

# Bilingualism in Quebec Business

## Le bilinguisme dans l'industrie québécoise

Roger Chartier

Volume 23, Number 3, 1968

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/027920ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/027920ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Département des relations industrielles de l'Université Laval

ISSN

0034-379X (print)

1703-8138 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Chartier, R. (1968). Bilingualism in Quebec Business. *Relations industrielles / Industrial Relations*, 23(3), 402–414. <https://doi.org/10.7202/027920ar>

Article abstract

The author defines in general terms, to the English-speaking businessman, the complex concepts and problems of language as an essential part and vehicle of culture, the relationship of language to nationalism, and the insertion of bilingualism in the business organization of today, especially in Québec.

# Bilingualism in Quebec Business

Roger Chartier

*The author defines in general terms, to the English-speaking businessman, the complex concepts and problems of language as an essential part and vehicle of culture, the relationship of language to nationalism, and the insertion of bilingualism in the business organization of today, especially in Quebec.*

## Introduction

There may be some relevance, for the topic at issue, to the story that sociologist Everett C. Hughes, well known for his studies on French Canada, used to tell with tongue in cheek to his University of Chicago students during lectures on race and culture contacts.

« I once knew a widely travelled Englishman who had a very simple device », explained Professor Hughes. « When he got to any place where he did not speak the language (and he could not speak any language but English), he would get off the train or boat and stand there and just shout and make a big noise, day or night, until people came to pacify him. He got excellent service, and if anybody from miles around could speak English, that person would be brought to do him service. »

« The fact », humorously adds Dr. Hughes, « that an Englishman could make a noise in any part of the world and be served is a significant fact in the history of social science ! »

So, may I add, is the fact that the real or imaginary Englishman's technique is gradually losing its effectiveness, for him and for any other person who would insist on speaking a « foreign » language or on remaining unilingual in a bilingual country or province.

I shall deal briefly with the human dimension of bilingualism and biculturalism, with values and aspirations, with cultural differences, and especially with that basic cultural element which is language.

CHARTIER, ROGER, directeur général du personnel, Hydro-Québec, Montréal.
--

My concern with man, culture and language leads me at the outset to state that, beyond the statistical, psychological and political differences here involved, people are people, and men share a number of basic common traits all over the world, so that what unites them is always stronger than what separates or differentiates them. Human nature is the same in the United States, British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec, although its manifestations may be quite different in some instances. A realistic recognition of the following facts is essential to any successful business venture in any part of the world, namely: that men's basic fabric and aspirations are everywhere and at all times to be respected, and that objective differences between them, which must be clearly acknowledged, should also be evaluated as positive and useful elements of any business organization, as powerful levers for the attainment of the objectives of the organization.

But first, one must distinguish fact from fancy, reality from myth in the Quebec situation: it is high time, for instance, that we dispense with the « agricultural » myth in a province where less than 10% of the working force is engaged in agriculture, while the rest have evidenced a very strong commitment to industrial life for decades. It is high time, also, that we discard such superficial epithets as « priest-ridden », uneducated, poor but honest, reliable and hard-working but unsuited for managerial or even supervisory positions, oriented toward the liberal professions but unprepared for, and hostile to, business life, and so on.

One objective difference, however, which is obvious to all about Quebec is the difference in culture, and especially language in relation to the rest of the North American continent (if we except pockets of population of French culture in other Canadian provinces and in some Northeastern States of the Union).

In Quebec today, 87% of the 5,600,000 population are of French origin; 25% of the Quebecers are bilingual, which is twice the figure for the country as a whole; in Canada, the French have a 6-to-1 chance to be bilingual in relation to the English; 30% of Canadians of French origin can speak English while only 4.4% of Canadians of British origin can speak French.

As FORTUNE puts it in its February, 1965 article on French Canada, it

« is a nation with its own language, a distinct and cohesive culture, and a history extending back to the early seventeenth century... They (The French Canadians) don't want to be treated as outsiders, and at the same time they want to remain a separate group ».

