House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Official Languages

LANG • NUMBER 013 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, April 29, 2010

Chair

Mr. Steven Blaney

Standing Committee on Official Languages

Thursday, April 29, 2010

● (0900)

[*English*]

The Chair (Mr. Steven Blaney (Lévis—Bellechasse, CPC)): Good morning, and welcome to the 13th meeting of the Standing Committee on Official Languages.

[*Translation*]

Mr. John Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, CPC): Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Weston, you have a point of order.

Mr. John Weston: Because a certain hockey team won the game last night, I think that

[*English*]

it would be a big mistake for our committee not to acknowledge that.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Well, I am going to exercise my privileges as Chair to say that I accept and support your point of order.

[*English*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3), this is a study of immigration as a development tool in official language minority communities.

[*Translation*]

This morning, we are meeting for the second time as part of our study on—

Mrs. Shelly Glover (Saint Boniface, CPC): Mr. Chairman, pardon me for interrupting, but we have no audio on this side.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Could we do some tests?

[*English*]

The Chair: Ms. O'Neill, are you fine?

Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon (Miramichi, CPC): I am fine.

The Chair: Okay.

[*Translation*]

I was saying that, as part of our second meeting on immigration as a development tool for official language minority communities, we have three experts appearing before us this morning. The first is already here. So, I think we can start to break the ice right away. He is adjunct professor in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics at the University of Ottawa. We are delighted to welcome Mr. Charles Castonguay.

Good morning, Mr. Castonguay. Welcome to the Committee. I invite you to make your opening statement.

Prof. Charles Castonguay (Adjunct Professor, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Ottawa, As an Individual): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If memory serves me, it was the former Commissioner of Official Languages, Ms. Dyane Adam, who was one of the first to have the idea—

I will be reading a statement in English because I know that if I start to improvise, I will go beyond the 10 minutes I am allowed.

[*English*]

She had the idea of attracting francophone immigrants to bolster francophone minorities outside of Quebec. If one examines the studies upon which Madame Adam based her policy, they raise doubts as to the soundness of that policy.

[*Translation*]

The paper I am summarizing for you now appeared in the publication *INROADS* in 2008. I have copies, if you are interested. An earlier version also appeared in the publication *Francophonies d'Amérique* in French. I will be making my opening comments in English, but of course, during the question period, anything goes.

[*English*]

One of the studies that underlie Madame Adam's enthusiasm for the subject was prepared by Jack Jedwab, who will be with us later, I suppose. It shows that the adoption of English as the main home language reaches 50% among francophone immigrants, so French mother tongue immigrants from abroad, after only 10 years of residence in a province outside Quebec....

● (0905)

Jedwab also showed that Quebec's share of francophone immigration was lower than the relative weight of Quebec's francophone population within the total population of the francophone population of Canada. So right off the bat, if francophone immigrants outside Quebec assimilate so rapidly to English, while at the same time Quebec's francophone population doesn't receive its fair share of francophone immigrants to Canada, a policy encouraging even more francophones to immigrate outside Quebec doesn't look like such a good idea.

In my research, Jedwab worked with the 1996 census data. I had access to 2001 data for my French paper and 2006 data for my most recent paper in English. I found, first of all, that of the 48,000 francophones who had immigrated to Canada between 2001 and 2006, 80% were enumerated in Quebec at the 2006 census and 20% were in the rest of Canada.

Since Quebec's francophones currently weigh in at 86% of the total francophone population of Canada, as far as Quebec's share of recent francophone immigration to Canada is concerned, Quebec thus appears shortchanged indeed. In other words, the rest of Canada is already doing better than Quebec in terms of francophone immigration. This corroborates what Jedwab found using 1996 data.

I also found that within a given province outside of Quebec, the power of assimilation of English is approximately of the same order among francophones from abroad as among those born in Canada. With the exception of New Brunswick, anglicization rates of immigrant francophones are, as a rule, higher than 50%. This means that right from the very first generation, francophones from abroad contribute more to the rest of Canada's English-speaking population than to its French-speaking population. This basically corroborates Jedwab's other finding.

I examined this second point more closely by looking at the situation in several key census metropolitan areas. I found that by the age of 45, francophones from abroad contribute more to the English-speaking population than to the French-speaking population in all the metropolitan areas outside the bilingual belt. The bilingual belt runs basically from Moncton to Sault Ste. Marie, and it essentially comprises the Acadian part of New Brunswick as well as eastern and northern Ontario. It's a concept we became aware of at the time of the Laurendeau-Dunton commission. It's the neighbouring areas outside the province of Quebec that have a high percentage of francophones.

So in all the CMAs outside the bilingual belt, I repeat, by the age of 45, the assimilation of francophones to English is over 50%. In this regard, the three CMAs that stand out as exceptions to this rule are in the bilingual belt; namely, Moncton, Ottawa, and Sudbury are the only large urban centres outside Quebec where francophone newcomers are more than just a flash in the pan.

If the contribution of immigration to the francophone populations outside Quebec is to be optimized, the bilingual belt stands out as the obvious destination to favour.

● (0910)

Like allophones, francophones who immigrate beyond the belt are evidently more bent on bettering their lot by shifting to English than on bolstering the floundering demographics of the flimsier French-speaking minorities.

Shortly after the 2006 census, Statistics Canada carried out a survey on the linguistic vitality of francophones outside of Quebec. Statistics Canada found that a distinctly francophone identity remains well rooted solely in the bilingual belt portions of the rest of Canada. Their francophone populations are the only ones to offer a sound enough stock upon which francophone immigration can be viably grafted.

Actually, the picture was clear right from the start. At the time of the Laurendeau-Dunton commission, when the reality of the bilingual belt was first recognized, it has simply become clearer, with the passage of time and the accumulation of evidence outside Quebec, that it is only within the bilingual belt—regions of New Brunswick and Ontario—that the retention of French as the main home language remains reasonably high, that francophones retain a sufficiently distinct identity, and that French still pays off enough in the workplace.

The national unity imperative has no doubt clouded the perception of this reality. Saving face vis-à-vis public opinion in Quebec has led, among other things, to the giddy concept of sustainable assimilation. This is the concept that is developed at Canadian Heritage. Presumably even an assimilation rate of 90% can be sustained if a sufficiently large stream of francophones or francophone immigrants is steadily poured into the linguistic melting pot. The problem with a contrivance of this kind is that it does nothing to enhance the long-term viability of French in Canada as a whole. The contribution of immigration to the francophone populations beyond the bilingual belt is ephemeral.

Nor should the needs of Quebec be ignored. As we have seen, Quebec is not receiving its fair share of francophone immigration to Canada, and Quebec francophones have just been jolted by a sharp drop in their share of the population in Montreal as well as in the whole of the province of Quebec. In fact, anglophone immigration to Quebec has helped the anglophone share of Quebec's population to remain stable during the 2001-2006 period. Despite Quebec's continued efforts to recruit more francophone immigrants, the recent contribution of international immigration to the province's anglophone minority was, proportionally speaking, more than double its contribution to the francophone majority.

Furthermore, francization of anglophone immigrants in Quebec is non-existent, so that anglophone immigration contributes, in full measure, to the English-speaking population of the province. Indeed, the growth rate of the English-speaking population of Quebec between 2001 and 2006 was higher in Montreal and in the whole of the province than that of the French-speaking population. Given this new state of affairs—and this is a first in Canadian census history; we have never seen this before. The relative weight of English as a mother-tongue population—those are the statistics for which we have the longest series of historical data—has always decreased since Confederation. Given this new state of affairs, it is conceivable that more may be actually done to foster Canadian unity and to allay francophone fears of becoming a minority in the only province where they are a majority. More may be conceivably done to foster Canadian unity by encouraging francophone immigration to Quebec rather than to massively English-speaking destinations outside the bilingual belt.

The overarching objective of any policy on francophone immigration should be to sustain a viable francophone population in Canada as a whole. Since francophone immigrants are in relatively short supply, they should be guided toward the francophone populations that have the highest linguistic vitality. This means towards Quebec and the bilingual belt portions of New Brunswick and Ontario.

● (0915)

The cosmetic use of francophone immigration to maintain the illusion of viable francophone minorities, coast to coast to coast, boils down to wasting a precious resource. It's high time Canadian language policy faces up to reality.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: You have set the table for a good discussion among Committee members. Because our other two witnesses have not yet started, we will immediately begin to—I am almost tempted to say —"grill" you, starting with Mr. Bélanger.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Do you know what has happened to our other two witnesses?

The Chair: Mr. Bélanger, our clerk will be able to answer that question.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mrs. Isabelle Dumas): The other two witnesses informed me that they would be arriving late this morning, either because they were taking the train or driving.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: Is there a snow storm or what? Ah, ah!

Mr. Castonguay, you are true to form—

The Chair: Excuse me, Mr. Bélanger, but I am told that another witness has just arrived. We are going to give her time to get settled in.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: No problem. Whatever you feel is best. I guess you would like us to pause for a few moments?

The Chair: No, no. Go ahead.

Ms. Lamarre, please come and be seated. We will begin with you.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: I think it would have been helpful for Ms. Lamarre and Mr. Jedwab to hear Mr. Castonguay's comments. Perhaps that would have stimulated some debate among our witnesses; but that will not be the case.

What would you like us to do?

The Chair: I think we should go ahead and hear the witnesses. They will have an opportunity to hear your questions, for example.

We will continue with the opening statements, Mr. Bélanger.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: That is fine.

The Chair: I would like to welcome our two new witnesses, who are arriving right in the thick of things. We have already begun the meeting. Mr. Castonguay made his opening statement, and if one of you is prepared to start, I would invite you to do so now.

I see that Ms. Lamarre—

Ms. Patricia Lamarre (Associate Professor, Joint responsibility (languages) for the Centre of Ethnic Studies, Faculty of Education, Université de Montréal, As an Individual): I would really appreciate being given a brief summary.

The Chair: Yes, regarding Mr. Castonguay's remarks.

Mr. Richard Nadeau (Gatineau, BQ): The ABCs of our procedure here.

The Chair: Yes. Well, each witness makes a 10-minute opening statement, which is followed by a question period.

We have already heard Mr. Castonguay's opening remarks, in which he presented his views. We would now like to hear your perspective. Following that, we will open it up for discussion.

[*English*]

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: Are you still doing this, Jack? Do you want to go first?

[*Translation*]

I was not aware that I was expected to make a 10-minute opening statement, but it does not matter. I will get started and just pretend I am having a conversation—

The Chair: Just a moment, please.

Mr. Weston has a point of order.

