



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Official Languages

LANG • NUMBER 039 • 1st SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, May 1, 2012

—
Chair

The Honourable Michael Chong

Standing Committee on Official Languages

Tuesday, May 1, 2012

•(0845)

[Translation]

The Chair (Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC)): Welcome to the Standing Committee on Official Languages. Today is Tuesday, May 1, 2012, and this our 39th meeting. We are here today pursuant to Standing Order 108 for a study on the evaluation of the Roadmap: Improving Programs and Service Delivery.

Appearing before us today we have Ms. Bossé and Ms. Kenny, from the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne du Canada, Mr. Burke, Ms. Martin-Laforge and Mr. Thompson from Quebec Community Groups Network, and finally, Mr. Clément and Mr. Lemoine from the University of Ottawa.

We will begin with the representatives from the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne du Canada.

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny (President, Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne du Canada): Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the committee. First of all, I would like to thank you for inviting the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne to appear once again before you as part of your study on the Roadmap for Linguistic Duality.

My name is Marie-France Kenny and I am the president of the federation. Today, I am accompanied by our director general, Suzanne Bossé. We are privileged to be the last to appear of the francophone and Acadian community organizations that have appeared before you. This provides us with a wonderful opportunity to draw from everything that has been said to look towards the future and set the foundations for the next initiative, an initiative which, as Senator Comeau put it, is not a new roadmap but rather a GPS to update everything that will follow the roadmap as of 2013.

The participation of all Canadians in our linguistic duality and community support for official language minority communities are the two main pillars of the Roadmap for Linguistic Duality. Initiatives and projects that resulted from the roadmap were aimed at meeting these objectives. The community organizations that appeared before you described, in quite eloquent terms, the results that have been achieved. They have mentioned the challenges, but also the successes, the obstacles met along the way, and also the opportunities that have been found.

The mid-term report published by Canadian Heritage a few weeks ago also makes mention of certain successes and progress, but was somewhat laconic when it came to challenges. The testimony provided to this committee regarding the mid-term report shows us that, in looking towards the future, the two objectives of the roadmap

remain quite relevant. We are therefore recommending that the government initiative, which will follow the roadmap starting in 2013, should also strive to ensure the participation of all Canadians in linguistic duality and support official language minority communities.

Let us now take a look at the substance of this next government initiative. Francophone and Acadian communities set development priorities in the Strategic Community Plan that resulted from the broad consultative process which took place during the Sommet des communautés francophones et acadienne in 2007. The community representatives who appeared before you are all members of the Leaders' Forum, a group of some 43 organizations and institutions involved in the implementation of this plan. Several of them have, moreover, talked to you about this issue.

Given the objectives that we have just recommended, it would be quite logical and natural that the initiative following the roadmap be aligned closely with this Strategic Community Plan. After all, the government and the communities are both seeking the same result: communities or individuals that have everything they need to be successful and to contribute to the development of our country. The Strategic Community Plan includes five major themes, three of which show the way with respect to the priorities that the post-roadmap initiative will be focusing on; mainly, our population, our space and our development. They too align closely with the priorities of the government.

When we talk about our population, we are talking about strengthening the demographic weight of our communities. We are talking about supporting youths and families so that they will be able to pass on the French language and strengthen their sense of identity through greater access to cultural and heritage activities and child development support programs. We are also talking about strategies to welcome, integrate and retain migrants and immigrants who settle in our regions so that they can be successful and contribute to the development of our communities and regions. Mention, moreover, should be made of roadmap investments that enabled the Department of Citizenship and Immigration to provide better support to our communities in reaching the Strategic Community Plan objectives to promote immigration within the francophone minority communities.

Such support should also be renewed and expanded so as to strengthen, as well, community capacity in this area. The initiative that follows the roadmap should also include the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade so that it can equip communities and embassies to engage in promotion activities abroad. The theme Our Space is about access of francophone citizens to a wide range of activities and services in French delivered effectively, enabling them to participate actively in the growth of their community. It is also about providing a continuum of services that deal with every aspect of daily life, from education to health, from justice to culture, from youths to seniors.

This theme also deals with empowerment, ensuring that citizens themselves become involved in the growth and economic and social well-being of their communities. This leads me to the important consideration of priorities that should be in the initiative following the roadmap.

The implementation of the roadmap was undertaken by a well-coordinated and committed network working on behalf of francophones. The roadmap emphasized services to citizens, but it was the organizations and institutions in the communities that delivered the services.

● (0850)

They did this without any significant strengthening of their capacity. However, it seems to us that the more you invest in the capacity of the service delivery agency, the greater yield you get from the investment in terms of effectiveness, results and client satisfaction. Hence it is important that the initiative following the roadmap focus on service delivery and on strengthening this network of associations and organizations which, from one end of the country to the next, focus on the citizen and are best able to provide services at the least cost.

Let us now examine the theme of development. Francophone and Acadian communities have given themselves the objective of dealing with the aging population and rural exodus, stimulating jobs and economic growth. They want to achieve this by relying on the vitality of their network, on both private and community entrepreneurship, on innovative local development strategies, on the strengthening of human capital, on the acquisition of those skills required to ensure that everyone is successful and on the recognition of foreign credentials.

It is essential, to do this, that the initiative following the roadmap include, in particular, investments in manpower training, either through the development of essential skills such as literacy or through post-secondary education. Supporting entrepreneurship and cultural and heritage tourism initiatives is also important.

I have provided you with a few brushstrokes to give you a general overview of the objectives of the Strategic Community Plan and what will become the next Roadmap for Linguistic Duality. Moreover, I would really like to emphasize the importance of making sure that the primary initiatives of the current roadmap not come to an end on March 31, 2013. These initiatives will create momentum that must not be halted at a time when the benefits are starting to be felt.

I would also like to say a few words about the participation of Canadians in this linguistic duality. In this respect, the current roadmap rolled out certain initiatives which included the implementation of Canada's language portal and universal access to the Termium software.

Although these initiatives are commendable, it is important that we make a distinction between the strengthening of linguistic duality in the public service and in Canadian society. Since the initiative that follows the roadmap will bring us to 2017 and the 150th anniversary of Canada, we would look favourably on any initiatives that would create opportunities for dialogue and exchange amongst Canadians, leading to a better understanding and interest in this linguistic duality.

To conclude, I would like to provide you with a few key concepts regarding the governance of the next Roadmap for Linguistic Duality. We feel that the success of this initiative will depend on the extent to which we define the roles and responsibilities of those called upon to implement it. I am referring here not only to federal institutions but also to provincial, territorial and community governments.

We need to create a management and accountability framework, and our communities need to participate in defining objectives, indicators and timelines. Moreover, community organizations and institutions will no doubt be called upon to play a lead role in implementing this new roadmap, as they were in the case of the current roadmap.

In planning services and in ensuring a positive outcome for such an initiative, it is essential that we all have a good idea of how it is to be implemented along the way. We are recommending that the next roadmap include a monitoring tool that will enable us to follow investments as they are made, by department, by year and by program.

To conclude, I would like to leave you with some more general thoughts. The Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, the Hon. James Moore, asked us, last fall, which story francophone and Acadian communities would like to tell in the next roadmap in 2017-2018, as part Canada's 150th anniversary celebrations. We would like to be able to say that the support of the federal government has enabled francophone and Acadian communities to make giant strides in achieving substantive equality, that we have stopped being looked at solely as minorities, but rather as fully-fledged citizens who, shored up by this substantive equality, contribute fully to development and economic prosperity, and that we are more confident than ever that our children and grandchildren will, after us, be able to continue building this country in both official languages.

And finally, we hope that more than ever before, Canadians will have had the opportunity to talk to each other, to understand each other, and to appreciate all of the richness of our linguistic duality.

Thank you.

I am ready to answer your questions.

● (0855)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Kenny.

We will now hear from the Quebec Community Groups Network.
[English]

Mr. Noel Burke (Interim President, Quebec Community Groups Network): Good morning, Mr. Chong, Monsieur Godin, Monsieur Bélanger, and all members of the committee.