They fight for their identity, for the preservation of their cultural values; and yet, they are not satisfied with survival alone; what they want is progress in education, a much greater measure of control over their economic life, and a solid amount of political self-determination.

As of now, French Canada constitutes part of a political unit (Canada) of which it is a « charter-member » minority, but not a dependency. It is deeply culture-conscious. While alien or hostile to another culture, it is nonetheless subtly influenced by it. Though at home from time immemorial, the French Canadian at times feels like a stranger, or rather like a minority member, in many parts of business and industry; the term « minority » applies here to those who, as Louis Wirth suggests,

« because of physical, social or cultural differences, receive differential treatment and regard themselves as people apart. Such groups are held in lower esteem, are debarred from certain opportunities, or are excluded from full participation in our national life ».

The logical temptation is, of course, for such groups to redefine their so-called « political unit » into narrower lines of demarcation, to balkanize the country in which they live. None of the preceding thoughts, I believe, are irrelevant to our discussion. I now find it necessary, however, to get closer to our subjects.

### **Bilingualism in (Quebec) Business**

« Bilingualism » calls for a definition of LANGUAGE, which in turn presupposes a correct understanding of CULTURE, whose basic element and carrier is language. Only then will it be possible to have a look at BUSINESS with its basic tenets and characteristics, and to determine whether two languages may coexist therein without slowly eroding its fundamental fibre.

### **CULTURE**

What, then, is *culture*, whose understanding is so basic to our apprehension of language? It is far more than intellectual knowledge or intellectual refinement. Sociologically and anthropologically, culture

is a character attributed to communities and peoples (not unlike personality to individuals). It embraces *all* the manifestations of social habits, the reactions of the individuals as affected by such habits, and the products of human activities as determined by those social habits. Culture, both *material* and *spiritual*, encompasses all adjustments of man to surrounding nature (nutrition, shelter, inventions, artifacts, goods, technical processes, etc.), all his adjustments to other men (human activities and relations, groupings, and institutions, *language*, and habits or customs, etc.), as well as the subjective behavior of man (art, religion, science, ethics, ideas, beliefs, values, etc.).

In other words, culture comprises one's social heritage, a set of traditional ways of thinking and acting which are *not* biologically inherited (as racial traits are) but which have become customary, conventionalized, socialized, and thus imposed upon individual members of a given community from generation to generation. In short, culture is the sum-total of the acquisitions of any human group in *language*, rites, folkways and mores, style of life, ideas, practices, material objects, feelings, ideals and opinions, philosophy and formal law, technical and rational devices by which men have at all times sought to control their environment and themselves.

### LANGUAGE

Amidst all those important elements of culture, what is the privileged position of language? Of all aspects of culture, language was the first to receive a highly developed form; its essential perfection is a pre-requisite of culture as a whole. Language may be defined as a system of phonetic symbols for the expression of communicable thought and feeling. Phonetic language takes precedence over all other kinds of communicative symbolism, such as: gesture, writing, imitation of overt behavior, and so-called « *soci* »<sup>1</sup> suggestion ». It is a perfect symbolic system for the handling of all references and meanings that a given culture is capable of. The whole content of any culture is expressible in its language. Language is so deeply rooted in the whole of human behavior that there exists hardly any function of such conscious behavior in which it does not play a part.

Language has a number of essential *functions*: 1. It is a basic communication tool between human beings; 2. It may be the greatest single force toward uniformization and socialization among human beings: the mere fact of a common speech serves as a potent symbol of the

social solidarity of those who speak it (« He talks like us, so he is one of us ».); 3. It is an accumulator of culture; 4. It is a foremost factor in the growth of individuality; and 5. It is always there to remind society of the psychological place held by all its members.

