



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Official Languages

LANG • NUMBER 010 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, December 7, 2004

—
Chair

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez

All parliamentary publications are available on the
"Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire" at the following address:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Standing Committee on Official Languages

Tuesday, December 7, 2004

• (0905)

[Translation]

The Chair (Mr. Pablo Rodriguez (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.)): We'll begin the meeting.

[English]

Welcome to all of you.

Welcome, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Quilliams, from the Quebec Community Groups Network. Welcome to our meeting.

[Translation]

We have a quorum. Others will be joining us later, but we can start right now.

[English]

Mr. Murphy informed me that his presentation could be a little bit longer than 10 minutes, maybe 12 or 13 minutes. I said there was no problem with that.

We'll start with your presentation and then have a round of questions, Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Martin Murphy (President, Quebec Community Groups Network): Good morning, everyone.

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the kind invitation to speak to you about some of the conditions or circumstances for the English-speaking minority in Quebec today.

On behalf of my colleagues in the Quebec Community Groups Network, thank you for the invitation to provide feedback on the government action plan to support the development and enhance the vitality of the official language minority communities.

The Quebec Community Groups Network brings together 23 English language community organizations across Quebec, from the Outaouais to the Gaspé and the North Shore, and in between, to promote and support the use of the English language in Quebec and to work with provincial, regional, and municipal government authorities to sustain and support the development of the English language minority communities. The QCGN, the Quebec Community Groups Network, also aims to promote dialogue and mutual understanding between the linguistic communities in Canada.

As I speak to you here today, I think it is probably fair to say that many of you may not know that the English-speaking linguistic minority community of Quebec finds itself managing a serious demographic decline and an unmistakable loss of community

vitality, with important and often negative social repercussions related to this transformation.

However, the erroneous misperception and myth that we are so well off that our minority doesn't require much support from the Government of Canada continues to circulate among many decision-makers in Ottawa; thus we will take a few minutes to brief you and give you an important glance at the English-speaking community in Quebec in 2004.

As Jack Jedwab's recent report for the Commissioner of Official Languages illustrates, the Quebec anglophone community has experienced a net deficit of at least 20,000 community members in every census period since 1971. The English mother tongue population has declined from 789,000 in 1971 to 591,000 in 2001. This is equivalent to the population of Prince Edward Island leaving Canada—not once, but twice. The net loss of a further 30,500 English mother tongue people between 1996 and 2001 in that five-year period represents a decline of 7.5% of the anglophone mother tongue population in Quebec.

There is an absence of any consideration of the English-speaking minority regarding immigration policies and programs, which limits the possibility of replenishment by either the Canadian or Quebec government. In 1991, the McDougall-Gagnon-Tremblay accord reinforced the Quebec government's role in the process of immigrant selection, as well as transferring resources in the area of integrating new arrivals from the federal to the provincial authorities.

In view of the dramatic and continuing decline of the English-speaking population in Quebec, we recommend that the federal government invite the provincial government to review the 1991 accord, with the objective of providing some relief to allow for replenishment and some stability.

Furthermore, in the section on citizenship and immigration in the action plan, under support to communities for recruitment and integration of immigrants, \$9 million has been committed over these five years, but last year the former minister of immigration announced that he planned on encouraging more immigrants to settle in francophone communities in the rest of Canada, using all these funds to that end.

Incidentally, there was an increase in the French mother tongue minority population of over 10,000 between 1996 and 2001 because of the substantial federal financial support, which we applaud, but when measured against the funding for the English-speaking minority population, it helps to explain the net loss for us of 30,500 English mother tongue population in Quebec in that same period.

•(0910)

As you are no doubt aware, section 59 of the Constitution Act of 1982 excludes naturalized Canadians of English mother tongue living in Quebec from the protection of minority official language educational rights under section 23 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In other words, minority language instruction, based on an individual's "first language learned and still understood", as found in paragraph 23(1)(a) of the Canadian charter, has been adopted by every other province in Canada except Quebec.

While the Government of Quebec has steadfastly refused to extend the scope of section 23 of the charter in its entirety to make it applicable in Quebec, it should be noted that section 23 provides greater rights for French-speaking minorities outside Quebec than it does for the English-speaking minority in Quebec. So we ask the federal government to be concerned about the loud and clear alarm bell sounded in the 2001 census data for the survival of our minority communities in Quebec, and that it address this outstanding issue with respect to demographic decline and vitality indicators with its counterparts in the Quebec government.

The mobility, especially the interprovincial migration, of our community members seems to have an impact on the demographic situation of Quebec anglophones, both in terms of the decline in community numbers and the weakening of the social fabric, as many of the out-migrants appear to be well-educated, youthful members, crucial to the collective future. We need to understand not only this pattern of mobility but also know more about the motivation of those who have left and attempt to understand what, if anything, could entice individuals and families to return to Quebec.

Crucial to community vitality is the presence and strength of institutions and networks, which provide the capacity for collective action. As the report of the advisory committee to the Minister of Health mentioned, there are no health institutions designated with an anglophone community mission in many of the 16 health regions in Quebec. It is likely not a coincidence that these were the regions that experienced an important reduction of guaranteed health services under the former government's review of regional health access plans, nor is it a surprise that these regions, the Mauricie, Centre du Quebec, Lanaudiere, and Abitibi-Temiscamingue, experienced substantial drops of 15% to 20% in their populations between 1996 and 2001.

Again, the public opinion survey, as mentioned above, reveals a lack of confidence among anglophones in their institutional leadership, as well as deep concern about the future of their communities.

Analysis of the 2001 census shows that Quebec anglophones are less than half as likely as their numbers would suggest to be working in the public administration industry, the federal public service. There is a practical consideration to this—secure jobs for a community with higher than normal unemployment rates, as well as the symbolic aspect of inclusion.

We believe the Government of Canada must work proactively in collaboration with the leadership of the English-speaking community to solve the complex problems that arise from the demographic decline and the loss of community vitality.

First of all, our community must be given the tools by the Government of Canada to collect and analyze basic information about the English reality as a minority population in Quebec. For example, the English-speaking population of Quebec has decreased dramatically in size over the last generation, yet there's very little knowledge about its condition, its hopes, its aspirations, or its future. A minority community must have a collective capacity, spirit, and soul; thus we must be able to look at leadership and governance in our community, the place of institutions, the collective pride within the community, and our capacity for collective action.

Thus, the post-censal study planned for 2006 to measure the effectiveness of the government action plan must examine not only the dynamics of the language of a minority community but also demographic and community vitality.

•(0915)

The information gleaned about linguistic behaviour to discover the means and motivation for people to use language in certain circumstances is of particular interest to the francophone minority outside of Quebec. For the English-speaking community of Quebec, however, language dynamics are less crucial in terms of understanding their situation and demographic prospects because the capacity of detailed analysis of language dynamics has limited potential to explain the demographic and community vitality of most Quebec anglophone communities.