My name is Noel Burke. Currently, I'm the interim president of the Quebec Community Groups Network, QCGN. With me today is Sylvia Martin-Laforge, who will share some of our remarks, and Stephen Thompson, our policy point man, if I can put it that way.

You are aware that the QCGN is a member-driven organization whose 38 members work to directly benefit the nearly one million Canadians who live in our English-speaking linguistic minority communities, collectively referred to as the English-speaking community of Quebec. The QCGN in its capacity as the community's strategic representative with government has coordinated closely with the organizations and institutions serving our community that have provided this committee with evidence in support of your study on evaluating the road map for Canada's linguistic duality. We have followed their appearances with great interest and believe that as a community we have demonstrated the benefits of Government of Canada investments in our minority community.

The QCGN and its community partners understand that the purpose of today's appearance is to provide our community's summation on the input we have provided to the road map study. The committee has undertaken this study for the purpose of making recommendations toward Canada's official languages strategy when the road map expires next year. You are looking forward, and we are here to assist you in your deliberations.

Our intention is to provide the committee with our summative perspective on how the Government of Canada can effectively and efficiently enhance the vitality of Canada's English linguistic minority communities. To support this presentation, we will use two key events: the study undertaken by your colleagues on the Senate Standing Committee on Official Languages; and the Strategic Priorities Forum, an exhaustive community consultation undertaken over the past year.

By the end of this morning's presentation, we hope we will have succeeded in bringing greater understanding to the honourable members of this committee on the following: our community's observations on how Canada could more effectively support the vitality of its English linguistic minority communities; and the criteria the Government of Canada might use when prioritizing public support of our community.

The language discussion in Quebec is fascinating, vibrant, and never-ending. We have noted your interest and would welcome the opportunity to talk to you on this subject at a later date. Today, however, the community we represent has agreed that the QCGN's focus, like that of the study you are undertaking, should be forward looking, towards the Government of Canada's next official languages strategy.

The English-speaking community of Quebec acknowledges our indispensable partnership with the Government of Canada, whose commitment to the vitality of both of our nation's official language

minority communities is very much in evidence. Some have asked if there will come a day when this partnership is not necessary; our answer is no.

The Prime Minister's message, which prefaces the road map, speaks of the vital Canadian value of linguistic duality, "a cornerstone of our national identity, and it is a source of immeasurable economic, social, and political benefits for all Canadians."

The Prime Minister made a direct link between our national commitment to linguistic duality—and, by extension, our official language minority communities—and our future as a unified Canada. The Government of Canada's partnership with this nation's official language minority communities is rooted in our Constitution and manifested in the Official Languages Act. We are in this together for the long haul.

We know a rebalancing of the partnership between the community, public, and private sectors is coming, and we look forward to participating in this evolutionary change. But the Government of Canada's commitment to the vitality of our community and the duty of federal institutions to ensure that positive measures are taken for the implementation of these commitments are a matter of law. We can think of no other communities with this special partnership with the Government of Canada.

● (0900)

Ms. Sylvia Martin-Laforge (Director General, Quebec Community Groups Network): The QCGN appeared before your colleagues at the Senate Standing Committee on Official Languages last week, providing our community's comments on the Government of Canada's response to the committee's substantive report, "The Vitality of Quebec's English-Speaking Communities: From Myth to Reality". You have heard this report referenced many times by community sector organizations serving our community who have provided evidence to this committee. This historic report and its recommendations are a must read for those shaping Canada's official languages strategy.

There are three decisive messages we draw from the Senate report. First, Canada's French and English linguistic minority communities, as with all the citizens of this great country, must be afforded equal voice in the development of policies and programs aimed at enhancing the vitality of our communities.

Second, Canadians living in English linguistic minority communities should have equal access to government programs and services that originate or receive funding from the Government of Canada. It is not acceptable that, in the words of the Honourable Dennis Dawson, speaking as a member of the Senate committee on September, 13, 2010, our language rights become "collateral damage" or an afterthought in program delivery.

This both necessitates and translates into the third broad message. We deserve an equitable share of federal resources devoted to the government's support of our nation's official language minority communities.

Our testimony to the Senate committee on official languages welcomed the government's response to the Senate's report and generally supported its content. We urge this committee to review our Senate testimony of April 23. It highlights best practices in developing and maintaining effective partnerships with the community sector in our community. Our Senate testimony provides full credit and recognition to leading departments like the Treasury Board, Industry Canada, HRSDC, and especially Health Canada and Canadian Heritage, whose increased investment in understanding the needs of our community has led to direct benefits experienced by members of our community.

Mr. Noel Burke: Beginning in 2005 and continuing over the life of the road map for Canada's linguistic duality, 2008 to 2013, real progress has been made by many federal institutions to improve their ability to enhance our community's development. This accomplishment is being achieved in three ways.

First, the Government of Canada has made investments in helping the community understand its needs and priorities and plan for its future. Most recently, for example, Canadian Heritage provided funding for a community priority-setting conference in March, following nearly nine months of consultations throughout the community.

In preparation for the conference, the community consulted internally and with its supporting public and private stakeholders for over six months. More than 180 leaders from our community, representing communities and sectors from across Quebec, gathered over the weekend of March 24 and 25, 2012, to determine our community's future vision and priorities.

The conference concluded with the signing of a declaration that identifies priorities to ensure a vital and sustainable future. We provided copies of the declaration to your staff immediately following the conference and brought copies with us today for distribution by the clerk. I will mention them subsequently in our remarks.

The priorities are not to be considered individually or incrementally, but together as a holistic and unified vision of the community. We rejected the notion of producing another laundry list of development priorities.

Communities function as complex interdependent systems. One cannot just work on one area and then move to another without having an effect on the other area. People do not sequentially choose between care for elderly parents, a child's education, and the economic security of their families. It is a weakness of both government and the community sectors that too often, areas of importance to community vitality and individuals are organizationally stovepiped. The remedy is effective coordination. We are very pleased to note that this committee is evaluating current coordination mechanisms and asking how the system could improve.

What we as a community have aimed to achieve through the consultation process we have just completed is an enunciation of the environmental conditions for community vitality. The six priorities we have announced will act together to create sustainable communities. Please refer to the declaration from the community priority-setting conference of the English-speaking community in Quebec. The six priority areas we have identified are: access to

services in English; community building; economic prosperity; identity and renewal; leadership and representation; and strong institutions.

We are suggesting that the government use these priorities as criteria for providing public support for the vitality of the English-speaking community in Quebec. The declaration document provides detail around each of those priorities. Although they sound very general in nature, we see them as the core conditions for vitality.

Second, the Government of Canada has made specific investments in research capacity. For example, federal funding was a catalyst in establishing the Quebec English-Speaking Communities' Research Network, known as QUESCREN, a joint initiative of the Canadian Institute for Research on Linguistic Minorities, CIRLM, in Moncton, and Concordia University's School of Extended Learning.

Health Canada has provided significant research support to our community through its relationship with the Community Health and Social Services Network, a network of community organizations, resources, and public institutions striving to ensure access to health and social services in English for Quebec's English-speaking communities.

We would like to pause here to acknowledge the leadership of the CIRLM in the establishment of a research capacity dedicated to our community. Good public policy requires an evidence base, which requires research. QUESCREN has been instrumental in creating a space in which researchers in the community sector can meet, to the benefit of individual members of our community. For example, QUESCREN has put us on the map and has launched conference sessions and a theme within ACFAS, and has developed and supported community-based research that has benefited a fledgling seniors' network.

Public investment in research is an excellent example of a positive measure that the Government of Canada's institutions can undertake to enhance the vitality of our community and the rationale for policy development. We are a unique linguistic community, and very little research has been done on us as a community, especially our evolution over time. The public, private, and community sectors will all benefit from a focused research agenda for our community.