Vocabulary is a very sensitive index of the culture of a people. Abstract terms, for instance, may be infrequent in a language whose speakers formulate their behavior on more pragmatic lines. The choice of words in a particular context or culture may convey the opposite of what they mean on the surface or to people of another culture; the same external message is differently interpreted according to the culture of the hearer. Language cannot, in the actual contexts of behavior, be divorced from action; it is the carrier of an infinitely nuanced expressiveness.

#### LANGUAGE AND NATIONALISM

Anthropology makes a rigid distinction between ethnic units based on race, on culture and on language. These do not need to coincide in the least, and in reality seldom do. But with the increased emphasis on nationalism in modern times, the question of the symbolic meaning of race and language has taken on a new significance, and the layman is inclined to see culture, language and race as but different facets of a single social unity, which he turns into a given country.

Language differences have always been important symbols of cultural differences, as must be evident from the preceding demonstration; and yet, it is only in recent times that language differences have taken on an implication of national antagonism, with the hypertrophy of the ideal of the sovereign nation. Rather a political and national unit, once definitely formed, uses a prevailing language as a symbol of its identity, whence gradually emerges the peculiarly modern feeling that every language should properly be the expression of a distinctive nationality.

Language is the most important factor in modern nationalism, as the source from which springs all intellectual and spiritual existence; it is, in the words of Edward Sapir, the most suitable expression of spiritual individuality; it is the key to the most essential characteristics of a people and its culture; it is seen as the very cornerstone of national existence; it is the object of social and political conflict stemming from national pride, honor and prestige, and need for survival or expansion.

Thus, culture (and especially language) differences, contacts and conflicts are not to be taken lightly, as toys for the attainment of one group's political or financial objectives; for they are as close as can be to the most profound feelings of individuals and groups, they reach whatever is fundamental in them. Language, as the irreplaceable expression and vehicle of a given culture, is not easily a garment that a people will wear after working hours (in family and social life) and shed for another one at the workplace to please the boss and *his* definition of « efficient » communication.

### BILINGUALISM

This is as good a time as any to circumscribe the concept of « bilingualism » (which parallels, on a narrower footing, that of « biculturalism », as we have just seen). If by bilingualism we mean the coexistence of two languages in a country, province or even business, I see no objection; but I will point out that if, in a given unit, the two languages are to survive, they must have *equal* status, both formally and practically; otherwise, we shall have, in a short time, practical unilingualism, English-style; such an alternative would indeed make things administratively easy, but it is just not wanted by the users of the other language (French), who are both producers and consumers and are in a position to render English unilingualism in Quebec business financially inefficient.

If by bilingualism we mean the habitual use of two languages, or the ability to speak one's native language and another one with approximately equal facility, I hasten to emphasize, in view of my definition of culture and its close association with language, that no individual, whatever his illusions, is ever *perfectly* bilingual, let alone bicultural. True, some elements of a given culture are to be found in another culture; but the emphasis, the dosage of each varies from one culture to the other; some elements are missing in one which are dominant in another; so that at the end one cultural « mix » is easily distinguishable from any other (much as we would like at times to stress likeness rather than distinctiveness), and thus the man of one culture is basically different from that of another, and finally, the man of one basic language is essentially distinct from that of any other, despite his fluency in other languages.

In my way of seeing things, then, perfect bilingualism in an individual is a myth, and the so-called « perfectly bilingual » person is

usually a painfully marginal one, sitting between two cultural chairs and rejected or suspected by both sides, finally winding up with no culture and no sound language at all. If this be true for a given cultural elite, how much truer it is for the people at large sharing that culture. There is indeed a definite limit to the ability of those people to assimilate and master another language without losing their native one, which alone for them should be essential. Such being the case, no economic or other reality should force such a double linguistic demand upon them, at the lower echelons of the firm, especially if the double demand is not imposed upon another cultural group in order that they may rapidly and freely climb the political, social and economic (especially, industrial) ladder.