As I said in my presentation at the ministerial consultations held on October 27, there is an unmistakable imbalance between the established needs of the English-speaking community and the level of funding provided by the Government of Canada to meet these needs. The current formula governing the basis for funding does not respond to the challenges faced by our community, nor does it fulfill the obligations of the Government of Canada to the English-speaking linguistic minority of Quebec, and it borders on exclusion rather than asymmetry.

Page 26 of the annual report of the Department of Canadian Heritage for 2002-03, under direct support to both official language communities, reports that \$3 million-plus for Quebec out of a total of \$34 million-plus was invested in the English-speaking linguistic minority of Quebec. I repeat, \$3,482,000 versus \$34,746,000 for both official language minority communities. Please remember that there are 918,000 "English first language learned and understood" anglophones in Quebec and there are 987,000 francophones.

Moreover, the Canadian government must become proactive in its support of the English-speaking minority in Quebec. For example, intergovernmental agreements for support for minority language services in Quebec must be renewed with the Quebec government and extend beyond the delivery of health and social services in English. Measures to ensure access to justice in English throughout the province and stimulate economic development for the communities and the regions must be included in these agreements. The presence of a government in Quebec more favourably disposed to working with the Government of Canada now is an opportunity that should be taken advantage of in the implementation of the action plan for anglophone Quebecers.

In the section on education in the government action plan, it is noted that the federal government is investing \$381 million in addition to the existing \$929 million over these five years in minority language and second language instruction. It also targets the revitalization of immersion, promoting the advantages of this type of instruction. In this regard, you are no doubt aware of the so-called Michael Parasiuk case now before the court, concerning the fact that he has been denied a certificate of eligibility for his son to receive his primary education in English in Quebec because Mr. Parasiuk himself had received his elementary schooling in an immersion program in a school designated as English in Manitoba.

It is our belief that it is not rational to make a financial investment of this magnitude if the consequences disadvantage the very audience these measures are intended to benefit. So we recommend that the federal government address this issue before renewing the agreement in education with Quebec for the next five years.

As of today, there has been measurable success of the implementation of the government action plan only in the health sector. Working in close partnership with the community, Health Canada first constituted a proactive ministerial advisory committee from our linguistic community, which brings together community leaders with an expert knowledge in this sector. Then they invested in a comprehensive study to understand the particular situation of anglophone Quebecers in this sector. Health Canada subsequently committed the financial resources to build the necessary infrastructure within the English-speaking community of Quebec to implement the measures in the action plan in health. With this infrastructure, ten groups across the province are coordinating new health networks that will in turn develop programs to improve access to English language health and social services and empower the anglophone community to take a more active role in health care decisions made in their regions.

• (0920)

It is our opinion that each department involved in the action plan must commit to emulating the Health Canada model and work hand in hand with the community leadership to develop the necessary organizational and community infrastructure to ensure that the targeted measures and the investments in this plan will indeed be used to develop community vitality in the communities across Quebec.

I would very much like, at this time next year, to be able to report to you that the English-speaking community of Quebec, together with the Government of Canada officials, have made measurable progress towards the revitalization and growth of our communities. Also, I would like to report that the Government of Canada did invest the necessary funds and measures through the action plan to empower the English-speaking community of Quebec to build the needed infrastructure and capacity to support the development of all English language minority communities throughout Quebec.

In closing, I want to thank you again and express our appreciation for the opportunity to provide community feedback on the government action plan. Thank you, sir.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Murphy.

Before going to Mr. Lauzon, I'd like a clarification. How many English-speaking people are there in Quebec, as of today?

Mr. Martin Murphy: There were three measures in the recent 2001 census data.

One is English mother tongue, which is 591,000. Then there is a new reading that was introduced in this last census of English most often spoken, so there were around 700-and-some. Then there are those who have said English and French. So what Statistics Canada did, as I understand it, was divide these numbers and attribute half of that cohort to the English-speaking community and the other half to the French-speaking community, which means there's a total, according to Statistics Canada, of 918,000 first official language learned and still understood English in Quebec, and there are 987,000 first official language learned and still understood francophones in the rest of Canada and the three territories.

• (0925)

The Chair: You are saying there are 918,000 people whose first language was English and they still understand it today?

Mr. Martin Murphy: Yes. It's the English mother tongue, plus those who speak it more often at home, and those who associate themselves as belonging to the English-speaking community. It's identified in the report as first language learned and still understood.

Mr. Peter Quilliams (Executive Committee Member, Quebec Community Groups Network): Another common reference is first official language spoken.

Mr. Martin Murphy: Thank you for the precision.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Lauzon.

Mr. Guy Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, CPC): Thank you very much, Mr. Murphy. Welcome, Mr. Quilliams.

That was quite a briefing. I appreciate it. You've obviously done a lot of research to come up with all these facts.

I get the impression from your report that you feel the action plan has not been kind to the English language minority group. Am I reading your report correctly?

Mr. Martin Murphy: At the first ministerial consultations a year ago we identified the problem we had in accessing the funds in the first place. We do not have the infrastructure in order to brief ourselves more completely on the opportunities, to speak to you people and other people about our needs, and enlist the support of government.

The problem, of course, is always funding. We have a total of \$300,000 to operate our headquarters in Quebec City. We have a full-time executive director, we have an operations manager, and we have a secretary. That's the staff we have to serve all our members, from the Outaouais to the Gaspé and in between.

From that \$300,000 we have been meeting, bringing the people together, three times a year; that is, the president and the executive directors of our 23 groups. This year we will only meet twice. The rest of the time we have to handle our business by phone. We have no money; \$300,000 to operate is all we have.

What I said at the first ministerial consultation is we need support to build an infrastructure so that we will have people to establish what our needs are in the different communities, and to make the applications, which are quite complex, and to be sure that the program is implemented according to the terms of reference.

Mr. Guy Lauzon: You mentioned 23 groups in 23 regions. I think they're broken into regions, you called them?

Mr. Martin Murphy: No. Now there are 11 regions and the balance are what we call sector groups. For example, the Quebec Association of Adult Learning, the Quebec Federation of Home and School Associations—

Mr. Guy Lauzon: What is the total membership of those 23? Just give me a ballpark figure. Would there be an average of 100 in each?

Mr. Martin Murphy: More. You see, most of the associations don't go via membership as such, in terms of assessing a fee and saying we have 5,000 members and so forth. Rather, you are serving a certain geographical area in the case of regions, and in the case of sectors generally, not always, it's provincial in scope.

Let's take the Quebec Federation of Home and School Associations. There are nine school boards spread throughout the province. How many members do they have? They have nine. But whom do they represent? All of the English population that goes to these schools, except that many other people would claim to represent them too. Obviously, there's an English school boards association.

• (0930)

Mr. Guy Lauzon: You're saying you don't feel you have your fair share of the action plan because you don't have the resources to ask for it.

Mr. Martin Murphy: Correct. And we appealed to the different players, not to spend all the money but rather to give us the funding so that we can get the infrastructure in order that we can access these funds. When this happens we don't want to go there and say, I'm sorry, you weren't there when you should have been there, and consequently we have to make the commitment because this is the government commitment over five years. We said, help us now so that we can access the funds, because you have an official language minority in Quebec and they have a right to these funds—except we don't have the staff in order to do what has to be done to access the funds. We have appealed in many forums for support, and as of today, I regret to say, we don't have that tangible support.