● (0905)

Third, finally, thanks to the leadership of such key departments as Treasury Board and the Department of Canadian Heritage, and institutions that include the Parliament of Canada and the Commissioner of Official Languages, a welcome and recently emerging interest in Canada's English linguistic minority communities is developing amongst federal institutions...with which we have not benefited from prior relationships, and we are quite pleased with this.

There are opportunities and challenges associated with this, which we would be happy to discuss during the question period.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Perhaps you could just quickly wrap up, Madame Martin-Laforge, because we're running out of time here.

Ms. Sylvia Martin-Laforge: Yes.

I'll let my president do his wrap-up.

The Chair: Okay.

Go ahead.

Mr. Noel Burke: I'll take 30 seconds or less.

The English-speaking community of Quebec and its supporting public partners have invested significantly in establishing our community's priority areas. We have shared those with this committee, and we invite the Government of Canada to consider them as the criteria that our community expects to be used in establishing the measures and priorities of public support.

We would like to thank the Government of Canada for its ever-increasing efforts to understand our unique community and support our collective vitality. We as a community acknowledge and pledge to continue our reciprocal obligation to work collaboratively with our federal partner, providing clear, evidence-based development priorities that will directly benefit the nearly one million Canadians who are proud members of the English-speaking community of Quebec.

Finally, we would encourage this committee to follow the lead of your colleagues in the Senate and come to Quebec to visit our communities. Do not rely on assumptions or myths. Come to see us for yourselves. You are welcome.

Thank you for the extended time.

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

[*Translation*]

We will now hear from the representative from the University of Ottawa.

Mr. Richard Clément (Director and Associate Dean, Official Languages and Bilingualism Institute, University of Ottawa): Thank you.

Mr. Chair, members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to appear before the Standing Committee on Official Languages during the consultations on the Roadmap for Canada's Linguistic Duality 2008-2013.

I am Richard Clément, Director of the Official Languages and Bilingualism Institute and Associate Dean of the University of Ottawa Faculty of Arts. With me is Hilaire Lemoine, Executive in Residence at the University of Ottawa and former director general of official languages support programs at Canadian Heritage.

So as to provide you with some context for my remarks on the roadmap, I would like to begin by saying a few words about the University of Ottawa and its contribution to bilingualism in Canada. Since its beginning in 1848, the University of Ottawa has been a bilingual university; a committed leader in promoting bilingualism and fostering the development of French culture in Ontario, across Canada and throughout the world; and an institution open to cultural diversity.

The university's continually expanding array of French-language undergraduate, graduate and professional programs has been attracting a growing number of francophones. Their number rose

above 12,000 in September 2011, putting the University of Ottawa in first place nation-wide for French-language studies outside Quebec.

● (0910)

[*English*]

In addition, more than 3,000 French immersion students from high schools across Canada come to the University of Ottawa. To ease their integration into a bilingual institution, the university has set up the French immersion studies program. The program has been available since September 2006 and is the only program of its kind in Canada giving students from French immersion and core French programs, as well as francophile students, the opportunity to study in their second language, today in over 74 undergraduate programs in five faculties. Students receive a French immersion designation on their diploma. Over 1,200 students were enrolled in French immersion studies in September 2012.

Lastly, in 2009 the Government of Canada chose the University of Ottawa to be the managing institution of the language rights support program, LRSP, through a joint partnership between the institute and the Faculty of Law. The LRSP was recently extended for five years, with the university continuing to be the managing institution—a vote of confidence for us.

[*Translation*]

I would like to say a few words about the Official Languages and Bilingualism Institute and its contribution to the objectives of the roadmap. The University of Ottawa established the Official Languages and Bilingualism Institute in July 2007. OLBI has as its mission to become a national and international centre of excellence in official language education, language skills assessment, research and language planning.

As such, OLBI set up the Canadian Centre for Studies and Research on Bilingualism and Language Planning. This centre is a national forum for research on language education, public policy and language planning. One of its many activities is to host an annual conference that brings together 125 to 150 language education researchers, instructors, practitioners and experts from Canada and abroad to discuss current issues. For example, this year's conference was held last week on the use of new technologies in language education.

[*English*]

In addition, close to 50 practising language teachers come to OLBI each year for professional development in second language teaching at OLBI's summer university, which is offered in partnership with the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.

[*Translation*]

Furthermore, OLBI's Development and Promotion Office coordinates the marketing of Canadian expertise across the country and around the world in the area of bilingualism and official languages. OLBI signed a memorandum of understanding with the Council of Europe's European Centre for Modern Languages, the ECML, in January 2008, which was renewed in March 2012. Under that agreement, OLBI acts as the ECML's Canadian point of contact, coordinates the participation of Canadian experts in ECML research and development projects, and promotes the sharing of best practices and new methodologies by language educators in Canada and Europe.

OLBI is also very active in the Inter-American Organization for Higher Education, which represents over 400 institutes of higher education in the Americas, including 28 in Canada. OLBI offered to develop and coordinate the inter-American network in language training, which was launched at the Conference of the Americas on International Education last week in Rio de Janeiro. The goals of the network are to encourage language learning in the Americas, promote mobility and internationalization, foster the sharing of pedagogical models, and promote research in language education and language planning.

[*English*]

OLBI is also the main partner in the Canadian International Development Agency's national language project in Sri Lanka. The purpose of this four-year project between the Government of Canada and Sri Lanka is to provide support for the implementation of Sri Lanka's official languages legislation in an effort to achieve peace and reconciliation after more than 30 years of conflict between the country's two main ethnic groups.

OLBI has also been invited to participate as a Canadian institution in the European Commission's project known as Languages in Urban Communities—Integration and Diversity for Europe. This three-year project is led by a consortium of 12 European post-secondary institutions, of which OLBI is a member. The purpose of the project is to describe the role of multilingualism in the development and evolution of major European cities. OLBI will be called upon to share the experiences of major Canadian cities, such as Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, and Ottawa.

● (0915)

[*Translation*]

The above initiatives are but a few examples of national and international coordination, outreach and promotion of Canadian official language expertise that showcases the skills Canada has acquired over the last 40 years in the area of official languages and multiculturalism.

From our understanding, one of the major impacts of the Roadmap 2008-2012 is the maintenance, over five years, of the federal government's funding level for official languages, based on the final year's budget, 2007-2008, of the Action Plan for Official Languages. This level of funding has enabled the provinces and territories to maintain, or in some cases, expand, their minority language and second-language education programs. The Roadmap has also made it possible for federal government departments and

agencies to launch new initiatives that have benefited the University of Ottawa and OLBI, including the Public Works and Government Services Canada University Scholarships Program in Translation, and the Canada School of Public Service initiative to extend access of language learning tools to Canadian universities. The Roadmap's greatest benefit, however, is the Government of Canada's formal five-year commitment to official languages.

A roadmap or action plan approach over five years with a specified financial commitment would be a way for the Government of Canada to renew its commitment to promoting official languages in Canada. We would like to propose a number of initiatives which should be considered in a next five-year plan, and which would contribute to the advancement of the official languages in Canada.

1. The rate of bilingualism among young Canadians. The federal, provincial and territorial governments should agree on a target for the rate of bilingualism among young graduates of the educational system. This target should be realistic, and to be met, would require a review of second-language programs on the basis of a Canadian adaptation of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. It should also result in a national campaign to promote the advantages of bilingualism to young people, as well as the creation of incentives for universities to offer second-language programs similar to the French immersion studies program at the University of Ottawa.

[*English*]

2. Official languages, e-learning for all Canadians: official languages learning opportunities should be available free of charge, anytime and anywhere in Canada, to all Canadians wishing to learn the other official language. Self-learning programs could be developed, adapted to the Canadian context, and published on the Internet. The learner could also have access to language monitors by means of a help line provided by designated public or private educational institutions in each province or region. Language skills testing would also be available online.