Mr. John Weston: Because they, unfortunately, arrived a little late, I think it might be wise to open it up for questions. That way, Ms. Lamarre and Mr. Jedwab will have a better understanding of what Mr. Castonguay just said.

Ms. Monique Guay (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): No, that is not the way it works.

Mr. John Weston: Is that all right?

The Chair: I think we will follow the normal procedure, Mr. Weston. Now that our witnesses are here, we will hear from them first.

Are there any further points of order?

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Could we ask Mr. Castonguay to briefly summarize his testimony for the benefit of our two new guests?

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: Thank you; I would appreciate that.

● (0920)

The Chair: Yes, I am in favour of that—if Mr. Castonguay is willing to do it.

Mr. Julian, is your comment along the same lines?

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Yes, I wanted to make exactly the same suggestion.

The Chair: Great!

Mr. Castonguay, could you summarize your presentation? That will be helpful, even for us.

Prof. Charles Castonguay: Yes, I can. I have confirmed and clarified the observations made by Mr. Jedwab, based on 1996 census data, with respect to the policy of encouraging Francophone immigrants to settle in areas outside Quebec—not only Ottawa, but Toronto, Sudbury, Calgary, Vancouver, Edmonton, and Halifax. Mr. Jedwab's study did not necessarily support that policy. If memory serves me, it found that, after 10 years in Canada, more than half of international Francophone immigrants, whose mother tongue was French, had already adopted English as the language spoken at home. Consequently, that policy tended instead to support a demographic deficit—which does not exist—in the Canadian English-speaking majority outside Quebec.

Mr. Jedwab also presented statistics which showed that, basically, Canada, outside Quebec, was already taking in more Francophone immigrants than Quebec. I was able to confirm this using 2001 and 2006 census data contained in two papers which I have copies of for everyone. The most recent one is in English and relies on 2006 data, with a slight difference… Outside Quebec, there are different linguistic realities. There is what is known as the bilingual belt—in other words, the Acadian part of New Brunswick, the Franco-Ontarian region of Ontario (Eastern and Northeastern Ontario) and key metropolitan areas like Moncton, New Brunswick, and Ottawa and Sudbury, in Ontario. I should just mention in passing that immigrants from abroad habitually settle in major urban centres. That is where the jobs are, and so on. That is why I paid particular attention to metropolitan areas. I noted that in those three urban centres, Francophones did not lose their mother tongue; rather, French continued to be the language spoken at home for most of them, whereas outside of those areas—and here I support Mr. Jedwab's findings—starting with the first generation, by the age of 45, more than half of the Francophones who had settled in Halifax, Vancouver, Calgary or Toronto had adopted English as the language spoken at home—

The Chair: Perfect. Thank you—

Prof. Charles Castonguay: I guess we can leave it at that.

I was questioning the wisdom of a policy that relied on a rare resource.

[*English*]

It's a precious resource, francophone immigration; there isn't that much available worldwide to come in and help the flagging demographics of the francophone minorities, which are too far removed from what one could call French Canada, French Canada being Quebec, the Acadian part of New Brunswick, and the franco-Ontarian part of Ontario. They are too far removed for this fresh supply of francophones to have any long-term effect. It's ephemeral.

I'm just putting into question the whole policy, based on the facts.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Mr. Jedwab, I believe you are now ready to make your opening comments.

Mr. Jack Jedwab (Executive Director, Association for Canadian Studies, As an Individual): Would you like me to use the 10 minutes I have been allocated?

The Chair: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Jack Jedwab: I was expecting to speak more generally about Francophone immigration outside Quebec, as well as Anglophone immigration inside Quebec. That is the topic I was expecting to address when you invited me.

Perhaps I could just digress for one moment. I carried out a study for the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages that dealt with Anglophones… Can you hear me? Do I need to use a mike? Normally, I have quite a loud voice.

● (0925)

The Chair: For the purposes of translation, I think it would be appropriate for you to use the microphone.

Mr. Jack Jedwab: Can you hear me better now? Perfect.

So, I had the opportunity, in response to an invitation by Dyane Adam, who was the Commissioner of Official Languages at the time, to carry out a study on immigration and the vitality of linguistic minorities—the one that Mr. Castonguay referred to. I would just like to mention that, as part of that study I was commissioned to carry out, I also had the opportunity to meet with many leaders of Francophone communities outside Quebec, as well as the Anglophone community leadership in Quebec.

It should also be acknowledged that, at the time, an asymmetric approach was used by decision-makers at Citizenship and Immigration Canada with respect to Quebec, as opposed to the rest of Canada. I would just like to explain what I mean by "asymmetric". In the case of Quebec, I was told quite clearly during the discussions that there was the McDougall-Gagnon-Tremblay agreement—an agreement relating to resources for immigrant integration—as well as another agreement signed in 1978 dealing with the immigration selection process, responsibility for which had been transferred to Quebec, except in cases involving humanitarian immigrants, or refugees.

Therefore, I was asked to respect that agreement. That is advice that I consider to be very wise and that I want to emphasize here today—in other words, the need to respect Quebec jurisdiction with respect to immigration, while at the same time considering the fact that, outside Montreal, there were communities whose demographic situation was not so positive, and which were even fragile or vulnerable in some cases. I also had to evaluate ways of cooperating with the Government of Quebec to see whether resources could be provided to English-speaking immigrants wanting to move to regions outside Montreal.

Therefore, the mandate I was given, in terms of examining the situation in Quebec based on that premise, was somewhat limited.

[*English*]

That was just to give you a recapitulation of the approach to Quebec vis-à-vis this issue. I'll say rather summarily that, as I said before, going forward in terms of the situation of English speakers living in Quebec, it's very important to respect the two agreements that have been struck with that province in terms of immigrant selection and the resources accorded to immigrants who choose to settle in Quebec whose primary language is English.

That said, I think there are opportunities or other means to honour the commitment the federal government has to the vitality of linguistic minorities, which includes a commitment that extends quite obviously to Quebec with respect to the English language community, in terms of its vitality. Some of you may be aware that the federal government definition of an English speaker in Quebec is based on a derived census variable: first official language spoken. With that variable, or indicator, if you like, the population of English speakers in Quebec is anywhere between 900,000 and one million persons.

The indicator that the Government of Quebec uses is mother tongue. Based on that dimension of the census, you're looking at a population of somewhere around 600,000. So there's a vast gap between the federal definition of who's an anglophone in Quebec and the Quebec definition, if you do the simple math, a gap of about 300,000. Within that gap of 300,000, you'll find a very substantial number of people who were not born in Canada.

So under the federal definition, the English-speaking community looks a lot more vital from the standpoint of numbers, if you're going to measure the quality of the experience of the community on the basis of its numbers, as opposed to the Quebec definition, which will have far less immigration built into the number that it estimates constitutes the English-speaking population.

Within that group, I think my advice again, in the limited amount of time I have and to the extent that I'm treating that issue, is that there are pockets of vulnerability within the group of individuals that the federal government will designate as English speakers and that the provincial government may not designate as English speakers.

There are a lot of statistics to show, for example, that immigrants originating from South Asia, which is primarily English speaking—even if their mother tongue may be Punjabi or various other languages—often find themselves in situations of economic vulnerability. They're disproportionately greater. As much as Quebec has authority over integration—except for humanitarian cases, as I mentioned earlier—and it also has a manpower agreement with the federal government, to the extent that there are opportunities to support those groups that are making an adjustment to Quebec's reality, that would be a useful way in which the federal government could play some role. It would have to do that in a collaborative fashion with the Government of Quebec, given the Government of Quebec's jurisdiction in that regard.

I think that's also true to the extent that outside of Montreal, where again the immigration plays out differently than in Montreal, the federal government can provide the support to those communities, as it has traditionally, and look at the type of support it provides so that those people choosing to become part of the English-speaking community in the Eastern Townships or in Quebec City can access those resources and permit them to be part of the community experience.

All the while, I think it's incumbent on the English-speaking community of Quebec to support the need for the acquisition of the French language,

● (0930)

[*Translation*]

and the need for all immigrants to learn the French language.

I think it is also important, for the Government of Quebec, that the Anglophone community be involved in delivering that message to immigrants, in terms of the need to learn French. I think that Anglophones in Quebec, particularly the young generation, are very interested in learning French. I want my own children and the children of my colleagues to learn French and, naturally, they speak it better than I do.

So, there is a need to involve Anglophones in Quebec in the process of promoting French in Quebec as well as diversity, particularly within the Montreal community, and to ensure that no contradiction between the two emerges. We often hear this idea that there is a contradiction between belonging to an ethnic community, whatever it may be, and the desire to learn French or English. We see this kind of debate taking place in Quebec, as well as outside Quebec. But I think that if we include all groups in the process, and if they have the sense that they are truly involved in the process, that will better serve immigrants, the Government of Quebec and the federal government's goal of preserving the communities' vitality. So, that is my short speech on Quebec.

As for the rest of Canada… Mr. Castonguay quoted me earlier and said that he agreed with me—which is very rare, so I am not sure quite what to say. Even though he agrees with the figures I published at the time, we each draw very different conclusions.

I agree that we have to work hard to create the conditions, outside Quebec, that will support Francophone communities which, at the time I conducted the study, expressed the desire to receive immigrants. Although there are some issues, as Mr. Castonguay clearly pointed out, in terms of preserving the French language among these immigrants, we also know that there are more general issues of anglicisation within the same communities. We have to work very hard to support these communities and the efforts they are making, rather than criticizing them for being unable to progress or even maintain themselves.

I think we made an historic mistake in the 1960s with the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. We opened up our society to diversity, within our duality, but we did not really consider what direction might be taken by immigrants settling outside Quebec, without the necessary resources to support existing Francophone communities. Had we looked at that issue more closely, we might have discovered that there was an opportunity to attract more Francophones to areas outside Quebec and provide resources to these communities. We made some historic errors.

I would not like to see us taking the same approach as back then. I hope that we can make more resources available to these communities, so that they are able to receive immigrants in French. I know there are community groups here in Canada that have that same desire. I also know, based on the experience of civil society, NGOs and my own community experience, that it is not possible, using numbers alone, to measure the landing experience for immigrants coming to this country. That must also be considered.

Despite policies put in place to promote increased immigration outside Quebec… This morning, when I was on the train, I was looking at Citizenship and Immigration Canada's figures on the number of Francophones, which they define, in this case, as individuals who speak French when they arrive here, as well as people who speak French and English when they arrive. I do not think we have seen any significant increases. We have seen increases in actual numbers, but they reflect an increase in total actual numbers of immigrants in recent years. In percentage terms, however, it is not very significant.