Mr. Guy Lauzon: How much of this, because you're not properly organized, do you feel you've missed out on so far?

Mr. Martin Murphy: I think over the five years we are not expecting equality. There's \$751 million. We're not expecting half because we acknowledge and recognize that for the francophones that money has to be spent over the other nine provinces and the three territories, but we do think that somewhere in the balance of one-third, or 30% or something, should be reserved for an investment for the other official language minority in Quebec.

Notice that the numbers are in between 900,000 and one million in both cases.

Let me give you an example. I've used health as a model. There are three measures in health. One of them is for networking. There was \$14 million. So for the distribution we have, the commitment is \$4.7 million, one-third. It's great. The francophones have the balance.

In the primary health care that's going on now, there's \$30 million. We have been committed for \$10 million, one-third. It's very good. It's excellent. We appreciate it.

In training and retention there's \$75 million. We will get \$12 million and the balance will go to the francophones. Here again we understand it's because training and retention are across the nation and the three territories, but at least there's the rationale, and there is evidence that we are being attended to.

Mr. Guy Lauzon: You seem to suggest that the health sector seems to be working properly, or the way you would feel it should be.

Mr. Martin Murphy: I'll let my colleague speak to that.

Mr. Peter Quilliams: The health sector, I would say, is the best model we have.

Mr. Guy Lauzon: What would it take to get all areas...? For example, in education, what would it take for you to be as satisfied with the education portfolio as you are with the health portfolio?

Mr. Martin Murphy: We submitted an application for funding to build an infrastructure to access these measures and also to provide services to support the Government of Canada's application of the Official Languages Act for our community.

Mr. Guy Lauzon: When was that submitted?

Mr. Martin Murphy: We submitted it March 8, and we asked for \$680,000. We have received \$300,000 over these five years.

We only had our headquarters in 1999. Prior to that we were working from our offices in addition to our day jobs, which I am doing myself as president. I have a full-time day job and I'm also president of the Quebec Community Groups Network. So it's heavy duty—

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Martin Murphy: Notice, sir, that our request is not inordinate. We didn't ask for millions. We asked for \$680,000, and we're still waiting for that kind of support so that we can hire one or two extra people in order to get around the province to find out what the needs are, apply for funds so that we can take advantage of the measures in the plan.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lauzon.

Mr. André.

[Translation]

Mr. Guy André (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Good morning, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Quilliams. I'm happy to see you here this morning. I've read your presentation. If I understand correctly, the organization you belong to receives money from the Department of Canadian Heritage and redistributes it to 23 Quebec Anglophone minority associations, including Alliance Quebec and a number of others. What are your criteria for redistributing those funds to the various associations?

• (0935)

[English]

Mr. Peter Quilliams: I'll try to reply to that. First of all, let me just help you with the understanding of these 23 member associations.

To be a member of the QCGN you first have to meet the criteria of Canadian Heritage. They are the ones who accept or refuse requests to be a member of the QCGN. First of all, Canadian Heritage will agree to fund, and subsequent to that the organization can apply for membership within the QCGN. That is the way we have developed our membership within the QCGN. It is first of all through Canadian Heritage.

Second is the way it's distributed each year—a sum of roughly \$3 million. We have developed with Canadian Heritage a funding program to which these 23 organizations, on an annual basis, in a December timeframe, must apply for funding. There are certain criteria required for this application. Then a group comprised of QCGN members and Canadian Heritage employees sits down to do an evaluation and come up with a rating of the 23 applications. Assuming everything is appropriate, the funds allocated are typically somewhat similar to previous allocations.

If you are familiar with the results-based management program of Treasury Board, in the last two or three years organizations have needed to demonstrate not only their ability to fill in applications, but also their ability to generate results. For those organizations that, for whatever reason, have faltered a little bit, not all of the money allocated is actually provided to them. So at the end of the year you will find a pot of money that hasn't been redistributed, and we scurry around with Canadian Heritage before the end of the fiscal year to find a home to spend that allotment of money on.

So first the membership of the QCGN is Canadian Heritage-gated, and two, we work with Canadian Heritage to understand how best to distribute the limited funds we have on an annual basis.

Mr. Martin Murphy: Can I just add one thing to that? We do not make the recommendation for the funding amount. That's done by the Department of Canadian Heritage. We don't look at the figures and the distribution. The historical pattern has meant that certain amounts were given to people, but now that has changed with results-based management. So I repeat, we do not make the recommendations, nor do we make the decisions on exact figures of funding.

[Translation]

Mr. Guy André: You take into consideration the objectives those organizations want to achieve and the activities they want to carry out, and you do an evaluation based on the program of the

Department of Canadian Heritage. Based on your expertise, since you represent all those organizations, what are the action, activity, research and results priorities that the recommended organizations should have? What are your current priorities, having regard to your file as a whole, for the coming years?

• (0940)

[English]

Mr. Peter Quilliams: Perhaps that could be answered in a number of ways, depending on whether you are a sector organization or a regional organization. I come from a regional organization, so I'll speak to that.

Survival as a community is our number one priority. In the last census we were 43,000 or 44,000 people; now we're down to 40,000. That's a dramatic decline over that period of time. So we have had a significant loss, as far as numbers are concerned.

There is also deterioration within those numbers that remain. We are a community that is becoming much less educated and much more dependent upon government handouts. Because of events in the province between 1971 and 2001, there was a mass exodus. As Canadian Heritage has explained to us, it is as if we have lost a generation of people who would be supporting that community today. That gap is in the 30- to 50-year-olds, who would be providing our vitality and our revitalization. That's the group that would be providing children to attend schools, etc.

We have a definite priority, and that is our survival as a community within Quebec, supported by the fact that we have demographics that demonstrate that we are in a dramatic decline. At the same time, the larger community around us is growing and thriving. There are increases in population, education, per capita income, etc.

Second, looking at our profile you'll also see that we're a much more aged community than the francophone community around us, which means our dependency upon the health system is extremely acute. The difficulty has been that even though there are professionals in these institutions who are more than willing perhaps to provide the level of service in English, it hasn't been easy to do so.

Do you want me to stop?

The Chair: No. Finish your answer quickly, please.

Mr. Peter Quilliams: Health and social services to the aged is the second priority. Priority number one is survival. Priority number two is to ensure that the—

The Chair: Thank you.

[Translation]

Mr. Godin.

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Pardon the interruption, but, as you know, we're quite busy in the House of Commons and on the various committees.

If I understood you correctly, you said that it's not the Quebec community groups network that recommends how much money should be allocated to the groups; it's the Heritage Department.

[English]

Mr. Peter Quilliams: There's just a little nuance there. We do not make the recommendation on the amount that goes to groups. Our role in the evaluation is to simply take a look at the application and judge it on its merits.