[*Translation*]

3. Mobility scholarships and bursaries. The University of Ottawa offers more than 350 programs in French in 10 faculties. Mobility scholarships and bursaries would make it possible for francophone students in English-language universities in Canada to complete part of their program at the University of Ottawa and join the 12,000 francophone students currently registered there. The scholarships and bursaries would also provide French immersion students in English-language universities who wish to complete some or all of their remaining studies in French with access, for a given period during their program, to the University of Ottawa's French immersion studies program and linguistic support that cannot be found anywhere else in Canada.

4. Summer university for young researchers on the official languages. Canada needs to attract young researchers to the field of official languages. The University of Ottawa is considering a summer research training program led by a team of distinguished Canadian researchers. The program would be made a training and research priority of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

[English]

5. Public service language training. The Government of Canada has decided to stop offering in-house language training to government employees and turn to third-party providers instead. The preferred providers should be universities with language institutes, especially those that have been involved in the Canada School of Public Service initiative to extend access of language learning tools to Canadian universities under the current road map. Moreover, to ensure the quality of the language training provided, the Public Service Commission should designate OLBI, in its capacity as a centre of excellence and national forum for official languages, as the coordinating body of a consortium of language institutes to train and certify language educators, as well as develop second-language programs. In addition, the Public Service Commission should consider transferring its language assessment unit to OLBI, given the OLBI's language assessment expertise.

[Translation]

To conclude, the University of Ottawa and OLBI can be of significant assistance to the Government of Canada in its leadership role with respect to official languages in Canada. Moreover, the University of Ottawa is well positioned as Canada's university to support the bilingualism initiatives of the federal public service and provide skilled bilingual prospective employees.

We thank you for your attention and we would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

• (0920)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Clément.

We will now proceed with questions and comments.

Mr. Godin, the floor is yours.

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

[English]

I would like to welcome you to the committee.

[Translation]

To begin with, we received a letter dated April 26 from the Association de la presse francophone. I see that we have scheduled one hour for the minister on Thursday's agenda despite having asked that he be available for two hours. He will, therefore, be present for only one hour. So we have another hour available to us. In my opinion, I think it is important that representatives from the Association de la presse francophone appear. The members of this association want to meet with the committee with respect to the funding that has been eliminated.

I asked the minister this question yesterday and he told me that there had been no cutback. However, this is completely contradictory to the comments that we have been receiving with respect to this issue. I would recommend that representatives from this association meet with us so that we can discuss the situation. If we have some time, perhaps we could discuss this matter later on.

The Chair: We had planned to discuss Mr. Gourde's motion during the first hour, on Thursday.

We have one hour with the Minister of Canadian Heritage, but prior to that, we have 1 hour and 40 minutes to discuss Mr. Gourde's motion. He served notice of the motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Tomorrow, we should discuss this organization that wants to meet with us.

The Chair: Fine.

Mr. Yvon Godin: He does not know what to do with the Roadmap.

[English]

I'm sorry we were not at your annual meeting in Montreal, but I think you understand there was a leadership convention in Toronto and it was pretty hard not to be there. We did send some people to attend, but we wanted to be there.

[Translation]

Ms. Kenny, representatives from the FCFA as well as the QCGN are recommending that there be another Roadmap or that it continue. You are saying that this has been positive. Although it may not have yielded all of the desired results, you feel that it would be positive to continue the Roadmap. Is that accurate, Ms. Kenny?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: Yes, indeed we do.

Moreover, we are recommending that the three components I alluded to, namely our space, our population and our development, be more aligned with the Strategic Community Plan.

I will let the representatives from QCGN respond, but I think that they too have gone through this priority-setting exercise. Since we have each set priorities for ourselves, we felt that it would be important that a new Roadmap be in line with the priorities of each community.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Burke, do you wish to add something to this matter?

[English]

Mr. Noel Burke: I would add that the work that has been accomplished through the previous road map has enabled us to come to a climax this year with the establishment of priorities among the various English-speaking communities of Quebec. That's a challenge we have met, and it's incumbent on the government to continue that support, because I think we're going across a threshold that will make a very successful and sustainable community for us. We're convinced of that. So we would absolutely support the continuation and renewal of the road map.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Godin: The representatives from the University of Ottawa are also in favour of this. I know that you did in fact state this. Nevertheless, this bears repeating because we still do not know whether or not this will occur. I truly would like to know how you feel with respect to this situation. You are therefore in favour of another Roadmap?

Mr. Richard Clément: That is correct. The Roadmap is an action plan, but it is also a financial plan that is absolutely crucial if we are to continue this initiative.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Let us now talk about the Roadmap.

You have certainly heard from people reporting on what has been going on in these meetings. Representatives from various organizations and communities have told us that they had not been consulted about the Roadmap. I am not referring to you, as a national organization, but rather to the communities themselves.

Would you agree with these community representatives? Last week, certain individuals from the north told us clearly that they had not been consulted. It has also been said here—and I would like to hear your thoughts on the matter—that the government expected our committee to hold the consultations and felt that this would be adequate. Would you agree?

• (0925)

Ms. Marie-France Kenny: As far as the next Roadmap goes, I completely agree with you, we were not consulted. As far as we know, no members of the FCFA or the Leaders' Forum were formally consulted.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Do you think it would be necessary to meet with communities if there were another Roadmap? That is fundamental, we must work with communities.

How can the government work with communities, whether we are talking about francophones outside Quebec, Acadians or anglophones within Quebec, if they have not been consulted?

Ms. Marie-France Kenny: Without a doubt, we must be consulted. Such consultation is essential so we can work together in order to align both government priorities and those of the communities and ensure that the next Roadmap meets their needs. Frankly, we are in the best position to do so since we are on the ground. In both cases, we deliver the services. It follows that we are aware of needs on the ground. In our opinion, it is essential that we be consulted. I am not talking about the FCFA, but rather the network.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Ms. Martin-Laforge, what do you have to say?
[English]

Ms. Sylvia Martin-Laforge: Our president asked me to answer this one.

I think a blended approach in consultation is important so that everyone understands they have been consulted. In the English-speaking community over the past many years, the connection of consultation to the road map has not always been understood. As my president said a few minutes ago, in the last year or so—and certainly with the priority-setting conference in March—in the community at large, individuals and organizations have understood better the need to work together to give a common understanding of what we want as a community. So I think the QCGN over the past years has done what it was supposed to do in getting community input on the road map.

I think the democratization of consultation needs to be continued. We have to see how we can get to the individual so those people can give input on what they need. As a result of March 24-25, we're starting to get to the level of the individual, as far as feeling that the Government of Canada has an impact with a program like the road map.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Ms. Kenny, in your brief, you discuss the importance of immigration. What do you think of the closing of immigration offices, such as the one in Moncton for example?

We know that Quebec is heavily involved in immigration. It has several representatives on site, in various countries, where the rest of Canada is not represented. With all due respect, I believe that when Quebec works on immigration, it does so in the interests of Quebec. Quebec was handed a responsibility with respect to immigration. However, when offices are being closed in Moncton or Prince Edward Island, do you believe that goes against the interests of minority francophones? I mention francophones because they are the most affected.

For example, in Prince Edward Island, there are immigration problems. The office will close and there will not even be one in Moncton. People will have to deal with the Halifax office.

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: In fact, it is our understanding that the Halifax office will also close and that everything will be centralized in Montreal. That would mean services for Atlantic Canada would be offered out of Montreal. This is of great concern to us. An Atlantic group is studying the repercussions of that decision. We will be able to provide you with further information.

Mr. Yvon Godin: It is all very well to have a roadmap, but on the ground, we seem to be going in the opposite direction.

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: Precisely, and I want to tell you that we are very concerned by the fact that when Quebec does promotion and recruits francophones, in so doing, you will agree, it is competing with us. In our case, when I arrive in Paris to promote our province and I talk about Saskatchewan, not many people raise their hand and say they know about Saskatchewan, and there are even fewer who know how to pronounce our province's name. As for Quebec, they have seven permanent staff members in the Paris office. Obviously they are strong competitors and we do not feel well represented.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Gourde, please go ahead.

