

OTHER OPPORTUNITIES AND THAT SERVICES, INCLUDING EDUCATION, BE AVAILABLE UNDER REASONABLE CIRCUMSTANCES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

HERE, OF COURSE, THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SEPARATISTS AND FEDERALISTS EMERGES QUITE DISTINCTLY. FEDERALISTS, GENERALLY, ACCEPT THESE AND SIMILAR PRINCIPLES; SEPARATISTS, WHILE SOMETIMES UTTERING CONFUSING QUALIFICATIONS, CLEARLY DO NOT. BUT, ANGLOPHONES ARE AWARE THAT EVEN SOME FEDERALIST FRANCOPHONES HAVE EXPRESSED SYMPATHY FOR THE OBJECTIVES OF BILL 101, FOR EXAMPLE, EVEN THOUGH DISAGREEING HONESTLY AND STRONGLY WITH THE METHODS IT CALLS FOR. ANGLOPHONES ARE THEREFORE CONCERNED THAT THEIR COMMITMENT TO A FREE AND OPEN CANADIAN SOCIETY MAY NOT BE RECIPROCATED BY FRANCOPHONES BECAUSE THE FRANCOPHONE NEED TO PROTECT LANGUAGE, CULTURE AND IDENTITY WILL CAUSE THEM, WHEREVER AND WHENEVER POSSIBLE, TO "WALL IN" THEIR COMMUNITY WHILE RESENTING AND RESISTING COMPARABLE MOVES BY THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING COMMUNITY. THIS TENDENCY TO INSULATE IS BASIC TO THE SEPARATIST APPROACH. FEDERALISTS, ON THE OTHER HAND, SAY SIMPLY: LET QUEBEC BE PRIMARILY A FRENCH-SPEAKING PROVINCE JUST AS, FOR EXAMPLE, ONTARIO IS PRIMARILY ENGLISH-SPEAKING. BUT, LET BOTH PROVINCES RECOGNIZE CERTAIN RIGHTS FOR THEIR LINGUISTIC MINORITIES. QUEBEC'S BILLS 22 AND 101 GO BEYOND THIS REASONABLE PROPOSITION AND MAKE MATTERS MORE DIFFICULT AND CONTROVERSIAL BY DEFINING FRENCH