Mr. Yvon Godin: But if you judge it on its merits, what's it on? Do you tell Heritage that you agree with it or that you don't agree?

Mr. Peter Quilliams: In actual fact we work with Canadian Heritage as a group—

Mr. Yvon Godin: Then you do make a recommendation.

Mr. Peter Quilliams: —and we make a recommendation on the three categories. To help you out, one is—

• (0945)

Mr. Yvon Godin: Yes, help me, because you said you were not making a recommendation and now you're saying there's a nuance and you're making a recommendation.

Mr. Peter Quilliams: We don't make a recommendation on the specific dollar amount. Canadian Heritage has the authority to determine the amount of dollars that goes to each organization. We make a recommendation as to the classification of the application—whether it scores high, medium, or low.

Mr. Yvon Godin: But if you say it's low, they surely don't get it.

Mr. Peter Quilliams: They surely do.

Mr. Yvon Godin: They do?

Mr. Peter Quilliams: Yes.

Mr. Yvon Godin: If you say high, then they don't get it?

Mr. Peter Quilliams: They still do. We're rating the applications. The choice on how the money is allocated after is Canadian Heritage's prerogative.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Heritage Canada says how much they get, and after that you make a decision on how it's distributed?

Mr. Martin Murphy: The QCGN and Canadian Heritage have developed a criteria to study each application, and there are simply figures—5, 10, 15, 30, whatever it is. Three members of QCGN and three members of the Department of Canadian Heritage review each one of the applications and assign a mark. We give it to the Department of Canadian Heritage. Then at the regional bureau and at the national level they decide that each one of our groups is going to get x number of dollars based on their application.

Even though a community may get a weak rating in one year, that doesn't mean they don't still require funding to support them. So consequently you cannot cut them off. What they need is some direct help, which we provide for them, in order to make sure their application—

Mr. Yvon Godin: So in reality you have an influence on how much money they will get if you make a recommendation. They're not there for nothing. If you're making a recommendation, you must have some kind of influence on Heritage Canada. They want to hear from your group what you think.

Mr. Martin Murphy: On the merits of the application, but not in terms of the figure that's ultimately allotted by the Department of Canadian Heritage to any one of our members....

Mr. Yvon Godin: I met a group called the Greater Quebec Movement, and they want to be recognized. You know who that group is, don't you?

Mr. Martin Murphy: I don't know very much about it, quite honestly.

Do you know anything about it?

Mr. Peter Quilliams: No.

Mr. Yvon Godin: I think this group branched off from Alliance Quebec. They're not happy.

Mr. Martin Murphy: I see.

Mr. Yvon Godin: They're not happy campers. They feel they're not being treated well.

Mr. Martin Murphy: They haven't seen us.

Mr. Yvon Godin: They didn't see you. Maybe I will recommend they go and see you then.

Mr. Peter Quilliams: Again, sir, to get to the QCGN, Canadian Heritage will take a look at an organization and invite them to apply. Once Canadian Heritage have provided them with some funding, in subsequent years they can come to the QCGN to apply for membership. We do not have the means to extend an invitation to an organization that has not already been blessed and approved by Canadian Heritage.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Godin: It's Canadian Heritage that decides. Thank you.

The Chair: You have two minutes left.

Mr. Yvon Godin: I know you're aware of the fact that Quebec is a province, but there are nine others, plus territories. For Francophones outside Quebec, it's not easy to be divided as they are. You've heard the news. Francophones outside Quebec have very often been forced to go to court to have their right to schools recognized, in Prince Edward Island, for example. In New Brunswick, they had to go to court to have the right of food inspectors to have their organization in the regions recognized. We all have examples.

So when you take the number of persons into account, you can really say that Francophone communities outside Quebec truly constitute minorities in the large Anglophone mass. So there are a lot of organizations. You have an organization, whereas there are 12 others in Canada for Francophones outside Quebec. There's a major difference, and I believe you recognize it.

[English]

Mr. Martin Murphy: There's notice in my presentation. I acknowledged the investment of the Government of Canada in both communities. We celebrate the fact. We acknowledge that the francophones are living, in many cases now, a similar experience to our own, mind you. But certainly you're right. We know of and we acknowledge that, and we celebrate the investment.

The problem we have is that when we were established...in 1999 we had 13 organizations and we got \$3,041,000. Today, we have 23 organizations, and we'll soon have 24, and we still have \$3,041,000. I know the framework agreement expired last March 31, that this is the transition year, and that it's subject to renewal. I think Minister Frulla announced at the ministerial consultations that she hopes to be able to sign a new agreement for the next five years by April 1. So we are appealing to all of you to see that there's a principle of equity. Right now, it's not our definition of equity when we have \$3 million out of \$34 million.

• (0950)

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Godin.

Madame Boivin.

[Translation]

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, Lib.): Good morning, gentlemen.

I'm from the Province of Quebec. I listened to your speech and your statement of needs, but I admit I'm not certain I understood them very well, particularly in the current context. And yet I take pride in being a relatively well informed person, who's interested in the issue of official languages in Canada. One thing comes up frequently: we hear a great deal said in public about the Francophone minority communities. They're part of all issues. As Mr. Godin said a moment ago, we hear about them every time there are lawsuits, and so on to obtain schools, health care, for what are called basic services.

[English]

The Chair: Do you need translation? I don't know how good your French is.

Mr. Martin Murphy: We understand French very well. It's just that because my French is not perfect, I don't feel comfortable—

The Chair: That's fine. It's just that if you need it, you can use it.

[Translation]

Pardon me, Ms. Boivin.

Mr. Martin Murphy: My understanding is good.

Ms. Françoise Boivin: In fact, I look at what's going on in public in Quebec, and I don't see, among Quebecers, the cry from the heart that you made this morning regarding your demands and your needs. Is that because no one's transmitting your message? Is it because there's less activism? I'm trying to understand.

I admit this is the first time I've heard of your group. In Quebec, everyone knows Alliance Quebec. It may be the most militant of your groups.

So I'm sort of wondering about your needs. How do you reconcile what you're telling us with, for example, the report that the Office de la langue française recently submitted, which said virtually the opposite of what you just told us in your presentation. It's almost as though we were told that it was extremely alarming to see the number of people speaking English at home compared to the number of Anglophones in the province. I'm trying to reconcile all that. How is it that we haven't heard of your group? Is it only a matter of money?

[English]

Mr. Martin Murphy: There are a couple of things. One is that

[Translation]

Alliance Quebec is one of our members

Ms. Françoise Boivin: I learned that this morning.

Mr. Martin Murphy: I'd like to give you an example.

[English]

I would point to one of our members on the north shore. I think we have to make a distinction between the reality and Montreal Island, and there's the problem. I think people will say of the anglophones in Montreal, what are they complaining about? They have all of these services and conditions, so what's the problem?

The moment you go off the island—and you're now more on the east island and so forth... Let me give you an example from the lower north shore. For six months of the year, 70% of the adult population has to leave for work. That leaves the elderly there with young children, fending for themselves.