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to thank the witnesses for being here this morning.

I will continue in the same vein, thanks to Mr. Godin who asked some of my questions already.

Amongst the various initiatives that were implemented under the Roadmap and that you would like to see maintained, it seems to me there are two types of initiatives. There are initiatives that respond to temporary needs and may last two, three or four years, whereas others are more permanent in nature, such as educational initiatives. In fact, we know this is important because of students who change over the years. Certain initiatives must therefore continue.

What type of initiatives would be a priority for you? Would both types be a priority? Do you have concrete examples of new initiatives that should be longer-term and initiatives that deal with other specific problems? In the latter case, once those problems have been resolved, we could then move on to other initiatives. What is your view of all of this?

• (0930)

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: Actually, I said so in my presentation. We would not like to see current initiatives suddenly stop on March 31, 2013. There are certain initiatives, and consultation is important for them, which have a certain momentum and that we must pursue.

However, there are other priorities too. You know, things change over five years, and this is why it is important for all sectors. As you stated, a great deal has been invested in early childhood. If all this suddenly ended in 2013, all will have been for naught. We will not have the capacity to continue to fund these initiatives. Communities can certainly not do it on their own. We will have to drop certain activities and launch others. This is why these consultations are so important.

[English]

Mr. Noel Burke: I'll answer the question generally and then ask Sylvia to add some specific examples.

I think what we've achieved in the establishment of these six priorities allows us to provide a framework for sustainable projects over time that we hope would actually become self-sustainable, that are not dependent on government forever.

An example like access to services in English is an issue for rural Quebecers as much as it is for residents of the Montreal area. That access is in different ways, so by providing those priorities and inviting community organizations and members who promote and propose projects, if they're in the context of these six priorities, we feel that has sustainability over time.

We see local initiatives and local organizations that are member organizations proposing projects that could be funded privately, publicly, provincially, or federally, but they may have short-term advantages. We're suggesting, and the community has agreed with us at our conference, that they must be in the context of these six, so that art and entertainment or art and culture projects are not just for the sake of the promotion of art, but also must, in some way, promote access to services, community development, economic prosperity, etc.

Perhaps Sylvia might have a specific example or two of the experience over the last road map.

Ms. Sylvia Martin-Laforge: I think if I just leave you with the example of health and social services, the work that has been done in the area of health is paramount to everyone in our community. Will it ever end? Will there ever be a need to disengage from that? Some of the consultations with the province would tell us that while they are supportive of access to English for our community, there needs to be leverage, so leverage is always important to the English-speaking community.

[Translation]

The Chair: I believe Ms. Bossé would like to add something.

Ms. Suzanne Bossé (Director General, Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne du Canada): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to add that Mr. Gourde's question must also refer to true equality. In certain areas, I don't think we can say that francophone and Acadian communities have achieved equality. We're not there yet. More specifically, Mr. Godin mentioned immigration. The fact is, in the last budget, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration eliminated the financial support that allowed communities to go out and promote and recruit, which is certainly a major setback for us. In some areas, we have achieved various levels of development. At this time, we have certainly not reached the level of equality that would meet the government's priorities. We will certainly need continued support to move to the next level and truly reinforce all the successes of the last 10 or 20 years that allowed us to achieve the current Roadmap.

• (0935)

Mr. Jacques Gourde: Would you like the broader consultation by the department to take place in your province and within your organizations, or in Ottawa? What is your vision of this consultation?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: For us what counts the most is that there is a consultation. Whether it take place on Skype, through videoconferencing, in person in Ottawa, or through a tour of communities, does not matter to us. We are prepared to sit down with Heritage Canada and request that the consultation be done in an effective and efficient manner. We agree that there is no need to spend millions of dollars on this consultation. We would rather spend millions of dollars for the next Roadmap rather than on a consultation. There are several ways to consult and we are prepared to sit down with the department and discuss the least costly and the most effective ways of going about it.

Mr. Jacques Gourde: Thank you.

Ms. Suzanne Bossé: There are, among others, the 43 organizations of the Leaders Forum that Heritage Canada, who is responsible for coordinating the Roadmap, could meet with over one or two days. That is an inexpensive possibility. More and more departments are having online consultations, which allow people within communities to make presentations and send briefs.

[English]

The Chair: Okay. Merci.

Mr. Burke?

Mr. Noel Burke: I'd like to make a brief response, if I may.

The Chair: You may, just briefly.

Mr. Noel Burke: I neglected to mention earlier, as one of the members mentioned their inability to attend, that your chair, Mr. Chong, attended our consultations in March and was very welcome.

The community is attended to by elected officials of governments of any stripe and level as the first and most important step to help clarify misperceptions about the community. The English-speaking community in Quebec is a vibrant and vital community. Montreal is not a place of privilege in which the English-speaking community has access to everything.

You are more than welcome at any time.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Bélanger.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Ladies and gentlemen, good morning.

First of all, I would like to tell you that this is my last session at the Standing Committee on Official Languages. Someone will soon be taking my place.

You know, I have now spent 17 years in Parliament. I have always been associated one way or another with the Standing Committee on Official Languages. One thing I always liked about this committee, was that when we got here, we set aside our partisan hats and worked together quite closely in order to help our communities. Over the last year, the atmosphere has completely changed. I now feel forced to keep my partisan hat on when arriving at the committee. This is most unpleasant.

Over the last year, we have been conducting this useless study of the Roadmap. In fact, we are doing Heritage Canada's job. They did not even have the courage to tell us that when we were starting. They waited until February when we had already done two-thirds of the work.

All this is to say that I had hoped to leave on a positive note and show you a short video. Unfortunately, that will not happen, but I shall certainly share it with my colleagues. I wanted you to see this video because it shows positive things that were accomplished under the Action Plan and the Roadmap. That video was filmed in March by about 40 interns at the Montfort Hospital. They came from across the country and were studying health at Ottawa University and the Cité collégiale. We do hope they will go home and help their communities. This is the product, the fruit if you will, of a few programs managed by the Department of Health and the Consortium national de formation en santé under the Roadmap. I am happy to share it with those who wish to see it.

On that note, Mr. Clément, I noted your recommendations. Thank you.

• (0940)

[*English*]

Mr. Burke, I will visit. I won't wait for the committee to go, because it's not likely to travel, with this attitude, but I certainly have and will continue to visit communities in the English communities in Quebec,

[*Translation*]

and francophone communities.

I would like to come back from time to time to replace the person who is taking my chair.

I would like to continue by expressing another of my major concerns, if you will permit. For that matter, Mr. Godin partly raised it.

By the way, Mr. Godin, according to my information, 19 offices will close across the country and the number of regions will drop from 5 to 3. The Quebec office will merge with the Maritime provinces' offices. The Ontario office will stay open, whereas the Prairies provinces and British Columbia's offices will merge. I heard that the Vancouver office may be moved to Calgary. We wonder why, but time will tell.

On the issue of immigration, I know that we have gone from 1,500 people to about 1,600 or 1,700 people per year in our communities.

Out of 200,000 immigrants or more per year, do you believe this number is sufficient, Ms. Kenny?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: No I do not believe so. I would like to comment on that issue. I believe you obtained your numbers from the mid-term status report on the Roadmap. We have analyzed these numbers and we certainly challenge them.

First of all, let me state that these numbers are based on the mother tongue. According to these numbers, there was an increase of 100 people over two years in our communities. However, in 2006, 13% of our communities were made up of immigrants and that proportion has not ceased growing since then. Given all of the initiatives to promote recruitment, we definitely challenge those numbers.

Perhaps we should be measuring the first official language spoken. For example, if a person arriving in our community is of Arab origin, that person's mother tongue would be Arabic. However, that person's first official language is often French and that is what should be measured. We will be able to do so as of 2011.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: In the previous Parliament, the committee did some very good work examining the whole issue of immigration. If we do nothing, the country will become increasingly polarized, that is to say fewer francophone immigrants outside of Quebec and most francophone immigrants moving to Quebec. Over the next 20 years, that will lead to greater polarization and we all know what that can mean.