### BUSINESS

Let us now turn to industry, to the business, commercial or service organization as it relates to the matter of bilingualism and biculturalism. We have long been familiar with Max Weber's basic characteristics of an ideal type be called « bureaucracy », and which is applicable to industry. Those characteristics were not waste and indolence, as the word might suggest at first, but specialization on the basis of technical qualifications possessed by experts, a hierarchy of authority, a system of impersonal rules and relationships in which all actions are functionally related to the objectives of the organization and are posed within a given sphere of responsibility, and in which formalism protects all members from ill-feeling and arbitrariness. In short, the business concern is to be conceived, in that light, as a rational institution perfectly geared to technical and administrative *efficiency*.

The problem here, however, is that the technical and administrative elements of efficiency do not operate in a vacuum; they are, rather, closely related to the social, the economic and the political fields, just as much as the business organization itself. Another way of making my point clear is to state that efficiency is essentially a *value*, rather than a neutral or objective criterion; it is not therefore readily definable by all in the same fashion; and I suspect that there are as many definitions of it as there are definers (individuals or groups) in a given situation.

Thus, a business organization can never be totally rational and efficient, since it is burdened, from the inside as well as from the outside, with « irrational » elements such as tradition, shop or office customs,



personal considerations around which organization charts are often built, and feelings of all sorts. All such elements have to be taken into account, whether we like it or not, since what matters at the end is *results*, irrespective of the means (purely rational or scandalously irrational) by which such results are achieved.

In that light, « bilingualism *vs.* competence or efficiency » may well be a false problem, just as well as « unilingualism *vs.* competence or efficiency », for that matter. For what may be deemed ineffective or dangerous or time-wasting or irrational on internal grounds may become absolutely necessary in the face of outside pressure by a large group of culturally-similar people who also happen to be, say, potential customers or part owners of the business concern. To put the case bluntly, it may be a paying proposition, after all, for some corporations to foster bilingualism at some risk for efficiency and economy as previously defined, in order to please the French Canadians either as potential *customers* or as potential *destroyers of Confederation*. I go one step further, and maintain that such corporations would do well in attempting to please the French Canadians as potential *employees*, first in the Province of Quebec and then throughout Canada: the one way to do this would be, of course, to hire them *on an equal footing* with their English-speaking colleagues, that is, by not compelling them to be bilingual any more than they do English-speaking Canadians. This may not be a realistic proposition, for communication purposes, in view of the fact that so many Canadians, as yet, are strictly unilingual; but as long as this equality of treatment is not achieved, something will be basically wrong with industry and with Canada, especially in Quebec.

Business in French Canada, traditionally, was established by ethnic strangers who sat at the top, remained strangers and surrounded themselves with culturally-akin executives, as Professor Everett C. Hughes has so ably and forcefully demonstrated. This was quite understandable; but was it, is it *now*, truly efficient, even in technical and administrative terms? Is it not possible that often false and costly criteria for promotion, on the basis of ethnic stock and language, were introduced by culturally-alien managers? The danger arises from drawing conclusions as to the racial basis of observed cultural differences and proceeding to confirm these conclusions in policies of labor recruitment and economic organization. Has there not been wasted much talent on that basis, in Canada as well as everywhere in the world where industrialization was transplanted by « foreigners »? Has not the way been paved to deep-felt frustration and to protest in the form of nationalism?

Have the English Canadians tried to be anything but « aliens », linguistically and culturally, to the French Canadians with which they had so little contact outside the workplace and for whom they acted as glorified « paymasters » ?