By way of conclusion, I would like to touch on one final point. Last night, I was looking at figures from the U.S. census—the "American Community Survey". I had nothing to do. It was during the second intermission of the hockey game. I needed some distraction, because I was a little nervous, as you noticed.

● (0935)

It shows that 154,000 French nationals emigrated to the United States. Between the years 2000 and 2008, 42,000 French immigrants settled in the United States.

As you know, the United States does not have a program which supports Francophone linguistic minorities. That does not include Haitians: 522,000 Haitian immigrants currently live in the United States. A significant proportion of them arrived in the U.S. between 2000 and 2008, before the terrible disaster which occurred in Haiti less than a year ago.

The numbers we found are really very small. That does have quite an impact on communities outside Quebec. In terms of their vision of the future, that also gives them a little hope. I understand why Mr. Castonguay says that this is false hope, but I do not want to criticize them. That is pretty well what—

The Chair: Perfect. Thank you very much, Mr. Jedwab. Both of you have made your positions clear.

Now, to find out whether the glass is half full or half empty, we welcome Associate Professor Patricia Lamarre, Co-director of the Centre for Ethnic Studies, Faculty of Education, Université de Montréal.

Ms. Lamarre, would you like to make some comments? The Committee is basically interested in how immigration could be used as a tool to develop Canada's official language communities.

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: First of all, I want to extend my sincere thanks for your invitation to appear. This is the first time I have appeared before a committee. I must apologize; I did not realize I was expected to make opening comments. I thought it was a round table, where people would be asking questions and there would be a general discussion. At the same time, I do not think this will be a problem. I can easily use the 10 minutes I have been allocated, as I always have something to say.

I work at the Centre for Ethnic Studies at the Université de Montréal. At the Centre, we focus on immigration and the integration of newcomers to Montreal and Quebec in a number of areas, including the workplace and school. I represent neither the Francophone nor the Anglophone communities. My life experience has taken me all across Canada. I have lived in both Anglophone and Francophone communities. To which group do I belong? Well, the answer to that is not clear. Was I part of a minority or a majority? I was born in Quebec City, of a Francophone father and an Anglophone immigrant mother. I went to French school, but at home, we spoke English. When I was asked, for statistical purposes, what my mother tongue was, I would answer that it was English. If I am asked what language I use in the social or school context, I say that it is French. If I am asked what my language of work is, I say that they are both French and English. If I am asked what language I love most, I say, both. I guess I consider myself to be a "Franglophone". However, in the statistical data, I do not exist. So, it is on behalf of people in the same situation as myself that I would like to speak to you today. There are many of us. Our language practices on a daily basis are not considered—perhaps because they are too complex for the purposes of statistics, that aim to measure a linguistic reality by placing individuals in groups. When you do that, though, what are you actually doing? You are squeezing out or losing the reality for a great many Canadians, Quebeckers and immigrants.

Today I will be questioning a number of ideas. In my opinion, we are at the end of a period of accommodations between two well-defined linguistic communities. I have sensed that for a good 10 years now—since I began a research program at the University of Montreal. We are at the end of a period during which we arrived at solutions and political accommodations—the 1960s and the 1970s. That approach involves duality, the duality of two communities. Linguistic diversity is separate—it is someone else's reality, that of allophones. Eventually they will become integrated into something which is still perceived as being tightly closed—the Francophone and Anglophone communities.

The fact is, however, that these communities are transforming themselves from within. Let us take the example of the Anglophone community in Quebec. It is very multicultural, very multilingual and very bilingual. The same applies to schools that are located in Anglophone areas of Quebec. There are schools with large numbers of Francophone rights holders and large numbers of bilingual, trilingual or unilingual rights holders who are in French immersion to become bilingual in order to survive, to feel comfortable, be mobile and be able to participate in the life of Quebec.

As regards immigrants to Quebec, we have noted a marked improvement in their proficiency in French. The figures speak for themselves. In terms of the status of the French language, we can look at daily use of the language in the workplace and long-term practices in the home. They show that French is establishing itself. However, it is doing so in a context where there are other languages, including an interest in English on the part of both Francophones and immigrants. Therefore, the context is one of duality.

I lived outside Quebec for 10 years, in the Acadian community in Nova Scotia.

● (0940)

I witnessed the emergence of French-language school boards in British Columbia. We are not serving Francophones outside Quebec who use only that language; we are serving Francophones who want to maintain their French and their Francophone identity, while at the same time using English, and possibly other languages. We see small French-language schools in British Columbia, Ontario and Alberta taking in immigrants who are welcome there, because they help to maintain what is in place. Those small schools need a clientele. Communities outside Quebec are very happy to welcome immigrants, but what does that require them to do? It requires a redefinition of Canadian Francophonie, Quebec Francophonie and what it is to be a Francophone.

Are we going to say that a Francophone is someone who identifies very closely with the language, or will we say that a Francophone is someone who is proficient in French? In order to define this kind of social reality, which evolves quickly… We all know that the 20th century was a period of rapid transformation; in the 21st century, that transformation is occurring even more rapidly. Canada developed the concepts of linguistic duality and multiculturalism in the 1960s and 1970s. There is a need to reflect on and clarify what we are now and where we are going in the future. That means we need to change our indicators. Here I am talking to the language experts. They measured one reality in the 1960s and 1970s, based on a model of linguistic assimilation. They looked at the language spoken at home.

And yet, if we engage more with the people who speak different languages at home and ask them, not what the dominant language is at home, but rather, what languages are spoken in the home, we discover a completely different reality. There are people who speak several languages at home and want to preserve those languages, because they see those language skills as resources that are beneficial for their children's future.

Now it is up to us, in government, to see those resources and those skills as future assets that will take us a long way. We have to stop thinking in terms of language dominance. We need indicators—data and census analysis—that are more sophisticated and nuanced. We also need to consider ethnography. There are good ethnographers here in Canada. If you want to learn more about the educational realities of small French-language schools outside Quebec, talk to ethnographers. There are some. They are here in Ottawa, this week, for a symposium which is being held at the University of Ottawa. You can hear what they have to say this afternoon.

What you need is a study that captures the complexity of identity-related connections to language and of language and identity-related practices. Thank you.

● (0945)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Lamarre, for your enlightening comments and for using the expression “Franglophone”, regarding which it will certainly be said that you hit the nail on the head. It is a very interesting concept.

Mr. Bélanger.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: It was wonderful, what we just heard! And that includes everyone.

I may surprise you, Mr. Castonguay. We must not be indifferent to the alarm you raised quite some time ago, in my opinion. I agree with you on that.

I am very disappointed to have only five minutes for my questions, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, Mr. Castonguay, I would say that your approach is an extremely mathematical one. That goes without saying, since you are a professor of mathematics. It is a very statistical and—I hope you will not mind my making a somewhat critical comment—very cold approach.

These statistics, whether they are from 1996 or 2001, may present a true picture of a new reality, to use Ms. Lamarre's expression. They do not include the impact, however minimal, of the emergence of Francophone school boards across the country, outside the infamous bilingual belt you referred to. I am talking about the die-hards in Zenon Park, in St-Boniface, at the Campus Saint-Jean in Edmonton, as well as those in British Columbia, and Whitehorse, in the Yukon. In Whitehorse, Yukon, they now have schools and a day care service that did not exist when the statistics were compiled in 1996—statistics which do not reflect the impact of these schools.

Do you take that in consideration, Mr. Castonguay? That is my first question.

Prof. Charles Castonguay: Yes, certainly. I am neither a doomsayer nor the bogeyman. I was the first, and almost the only, analyst to point out that having a French-speaking school system, alongside with day care services, all the way up to university, was yielding results in New Brunswick. Outside Quebec, it is the only province where Francophones have succeeded in reducing the rate of anglicisation among young adults. The rate was 12% in 1971 and 9% in 2006. So, there is also some good news in the statistics, and I try to make people aware of that.

You referred to management of independent school boards in Ontario. However, that right was secured long after the achievements of Mr. Robichaud, in New Brunswick. As early as 1969, an official languages act was passed. That is not a bad thing. It supports the communities; it gives them more independence and certainly influences the way in which things evolve.

At the same time, there is one region where we would like to see greater development, and that region is Ottawa, which includes Eastern Ontario. I am basically referring to the metropolitan Ottawa region, which includes more than a third of Ontario's Francophones. It is highly concentrated. In a way, it is like a small version of Acadia, with several hundred thousand Francophones. Using round figures, it is comparable to the entire French-speaking population of New Brunswick. And yet we are not seeing positive developments in Ottawa, which is not an officially bilingual city. No districts outside Quebec have been declared bilingual, as was recommended by the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission.

● (0950)

[*English*]

That was the cornerstone of the policy it was advocating in the sixties, and it was adopted in the first Official Languages Act of 1969.

[*Translation*]

But that was never implemented. It was set aside by the Trudeau government in about 1977, probably because it would have provoked a backlash. In Windsor, in particular, just such a backlash occurred when there was talk of declaring it a bilingual district. At the time, the rate of anglicisation was about 65%. Now it is more than 70%. Since the Official Languages Act came into effect, the rate of anglicisation among young adults in Ottawa has doubled and continues to rise. What can I say? If the news is bad, do not shoot the messenger.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: Fine.

Prof. Charles Castonguay: I also have good news, but it is rare. I think we need to be realistic. The indicators on which the Official Languages Act was based are being called into question. I am referring now to the percentage of Canadians whose mother tongue is French, to the percentage of Anglophones or allophones, and to the language spoken at home. The Laurendeau-Dunton Commission had recommended that Statistics Canada ask these questions. It did so in 1971, thereby complying with a U.N. recommendation. The United Nations had in fact suggested that member countries collect this kind of information.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: Mr. Castonguay, if the Chair does not interrupt you, I am going to have to. I have another question.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to ask my question. I do not know whether I am going to receive an answer right away.

I, too, am a "Franglophone".

Prof. Charles Castonguay: As am I.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: My grandchildren are learning three languages: English, French and Hungarian. They may learn Spanish as well. Under current programs. immigrants are encouraged to learn only one language: French or English. The question I would like an answer to later is this: should we consider teaching two languages to our immigrant population—in other words, English and French?

Thank you.

The Chair: I imagine a lot of people will want to answer that question.

We will move now to Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning to you all.