Unless I'm mistaken, the target had been set at 4.4% by 2021. But that is what we presently have. In the meantime, we are at barely 1.8%. Only Manitoba is aiming for 7% in order to reestablish a certain balance.

Do you have any comments about that?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: There is no national target. When the committee did its study, we actually recommended there be a national target, that is to say a national strategy.

The other thing I must tell you is that we learned that the Destination Canada initiative that allowed us to recruit and promote francophone communities has been abolished. That was a Roadmap initiative. That initiative has been reduced by \$600,000. So, travel will no longer be paid for people from provinces and communities in order to—

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: Excuse me. Are you telling me that funding for Destination Canada, that communities came here to praise, is being cut?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: At Destination Canada, funding for people travelling from communities and provinces has been cut. You understand that provinces received money to fund travel for people from communities.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: I still have 1 minute and 14 seconds.

I thought Minister Moore said in the House that no funding would be cut from the Roadmap and you congratulated him about that.

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: And—

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: And now you're telling me there are some.

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: That is what we learned. We are trying to meet with Minister Kenney to clarify the situation. We have a meeting set up with Minister Moore this week. So, we are certainly trying to clear this up.

However, I can tell you that we are very concerned. On the one hand, we were told that investments in the Roadmap would not be reduced, but on the other hand, we have now learned that investments in the Roadmap are effectively being cut.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: Do not be surprised. That department, as well as the cabinet, has a tendency to mislead the population. Just look at what happened with the F-35s.

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: If I may say so, Mr. Bélanger, we have set the target at 4.4%. That involves not only communities, but also Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

Through these cutbacks in Destination Canada's expenses, we have just lost—

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: This is something that should be followed, madam.

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: —the only funding that allowed us to do recruiting and promotion.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: Thank you.

I still have 10 seconds. So I will tell you that I shall continue to be involved and to keep an eye on these files.

I wish you good luck in your efforts.

Thank you.

• (0945)

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: Thank you, Mr. Bélanger.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bélanger.

Mr. Trottier, the floor is yours.

Mr. Bernard Trottier (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to thank our guests for being here this morning.

I think your testimony is very important and I do not consider this committee's work to be useless. This is important work. It would be a mistake for the committee not to study the issue of the Roadmap, because I think it is the most important work the Standing Committee on Official Languages can do, that is to launch a long-term plan. We discussed it with the minister. It is precisely because the Roadmap is a long-term plan that its expenditures were not

reduced. According to the testimony of several of our witnesses, often, it is not known if the funds are from the Roadmap or from the departments themselves. So, that may be the problem. We will never apologize for trying to save money when providing government services.

I had some questions for the Ottawa University representatives. I studied there myself in the past. I think you are doing wonderful work. This is a very special experience within Canada. Are other universities in the world doing this type of work?

Although the experience in Canada, as a bilingual country, is quite unique in creating this climate of closeness between the linguistic communities, there are other countries in the world, such as Belgium, Switzerland or even certain Eastern European countries, with more than one language. Do you have contacts with those universities in other countries of the world in order to share this experience?

Mr. Richard Clément: Yes, we are in constant communication. I mentioned our relationship with the European Centre for Modern Languages in Graz. In fact, it was created as a result of the Council of Europe's language policies. Through the centre, we maintain relationships with 37 European countries that work on the same principle.

Currently, there are few universities offering a bilingual education like us. The University of Fribourg is one example that comes to mind. We have invited representatives of this university on several different occasions to come and speak to us about their experience. Obviously, it is a completely different context. Even if our relationship with them is one allowing for the transfer of knowledge, even at that level, the context limits the extent to which we can transfer that knowledge. The legal context of languages is completely different.

Mr. Bernard Trottier: I see the supply side exists. This means that there are youth and management training programs. But, where is the demand coming from? What is stopping the demand? Why are people not enrolling in bilingual training programs? What is preventing them from doing that?

I imagine that there is a constant desire for economic progress. However, is it also love for the other language? What can government do to generate love? It is always difficult for the government to determine how to generate that love, but that is the real issue. Do you agree with me that this is the impetus behind the demand for language studies?

Mr. Richard Clément: I do agree, all the more so because I have spent a good part of my career as a researcher repeating that to all and sundry. Obviously, how useful a language is plays a role for many people.

Ultimately, the ones who learn more than the basics and retain that language, the ones who keep up their skills, will be those who find other reasons to be interested. I believe that this involves integration to some extent, a desire to communicate with members of that other group and to become like those who can speak that other language by sharing their culture.

How can we create that kind of situation? I think it is a matter of interaction between groups and mutual appreciation. There needs to be interaction in an equal and pleasant environment that will lead to positive relationships. There are some federal programs that do this. For example, programs that allow students to travel across Canada and live in a second-language setting.

Mr. Bernard Trottier: For students taking part in exchange programs, has the trend over the past five years been to do not all, but perhaps just part of their studies in the second language? Is the trend going up or down?

• (0950)

Mr. Richard Clément: In our opinion, there is a clear and constant increase. We are talking about francophile students, meaning anglophones who come to us and take part in our immersion programs.

As a result, it is clear that our intake capacity is under significant pressure. Furthermore, the immersion program funding is indirectly provided by the federal government through, in this case, an agreement with Ontario. So, with more funding, we could increase our capacity.

Second-language acquisition can also be a by-product, meaning without the language being the focus of the studies. The best way to learn another language is when a subject other than the language interests you. For example, you could learn another language—say, French—by studying history. So thanks to an interest in history, someone might learn the other language.

This is how we motivate students to not only maintain their language skills but also improve them.

Mr. Bernard Trottier: During your presentation, you talked more about working with the Réseau interaméricain de formation en langues.

As you know, our foreign policy is turning increasingly toward the Americas. I think that South and Central American countries have long been ignored but we are showing an increasing interest in them now.

What economic, cultural or social advantages or educational opportunities are available to young Canadians who wish to work with Latin American countries? Having this linguistic knowledge furthers Canadian solidarity. How can we encourage young people to get interested in learning languages?

Mr. Richard Clément: Other than learning French and English, young people are increasingly interested in learning a third or fourth language. This fact is clearly evidenced by various programs at the University of Ottawa.

Our relationship with South America heavily favours the learning of Portuguese and Spanish. Our young people are very interested. The fact that this allows them to travel, for example, is also an incredible advantage. Everyone wants to travel. Language, again, is learned as a by-product of one's interest in learning more about others during travel, which keeps them motivated.

The Chair: Thank you.

We will now take a short break.

[English]

We'll take a brief break for two minutes.

- _____ (Pause) _____
-
- (0955)

[Translation]

The Chair: We will now continue with the 39th meeting of the Standing Committee on Official Languages.

[English]

We will continue with the 39th meeting of the Standing Committee on Official Languages, beginning with Mr. Williamson.

Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC): Thank you.

I thought it was back to the opposition.

[Translation]

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[English]

My question is actually a clarification or perhaps to have more insight from the Quebec Community Groups Network.

Did I understand, Mr. Burke, that the eventual goal of your group is to not rely on the federal government for support or resources but to also begin to seek funding from the private sector? Did I understand that correctly? I'm curious. Can you elaborate a bit and tell me what your plans might be for that?

Mr. Noel Burke: The point might be more about relying exclusively on the federal government...seeking out support and resources from other ventures.

Speaking for myself, and this is not something we've discussed at the board, although people are aware of it, some of the preparatory work that has been done around the notion of social economy is very interesting to us—I know it is interesting to other groups and parties as well—and that's the ability for private concerns to be advantaged by engaging in the social economy formula, whereby they invest and get repaid over time. We are interested in exploring that, and also, to put it in a delicate way, to look at improving our relations with the provincial government as well.

