contributions that it allows for individual development, and where he criticizes the adoption of official cultures as harming non-official cultures. For Trudeau this policy is about allowing the individual access to cultural communities that are seen as equal within the country and not about recognizing the contribution and place of a diversity of communities within Canada. In this way the Trudeau government further adapted multiculturalism to the broader agenda he took into government that focused on

5. Conclusion

Canadian multiculturalism has evolved from this original policy into a complex set of policies and programs with a range of goals including cultural support, but also extending into other areas such as anti-racism. The issues that multiculturalism faces have changed dramatically and it has become a central part of Canadian identity²⁷. This has been possible because of the foothold that multiculturalism gained as a result of the interaction between ethnic minorities, such as the Ukrainian community, and the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, and as a result of the willingness of the Trudeau government to adopt it as an alternative to biculturalism. It is important to understand Canadian multiculturalism within this context. Central to the adoption of the policy is that well-established ethnic minority groups, which had built political capital over the half-century prior to the introduction of the policy, were advocating in its favour. Further, the timing of the policy's adoption is important. The national unity debate of the 1960s and 1970s became a rallying point for ethnic minority organizations whose understanding of the country as multicultural contrasted with many on the English and French side of the unity debate. With the election of a Prime Minister who rejected the idea of biculturalism and sought to build a single national identity that included all Canadians, a unique set of circumstances favourable to the adoption of multiculturalism were present in 1971.

There are significant implications here for the export of Canadian multiculturalism. These are not that the policy is limited to Canada as a result of

²⁷ This is at least the case with multiculturalism in English Canada. Multiculturalism in Quebec is much more controversial and deals with a number of unique issues.

these circumstances, but rather that one must look at the history of multiculturalism in the country to see how it might be applied others. Multiculturalism cannot simply be transplanted as a policy from one country to another, but requires that ethnic minorities advocating in favour of it build up a degree of political capital that goes beyond advocacy in favour of multiculturalism. The Canadian case also speaks to the importance of timing in the adoption of multiculturalism. While not limited to issues surrounding national unity or even national identity, important to the export of multiculturalism is that national discourse allows for advocates in favour of the policy to put forward their ideas, and that circumstances are politically favourable to them. The unique situation that contributed to the adoption of multiculturalism does not completely restrict its application to another country, but rather suggests that an examination of the position of ethnic minorities and the national politics of the country is a necessary aspect of a comparative consideration of multiculturalism.

The Ukrainian community played an important role in the creation of Canadian multiculturalism. They were able to take advantage of an opportunity that was presented to them by a broader debate regarding national identity to advance a policy that would evolve into a defining aspect of Canadian identity. The acceptance of such a role for multiculturalism was not immediate, but rather the 1971 government policy merely opened the door to the further political mobilization of ethnic minorities in this regard and to the adoption of a more comprehensive multicultural program. The adoption of the initial policy illustrates the importance of ethnic minority political mobilization on such an issue and on the need for national circumstances that create a space for such a debate to occur and which lead

to a political situation in which the policy is seen as favourable to governing parties.

The Ukrainian community's involvement in multiculturalism in Canada is thus central to an understanding of Canadian multiculturalism.

Bibliography

Belash, BM. (1963 November). *Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Preliminary Hearing*. Ottawa ON. p. 219-234.

Canadian Mennonite Association. (1965 September). *Brief to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism from the Canadian Mennonite Association*. Ottawa, ON.

Champion, Christian P. (2006). Courting "Our Ethnic Friends": Canadianism, Britishness and New Canadians, 1950-1970. *Canadian Ethnic Studies Journal*, 38(1), 23-46.

The Edmonton Journal. (1971, October 9). City Ethnic Groups Wary of Multicultural Program. *The Edmonton Journal*, 21.

Friends of the Children's Public Library in Sudbury. (1964). *A Brief from the Friends of the Children's Public Library in Sudbury for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*. Ottawa, ON.

Hawkins, Freda. (1972). *Canada and Immigration: Public Policy and Public Concern*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Hynka, Isydore. (1963 November). *Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Preliminary Hearing*. Ottawa ON. p. 81-84.

Hlynka, Isydore. (1981). *The Other Canadians: Selected Articles from the Column of "Ivan Harmata" Published in the "Ukrainian Voice"*. Winnipeg: Trident Press.

Kymlicka, Will. (2008). Marketing Canadian Pluralism in the International Arena. In Linda White, Richard Simeon, Richard Vipond, and Jennifer Walker (Ed.) *The Comparative Turn in Canadian Political Science*. (pp. 99-120). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Lalande, Julia. (2006). The Roots of Multiculturalism: Ukrainian-Canadian involvement in the Multiculturalism Discussion of the 1960s as an Example of the Position of the "Third Force." *Canadian Ethnic Studies Journal*. 38, 47-64.

Laurendeau, Andre. (1991). *The Diary of Andre Laurendeau Written During the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1964-1967*. (Patricia Smart, Trans.) Toronto: James Lorimer and Company. (Original Work Published in 1990).

Lewis, David (York South). "Canadian Culture," Canada. Parliament. House of Commons. *House of Commons Debates (Hansard)*, 3rd Session 28th Parliament (Oct. 8, 1971) p. 8547-8548.

Lupul, Manoly. (2005). *The Politics of Multiculturalism: A Ukrainian Canadian Memoir*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.

Malling, Eric. (1971, October 11). PM to Ask About Ukrainians. *The Toronto Daily Star*, 1.

March, Roman. (1980). Political Mobility if Ukrainians in Canada. In W. Petryshyn (Ed.), *Changing Realities: Social Trends Among Ukrainian Canadians*. (pp. 213-224). Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.

McRoberts, Kenneth (1995). *Competing Nationalisms: Quebec-Canada Relations*. (Working Paper N.107). Barcelona, Spain: Kenneth McRoberts.

McRoberts, Kenneth. (1997). *Misconceiving Canada: The Struggle for National Unity*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.

National Executive of the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians. (1964 June). *Submission to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*. Ottawa, ON.

Pearson, Lester B. (Prime Minister). "Canadian Flag." Canada. Parliament. House of Commons. *House of Commons Debates (Hansard)*, 2nd Session 26th Parliament (Jun. 15, 1964) p.4317-4326.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. (1965). *Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Preliminary Report*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. (1967). *Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Final Report Volume I*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. (1969). *The Cultural Contribution of Other Ethnic Groups*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Russell, Peter H. (1991). Can the Canadians Become a Sovereign People. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 24, 691-709.

St. John's Institute. (1964). *A Brief to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*. Ottawa, ON.

Trudeau, Pierre Elliot. (1968). *Federalism and the French Canadians*. Toronto: Macmillan.

Trudeau, Pierre Elliot (Prime Minister). "Canadian Culture," Canada. Parliament. House of Commons. *House of Commons Debates (Hansard)*, 3rd Session 28th Parliament (Oct. 8, 1971) p. 8545-8546.

Trudeau, Pierre Elliot. (1993). *Memoirs*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Inc.

Ukrainian Canadian Committee Lakehead Branch. (1964). *A Brief to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*. Ottawa, ON.

Yuzyk, Paul (Manitoba). "Speech from the Throne." Canada. Parliament. Senate. *Debates of the Senate Official Report*. 2nd Session 26th Parliament (Mar. 3, 1964) p. 50-58.