My heart starts beating wildly when we come to this topic. By that I mean the daily reality, what is actually going on on the ground, in real life, in terms of the French fact in North America as a whole, and particularly Canada and Quebec—for some fundamental reasons. Like Mauril, I am from Ontario, but from that part of Ontario which is right next to Quebec. I am from Hawkesbury and I am the member of Parliament for Gatineau. So we are still talking about the Ottawa Valley. I thank heaven that we were right next to Quebec. I am talking about Eastern Ontario. Things were different elsewhere in Ontario. I have cousins who are called Lalande instead of Lalonde, and others who go by the name of Nadal, rather than Nadeau, because at one point their parents moved, and at that time Francophones did not have the right to manage their own schools.

I lived in Saskatchewan and I worked to secure the right to school management. As you know, the Conservatives in Saskatchewan abolished French-language schools in 1931. The New Democrats only brought them back in 1995, some 64 years later. I arrived at the end of that lengthy period, in the early 1990s. I will always remember the day I went to Willow Bunch. It is a small Franco-Saskatchewanian village that used to be called Hart-Rouge, which then became Talle-de-Saules, and eventually, Willow Bunch. Most of the people who live there have names like Duperreault—a name which is no longer pronounced that way—Granger, a name that is also no longer pronounced that way—or Boisvert—an another name that is no longer pronounced that way. When we got to the village, we needed the signatures of 10 parents to have the right to establish a French-language school there. But we were unable to collect those 10 signatures, even though we spent a week there. Some of the grandparents were in favour, but not the parents.

Now we are asking immigrants who come to Canada to do the work in these communities where assimilation has occurred—not because Francophones wanted it, but because of the social pressure associated with the Canadian reality. Think of it: Francophones in Saskatchewan went for 64 years without any rights; that destroys communities that already have a minority status. In 1931, there were 63 French-language schools, but we were only able to reopen eight of them—not because people were no longer there, but because the communities had been assimilated. There are only 6,000 people for whom French is the language spoken at home. I say it is the language spoken at home, but that does not mean they do not speak English.

Given that reality, do you not think that we are asking that immigration… Quebec only represents 2% of the North American population. There is a critical mass there. Assimilation is certainly quite possible, as we can see in the Pontiac region and Montreal, where 47% of Quebec's population lives. But to be perfectly frank, when I go to Montreal, I am really not sure that I am in a French-speaking city.

Why not direct our energy towards what should be our focus, rather than asking Francophone immigrants to maintain the French fact in communities which are having a terrible time trying to do that on their own? Mr. Castonguay, Ms. Lamarre and Mr. Jedwab, I invite you to comment.

● (0955)

Prof. Charles Castonguay: As I understand it, you are asking whether it is appropriate to scatter what I termed "a precious resource".

I have already clearly explained that this is not the way it is supposed to be. We could talk about this at length, but some basic indicators allow us to ascertain over time the vitality of the different linguistic groups from one census to the next. It is very important not to abandon those indicators which have served us well, which will continue to serve us well in the future and which are so valuable. They allow us to identify which people speak primarily or exclusively French at home, or English at home. If people say they speak both English and French, I adjust my analysis the same way that Statistics Canada does: I count one half as being French speakers and the other half as being English speakers. That reflects the relative frequency of their use. We are trying to get a better handle on the grey areas that normally arise when both languages are in contact with each other. Admittedly, there is bilingualism.

When we look at population growth, based on statistics from the last two censuses, we see that the number of additional French mother tongue speakers in Canada was less than 10 000 between 2001 and 2006. We have reached an historic turning point. In the next census, I am expecting to see a decline in real terms in the number of French mother tongue speakers in Canada, after simplifying the data, and taking into account double answers that may have been given.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Prof. Charles Castonguay: In terms of English mother tongue speakers, the number has grown by almost half a million over the last five years. There is a deepening linguistic imbalance.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Prof. Charles Castonguay: The important thing is to put our resources where they will serve us best in the long term.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Castonguay.

Prof. Charles Castonguay: Every person counts, and unlike what Mr. Jedwab said, they are small numbers—

The Chair: I am sorry, Mr. Castonguay, but in order to respect our schedule, we will have to try and… People want a chance to speak.

I would like to recognize Mr. Julian.

Welcome to the Committee, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am replacing Yvon Godin, the member for Acadie—Bathurst, who is our usual representative on this Committee.

Mr. Castonguay, I would just like to say one thing. I do not agree with everything you have said, except with respect to your comments about Ottawa as the national capital. I think it is terrible that the City of Ottawa has no respect for the federal government or French-speaking taxpayers who built this city. It is not acceptable that the City of Ottawa has not been made officially bilingual. So, I fully agree with you on that.

However, in terms of the vitality of the communities, Ms. Lamarre's comments are a breath of fresh air. The reality in British Columbia, as I see it, is very similar to what she described. As you know, British Columbia is one of the only provinces where the Francophone population is on the rise. There is finally a school system in place. And when you visit these schools, you really see a Francophone rainbow. There are accents from Africa, Europe, Asia and the Caribbean. It is remarkable. It is something that I have never seen in Quebec when I have been there. I lived in Quebec for 14 years—in Chicoutimi, Sherbrooke and Montreal. Yet I never saw the kind of Francophone diversity in Quebec that I see now in British Columbia. The immersion schools are overflowing. Parents often line up for an entire weekend to register their children at an immersion school. What does that mean? It means that all of these people are consumers of Francophone products—Francophone cultural products such as films, magazines and books. That is what contributes to Quebec's vitality in a major way. When there is a network in place outside Quebec, that contributes to the vitality of Quebec and Acadian cultural products. I think it is important to maintain and enhance the Francophone presence outside of Quebec.

Mr. Castonguay, you mentioned that in areas where there are Francophone post-secondary institutions, such as Sudbury, Moncton and Ottawa, the rate of assimilation is lower. That is a fact. These immigrants expand the Francophone community, where such institutions exist.

I have three questions. I would like to begin by addressing one question to Ms. Lamarre. First of all, in terms of French as a Second Language programs, what do you think can be done to improve the quality and quantity of such programs? French is often the second language of French-speaking immigrants.

Second, how can we enhance access to Francophone post-secondary institutions? There is no doubt that the availability of a Francophone post-secondary institution increases the Francophone presence.

Third, what other programs could be offered in order to continue to expand the Francophone presence and consumption of Quebec and Acadian cultural products? That is very important to our future.

● (1000)

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: The first question was about educational programs, and the third was about other programs, right?

Mr. Peter Julian: The first was about French as a Second Language programs in post-secondary institutions. The third referred to other types of programs which would contribute to broader distribution of Canada's cultural products.

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: In terms of school programs, I could tell you about a project launched in Quebec three years ago. It involves Community Learning Centres, within the Anglophone community, through which small schools in remote areas were given video conferencing equipment. That means that people living in Harrington Harbour or Blanc-Sablon—regions that are far removed from everything Francophone—can connect to all kinds of cultural events in English. It could be 30 or so students in a small primary school who are thus able to visit museums such as the Canada Space Center.

What is even more surprising is that these small schools are in contact with other English-language schools on the coast of Labrador. All of a sudden, an entire network has been built up in an area where people—as is often said in Quebec about this Anglophone minority community living on the

● (1005)

[*English*]

the Labrador coast, wilting on the vine.

[*Translation*]

People say it has no chance of surviving, and that the population is in decline. But I was there in January and it was teaming with life. I think we have perceptions based on numbers that do not jibe with people's reality. I would suggest that you visit the Community Learning Centres, which have transformed these schools into community centres that are open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. All of a sudden, the community has a place to go that is very easy to access, where people can play badminton on Friday night or do scrapbooking. Grandparents go there to tell stories to their grandchildren, because their own children are no longer there. It is an amazing experience that fills you with hope. It creates a community.

[*English*]

Don't underestimate what schools can do for community, all right? Who the community is, I'll come back to; it's something that could be made of many different types of people, but don't underestimate schools.

They're not being used. This kind of thing is not being used enough for exchange programs. I was recently asked....

Do you want me to take two minutes or stop?

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you.

[*English*]

That's a lot. Maybe you could keep your answer for the next question.

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: Okay. I've got too much to say.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Julian.

Continuing with questions from British Columbia, we'll now move to Mr. Weston.

[*Translation*]

Mr. John Weston: I would like to thank all three of you. I think you can see, by the length of the questions, that this topic is one that people feel passionate about. The comments I have heard today may be the most interesting ones I have heard since recently becoming a member of the Committee.

Ms. Lamarre, you just said that the numbers do not reflect people's reality. In English, there is an expression that goes:

[*English*]

"Figures lie and liars figure". I mean no disrespect, *mais*

[*Translation*]

I am concerned that the figures you have given us, Professor Castonguay, may lead us to the wrong conclusions.

[*English*]

The problem I have is that your analysis leads us to a very stark and polarized anglophone-francophone reality, which would suggest perhaps that the existence of French would be stronger if we had only a Quebec and then a "Rest of Canada".

What I'm hearing and feeling as a father of three kids in a French immersion school in B.C.—the lines are long, and it's hard to get into these French immersion schools—and what Mr. Julian was also saying is that in reality, French is so much stronger because of this large entity we call Canada, where the language is being promoted outside the province.

I have two questions that come from your evidence. First, we heard from you, Mr. Castonguay, that there's a squandering of a scarce resource if the francophone immigrants go outside the belt or outside Quebec. I would argue that this scarce resource is not only strengthening French but also encouraging other people who speak other languages to be sensitive to the importance and preciousness of French outside the belt.

Second, you said that anglo immigration to Quebec was proportionally double the francophone population, and I don't understand why that would be the case, given Quebec's unprecedented control over its own immigration.

I will first ask you, Madam Lamarre, to answer those two questions, and then perhaps Mr. Castonguay. I'm sorry we can't get everybody in because of time restraints.

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: First, I think what I need to address here is fear for French, fear for the vitality of French and the French fact in Canada,

[*Translation*]

the French fact; a Francophone society in Quebec.

[*English*]

There are real fears, and they're built on a history. I think we can't undermine those fears. There are things that need to be done in and outside Quebec to keep the French fact alive and well. So if I am pro-multilingualism and I see it as a new phenomenon that has a great deal of human capital value for the future, I do not want to give the message that I don't think French needs to be taken care of.

For French to survive, whether in or outside Quebec, it means schools that are healthy and well. It also means workplaces where people are interested in using French and learning French to be able to use it. I grew up in an English bastion in Quebec City. It was possible to live in Quebec City in the sixties without learning French. That's over. I live on the West Island in Montreal now and I send my kids to a French school.

These are kids that are *ayant droit*. They have the right. Their parents are choosing to send them to a French school so they can live and work in Quebec. It's the attraction of French that is going to make French a language that's alive and well and that will continue to thrive into the future. So when Mr. Julian asked me what to do with other programs, I would say that school is a big, important place.