Ms. Françoise Boivin: But that's true of everybody. It's true of the francophones; it's a generalized thing.

Mr. Martin Murphy: I'm answering your question, because you don't hear us talking about it. As I said before, we have a total staff of three people. Let's face it, we were really established in 1995, so we're nine years old, but we're building.

Secondly, in the lower north shore we have the highest high school dropout rates in the province of Quebec.

• (0955)

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Followed closely by the Outaouais, my region.

Mr. Martin Murphy: They have no roads, which means people have died due to foggy weather or roads blocked with snow in the winter months. A mother expecting a child has to leave in her seventh month—because you can't fly after that—to go to Rimouski or some other place, leaving her younger or older children at home for somebody else to take care of. This mother has to go to another place, where, even though she may be unilingually English, there are unilingual French people providing service.

We can go on and on listing an inventory of serious problems. We don't get into the legislation issue, but you know this is a separate debate to talk about how the francophones in other provinces don't have the same challenges we have in terms of the application of Bill 101 and freedom of choice.

Ms. Françoise Boivin: You do realize that you may be a minority in the province of Quebec but you're part of a big majority on a whole continent. Is that not a factor? Is that not helpful in some aspects?

Mr. Martin Murphy: Of course. That's why we said we celebrate the investment that is made for the francophones, but we underline to you people today some consideration of the fact that we're given, by the Government of Canada, in its obligation to implement the Official Languages Act, \$3 million. I don't think it's fair. That is not our definition of fairness.

Ms. Françoise Boivin: On the other hand—

Mr. Peter Quilliams: May I also contribute a little bit to the response?

This is your action plan. In it is a very succinct depiction of the anglophone community in Quebec as in need. This is not our invention. It is your action plan—

Ms. Françoise Boivin: I don't disagree with it. I'm just saying—

Mr. Peter Quilliams: It is based upon your demographics, it's based upon the context of Canada, and it's based upon the fact that we have francophones in a minority in a sea of English. We understand that, and so does this.

Ms. Françoise Boivin: I agree with that. You don't have to convince me. I'm just asking what your need is. It's not that clear. It's your needs that we don't hear enough about.

Mr. Peter Quilliams: Because we don't speak up loudly enough. I agree.

Ms. Françoise Boivin: That's right. That's all I'm saying.

Mr. Peter Quilliams: That is definitely why we are here today, because we seldom do come. We missed a standing committee last night—

Ms. Françoise Boivin: But I'm still not sure I understand your needs.

Mr. Peter Quilliams: —and we need to be complaining more often. I agree with you. Is this the kind of event where we hope we can get our message across? The message is in here. We don't have to add anything to it.

The action plan was designed around a minority community that had been struggling for a number of years and had an infrastructure in place and secretariats across Canada, so that they were ready to act as soon as the action plan was announced. Unfortunately, our own community, the quiet ones, the ones who don't speak up loudly enough, are not that well structured and organized. We do have some outlandish spokespeople perhaps, but if you go to the different communities off the island of Montreal, we are not that well organized. To enact this, we need that infrastructure. That's what—

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Can it come from the community itself?

Mr. Peter Quilliams: That's what Mr. Murphy was trying to reiterate. In order to execute this, we need more of an infrastructure to make that happen.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Boivin.

[*English*]

Thank you.

Mr. Vellacott, for five minutes.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC): Thank you.

Gentlemen, at the bottom of the last paragraph on the first page of your brief it says that of this \$9 million committed to the action plan over five years, the minister announced in 2003 that he planned on encouraging more immigrants to settle in francophone communities in the rest of Canada, using all these funds to that end. The good news is that those with French as a mother tongue within the

minority population increased by over 10,000 because of that substantial federal financial support.

Can you affirm for me that you're saying not a penny, not a drop, not anything, was used at all in terms of bringing in anglophones?

Mr. Martin Murphy: I'd have to refer you to the press release issued by the former Minister of Immigration when he was asked the question about this very thing. That's the authority we have.

• (1000)

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Is there something currently? I have some déjà vu about a recent press release or a press clipping that the Minister of Immigration, Judy Sgro, was also going to do something similar. Am I correct on that? Does this ring a bell?

Mr. Martin Murphy: We are not aware of any measure at all to support the immigration issue, the decline. We are proposing—

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: No, but in terms of using the bulk of it again for immigration, bringing in those with French mother tongues, is that something not more recent as well?

Mr. Martin Murphy: To bring in French mother tongue...?

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Dealing with the present immigration minister. Is this not tweaking with you? There was something recently—

Mr. Martin Murphy: I'm just trying to think of what you're referring to and it doesn't come to mind. Certainly, we can establish the authenticity of this statement made by the former minister.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: You assume then that the present minister is just following through, it being a five-year plan.

Have all these funds been spent already?

Mr. Martin Murphy: No. This was a commitment made, as I understand it, by the former minister to the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadiennes.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: That is to say, the funds not all having been spent yet, it's still an open question whether the present minister—that was a commitment of a prior minister here—will follow on. Is that your intent? Have you had any discussions or communications from the present minister to suggest she is going to carry on with that prior statement commitment?

Mr. Martin Murphy: No. The only reference I can give is our presentation, our exchange, at the recent ministerial consultations in October, where we raised the issue of immigration and appealed to the Government of Canada to consider raising the issue now with the Government of Quebec to review the accord. What has happened is I think you will find that the Canadian immigration department will demonstrate to you that Quebec was getting quite a percentage of French-speaking immigrants, and many of them, coming from different parts of the world, can in fact speak English. The problem is those who come to Quebec, speaking generally, cannot attend English schools. They cannot attend English schools. Secondly, of those who can, unfortunately, many see that entry to Quebec with a view to leaving once they have the right to leave. After three years or so many leave, so it doesn't provide us with any source of replenishment.

We'll be meeting with Premier Jean Charest as well. We've asked for a meeting with him to look at some measures that will stop the hemorrhaging of our population. I raised the issue at Premier Charest's recent Forum des générations. It was held in October.

What measures are we proposing? Number one is to look at probably the 1991 accord and see if there is some manner of regulation or some interpretation that can be brought to provide some relief. Number two is we know that it's Quebec that will decide to sign onto the Charter of Rights and Freedoms paragraph 23(1)(a) or not, but we're asking now, since the climate may be more positive, that the Government of Canada support us in asking Quebec to consider signing onto that. It would mean that people in the rest of Canada, knowing that if they were to accept a transfer, could in fact make the choice to send their children to an English school. But because paragraph 23(1)(a) is not in place, they know that's not an option.

We're looking also at employment. With respect to the employment level in the federal public service in Quebec, as I understand it, if we think of ourselves as approximately 12% or 13% of the population, about 7% of the employees on the federal civil service are English speaking versus our population base, which is 13%. So there's an imbalance there.

In terms of the provincial government, it's much worse. We have about 1% of our population in the provincial civil service.

If there were employment opportunities, I expect our youth may be more disposed to think they have a future and some hope.

• (1005)

The Chair: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Vellacott.

Monsieur Simard.

