



November 17, 2015,

Mme Danielle Dumas,  
Direction de la formation general des jeunes,  
1035, rue De La Chevrotière, 15<sup>e</sup> étage  
Québec (Québec)  
G1R 5A5

Mme Dumas,

In November 2014 the Leadership Committee for English Education in Québec (LCEEQ) responded to the consultation on the *History of Québec and Canada* programme proposed for Secondary III. The letter addressed to Normand Pelletier, and copied to your attention, stated that LCEEQ wished to have its voice heard regarding the History program, in the context of a consultation. It is most appropriate that LCEEQ be consulted considering the vast number of groups that it represents, including : youth, adult and vocational education in all English school boards, the public and private sectors, post-secondary education, and the professional associations of teachers, administrators, and non-teaching professionals. Although LCEEQ was still not recognized as part of the official consultation on Secondary IV one year later, we feel strongly that the voice of the English Educational Community be represented.

It is important to reiterate that the LCEEQ continues to recognize that many components of the new programme are welcomed. In particular, we laud the chronological organization at both levels. The development of the two competencies is appropriate. The connections to the broad areas of learning, the cross-curricular competencies, and the integration of other subject matter at the secondary level are encouraging.

Our stated position one year ago was clear:

*“From the outset, LCEEQ has stated that the promotion of a “national framework” is ambiguous. The title of the program, **History of Québec and Canada**, could be interpreted as giving equal attention to Québec and Canada, which is not the case, given the emphasis remains on Québec. It should be clearly indicated that the course focuses on the history of Québec in the context of Canada, North America, and the world. Furthermore, the concept of “nation” can still be interpreted in a limited way, which does not support the importance of diversity and pluralism, a hallmark of Québec principles.”*

5139 Alma Street      Pierrefonds, QC      H8Z 2M5      LCEEQ.ca

One year later having had the opportunity to examine the content of the Secondary IV curriculum, it is equally clear that our expressed concerns have not been considered. We continue to emphasize two critical aspects: the lack of Canadian content, and, that the numerous references to French Canada as a “nation” continue.

It is impossible to cite all the instances to support this position in this letter. At risk of identifying some references at the exclusion of others may be interpreted by the reader as tacit approval of the many instances not specifically identified. That said, and to strengthen the argument that these two weaknesses still exist within the proposed programme, we take this occasion to highlight specific examples.

The following historical periods have a **lack of Canadian content**:

- 1791-1840 The demands and struggles of nationhood (pp. 42-43)
  - Regarding the “demands and struggles of nationhood” (p.42) to whom does this refer: Canada’s, Québec’s, both?
  - There is no mention of Upper Canada in the War of 1812 (p. 43)
- 1896-1945 Nationalisms and the growth of Canada's autonomy (pp. 57-58)
  - Canadian feminists should be included as well (p. 57) such as Nellie McClung and the Famous Five.
  - There is no mention of English Canada’s position on the Boer War (p. 57).
  - There is no mention of the union movements in the rest of Canada (p. 58), such as the Winnipeg General Strike.
  - There is no mention of other political parties in the rest of Canada (p. 58), such as the Social Credit Party, or Tommy Douglas’ Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF now NDP).
- From 1980 to the present day Québec at a time of choices (pp. 73-74)
  - Since the PQ, BQ and ADQ parties are identified as supporting the “yes” side during the 1995 referendum (p. 73), then why not mention the PLQ, PLC and PC parties on the “no” side?

To address our second major concern, the numerous references to French Canada as a “nation” the following are examples of **Québec nationalism** found in the proposed programme

- The following statements, “Political tensions prompted the rise of *Canadian* nationalism which was amplified by prevailing socio-economic conditions” and “It both benefited from and contributed to the rise *Canadian* nationalism” (p. 42) imply that the conflict was between the English authority and the French majority. Given that a similar conflict occurred in English Upper Canada between the political authorities and the socio-economically disadvantaged masses, was this conflict driven as much by (if not more so) political demands and not just French Canadian nationalism?
- Durham referred to two races rather than two “nations” (p. 49). The former implies “people”, whereas the latter implies “states”;
- As a result of the BNA Act, did “two nations come together in a federal system” or was it two peoples, or three colonies?

- Although Mercier claimed provincial autonomy, he did so within the Canadian federation (p. 50). He supported such autonomy in all provinces, not just Québec
- Artists such as Felix Leclerc and Michel Tremblay (p. 66) were outspoken sovereigntists. Why not include outspoken federalists such as Mordecai Richler?
- Did Bill 101 “mitigate dissensions” (p. 66) between the English and the French or intensify them?
- Is the title “Québec at a time of choices” (p. 73) a reference to the referendums?
- By definition and according to the BNA Act, Canada cannot have “centralized federalism” (p. 74).

We are not satisfied with the proposed content of the new programme. The LCEEQ strongly believes that all Québec students need to be provided a complete and balanced account of our history and heritage, and not one viewed through the lens of a single political ideology if we are to successfully develop critical thinkers among our students.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cindy Finn". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Cindy Finn, LCEEQ Chair

c. c. : Mme Anne-Marie Lepage , sous-ministre adjointe Services aux anglophones, aux autochtones,  
et à la diversité culturelle