The other thing is the workplace, that there be jobs that will keep people interested and attract people to continue to use French as adults. I think we see it happening in *la francophonie hors Québec*—I don't even like that word—or *la francophonie canadienne* and the efforts to build workplaces and enterprises where you can live and work in French. Even if your website is in French, English, and Spanish, you've built yourself a place where you can live and work in French.

Those kinds of programs, I think, are what will continue to keep the French fact alive. I would not underestimate the power of the workplace and the economy.

● (1010)

Mr. John Weston: Mr. Castonguay?

The Chair: Your time is up, Mr. Weston. I'm sorry.

You will have to keep your answer for a next question.

Monsieur D'Amours.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to thank our witnesses for being with us this morning. I must admit that, just from the standpoint of statistics on immigrants' mother tongue, the only possible way of increasing the numbers in that area—it seems to me—is to only consider immigrant couples whose mother tongue is French.

Let us look at the situation around the world. In Belgium, as in many other countries, people do not only speak one language. In many cases, even if the mother tongue is not French, the family still speaks that language 90% of the time. So, if we do not want unilingual Francophone couples to emigrate, possibly from France, in order to start a family in Canada, then the percentages will undoubtedly change in the statistics on mother tongue.

Ms. Lamarre, you are evidence of that. You were able to speak French and live in French even though your parents were not necessarily both unilingual Francophones. If we limit ourselves to that, we will most certainly see a decline for the rest of our lives. I think we have to look a little further than that. We have to look beyond the traditional framework.

I would like to use Ms. Glover as an example. I have three nieces who attend school in Ms. Glover's riding, in Saint Boniface. Their mother tongue may not be designated as French, because they have one Anglophone parent and one Francophone parent. However, they live 75% of their life in French. It seems to me that if my sister had not moved to Saint Boniface, in Winnipeg, there would be four fewer people supporting the vitality of that Francophone community.

If we go no further than the traditional framework and leave it tightly closed, without ever opening it up, even slightly, there is no doubt that we will continue to see a problem in the statistics on mother tongue. We have to broaden our horizons. It is important to realize that immigrants coming to this country, even though they may have learned two, three, four or even five languages elsewhere before coming here and may not have French as their mother tongue, are still Francophones. Perhaps the method used is causing the problem. If we continue to do the same thing, we will continue to see problems and conclude that there is a decline happening across the country.

Ms. Lamarre, I would just like to know whether you think that what I just said may reflect the current reality, or whether you completely disagree with me.

● (1015)

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: I do not disagree. My own children are a good example. I am the fourth bilingual generation in the family of my father, who was a Quebecker whose parents were from Quebec and Acadia. I am raising my own children to be trilingual. I am married to an immigrant—in actual fact, divorced from an immigrant. My children are raised in English with me, attend a French school and speak Spanish with their father.

I am not the only person to be in that situation. In the 21st century, having skills in a number of languages is advisable.

Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours: That would mean that your children, whose mother tongue is not French, could still be Francophones.

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: I have a psychologist friend who came over to my house one day. Like many of my Francophone friends, he has trouble imagining that there can be such a creature as a "Franglophone"—in other words, someone who has the sense of belonging to two different systems and having two different identities. He asked my children, who were a little younger, whether they were Francophone or Anglophone, and my little girl answered saying she was a "bilingualphone".

[*English*]

It's even worse than "franglophone".

[*Translation*]

For my children, it just made no sense to take a position one way or the other.

I have been doing ethnographic research with young immigrants in Montreal, who speak different languages. Asking them to put themselves in one linguistic category or another does not make much sense, as far as they are concerned. They speak three or four languages. So, if you ask them what is the most important language in order to live in Quebec, they will tell you it is French. If you ask them what they need to live in Quebec, they will say they need both languages. In fact, Francophones will tell you the same thing: if they want to live in Montreal and have a good job, they need both languages.

I hear French people from France saying that just because they speak French does not mean it is easy to become integrated in Montreal. It is not language that facilitates integration; it is networks, work, and so on. It is what you do every day that helps you to become integrated into a community—not the language you speak.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. D'Amours.

Ms. Guay, please.

Ms. Monique Guay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am a Quebecker, a Francophone and very proud of my roots. However, that does not prevent me from speaking two other languages.

As I was listening to you, I was thinking to myself that you are all right, in a way, in particular when you describe your feelings. You have plenty of feeling, Ms. Lamarre, when you talk about how you perceive things. And we all do.

In terms of how Anglophones are treated in Quebec, because they are given services, that cannot be reproduced for Francophones in the rest of Canada. I do not see a day when that kind of equality will exist. I think that is where the difference lies. That difference will always be there. We are not going to start building schools. Also, as was pointed out earlier, the federal government is not investing money in Francophones outside Quebec—quite the opposite.

Personally, I have gone right across the country. I have met with Francophones outside Quebec who were having trouble keeping their community centre open—just for the chance to get with each other. We should forget about schools and everything else. I think statistics are important. Feelings are not the only thing that counts. We have to consider the numbers.

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: With respect to numbers, if you look at the Quebec government's numbers, you will see that there are significant nuances with respect to linguistic behaviour among immigrants, Francophones and Anglophones. Statistically, indicators with supporting numbers show that the linguistic situation is very complex. In that regard, I recommend that you read a recent piece of research by Michel Pagé that was published by the IRPP. It deals with the linguistic integration of immigrants to Quebec. If you use those numbers and "flatten" them, what you get is a binary picture based on a model where there is only room for one language in a society. I wonder about cosmopolitan cities in the 21st century. I think Quebec is part of that globalization. In order to be well positioned on that global market, Montreal must deal with languages.

● (1020)

Ms. Monique Guay: But Montreal already does.

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: Yes, and that cannot be prevented. Market forces are—

Ms. Monique Guay: Nor do we want to prevent that—quite the contrary.

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: I do think, though, that some of the statistics that are forever being cited in the media to alarm people have been "flattened". I am not afraid to say that. They present an extremely unnuanced picture of reality.

Ms. Monique Guay: I would like to hear what Mr. Castonguay has to say in that regard.

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: You are going directly to the source.

Prof. Charles Castonguay: I am not the person who simplifies the double and triple answers equally between the declared languages; Statistics Canada does that. It is the originator of that particular work method, and I adopted it, as do most Canadian researchers, Ms. Lamarre. When you refer to your colleague, Michel Pagé, you should at least state that you worked together with him on the IRPP study, which I am well acquainted with. Having spent five years as a member of the Comité de suivi de la situation linguistique, I am also very familiar with the data collected by the Office québécois de la langue française. I am very much aware of all the statistical and qualitative nuances of that information.

I am simply asking Committee members not to confuse micro-analysis and macro-analysis. I tried to present a simplified, comprehensive vision. Statistics Canada itself simplifies these statistics. When you conduct an ethnographic study based on 12 subjects in French-language school, you are not considering those Francophones who attend English school, as opposed to that one. That is not a comprehensive vision. Do not allow yourself to be distracted by your personal experience. I do not intend to tell you how many languages I speak. That has nothing to do with the overall status of languages in Canadian society. If we consider the main language spoken at home, rather than the mother tongue, the figures show that, over the last five years, the number of Francophones in Canada has increased by 65,000, whereas it was 800,000 on the Anglophone side. In terms of language of work, which I do not discuss in my paper—

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Castonguay.

Prof. Charles Castonguay: I have presented all the statistics. I tried to provide an overview of the situation this morning. It is always possible to get lost in the details.

The Chair: Yes, of course. This is a rather unusual situation, and I would just like to remind everyone of the procedural rules that apply in Committee. As a general rule, the questions are put by Committee members to the witnesses, and you are required to go through me to answer those questions.

While I understand that the witnesses may not agree, I would ask members to make proper use of their time by addressing their questions to the witnesses and receiving answers from them.

On that note, we will move now to Ms. Boucher.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Good morning, everyone. This is a very interesting discussion. And, of course, as soon as you talk about immigration and Francophonie, people become very passionate. I am from Quebec, I am also a Quebecker and I am a pure Francophone.

When I arrived here in Ottawa, the only words I know were: *yes, no, toaster*. I learned to speak English, and I find now that there is a wonderful complicity between the two languages. I have never felt assimilated.

The fact is that our children are a lot more open to the rest of the world than we were. They have many more opportunities to be so, if only because of the Internet and everything else. I have daughters who speak French, English and Spanish. One of them is learning Italian, but that does not mean she is any less Francophone.

I find this debate very interesting. Often we have a certain idea in our mind. I am sorry, Mr. Castonguay, but I have a bit of a problem with the figures and the statistics. I am having trouble making sense of them. What I see on the ground is something different.

I have two questions. We often talk about Francophones, as opposed to Anglophones. I would like to begin with a question for Ms. Lamarre or Mr. Jedwab, if he would like to answer.

The criteria used to determine who is a Francophone or Anglophone immigrant vary, depending on the government. Everyone knows that.

Could you give us an overview of the various criteria that now apply? What impact do they have on the immigrant communities, your analysis and the results of your research? Are they a success in terms of immigration to OLMCs, or official language minority communities?

● (1025)

Mr. Jack Jedwab: First of all, these questions warrant far more detailed and lengthy answers. It is not easy to simplify things. Even what Mr. Castonguay raises is part of a larger debate, and it is very difficult to condense that into a short analysis. All of that to say that the context in which we are appearing as guests today does not necessarily allow us to really go into detail, in the absence of an in-depth debate on these issues.

Like Mr. Castonguay and Ms. Lamarre, I can summarize the different categories. Citizenship and Immigration Canada's website basically deals with two categories. There is the language spoken on arrival—French, English, English and French, or neither English and French. And there are the figures provided each year by Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

That is not what Statistics Canada offers. It offers a different approach. First of all, it reassesses the situation every five years. There is a category for mother tongue, which is the language first learned and that you continue to understand. There is the language most often spoken at home. In 2001, there were different categories for the language most often spoken at home, which was a little confusing. There was also the language spoken regularly. So, there were three or four different categories for the language spoken at home. There is also knowledge of the official languages: do you know one or the other official language. There, again, there are several categories. There is the language spoken at work, the language most often spoken in a workplace. There are different categories, so it is easy to get lost in that data set.

Very often, the choice to emphasize one indicator or another will have an impact on how you see the status of French or other languages in a given context.