If this was never tried, no wonder French Canadian employees were judged mainly by what was considered their working qualities, their adaptability to the employers' way of working. As Robert Ezra Park hinted, was the choice of candidates for promotion set by economic, temperamental or sentimental considerations ? Everett Hughes has deftly pointed out that industry

« is always and everywhere a grand *mixer* of people, (and thus) has inevitably been a colossal agent of racial, ethnic, and religious *segregation*, and of racial and ethnic *discrimination* ». « There is current among managers... a body of opinion and lore concerning the work capacities and habits of various ethnic groups ; and insofar as such belief and lore do not correspond to verifiable fact, they point to discrimination... It is an interesting and apparently paradoxical observation that modern industry, which has developed a strong, sometimes ruthless ideology of indifference to persons, of choice of the best article for the purpose, and of the best man for the job, and which has shown a great drive, almost a mission, to sweep away beliefs, customs and institutions which stand in the way of industrial development, should also have become, not merely an aggressive and grandiose mixer of peoples, but also a great and sometimes stubborn agent of racial and ethnic discrimination... »

Canadian industry, and business generally, especially if established in Quebec, is going through quite a bit of soul-searching along cultural and linguistic lines in the face of mounting political protest and economic pressure. This should have started long ago, but it may not be too late yet if the right attitudes develop and the right moves are quickly made. It must make things possible for the French Canadian to join industry without sacrificing basic human and cultural values, without being constantly at a disadvantage because, although often bilingual, he is not as fluent in English as his English-speaking counterpart who usually does not have to be bilingual at all, and also because he is constantly judged and evaluated by ethnocentric, alien, and often irrelevant and unfair criteria.

Especially now that French Canadian educational institutions are more accurately and competently geared to industry, the arguments of « lack of qualifications » and « lack of commitment to industry » have fallen to the wayside; and if the situation does not change, subtle or

brutal ethnic discrimination will remain, together with managerial shortsightedness, as the true basic explanations for the French Canadians' lot in the future as regards industrial employment. And, of course, more bilingualism throughout Canada will make for more acceptable geographic mobility by French Canadian industrial employees.

All business organizations, whether public or private, have a stake in quickly doing their utmost to maintain a healthy and bicultural Canada, as well as in providing equality of opportunity to all Canadians, irrespective of their native tongue. This will not be easy; and yet, for global efficiency's sake, it may well be an absolute « must » for the near future. All must work at it not out of fear, not to yield to outside pressure, but because it is fair, basically rational, and long overdue !

## Conclusion

In the Quebec of today, the cultural reality demands certain forms of intelligent and flexible biculturalism and bilingualism if the business executive and his firm are to serve as useful catalysts, in an otherwise tense political and racial situation, and as efficient production media. Large business organizations must closely reflect the characteristics of the broader society in which they strive; otherwise, they are likely to become rather inefficient !

In as much as possible, therefore, the bilingual quality of communications in industry must always be improved; managers must make sure that recruiting, training, negotiating, and so on, are performed in the language or languages that will best suit the employees at various levels; French must be taught to management people, if needs be. French labour agreements, bulletins, reports, etc., should be as official as English ones and available to all who will have better use for them than for their English counterparts. There should be specific incentives toward bilingualism for managerial and supervisory personnel.

All this, by the way, is not ideology, or an abject yielding to political pressure from « aborigenes »; it is sheer common sense and courtesy; it is what is done in Brazil or in Spain; it is the only safe way to gain efficiency from within and respect from without on a long-term basis. In short, this is the way to do business and to perform services efficiently in French Canada.

## LE BILINGUISME DANS L'INDUSTRIE QUÉBÉCOISE

### INTRODUCTION

Je ferai, dans les lignes qui suivent, quelques remarques sur l'aspect humain du bilinguisme et du biculturalisme, sur les systèmes de valeurs et idéaux, sur les différences culturelles et surtout sur cet élément culturel de base qu'est la langue.

Au-delà des différences psychologiques, statistiques et politiques, je suis porté à conclure que les hommes ont, et ce partout dans le monde, un certain nombre de caractéristiques communes d'une façon telle que ce qui les unit est toujours plus fort que ce qui les différencie. La nature humaine est la même partout : ce qui est différent, ce sont ses manifestations.