It's less about not having any reliance.... I'd rather put it as not having any partnership with the federal government but diversifying our resources and partnership with other agencies, whether they be provincial government or private interest.

But the social economy formula is a very interesting concept.

Mr. John Williamson: Sure. That's wise.

[Translation]

I would also like to ask the representative of the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne du Canada what she thinks about this plan. Do you believe this plan would be useful to you?

•(1000)

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: To say that the government will no longer have to be accountable one day is not the issue.

Mr. John Williamson: To go back to Mr. Burke's answer, it would be a partnership, with some federal government funding.

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: We are already working on diversifying our funds. Obviously, federal funds constitute, for us, leverage at the provincial and local levels, and even with the private sector. The difficulty stems from the fact that we are far from achieving any real equality. The day that we do, we will be able to tell everyone that we are closing shop and going home. I am not convinced that this will happen in my lifetime. We have had official languages legislation for 42 years and yet people are still not complying with it. I am not sure that I will live long enough to see that, but I hope it happens faster than I think it will. With regard to the official languages, we see some momentum with the Action Plan and the Roadmap, etc., however, investments in this area still need to be made.

Ms. Suzanne Bossé: The social economy model we are talking about here requires various winning conditions in order to truly be successful. Each of the partners, be it in the private sector or at the municipal or community level, needs to have the capacity to enter into the partnership.

Currently, at the community level, the Roadmap seeks to strengthen the associative network. There was very minor additional support and that was the partnership models. In terms of immigration, we have 13 networks that have managed to bring together 250 partners. However, in order to bring them together and get them to consult and coordinate their activities, we will need more resources, and this reinforcement is still essential.

Mr. John Williamson: Do I have any time left?

The Chair: You do not have any time left.

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

Ms. Éline Michaud (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, NDP): Good day and welcome to all the witnesses. Thank you for appearing before the committee.

Before I get to my questions, I want to make two brief comments. First, in response to Mr. Trottier, if the Roadmap was so important to this government and if the committee's work was essential to developing a long-term plan for our communities, we should have been told well before the fact that the committee's work would be used to assess the Roadmap. Since some groups were not aware of the direction the committee's work would take, they have not been able to present all the information they would have liked to present and they probably did not make their testimony as effective and as relevant as it could have been for our purposes. I object to that.

Second, I was shocked and disappointed to learn that some measures in the Roadmap are being abolished, contrary to what the government proudly announced. I find that objectionable too. I am thinking of Destination Canada and the fact that travel is no longer paid. Just a few short meetings ago, some northern communities came to talk to us about their difficulties in implementing various measures, programs and initiatives due to that very thing: the cost of

travel. These groups are subject to more significant constraints. I am certain that other groups also experience similar constraints.

Destination Canada is a program that provides many benefits to communities regarding the renewal of their activities, among other things. I find the cuts to this program extremely unfortunate too. Like with everything else, we are getting information in dribs and drabs. At the very least, I hope that we will soon be told the extent of the damages so that we can react accordingly and help the development of all the communities, both the anglophone communities in Quebec and the francophone communities outside Quebec.

Following my little editorial remarks, I now want to get to your presentation, Ms. Kenny. You told us about the importance of properly defining the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders involved in implementing a new government strategy. That is, in fact, important, but do you think it is enough to ensure sufficient involvement by all stakeholders at the various levels?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: I will let my colleague respond.

Ms. Suzanne Bossé: Thank you for your question.

It is quite clear. In the implementation of the current Roadmap, there is horizontal work that is not being done. I will again use immigration because it is an excellent example of this. There is a steering committee involving federal departments, provincial governments and the communities. It is quite clear that, within the federal departments sitting on this committee, that there is a lack of cooperation and coordination regarding the work. I am talking about the departments responsible for health, immigration, human resources development and so on.

The current challenge concerns the horizontal work and the way it should be happening, meaning governmental and interdepartmental cooperation and the importance of aligning the provincial governments with the federal departments. There is a strategic plan to promote francophone immigration and this work is not being done. We want the next Roadmap to clearly set out the management and accountability framework.

•(1005)

Ms. Éline Michaud: Thank you.

To refresh my memory, the FCFA was among the groups consulted during the mid-term assessment of the Roadmap. Is that correct?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: Yes, there were online consultations and sectoral round tables, essentially, in which our federation was invited to participate.

Ms. Éline Michaud: In the course of your interventions and discussions with Heritage Canada, did the latter indicate to you at any time its intentions regarding the use of our committee's work to assess the Roadmap?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: On February 19, we learned that testimony here and your study would be used as consultations for the next Roadmap.

Ms. Éline Michaud: After your appearance, naturally.

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: Yes, after our appearance.

Ms. Éloise Michaud: Would it have been useful, in your opinion, to know the purpose of the committee's work prior to your appearance?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: Yes, but I dare say that it could hardly be considered a consultation. Consulting the FCFA is not enough to learn the opinion of all the members of the Leaders' Forum and the 43 organizations who came to meet with you.

Ms. Éloise Michaud: I completely agree.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Michaud and Ms. Kenny.

Mr. Boughen, you have the floor.

[English]

Mr. Ray Boughen (Palliser, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

May I add my voice of welcome to my colleagues in sharing with you part of the morning. We're glad this panel has been assembled.

Before I ask a question of the panel, let me say to Mr. Bélanger, I wish you well in your endeavours, wherever they may be.

Chair, we served together on DND a few years ago and we thoroughly enjoyed each other's company, I do believe, so best of luck to you, sir, wherever it is your travels take you.

I hear the panel saying collectively that the road map is the way to travel. I guess I would ask you to respond to the question, should the road map be revamped? Are there some detours that were in place that we had to work around? Is there a better approach?

I heard about workshops. Should that be part and parcel of the new road map if in fact it is framed the way it has been? Perhaps you could share with us your thoughts on those observations.

Ms. Marie-France Kenny: Part of our recommendation was to have a *tableau de bord*. I'm sorry, I am a translator, and believe it or not, I can't think of the—

A voice: Dashboard.

Ms. Marie-France Kenny: Thank you—a dashboard.

We know where the investments are coming from. Right now in the road map there are investments that are recurring. For example, the centre for leadership excellence, or something like it, involves Treasury Board salaries, which will be paid whether we have a road map or not. So these are recurring funds.

In my last conversation with Minister Moore, he said there were quite a bit of those in there. Those should not be part of the road map. These are investments the government will be making whether or not we have a road map. They will be paying the salaries of the Treasury Board Secretariat.

The other thing is that we don't know which programs are being funded. Health Canada, for example, might have had program Y. It no longer exists now as part of the road map, so is it a new investment? Is it something that we just took and put in the road map? We don't know.

Having this dashboard would tell us by departments, by year, what programs we are funding under the road map, because right now it's hard to make out where the money is coming from.

The other thing we think it should include is accountability on the part of the government and the community on where the money is going, what the progress indicators are on establishing goals and seeing how we meet those goals.

Mind you, with that comes the fact that we don't have at the base the capacity right now to do this work, so we need to build on the capacity of the associations that are already providing the services of the road map. So there are three—lots of recommendations for you.

It doesn't mean it wasn't successful. We just need to build on that success.

• (1010)

Mr. Ray Boughen: Thank you.

Mr. Noel Burke: Part of our ambition in establishing the six priorities that we mentioned earlier... While first they seem vague, in fact they're intended to be door openers to allow for the notion of interdepartmental funding of communities, and to allow communities to express themselves in a holistic way. Rather than refining, or should I say confining, ourselves to sectoral compartments like health, education, and other areas, it's to see us in a larger perspective. That seems to have had a good response from administrators of government departments—that interest in functioning more interdepartmentally and looking at the support of communities in a more holistic way than targeted specific projects, although they still would continue to exist.

I think an acknowledgement of a framework that's more open-ended is beneficial. It provides a win-win scenario for both the communities and the funding agencies.

I don't know if Sylvia has anything to add.