Hon. Raymond Simard (Saint Boniface, Lib.): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Welcome, gentlemen.

I would like to ask you maybe three or four questions, and if you could answer them in order, I just find that we get a little bit more done.

First of all, in terms of perception, my perception of Quebec is that in the urban areas the anglophone minority is extremely well served. There are more than adequate services, more than adequate infrastructure, but in fact the problems are basically in the regions. Maybe you can speak to me on that a little bit.

Secondly, Mr. Quilliams, you spoke about having lost a generation—the 30- to 50-year-olds. Have you lost them because they don't speak English any more, or have you lost them because they have left the province? I don't know if you can speak to that.

Third, you just mentioned again, Mr. Murphy, that fewer anglophones work in the public service. Have you analyzed why this is so? There has to be a reason for that. Is it because they don't speak both languages or fewer anglophones speak both languages? Maybe you could clear that up.

And lastly, I'd just like to know in terms of structure, the Entente Canada-Communauté.... I'm not sure what it's called in English. Is it the Canada Community—

Mr. Martin Murphy: Yes, the Canada Community Agreement.

Hon. Raymond Simard: Who are they assigned with? Are they assigned with your group or with Alliance Quebec? In other provinces, my province, for instance, we have one political group that is the head, they sign the agreement, and then it flows down to other groups from there. So maybe you could just clear that up for me.

Mr. Martin Murphy: The framework agreement is signed between the Government of Canada as represented by the Department of Canadian Heritage and of the Quebec Community Groups Network. But the clause on page 1 at the bottom is that we list the members who have signed on—

Hon. Raymond Simard: Who will benefit from this.

Mr. Martin Murphy: —as one of our members. So they are governed by the terms of reference.

Mr. Peter Quilliams: I'll do question two.

Hon. Raymond Simard: Which is the generation.

Mr. Peter Quilliams: Yes. This was a report that came from the official languages support programs branch in the Department of Canadian Heritage on March 12, 2004. The authors were William Floch and Jan Warnke. They were the ones who claimed we had lost a generation. In studying our demographic profile, they came to that conclusion, and I'm just sharing that with you.

Hon. Raymond Simard: Lost? Do you mean they left Quebec?

Mr. Peter Quilliams: They left.

Hon. Raymond Simard: They left the province. That's what you're saying, not that they're just speaking French now. That's not what you're saying?

Mr. Peter Quilliams: No, the conclusion they reached was that they had left.

Hon. Raymond Simard: Okay.

Regional versus urban—can you explain that to me, please? We hear you have world-class hospitals in Montreal and all that, and we hear the needs in Montreal aren't as severe obviously as they are in the regions. It would be more difficult, I would think, for an anglophone to get service in the Saguenay in a hospital than it would in Montreal. Can you explain the differences? Are you well served in the big urban areas as opposed to the regions?

Mr. Martin Murphy: I'm from Montreal, so, yes, we are. We have, as you say, world-class health, social services, and networks there. Because of the investment by Health Canada in the action plan, through measures of community health and social services, we are now establishing a network so that people in the far reaches of the province will ultimately have access to more direct service in the English language as well.

And notice the training too—the training and retention of caregivers through our working with McGill University, to train them so that they can in fact provide services in English, in the regions particularly, not exclusively but in the regions.

Hon. Raymond Simard: My last question was with regard to the federal public service. Is there a reason why there are fewer anglophones working there?

Mr. Peter Quilliams: No, I don't really know why. Is it recruitment? I don't know. I know that it's been a *préoccupation*. It's been an issue with both the community and the government for a number of years, and even in the action plan they are still trying to re-address an ongoing problem. To understand the root cause of it, I don't know if that analysis has been done. I particularly don't have knowledge of what the root cause might be.

Hon. Raymond Simard: That would be interesting.

Mr. Peter Quilliams: It would.

Just to complement a bit the answer to regional versus urban, certainly it's been understood, specifically with Health Canada, that regionally the issues are not at all the same as in downtown Montreal. The three initiatives they funded were speared directly toward the region and not toward the urban. If you read the document coming from the advisory committee of Health Canada, you'll see it was very specific that they wanted to address the problems within the region. So the \$4.7 million, for example, that's been announced recently is focused on the region.

In terms of the effort to provide training and human resources retention, although the institution chosen was in downtown Montreal, hopefully the audience or the group that's going to be receiving this service will be the Sherbrookes, the Magogs, the Cowansvilles, and places in other rural areas of Quebec.

•(1010)

[Translation]

Hon. Raymond Simard: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Simard.

[English]

Mr. Desrochers.

[Translation]

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Murphy, Mr. Quilliams, you represent 23 organizations, including Alliance Quebec, and you tell us that the Department of Canadian Heritage determines the amounts of money that are distributed to those organizations. Who negotiates on behalf of Alliance Quebec? Is it your organization or Alliance Quebec, in view of the fact that you represent all the organizations?

[English]

Mr. Martin Murphy: We negotiated the current agreement in 1999. The first agreement was in 1995, for four years. Then we negotiated a second agreement in 1999, governing these five years. So we negotiated a global amount of \$3,041,000.

Historically, Alliance Quebec and all of these other organizations had received x number of dollars, and it was almost an automatic allotment that was renewed.

Up until recently, now that we have results-based management.... Before, in 1995-96 and 1997, we'd put in our application and we would receive the cheque, and then we would make an annual report.

However, things are different now. As a matter of fact, December 13 is the deadline to apply for program funding for 2004-05. Each organization will submit its application to the Department of Canadian Heritage. A joint committee will review it and apply the criteria that both parties have agreed to in terms of its merit. Then we send in a figure of 30 or 32, whatever the total mark is, and that's the last we see of it until we get the preliminary allotment of funds for consultation.

[Translation]

Mr. Odina Desrochers: Will Alliance Quebec get the large share? What percentage will it get?

Mr. Martin Murphy: Yes.

[English]

Up until 1999 they were receiving \$934,000. It was for 1999-2000 that they were cut \$300,000, but I think the former minister, Sheila Copps, reinstated the \$300,000 for one year. Since that time they have been getting \$634,000.

However, this fiscal year they're getting \$200,000, plus \$100,000 for a strategic planning exercise.

•(1015)

[Translation]

Mr. Odina Desrochers: Is Alliance Quebec endowed with funds to defend the Montreal area only, or does it work for Quebec as a whole?

Mr. Martin Murphy: According to its mandate, it works for Quebec as a whole. However, Alliance Quebec is not the only organization working for the minority communities. Ten of our members have their head offices in Montreal.

Mr. Odina Desrochers: You tell us that Alliance Quebec may get 30 or 35 percent of your funding envelope and that it serves Quebec as a whole. You also have 22 other organizations doing the same work. In your view, is the Department of Canadian Heritage distributing the money well overall? Would you prefer to have more money distributed to the other 22 organizations compared to what is distributed to Alliance Quebec?