In Montreal, the status of the French language is very often measured in relation to its status on the island of Montreal. And one may wonder: why the island of Montreal? Why select that geographic area, rather than the Montreal metropolitan region? That is another question. Why not include Longueuil with the island of Montreal, and remove Dollard-des-Ormeaux? Why is it more appropriate to include Dollard-des-Ormeaux in an urban centre, as regards the status of a specific language? There are a lot of factors. And I do not think we can really reach any solid conclusions in a discussion that is limited to quick questions and answers.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We are already coming—

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Excuse me, but I would just like—

Mr. Jack Jedwab: I understand why you say you are having trouble making sense of the numbers. A lot of people find them confusing.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I am having a lot of trouble with the subject matter, in any case. I was hopeless at math.

Mr. Jack Jedwab: Mr. Castonguay is very good at math.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: He probably would have been a very good teacher. As soon as anybody talked to me about figures, I would break out in hives.

Have you already done some analysis? If so, could the Committee be given that analysis?

Mr. Jack Jedwab: No problem. A ton of analyses have been done in both official languages. That material is available on the web. Fortunately, the government translates everything, so we are very lucky.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Boucher.

In terms of any documents you may be sending us, we can have them translated into both official languages, if they are not already translated.

We now go back to Mr. Peter Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: Thank you, Mr. Julian.

You can see just how passionate people become when discussing these issues.

Mr. Castonguay, you mentioned earlier that in the next census, the number of Francophones is likely to decline. The *Petit Robert* defines Francophones as people who speak French. We know that the number of Francophones in Canada continues to rise. People may say that their mother tongue is English, and therefore they are not Francophones. But they are Francophones: they consume Francophone cultural products and they contribute to the vitality of all Francophone communities in Canada, as do the members of this Committee.

What I found most interesting about Ms. Lamarre's presentation was her point that we need to change our definitions if we really want to strengthen the vitality of Francophone communities in Canada.

I would like to come back to the questions I asked previously. What types of programs could be introduced in order to facilitate discussion and debate between the various communities that make up Canadian Francophonie? What should be done to expand access to post-secondary institutions? That really makes a difference.

What more should the federal and provincial governments be doing? If we agree on the fact that we want a dynamic French language in Canada, I think we have to look at the steps that need to be taken, rather than throwing in the towel and just leaving Francophones outside Quebec to fend for themselves.

● (1030)

[*English*]

Prof. Charles Castonguay: My point of view is that a type of territorial bilingualism would be more appropriate for Canada, much as in Switzerland or Belgium, or Finland for that matter, or other bilingual or multilingual countries.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter Julian: Could I ask a question? I asked my questions in French. But you are answering in English.

[*English*]

Prof. Charles Castonguay: English is my mother tongue. My father was Ernest Napoléon Castonguay, and we never spoke a word of French together. I called his mother, *ma mère*, as I thought that was her name, like Florence or Edith. I called her *ma mère* until I was 20 years old, when I realized that meant *ma mère*, okay? I am that much of an anglo.

I think a territorial type of bilingualism fits Canadian reality. When I say territorial bilingualism, I mean not only bilingual districts to support francophone minorities—

The Chair: Mr. Castonguay, please feel free to express yourself in the language of your choice. It is your privilege as a witness.

Prof. Charles Castonguay: Of course. Well, anyway, it is my mother tongue and I express myself better in that language. I'm sorry.

I just think it fits Canadian reality. The bilingualism and biculturalism commission, the Laurendeau-Dunton commission, thought in that direction also. If you are wondering what you might be able to do to help French in Canada, I pray you think of changing the

[*Translation*]

Citizenship Act, so that a person applying for Canadian citizenship who has taken up residence in the province of Quebec be required to prove that he or she has an adequate, minimal or sufficient knowledge of French. That falls within the jurisdiction of the federal government, I believe. You can do things like that. That would be tremendous helpful in fostering social cohesion in Montreal and in the Outaouais, in particular. We are talking about half of Quebec.

[*English*]

The bilingual belt within Quebec is Montreal, the Outaouais, and the Eastern Townships. Things are not going well, even in Quebec. You may be very preoccupied with the situation outside.

You're from B.C., Mr. Julian?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter Julian: Yes, but—

[*English*]

Prof. Charles Castonguay: Okay. To answer Mr. Weston, 90% of francophones of French mother tongue in British Columbia, born in the province, adopt English as their main home language by the time they're 25 or 30 years old and ready to raise children.

That assimilation rate...you cannot graft francophone, international, immigration on such a stock without it withering and being a lost cause. I'm sorry, but those are the facts.

I'd like to say something about statistics and about something that would be called qualitative statistics. You asked, what's a francophone?

● (1035)

The Chair: Very briefly, please, Mr. Castonguay.

Prof. Charles Castonguay: In my study in English I referred to a 2006 survey carried out by Statistics Canada pertaining to a sense of belonging. Respondents were asked with which language group they identify the most. To the francophone group only, mainly to the francophone group, to both groups equally, mainly to the anglophone group, or only to the anglophone group.

I mentioned the results in my presentation at nine o'clock. Francophones in the provinces outside of the bilingual belt and outside of Quebec essentially identified themselves as being anglos, French mother tongue. Later in life, as adolescents, young adults, mature adults, they identify themselves that way. That's the best definition of what a francophone is.

What do you feel? What is your gut feeling? How do you identify yourself? With which group do you identify the most? That is based on a random sample, not like most—

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Castonguay.

Once again, I must apologize for interrupting you. We are going to begin the third round. Then we will have to bring our meeting to a close.

Ms. Zarac, please.

Mrs. Lise Zarac (LaSalle—Émard, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I agree with Mr. Castonguay about the fact that more effort must be directed towards minority regions. We have heard it said many times that more resources must be provided in order to maintain the vitality of these communities.

On the other hand, the picture that has been painted is extremely complex. That complexity is increasing, because in Canada, we are the product of multiculturalism. I can easily identify with Ms. Lamarre. I, too, have an immigrant ex-husband. My children have always been considered allophones, even though their mother tongue is French. We always speak in French.

My daughter now lives in Ontario. She has a child who speaks English most of the time, even though French is used in the family environment. So, it is a very complex picture. At some point, we will have to be able to distinguish between the language that is spoken and the Francophone identity. We are mixing up the two. Certainly, they are connected. In terms of the statistics, I firmly believe that you can make them say whatever you like, if you do not ask the right questions.

Do you think that Statistics Canada is asking the right questions, in order to provide us with an accurate picture? It is somewhat of a concern to see that there are fewer Francophones in Quebec or Canada and more and more Anglophones. But is that an accurate picture?

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: Statistics Canada has data which, in my opinion, receive minimal processing and have not been adequately analyzed. Statistics Canada provides a great deal of information and that information is expensive to process. Also, there needs to be a desire to understand the complexity.

For 40 years now, our society has been organized based on a framework of linguistic duality. That has made it possible to establish a certain linguistic peace in the country over a 40-year period. I think the communities and the people who live with these languages—even some who identify themselves as Francophones, Anglophones, as well as all the others who do not necessarily identify themselves in that way—will completely transform the way we live with and experience the official languages in Quebec and Canada. The Francophone community in Quebec is changing just as much as the Anglophone community changed last year in Quebec. Quebec Anglophones are very multicultural and Francophones will become that way as well, thanks to Bill 101. That was the purpose of Bill 101: to bring people in from other places, because that brings about change from the inside. So, yes, the statistics can tell us a lot of different things.

In 2006, if my memory serves me, there was a survey on official languages that asked far more nuanced questions. Statistics make it possible to introduce a lot more complexity into our observations. However, what we see in the media and what is often used to alarm people are statistics that have been “flattened”.

Let us look at the statistics, but let us do so in a discriminating and nuanced way. That takes nothing away from what ethnography and statistics can contribute. There are two types of research that can enlighten us in different ways, but we cannot rely on one type of research alone.

● (1040)

The Chair: You have one minute left, Ms. Zarac.

Mrs. Lise Zarac: Can you tell us what you mean by "flattened" statistics?

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: What do you do when someone gives two answers? Do you attribute half to Francophones and the other half to Anglophones? If you say that you have two mother tongues, you do not exist.

Mrs. Lise Zarac: So, do you think we are asking the right questions?

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: The question is asked, but the answers are not processed accordingly. Furthermore, often the majority of questions used in the surveys that have been done up until recently—that is changing now; the indicators are changing—have been: what language is most often used at work? What language is used most at home? They do not ask: what languages do you use at home? What languages do you use at work? And in what proportions?

But that has changed. The Government of Quebec's data is far more nuanced with respect to the languages used at work. It provides a more nuanced picture. So, it is possible to arrive at a more nuanced picture from statistics.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Zarac.

[*English*]

We'll now go to Ms. O'Neill-Gordon.

Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Welcome. It's great to have you here this morning.

Coming from the province of New Brunswick, Canada's only official language...and also being an educator, I have to reiterate the words that were said here this morning. I certainly saw, personally, an increase in English-speaking people putting children in schools for French as a second language and for French immersion. I see that the English-speaking people are trying more and more to become bilingual and to learn the French language as well as English.

With respect to the attraction, the Citizenship and Immigration Canada francophone minority communities steering committee favours French language post-secondary educational institutions as a means of increasing the number of francophone permanent residents. Do you regard this as a good strategy, and are English language institutions in Quebec doing the same thing for anglophone immigrants?

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: Who is that addressed to?

Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon: Either of you.

Mr. Jack Jedwab: Could you repeat the question? Sorry, I'm not clear, Tilly.

Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon: Do you regard the post-secondary educational institution as a good way to increase the bilingualism in your schools, in your community?

Mr. Jack Jedwab: To the extent that those post-secondary institutions offer or require that there be language instruction.... I don't believe that in my institution, McGill University, we have any requirement for students to learn French. I don't know that this would work, either, in that institution, in terms of trying to create a requirement for it. You might be able to find other ways of creating incentives, but I doubt you'd be able to create a requirement like that. But again—

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: I think she's asking which university-degree language programs are offered in English universities.

Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon: Do you feel it's the way to go?

Mr. Jack Jedwab: I see. I'm not an expert on that. I don't know if you know...you may know that better than I do.

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: If I understand correctly, it's whether to continue to support post-secondary education in minority languages, such as at UBC, that there be French teacher training programs. If you're looking at St. Boniface or places like that, yes, of course. The more places where you can...language learning is a lifetime process. I think that's something we need to remember.

If we're going to ask people to become citizens when they can speak French, you're saying they're not going to learn it in the lifelong process. It's a lifelong process to acquire skills. It means you're going to sort out who can and who can't learn French. If you come to a place and you don't have French skills at the beginning, you can get them as an adult. It's not over. There's no reason to think that. I've seen the benefits of federal support to post-secondary education outside Quebec in places like Université Sainte-Anne, Simon Fraser, the universities in Alberta. It's a place where you can live and continue in French, whether you learned French in French immersion or whether you learned French in a small school in a village or in a French neighbourhood in Winnipeg.