Pour ce qui est de la situation québécoise, nous nous devons en premier lieu d'établir la différence entre la réalité et les différents mythes traditionnels qui existent quant à la personnalité et aux aspirations des Québécois. Il existe cependant dans le cas du Québec une différence certaine qu'on ne peut pas nier : on y trouve à la fois une culture et surtout une langue propre.

Les québécois combattent pour conserver leur identité, et leurs valeurs culturelles : encore il faudra noter qu'ils recherchent non seulement la survie mais encore le progrès dans l'éducation, un meilleur contrôle de leur vie économique et une grande part d'autonomie politique.

Le Québec est membre d'une entité politique dont il ne se veut pas dépendant. Quoiqu'étrangers ou hostiles à l'autre culture, les québécois en subissent une influence certaine. Il n'est alors pas surprenant que le québécois se sente parfois étranger ou plutôt membre minoritaire dans plusieurs parties du monde des affaires ou de l'industrie.

### LE BILINGUISME DANS L'INDUSTRIE QUÉBÉCOISE

Le bilinguisme exige au départ une définition de la *LANGUE* qui à son tour présuppose une juste compréhension de la *Culture* dont l'élément de base est la langue. Ce n'est qu'après avoir suivi ce cheminement qu'il sera possible de considérer l'industrie avec ses caractéristiques et de déterminer si la possibilité de coexistence des deux langues risques ou non d'en ébranler la base.

#### *La culture*

Disons en résumé qu'en plus d'être un caractère attribué à une communauté, la culture représente la sommation des traits propres à tout groupe humain tels la langue, les us et coutumes, la façon de vivre, les idées, les pratiques, les sentiments, les idéaux, les opinions, la philosophie, et les moyens techniques et rationnels par lesquels les hommes ont toujours cherché à maîtriser leur environnement et à se contrôler eux-mêmes.

#### *La langue*

De tous les aspects de la culture, la langue fut la première à recevoir une forme hautement développée : sa perfection essentielle est un prérequis à la culture en tant que tout. En fait, c'est un système de symboles phonétiques utilisés pour l'expression de pensées et de sentiments communicables.

### *Le nationalisme et la langue*

Depuis toujours, des différences de langue ont reflété des différences culturelles. La langue principale est un symbole d'identité pour une entité politique et nationale donnée. La langue est le facteur le plus important dans le nationalisme moderne, parce qu'elle est la somme de toute existence spirituelle et intellectuelle. C'est donc la pierre angulaire de l'existence nationale.

Les différences de culture (surtout de langue) ne doivent pas être considérées à la légère. Au contraire, elles atteignent ce qu'il y a de plus fondamental chez les individus et les groupes.

### *Le bilinguisme*

Si on entend par bilinguisme la coexistence de deux langues dans un pays, un province ou même en affaires, nous n'y voyons pas d'objection. Mais nous devons noter que la survie des deux langues exige pour chacune d'elles un statut égal sinon on aboutira en pratique à l'unilinguisme.

Si on entend par bilinguisme l'usage habituel des deux langues, ou la capacité d'en parler une et de comprendre l'autre avec presque autant de facilité, nous devons noter qu'aucun individu n'est jamais parfaitement bilingue quelles que soient ses illusions sur le sujet.

Nous croyons que le bilinguisme parfait au niveau des individus est un mythe et que la personne soi-disant parfaitement bilingue est coincée entre deux cultures qui toutes les deux la rejettent.

Si de telles considérations s'avèrent vraies pour une élite culturelle donnée, il est facile de concevoir jusqu'à quel point elles s'appliquent à la population en général. Ni l'économie ni aucune autre réalité ne devrait forcer les membres des échelons inférieurs de l'entreprise à maîtriser les deux langues surtout si ce bilinguisme n'est pas imposé à l'autre groupe culturel.