[English]

Mr. Martin Murphy: No, it's really not up to us to make that judgment. I think every organization can legitimately submit an application. They'll have to defend their needs, and it's analyzed. I think it's fair to say that everybody is looking for more money, but I don't know whether your percentage is right—if I understood you well—that about 30% to 35% of the funds go to Alliance Quebec; \$200,000 would not be 35%.

The Chair: Now they're getting \$200,000.

Mr. Martin Murphy: No, but \$900,000 was in 1995 to 1999, so it had been decreased to \$634,000 up until this year.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Desrochers.

Mr. Godin.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Being from a Francophone community outside Quebec—I prefer to identify myself as a French Canadian living in Canada—I look at the situation in Quebec and I honestly don't think that Anglophones are mistreated there. I'm going to tell you why as part of a brief comment.

The school system in Quebec is great, especially Montreal, where there are hospitals, McGill University, and so on. Montreal Francophones—this is the situation—who attend university and do medical research, for example, are forced to go to McGill University to get access to good information because there are no books translated into French. That's the situation, even in Quebec. So imagine the situation back home. Imagine the situation in the regions where there are 250,000 or 240,000 Francophones in one province and 48,000 in another. Imagine the difference.

There are Anglophones in Rivière-au-Renard. I went there, and the ones I saw didn't look like they were being mistreated. They even call the place Fox River. In my riding, in Miscou, a small island with a population of approximately 200 inhabitants, there's an English-language school for five persons. In the meantime, in my riding, we had to fight in the street to keep the French-language school open in Saint-Sauveur. The government sent out the riot squad with dogs and truncheons and all that to fight the parents who wanted to keep the Saint-Sauveur school, which has 143 students, open, whereas the Anglophones on Miscou, where there are five students, have their school. I don't get it.

When I go to Montreal, it seems to me I have trouble being served in French in restaurants in some places. Everyone speaks English.

If you got more money, what would you do better than what you're doing now. I know that my question may not be appropriate, but I'm simply saying, as an outside person, how I perceive how you're treated in Quebec, compared to us in regions outside Quebec, where we always have to fight. We have to go to court to win nearly all our cases. We can't even win them directly; we have to go to court. The federal government then spends money to go to appeal court to deny us what we've won. That's the situation of Francophones outside Quebec. I'd like to meet the person who will contradict me and claim that's not the situation.

I see the situation in Quebec, Montreal, and, as I said, when I compare it to what's going on in Rivière-au-Renard, I don't find that Anglophones are that mistreated. Back home, when a woman has to go to a hospital, she's confronted with the fact that the Francophone hospitals in the Acadie-Bathurst region have been closed, that maternity wards have been removed from the Acadian Peninsula. People have to cross regions where there are storms, even when it's not snowing: the winds off the Bay of Chaleur are strong enough to close the roads. I wonder how women can have children on the Acadian Peninsula. The government has cut Francophone hospitals in Francophone areas. I'm outlining the situation as I see it as a Francophone outside Quebec.

I would like to hear what you have to say on the subject.

• (1020)

[English]

Mr. Martin Murphy: I want to repeat something so that it's very clear: we celebrate the fact that the francophone community is

getting the funds they are. We acknowledge the situation they have, and we are aware of it. I travelled across the nation to find out. I spoke to the representatives in different provinces about their experiences. I've become somewhat familiar with their experiences. So we celebrate that.

Our purpose here is not to take away from them because we are only getting \$3 million; rather, it's to demonstrate that what we're looking for, on behalf of the Government of Canada, is some consideration of a greater fairness. Everybody wants more funds. That's human nature. We have demonstrated that many of the conditions we are now experiencing are identical to what the francophones have been experiencing over time, and still are, or many are.

For example, in the case of Winnipeg, I think most of the francophones, or at least a high percentage of them, are in a radius of 80 to 90 miles. If they have a meeting, an hour and a half or two hours later they can get together. In our case, for some of our people to come to a meeting, it's \$2,200 by plane.

Another thing we have to underline, in all fairness, to balance the portrait, is that we have had legislation that has not been entirely always favourable to the anglophone community. As a consequence, the climate is not as positive as we'd like it to be in order to encourage people to come and be part of our society.

[Translation]

The Chair: You had five minutes, Mr. Godin.

[English]

Mr. Yvon Godin: This is my last question, and it's important. I'll give up all the others after.

The Chair: What...?

Mr. Yvon Godin: Are you worried when a political party says we should maybe go to the Belgium system, where Quebec looks after the francophones, and us, we look after the anglophones of Canada?

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Godin.

[English]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Maybe you'll answer it later on in the press.

The Chair: No, you can't answer.

We'll go for a last round, starting with Mr. Vellacott.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: I didn't get to complete all of my previous questioning on the issue of immigration. In terms of your suggestion there, you didn't really develop it or go a lot further with respect to that issue. Are you suggesting or implying that in terms of a dollar figure you think it should be one-third of the \$9 million committed in the action plan over the five years, to bring individuals who are anglophones into the Quebec setting? If you had your dream world, your ideal, that's what you think might be fair?

Mr. Martin Murphy: No, we have not put a dollar sign behind the \$9 million. We are putting on the table the fact that 100% of the funds in the action plan have been formally committed to the francophones, and this in view of the dramatic decrease—in these last five years, 30,500—of the population in Quebec who have English mother tongue only. And the door doesn't seem to be open very wide in terms of the possibility of any source of replenishment.

If the federal government is concerned about the future of its minority communities, then I hope it will take notice and try to help us out, do something about it.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Let me put it this way, then. When we say “formal commitment”...and this was an announcement, but ministers make announcements and change their minds all the time. You'd know that if you were around this place even a year or two. That is to say, there's nothing legally binding them to that. They could make a change, make an adjustment. There could be some amounts given in a different direction on that.

Would you perhaps suggest, and I won't hold you to this in a binding fashion, \$500,000, or \$1 million...? Can you give me any sense of perspective? You're saying there should be some; if you get \$25 for it, is that enough?

Mr. Martin Murphy: Well, what I've done here today, and I know it's not satisfactory, because I don't have an answer for you in terms of figures—

•(1025)

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: But you'll work on that?

Mr. Martin Murphy: What I want to do is to put on the table the problem, in the hope that the federal government will address the issue and see in what manner there can be some source of replenishment for a community that is hemorrhaging.

Again, I expect that the federal government, when we have English-speaking minority communities now spread throughout the province, would be very interested in doing whatever has to be done to ensure some stability, some development, rather than a climate where they're neglected and feel there's no hope for their future, which will spell the demise of these communities.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Let me ask you another way, then. If this supposedly committed \$9 million is going to have people immigrate into other parts of Canada, to, in quotes, “minority” regions or areas, if there were dollars committed to that, so that we would have...into the minority part in Quebec, would it make sense—and I don't know how you can even insist on this—that they'd go off to areas other than, for instance, Montreal Island, or to areas where they would truly be a minority?

Do you know what I'm asking here? You can't really dictate that.

Mr. Martin Murphy: No, but for people living in these areas now, if there was some hope for their future, perhaps they would prefer to stay. Because there isn't that hope, they have no choice but to leave, even for education.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Do you have some idea of how you could encourage people to go into those areas, to build up the anglophone populations in those areas?