● (1045)

Mr. Jack Jedwab: The only thing I would add, though, is this. And I appreciate what you're saying about the interest that people are taking in immersion and so forth. But my conclusion, I must say, is based a lot on the statistics as well. I'm not nearly as satisfied as I'd like to be with the extent to which anglophones are acquiring the French language outside Quebec. I think there's a considerably greater degree of work that needs to be done in that regard, and I wouldn't be complacent about it.

I'm not sure, Mr. Chair, if I'm allowed to relate to a previous question or wait for a forthcoming one.

The Chair: It's up to the member.

Mr. Jack Jedwab: In places like British Columbia and Alberta, despite the significant concern over assimilation, a legitimate one, there have been real population increases among francophones in those parts of the country, largely owing to migration—not migration arising from immigration, but migration arising from Quebec francophones who have moved out to those places. I think that reinforces the need for continued support for communities in those places. Some may return to Quebec, some may not, but at least they have a right as Quebeckers, I think.

[*Translation*]

As Quebeckers, they have the right, anywhere in Canada, to have governments—particularly the federal government, because of its legislative commitment to vitality—that create conditions whereby people can continue to live in their language, in spite of the social pressure Mr. Nadeau referred to, which is in fact problematic.

Just as an aside, I should say that my mother tongue is English, but I like speaking French. That is why I do. My wife is a Francophone immigrant—same one—

Voices: Ah, ah!

Mr. Jack Jedwab: — and my children are in fact both Anglophone and Francophone.

The Chair: "Bilingualphone"—

Mr. Jack Jedwab: It depends on the circumstances. They will take that into account: they will speak French in some circumstances, and English, in others.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. O'Neill-Gordon, for sharing your time with other questions from....

Now we'll go to Monsieur Nadeau.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Thank you, Mr. Blaney.

[*Translation*]

In North America, the situation is such that there is a melting pot —particularly in the United States, of course. In Canada, we have a government that is bilingual—that is to say that the public service is bilingual, but not the country. There is one province which is bilingual, on paper, and that is New Brunswick. Quebec has been a self-declared French-speaking province since Robert Bourassa introduced Bill 22, and the other provinces are English-speaking. That is the reality.

However, there is another reality as well, as I see it, and that is the reason I am in politics: there is a cancer there. It is a little like someone who has cancer, but will not acknowledge it. That cancer is ethnolinguistic assimilation—the loss of the French fact. Whether you call "flattened statistics", negation or denial, there are certain views out there—I hear them. The fact remains that, ultimately, decade after decade, since 1951, since the censuses, the loss of the French fact has been giving an ever-increasing advantage to English. I am talking about Canada. That is the way it is in some regions of Quebec, but it is especially true for the overall picture in Canada.

I will always remember, when I went to Bellegarde, Saskatchewan, meeting a certain Mr. Cormier, who said to me—with a name like Cormier: "I'm proud to be French Canadian, even if I don't speak the language".

My brother-in-law is a Quebecker of Irish extraction. His name is Terry Bowles. I will send him the "blues". We have often argued. He would ask me why I was teaching French in Ontario. I asked him whether he was English, and he replied by saying that he was Irish. I asked him to speak to me in Gaelic, but he never did. He is entitled to his identity, and I, to mine. One thing is certain: our strength as a French-speaking people in North American can be attributed to the fact that we are still speaking our language. It is thanks to all of us and to our fight. It certainly is not thanks to the federal government, which allows certain provinces to shut down French-speaking schools, to assimilate people, and so on.

Louis Riel was not hanged for nothing; talk to Mr. Goldring about that. Let us not see the world through rose coloured glasses. It is important to know the facts and to face reality.

I have a question for Mr. Castonguay. What is the actual situation in terms of the loss of the French fact? In Saskatchewan, I taught at a French Canadian school. We tried to recruit students. At the time, there were 10,000 young Franco-Saskatchewanians. Of that number, we were able to recruit 1,000. But 9,000 other young Franco-Saskatchewanians were attending English schools. Even though they were rights holders, we did not have the full complement. Parents had to register their children at our school. We did not have the staff for that. This is a provincial responsibility. So, do not tell me the federal government can recruit students in French schools in order to help Franco-Saskatchewanians schools; that is just not true.

What is the situation with respect to assimilation, Mr. Castonguay?

● (1050)

The Chair: You have one and a half minutes left, Mr. Nadeau.

[*English*]

Prof. Charles Castonguay: I can only answer globally, because we don't have time to go into this province by province, or even eastern Ontario versus southern Ontario, and stuff like that.

At the level of the whole of Canada, in 2006, assimilation made a difference of three million between the population speaking English as the main home language and the population speaking French as the main home language in Canada. Some 400,000 French mother-tonguers in Canada.... This is a net figure, a squashed figure. I don't know what you would call it in English. I've never heard of that before, *des données écrasées*, but this is an overall, global, net figure. So 400,000 French mother-tonguers reported English as the main home language. That's the level of assimilation there. In Canada, 2.4 million allophones globally reported English as the main home language. Some 200,000 reported French.

When you juggle with those figures, you come up with the gain for the English net level, overall level, of 2.8 million new recruits for the English language through linguistic assimilation in Canada in 2006—2.8 million. For French there was a loss of 400,000 francophones anglicized, but a gain of 200,000 allophones who became French speaking, for a net loss of 200,000. The difference between plus 2.8 million for English and minus 200,000 for French is 3 million. In French you would say *ça fait du monde à la messe*. This is not a marginal phenomenon. It has to be looked at square in the face.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Castonguay.

Thank you, Mr. Nadeau.

This morning, through the comments of our witnesses, we are seeing that each of us feels directly concerned by this issue in terms of our linguistic, cultural, and sometimes, marital identity. We have the sense that we are players determining the destiny of official language communities.

We are coming to the end of our meeting. We have completed three rounds. I am told it may be possible to extend the meeting beyond 11:00 a.m., as no other group is in need of the room. I would like members to indicate how they wish to proceed.

Would you agree to our continuing the meeting a little longer? We could have a full fourth round. Does everyone agree?

Mr. Richard Nadeau: How much longer will it last?

A voice: We also have commitments.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: I was just wondering.

The Chair: If we have a fourth round, that will take us to about 11:15 a.m.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: I, personally, have no objection.

The Chair: Do I have the members' agreement?

Voices: Yes.

The Chair: We will have a full fourth round and will end the meeting at that time.

We will now start the fourth round.

Ms. Glover, Parliamentary Secretary for Official Languages, you have the floor.

Mrs. Shelly Glover: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to welcome our witnesses.

I had shivers up and down my spine as I was listening to you, Ms. Lamarre, because you were speaking for me. I was born an Anglophone, but at the same time, I am very proud to be a Francophone. I acknowledge that, if I am asked which language I am most attached to, I would have to say it really is both. And everything you said, Mr. Castonguay, just broke my heart. But my heart is very strong, and I think we have the potential to change your data.

When officials from Statistics Canada appeared before the Committee at the last meeting, we talked about the fact that the questions asked do not reflect reality. You also made that point, Ms. Lamarre. Rather than asking respondents what language they speak at home, we should be asking them which languages—in the plural—they speak, in order to truly reflect the current reality.

As Mr. D'Amours said, we are not taking a broader view of things. We are so focussed on excessively detailed questions that we are actually missing the reality.

I am sorry, Mr. Nadeau, but I do not see the situation in Canada as a cancer. It is a country that offers great opportunities to our immigrants. They helped me continue to perfect my French. It is thanks to people like Mr. D'Amours' sister, a Francophone who moved to Saint Boniface, that my children are bilingual. So, that is very important.

Mr. Jedwab, in an article you wrote entitled “Where there is a will there is a way?”, you answered questions that are not necessarily asked by Statistics Canada. That answers one of my own questions. I would like to talk about your data. Mr. Castonguay is always talking about the decline of French in Francophone communities, but in your article, you talk about the number of Anglophones born here who use French at work. Statistics Canada puts the number at 400,000, but Mr. Castonguay seems to ignore all of that. It is important to point out that Francophones' influence over the rest of Canada helps us to increase the level of French.

Can you tell me in what ways Francophones in Canada influence and enhance the level of French throughout the official language minority communities?

● (1055)

Mr. Jack Jedwab: Personally, I think that it is primarily in Quebec, New Brunswick and the National Capital Region that we have historically noted increased numbers of Anglophones who speak French in the workplace. And it is precisely because of the pressure to do so—something that is due in large part to the federal government, which has brought that pressure to bear in terms of job requirements, such as knowledge of the official languages—that we are seeing that increase.

Never, in the history of Quebec, have so many Anglophones and non-Francophones spoken French. That is equally true for New Brunswick and Ontario with respect to actual numbers of non-Francophones and Anglophones who speak French. There has been a progression. Even Mr. Castonguay cannot deny that increased numbers of Anglophones now speak French in Quebec. It is now at an historic level never seen before.

So, there is good news, and we have to continue to bring pressure to bear—not just by getting the message out that we would like people to speak French, or that it would be very nice or kind of them to do so. This is going to take pressure at the federal level, notably in communities where it is possible to encourage people to speak French through different means. Companies that deal with the federal government should also be encouraged to provide services in French. I know that that may be tough, tough measures are what is needed. Personally, I remain hopeful and optimistic about the future.

If you do not mind, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point. We have deviated from our initial topic, which was Francophone immigration. Mr. Weston raised a very important point. This idea of discouraging immigrants from settling outside Quebec conveys a message. The message may well be more important than the numbers. If our message is that Francophone immigrants should not settle anywhere else than Quebec, we may be sending the same message to Francophone Quebeckers who would like to move somewhere else in Canada. We could also talk about a scenario, if we follow the logic—a logic that I am sure neither Mr. Nadeau nor Mr. Castonguay share—where all Anglophones who live on the other side of the bridge—

Is it all right if I continue? Mr. Castonguay, I know that you like… Please allow me to finish; I have not spoken much today. I will be finished in a few seconds, Mr. Blaney.

Ms. Shelly Glover: Go ahead, Mr. Jedwab.

Mr. Jack Jedwab: The logic I refer to is one which says that all Anglophones should live on one side of the National Capital Region and that all Francophones should live on the other. I know that you do not share that vision, Ms. Glover, but by telling Francophone immigrants that they should not settle outside Quebec, we are sending them a somewhat broader message which is that, logically, ideally, all Francophones should be on one side, and all Anglophones, on the other. I could never tolerate or accept such a message. But that is sort of what we are saying. Beyond the numbers, be they good or bad, and beyond the indicators—good and bad—there is a message we are conveying to our society and our children—my children, Ms. Lamarre's children and many other children.