### *L'industrie*

Nous devons tous reconnaître que la préoccupation principale de toute organisation industrielle et bureaucratique est d'être conçue comme une institution rationnelle principalement centrée sur l'efficacité technique et administrative. Mais ces éléments techniques et administratifs de l'efficacité sont autant reliés au social, à l'économique et à la politique que l'organisation elle-même. En d'autres termes, l'efficacité est essentiellement une valeur. Mais en fait une organisation ne peut pas être entièrement rationnelle et efficace : on y remarquera toujours un certain nombre d'éléments irrationnels qui entrent en ligne de compte. (La tradition, les us et coutumes, les considérations personnelles et les sentiments.)

Le bilinguisme vs la compétence ou l'efficacité peut être autant un faux problème que l'unilinguisme vs compétence ou l'efficacité vu qu'à la fin ce ne sont que les résultats qui comptent. Ce qui peut sembler inefficace, dangereux ou même irrationnel d'un point de vue interne peut devenir absolument nécessaire face à une certaine pression de l'extérieur de la part d'un grand groupe de fins de la même culture. J'irais même jusqu'à dire que les compagnies agiraient intelligemment en considérant les Canadiens français autant comme des clients et des consommateurs

éventuels que comme des employés possibles et ce autant au Québec que dans le reste du Canada. Pour ce faire, elles devront évidemment les engager sur un même pied que leurs collègues de langue anglaise en ne les obligeant pas plus à être bilingues qu'ils ne l'exigent des Canadiens anglais.

Tant et aussi longtemps que cette égalité de traitement ne sera pas atteinte, il y aura toujours quelque chose qui ira mal avec l'industrie et le Canada surtout au Québec.

Nous savons tous que des étrangers ont établi l'industrie au Québec et qu'ils se sont traditionnellement entourés de gens de même langue pour les seconder. Même si c'est compréhensible, nous pouvons nous demander si cela est encore efficace même en termes techniques et administratifs. La langue ou le groupe ethnique comme seul critère de promotion ne serait-il pas faux et coûteux ? Combien de talents ont ainsi été perdus ? Cela n'explique-t-il pas la frustration profonde et la protestation au nom du nationalisme ?

Il n'y aurait alors pas à se surprendre que le critère d'évaluation des employés canadiens-français ait été leur adaptabilité à la façon de travailler de leurs employeurs.

L'industrie canadienne et le monde des affaires en général est forcée par la protestation politique croissante et par une pression économique à faire un examen de conscience, à penser les problèmes de langues et de cultures. Tout ceci aurait dû être commencé depuis très longtemps : il n'est cependant pas trop tard pour que le tout soit changé.

À l'avenir, il devra être rendu possible au Canadien français de se joindre à l'industrie sans sacrifier ses valeurs humaines et culturelles de base, sans être constamment en désavantage parce que même s'il est bilingue, il ne parle pas l'autre langue aussi bien que son semblable de langue anglaise et parce qu'il est jugé et évalué selon des critères injustes, souvent non pertinents, et étrangers.

Aujourd'hui, les maisons d'éducation de langue française préparent des individus plus compétents et plus sensibilisés aux problèmes de l'industrie. Ceci rend l'argument du manque de compétence complètement désuet.

Toutes les organisations canadiennes, autant publiques que privées, se doivent de faire de leur mieux pour conserver un Canada bilingue et fort en plus de fournir les mêmes chances et opportunités à tous les Canadiens quelle que soit leur langue maternelle.

#### CONCLUSION

La réalité culturelle québécoise exige certaines formes de bilinguisme et de biculturalisme intelligents et flexibles.

On devra en autant que possible améliorer le caractère bilingue des communications dans l'industrie : les dirigeants devront s'assurer que le recrutement, la formation, les négociations, etc., sont faits dans une ou des langues qui conviennent aux employés des différents niveaux.

Tout ceci n'est pas une idéologie, c'est du sens commun de la courtoisie. En fait, c'est la façon efficace de faire des affaires et de fournir des services au Québec.