I'll ask Mr. Quilliams.

Mr. Peter Quilliams: I'm struggling to understand your line of questioning.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Admittedly, in parts of Quebec, I guess Montreal particularly, where you don't have difficulties...or you do have services there reasonably well, and so on. What they're doing with this \$9 million is they are actually encouraging immigrants into parts of Canada where they'll live in a minority fashion, in a sea of English.

Are you thinking of the counterpart to that in Quebec, where, by the same logic, it would require you to have those people go into places where, as you reported here, it's difficult to get in and out of, into places where they are truly, in that case, an English minority in a sea of French? That equation kind of works the same way across in the other direction. Is that what you're suggesting, that we add to the numbers in Montreal, for instance?

Mr. Peter Quilliams: I think the issue is more the attitude of immigration versus the specific \$9 million. I don't know where that \$9 million was spent.

The issue, I think, is to open up the idea that we could invite those people in from outside of the province as immigrants, and that in fact the immigration program would support that, support the idea of growing an English base within Quebec.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: That's what I'm asking you; in Quebec, though, right?

Mr. Peter Quilliams: Correct.

The Chair: Mr. Vellacott, your time's up.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Desrochers, in a gesture of great generosity, gives his question to Mr. Godin.

Mr. Godin.

Mr. Yvon Godin: I thank Mr. Desrochers for his great generosity.

[*English*]

I want to come back to this important question that I believe in, really believe in. We have our country, and I believe in my country, from one end to the other. The leader of the Conservative Party had in mind an idea about Belgium. Everybody has to have the right to have in mind ideas on how our country could work. He talked about Belgium, and the way I interpreted it is that he meant Quebec could look at what is good for francophones, and us, we could look at the rest.

Does that scare you? From what you're bringing here right now, you kind of feel that immigration is bringing into Quebec more francophones right now than anglophones, and all that. With regard to this type of attitude toward changing the way Canada is, and looking at another system, how do you feel about it, as representatives of the anglophones in Quebec? Do you think it would be a good idea to have a system like that?

Mr. Martin Murphy: Mr. Chair, we are looking here at the development of our community, putting on the table some ideas for consideration and ultimately support. It is not our purpose to engage in analyzing or commenting on some political hypothesis. That's not our purpose here this morning. I'll have to decline the question.

• (1030)

Mr. Yvon Godin: No, I understand what you're saying, that you don't want to play politics. But I'm saying that the idea is out there. No matter which political party it comes from, I don't care, that idea is out there.

Would you agree that an idea like that could hurt the anglophone community in Quebec, the same as it would hurt the francophone community in the rest of the country?

Mr. Martin Murphy: What we're looking for in Quebec is some source of replenishment. From 1986 to 1991 there were 22,500 English-speaking people, or people who attach themselves to the English-speaking community, who left. From 1991 to 1996 there were 25,000 who left; from 1996 to 2001 there were 30,500 English mother tongue people who left. This is hemorrhaging, and we're saying, is there not some source of replenishment? Even people who come here now through immigration, speaking generally, are not eligible to send their children to English schools. Therefore, in terms of—

Mr. Yvon Godin: Well, my question is easy, Mr. Chair. Do you think you would be more served with something that looks like that, that Quebec looks after the francophones of Canada and the rest of Canada looks after the anglophones? That's an easy question. It's not politics; it's the reality out there.

Mr. Martin Murphy: We believe in a bilingual country.

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Godin.

The last intervention is by Mr. D'Amours.

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

First of all, thank you very much for being here.

I'm very pleased to understand that you realize the importance of bilingualism across Canada. I remember that during my own campaign some people weren't very in favour of respecting the question of the official languages in a minority environment. I'm very pleased that you understand that, because you live in a minority environment.

I am questioning one thing. Just like with the francophones, I can understand the fear you could have for some small communities, not in Montreal or Quebec, but all across the province of Quebec, where you have a few dozen anglophone people.

What do you think would be a good strategy to ensure those small communities will stay alive and will be able to keep their own vitality in that specific environment?

Mr. Peter Quilliams: Your question is, in the regional areas, what do we feel would be a process to...? Let me take my own region, the Eastern Townships. It spreads from Thetford Mines to Clarenceville, a very large area, from the *frontière* up to Drummondville.

The issue we have is one of attitude and hope. From the very beginning, it seems like as soon as the child gets out of the cradle we begin to talk about opportunities elsewhere and the political difficulties locally. And over time, I think that message has borne fruit in the fact that we export more of our youth than perhaps most other areas.

We're wanting to change that. We're wanting to have an attitudinal change that will suggest to them there is hope, that they don't have to go down the 401 and elsewhere in Canada to have quality of life and successes in their life. But to do that, we have to spend a great deal of time influencing and informing parents and teachers, those who influence our youth, to look at a bit broader aspect. The fact is that locally, you do have a chance, you do have hope, and you do have potential for quality of life right here.

We've launched some campaigns to do that. One is that we've tried to determine the 40 most popular occupations, for example, in our area, and where to get educated and what kinds of skills you need to get into those occupations. The reason for doing that is just to bring to the table the fact that there is a tremendous amount of potential and opportunity within our own location, within our own community. But for years and years we've had a mindset that says, "No, we should do something else; we should have our children go elsewhere if they really want to aspire—to Manhattan, Toronto, Calgary, no matter where—but don't stay here".

The program we're putting in place is to offset that. It's to work with educators, it's to work with guidance counsellors, it's to get in front of students, in front of their face, and to introduce them to the new reality of where they live and the new reality of the hope they can have if they stay within this location, with the fundamental knowledge that you have to be bilingual in the labour market. That's the program we've launched.

The other one is on health and social services, where we are fortunately a beneficiary of the Health Canada program. Just this year we have launched a program of trying to understand our constituency, of trying to understand the profile of the community and the health determinants. After that you sit down with the institutions and you inform them of your situation and you hope they will respond favourably. In most cases they do. It's an exercise we have to do on an ongoing basis.

• (1035)

The Chair: Thank you.

[Translation]

Thank you, Mr. D'Amours, you have exceeded the time allotted to you.

[English]

Mr. Peter Quilliams: You can catch me later.

The Chair: Mr. Murphy and Mr. Quilliams, thank you very much for being here with us today. I think it's been a very interesting meeting.

[Translation]

We'll conclude on that.

[*English*]

Again, thank you for being with us.

May I remind the members of the committee that our next meeting starts at 8:30, because we'll be discussing security around Mr. Bush's visit, as requested by the members of the committee.

Again, thank you to all.

[*Translation*]

Thank you very much for taking part.

[*English*]

Mr. Martin Murphy: I want to thank all of you again for spending this time with us. We appreciate it very, very much, and certainly we're a phone call away, with a commitment to work together to see if we can try to improve...for all Canadians.

The Chair: Thank you, and I'm sure we'll be discussing your report and comments.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: The meeting is adjourned.

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

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

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.