● (1100)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Ms. Glover.

I see that there are other witnesses, and three Committee members who are still hoping to ask questions. We will surely have an opportunity to hear the other witnesses.

On that note, Mr. Bélanger, I believe you asked for the floor.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: It is fascinating, Mr. Chairman. Here we have a microcosm of Canada and of its future. That is what is fascinating. I thought I would follow Mr. Castonguay's example, but instead I am going to say exactly what I want to say. Phrases were coming to mind as I was listening to the discussion. I was thinking of my desire to make Canada a place where I could live as a Francophone. Earlier I said that I was a "Franglophone", but really, I am fundamentally Francophone. At the same time, I want to live my life in English as well, because I made the effort to learn that language. It is my second language, and I would like to learn a third. All of that is personal, however.

In terms of the overall picture, I agree with Mr. Castonguay. Throughout its history, Canada has witnessed the steady decline of the French fact. The real issue for me is: with a determined effort on the part of the Canadian government, mainly, and provincial governments as well, would it be possible to stop assimilation and, possibly, reverse that trend? That is the fundamental question driving our efforts, or that should, at least, be driving them.

In a French version of the *Reader's Digest*, I read one day the infamous phrase about the pessimist and the optimist both being necessary to society: one invented the airplane and the other, the parachute. I am on the side of the optimists. My question is simple, but extremely complex. I do not expect to receive an answer today. It is an answer that will require some work, in my opinion.

With a determined effort by the government to create institutions, as was done with the school boards across the country and day care centres—and I come back to my example of Whitehorse, where there is a day care centre called the Garderie du Petit Cheval Blanc; I just love that name—and foster Francophone immigration, whether it is concentrated in Quebec or elsewhere, would it be possible to reverse that trend?

Prof. Charles Castonguay: Institutions are not enough. I think we missed the boat in the 1960s. We gave the Royal Commission of Inquiry a specific mandate.

● (1105)

The Chair: You have about two minutes for your answer, Mr. Castonguay.

[*English*]

Prof. Charles Castonguay: The working paper, or the mandate, whatever it was called, that was given to the commissioners was to see how Canada could develop "on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races". Pearson signed that, and that is not the direction that the commission took and that the Government of Canada later took under the leadership of Pierre Trudeau.

We're in a situation now where we're not in a bicultural country, where we're not in a binational country. It's very strange mathematics. Sometimes figures stagger me, too. We have one nation, two official languages, and many cultures—one, two, many. I don't know how you want to count that, but it just doesn't stick together. The non-recognition of a French Canadian nation, as such, as an equal partner—a potentially equal partner—for the English Canadian nation is where we went wrong.

Now, that type of recognition takes more than just a vote in a house of Parliament, saying "Quebec is a nation", whatever that means. You also have to put your money where your mouth is.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: Mr. Castonguay, forgive me for interrupting.

I do not want to play the schoolmaster here, but if you are willing to do your homework and send us the results of your inquiries, I promise to read what you send us.

I would like the other two witnesses to use the remaining time.

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: I would like to add one important point to the debate. I come back to the initial question: what should be done about Francophone immigrants? Where are we going to try and send them to settle? This dilemma also affects Quebec. Are we going to try to send them to the regions of Quebec, to introduce diversity into the Francophone population outside of Montreal? In actual fact, we can tell them to settle in a specific place, but subsequently, they will chose where they want to go. And where will they go? Well, that will vary from one person to the next.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We will move right along to Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: We discussed the definition of Francophone. I do not want to come back to that, but I would like to come back to the recommendations.

That is the most important part of your testimony today. Beyond the debate about whether we should just put all of this on the shoulders of Francophone communities outside Quebec, one assumes that we are all interested in promoting the French fact all across Canada, and balancing that with the rights of Anglophones that already exist in Quebec. That balance is important.

My first question is for Mr. Jedwab and Ms. Lamarre. What clear recommendations can you make with respect to maintaining or even increasing the presence of Francophone immigrants outside Quebec and improving their quality of life in French?

[*English*]

Mr. Jack Jedwab: I'm favourable to supporting the direction of those immigrants who are recruited and attracted by the communities outside Quebec on the basis of community-driven initiatives to support francophones emigrating outside of Quebec, and that the federal government extends support to that idea but also provides the resources those communities require in order to properly receive those individuals.

Now, let me say something—

● (1110)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter Julian: What resources are you referring to?

Mr. Jack Jedwab: Ms. Lamarre talked about community resources and community-school projects. In fact, this is tricky because of provincial jurisdiction. Perhaps it would be possible to work with provincial governments to that end, if there is a will to do so. Let us hope there is.

Also, there is a need to clearly establish the conditions that exist in those communities and not tell immigrants who are anxious to settle in these communities that English is not part of the reality they will face there. There are varying rates of linguistic decline. We saw the experience in New Brunswick. Mr. Castonguay noted the good news in New Brunswick. So, anything is possible.

In answer to Mr. Bélanger, it is possible, in some areas, to get around that reality, according to Mr. Castonguay, who referred to New Brunswick. However, that is something that is difficult to accomplish and it takes time. At the same time, it is essential that this reality be made clear to potential immigrants and that they be given an explanation of the specific circumstances in various places.

In Saskatchewan, under the circumstances, it would be very difficult for a Francophone immigrant to preserve his language without extraordinary resources being put in place. Even then, it would be difficult. That does not mean that, wherever possible, we should not be supporting Francophone immigrants or even Francophone Quebeckers who decide to go and live in Saskatchewan. We have to ensure that communities are supported with the necessary resources, so that immigrants or Quebec emigrants are able to live socially in French, because it must be acknowledged that it will be very difficult for them to do that in the workplace.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Lamarre.

[*English*]

Ms. Patricia Lamarre: Just very quickly, I think you need to speak to some more people, not just to the three of us who are here. If you talk to francophone associations from Alberta and Saskatchewan, you'll hear that their definition of community includes diversity and that they want that immigration. They're there, and they want them. So you need to hear from those people, not just the three of us here.

The other thing is that I think there's still a perception of a *francophonie hors Québec* that is rural. That's not necessarily true. There is Toronto.

[*Translation*]

There is a Francophone community in Toronto, just as there is one in Moncton and Vancouver. It has already become diversified and is alive and well, even though some would like to think it is dead and buried. And if you ask them, they themselves will tell you that they are alive and kicking. I am sorry, but we are here.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Julian.

We will, in fact, be hearing from representatives of the official language communities, and particularly the Francophone communities.

Before I allow Mr. Nadeau to have the last word, I would like to thank our witnesses for travelling to Ottawa to appear before the Committee. You have given us a great deal of material for our study. In fact, you have helped us to develop the questions we will be asking our future witnesses.

Mr. Nadeau, you have the last word.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Thank you very much.

I am continuing with the question-and-answer approach. According to what Mauril was saying earlier, and what Mr. Castonguay also said,

[*English*]

"You also have to put your money where your mouth is."

[*Translation*]

I remember a gentleman from La Broquerie, in Manitoba, whom I like very much, who now lives in the region and who used to be my boss. His name is Ronald Bisson, Executive Director of the Fédération de la jeunesse canadienne-française. He had asked Roger Bernard, who, unfortunately, has departed this world, having passed away, to carry out a study entitled *Vision d'avenir de la Francophonie*. He said that this study in four volumes was an initial blueprint that would lead to zero assimilation and advanced "refrancisation". When I was at the Fédération des Francophones de Saskatoon, I had proposed that this be a battleground for the Association culturelle franco-canadienne de Saskatchewan, as it was known at the time, its new name being the Association communautaire fransaskoise, but people laughed at me. I have no problem with people laughing at me. However, that is just the problem: there people were saying that nothing could be done. Imagine! These were people in Moose Jaw rethinking the future of Franco-Saskatchewanians. I continued to fight for that, however. We were demanding a bilingual province and that the actions of the Conservatives under Grant Devine be reversed: they had simply done away with things that affected Francophones, and we thought it was terrible. So, it is important that people know that.

You are right, Ms. Lamarre, that there are still communities out there, and I realize that we have to support them. However, it is also important to be aware of assimilation and acknowledge the fact that the Francophone critical mass in North America, in a specific region and forming a nation, is Quebec. We must not forget to focus on that. Because if Quebec suffers assimilation or shrinks, its influence… We must not weaken the strongest part. We should provide support to the weakest ones in this struggle, but we have to look at where is appropriate to devote our energies.

Mr. Chairman, could Mr. Castonguay table his two studies so that we could have them translated? That way we could have them eventually, once the translation is available.

● (1115)

The Chair: We will have to check that with Mr. Castonguay.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Would you agree to table your two studies so that we could have them translated?

Prof. Charles Castonguay: Certainly; no problem.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Fine. We will do that and, that way, we will have access to the translations, once they have been completed.

I would like to wrap up. Mr. Jedwab and Ms. Lamarre were asked what recommendations should be included in the report with respect to Francophone immigration.

Mr. Castonguay, what would you have us say in our report with respect to Francophone immigration outside Quebec? Is that where we should be directing immigrants or should we be directing them to Quebec? What are your recommendations?

I think you have about two minutes.

Prof. Charles Castonguay: I believe there will always be Francophones from Quebec and from abroad who are attracted to British Columbia, just there are large numbers of Francophones who are attracted by the climate and the job opportunities in California. We discussed that this morning. That is fine. That is great if they are fulfilling their own goals. However, if we want to invest in something which will, in the medium and long terms, strengthen French in Canada, a well-advised orientation policy for Allophone immigrants to Canada—I repeat—should point them in the direction of Quebec City, Montreal, Gatineau, Ottawa, Moncton or Sudbury—basically, to the bilingual belt and Quebec.

As for Francophones living in other areas, there is no reason why we could not develop a policy to support their cultural vitality, such as theatre, tours of authors-composers-performers, literature, and so on—something I hope would also be available to Francophones in California, Los Angeles, New York or Chicago. They are part of significant Francophone communities and are also potential consumers of French-language cultural products from Canada, and which are available in greater numbers than in Vancouver.

So, what we need is a nuanced policy, not a "flattened" one.

The Chair: That is great.

On that final note, I would like to extend my thanks. I would say we almost had an historic meeting of the Standing Committee on Official Languages today. I would like to thank all members for their passion.

The meeting now stands adjourned.

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: http://www.parl.gc.ca

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : http://www.parl.gc.ca