attribute the history of this particular provision. It is designed to prevent some of the European experiences from being transplanted onto a Canadian site. As I say, this may encourage Canadian ethnic groups who face the possibility of being assimilated into a melting pot. As to that theory I can only say that I would be surprised if the Canadian philosophy of the future of our many peoples is not now a pretty well defined mosaic philosophy rather than the melting pot philosophy. I would go further and I would say that the bicultural debate, and the whole movement toward the role of two languages, reinforces the sense of linguistic and cultural identity in other minorities. We are not saying, in consequence of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, to the Ukrainians in Saskatchewan, the Germans in Manitoba and the Finns in Alberta, that they are any less Canadians. When the Finns say "We want to have a Finnish newspaper or a Finnish night school" or the Ukrainians say "We want to have a Ukrainian newspaper but we still want to live side by side with our French and English neighbours," you do not say to them that only English or French newspapers are permitted and that no others are allowed. Canadian history has given the answer to that. We make a great fetish in this country of saying that unlike the United States we have not adopted the melting pot theory. We believe that each group should encourage its own cultural origins and traditions without sacrificing their chances of being thoroughly effective Canadians. I suggest that this is now part of the Canadian mystique, politically and socially. Relating this to the particular case of prov-

ince X-let us say that the Province of Saskatchewan or some other province were to say "We are going to compel the German or Ukrainian community to assimilate; you can assimilate with either the French or the English but you cannot have any other symbols; and if you were to say to the German community that they may not have their German newspapers, clubs, their Goethe societies and poetry-reading clubs; in my opinion that would be on the edge of this kind of problem. It would be an attempt to make their social life culturally unviable. This could result in serious bodily or mental harm to the life of the community concerned. I would suggest that as a matter of public record, what I am now describing as the Canadian way of life, is the one that most Canadians now support. They accept that we are a multicultural society with two official and principal languages, English and French, but recognizing the not necessarily subordinate position of all other cultural groups.

The Chairman: Dean Cohen, and honourable senators, I think we are getting to the point that if we were to continue it would be merely a matter of putting this on record but we would have to go over it again. Thank you very much, Dean Cohen, for being available today. I will let you know as soon as it is convenient when we can have another meeting.

Dean Cohen: Thank you for letting me talk so long.

Senator Choquette: It was a pleasure.

The committee adjourned.