Ms. Sylvia Martin-Laforge: One last thing. While we're scoping out for the large priorities, there is still a need to scope back in to see if there are initiatives in one or two or other of the departments that the departments could take on, on behalf of the English-speaking community for a five-year stretch.

We feel that both on the *Plan d'action* that preceded the road map and in the road map, we haven't been able to come with certain departments to have incubator projects that could give us some inclination and some evidence around five years—what could be done in the next five years. We need incubator projects in the next road map, should there be one, to give us some specific information.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Benskin.

Mr. Tyrone Benskin (Jeanne-Le Ber, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

I want to welcome all the representatives of these organizations.

[English]

I have to say—again, being the newbie—that I'm a bit concerned, a bit disturbed, at what I'm hearing. Canada is an English/French, French/English country. When I hear words like “equality” and “minority” within the French and the English communities here, I'm bothered. For me, a minority language in this country is Jamaican patois or Creole. Those are minority languages.

So for me, when we use terminology like that...and I think it's evidenced by the fact that we have to have something like the road map to support so-called minority languages across this country. For me, French is French is French.

I think one of the mistakes we're making is that we are looking at it in a linguistic context. Our visitors from the University of Ottawa are talking about how students are coming to learn a language, which is wonderful; it's great. I spent a year in South Africa, which has 11 official languages. Watching a newscast in Cape Town is a really exciting experience. But that's learning a language.

I think what we're talking about here—and I'm repeating myself from my previous meeting—is culture, with language being an extension of those cultures. That's what I believe the English community is fighting for—for lack of a better way of putting it—within Quebec. The French communities outside of Quebec are doing the same thing.

Mr. Trottier mentioned how we can get people to love the other language. I think the issue is taking the fear factor out. We have two groups here that are representing two supposedly minority languages, and what I'm reading is fear—fear about survival. The Acadians, who have always been members of Canada, are fighting for survival. The anglophone community in Quebec is fighting for survival.

I think we need to take it out of the context of simple language and really start dealing with the culture and the messages that are sent. When, for example—and I hate to put the partisan hat on, but I'm going to for 30 seconds—a unilingual Supreme Court judge or Auditor General is hired, it sends a message to that community that they're not important enough.

I'm going to stop, get off my soap box a bit, and ask each of you to respond to that, if you will, starting with our colleagues from Ottawa.

• (1015)

Prof. Richard Clément: Thank you.

It's an important question indeed. As I said earlier, you can't learn a language without the cultural content. It's simply impossible. Down in the classroom, the language teacher has to use the cultural content to convey the language and also to maintain the students' motivation. I fundamentally agree with you that the cultural aspect is important.

But at the same time, what we have is a situation, particularly among minority language communities, where that cultural content may become eroded as a result of contact with the other group, and that requires measures—cultural measures, if you will—that will counterbalance that situation.

That has been the reality that all minority language communities have been facing for years and years, not in an antagonistic manner, but really in a protective manner. One would hope that as a result of protecting that culture in a minority situation, those people will be able to go towards the other culture in a more assured manner and have links—positive links, harmonious links—with the majority groups.

Mr. Noel Burke: I guess we always have to be aware. I'll speak from my experience in the education sector, particularly with

immersion programming in Quebec. We always have to be aware of the unintended consequences. For example, heavy immersion programs in English schools in Quebec have rendered the English population functionally bilingual by the time they finish high school. That's something we're very proud of, and it's also a necessity if we want our children to live and work in Quebec. This is a reality.

The unintended consequences are that in heavy immersion programs, as my colleague mentioned, you can't divorce language from culture. Even though we cannot clearly define what English-speaking culture is, whatever it was is eroded because what comes with immersion teaching is the culture and the literary context. We have to be cautious about those unintended consequences.

I want to celebrate, though, your comments about culture being important. When we actually share and promote culture in both communities, we find that those perceived barriers don't really exist at all. For example, we had an anglophone group performing at the Jean Baptiste festivities in Montreal a couple of years ago. Some of the old frictions just didn't exist anymore.

I think what you are saying is that it is important to support culture, of which language is a part, even though it is not the principal element.

Ms. Marie-France Kenny: I agree with both of my colleagues.

What I would like to talk about is the question of fear. On the one hand, there is the fear of losing one's identity. That's why I talked a bit earlier about this dialogue we need to establish between all components of this society. Of course, I want to speak French and raise my kids in French, and I want everybody in this country to be bilingual. But I don't want to take away from my English neighbour. On the other hand, just because somebody in Quebec wants to speak English, some fear that we want to anglicize all of Quebec. I don't believe this is the case, but this fear is there. That's why we need to establish this dialogue.

I read blogs and letters to the editors complaining about francophones outside Quebec requesting to get their fine in French—and I don't because I don't get fines—or anglophones in Quebec getting something and people criticizing. This is not what linguistic duality is about. Linguistic duality is about me and my right. My English neighbour who doesn't speak a word of French, doesn't care about French, and doesn't want to learn French understands that I have this need to raise my kids in French, and he is a champion of linguistic duality, even though he will never learn the language. That's what we need to work on as a society.

With regard to culture, there's an interesting study that was done by Rodrigue Landry's institute. It's called "*Petite enfance et autonomie culturelle*", and it talks about the three pillars of community.

• (1020)

[*Translation*]

She is talking about the institutional completeness and social proximity. This is a study on early childhood that addresses the importance of love for the language over just learning the language for educational purposes.

The Chair: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Trottier, you have the floor.

Mr. Bernard Trottier: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My questions are for Ms. Kenny and Ms. Bossé.

In fact we have already met outside of this committee and you know that I am from a minority linguistic community. My family and I still live in a minority situation in the beautiful city of Toronto. I think that you could share your experiences with us.

My question concerns the priorities. Surely there will be another Roadmap. It is still possible that there might not be one, but I think that our minister has made a commitment in that regard and that based on all the witnesses who have appeared before this committee, it is working well. In other words, this long-term funding approach along with departmental coordination is generating positive results.

With regard to the next Roadmap, I know that it is always a difficult decision for the francophone communities outside Quebec, but if we had to pick between early childhood, education, arts and culture, economic development, health care services and seniors' services, should we, in your opinion, focus on one of these areas over the others?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: I think that Mr. Burke said it earlier. We can certainly have priorities but we must not forget the rest. In my mind, true equality stems from all of these areas. Some priorities that are missing, namely young people, are extremely important.

Mr. Bernard Trottier: Tell us about that, please.

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: Economic development—you talked about this—is extremely important. As is early childhood, obviously. There is also the whole issue of immigrant intake and settlement.

I live in Saskatchewan, but the same phenomenon is happening in Alberta. Many people are leaving one province and coming to mine because we are in the midst of an economic boom. Our job market is doing better than it is in some other provinces. There is the whole issue of immigrant intake and settlement. It is like having a plant and saying you are only going to feed one of the leaves. Obviously if you feed just one leaf the entire plant will die. We need to really look at the continuum of services from the start, or better yet, from before birth until death.

Mr. Bernard Trottier: Ms. Bossé, do you have anything to add?

Ms. Suzanne Bossé: I would like to talk mainly about the continuum. No preschoolers will learn French in places where there is a language transfer, if the parents are unemployed or do not have access to cultural events or if their health is poor. We cannot break up the continuum in saying that, this year or for five years, we will make health care and economic development the priorities, but we will not invest in education or young people, for example.

• (1025)

Mr. Bernard Trottier: What is your view of the coordination between the federal and provincial governments? Education falls under provincial jurisdiction, as does health care. Can the federal government intervene by implementing projects outside of what the province is already doing? Should we invest more money with or through the province? What is your view as a minority linguistic community?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: I must tell you that this is very troubling. There are transfers for health, immigration or many other areas, but without any knowledge of what is set out in the provisions on language. When the government transfers funding, it also transfers responsibilities but it keeps some responsibility. It transfers a portion of its responsibilities and it must make sure that the provincial government uses those funds to meet its obligations under the act, but it remains accountable all the same.

In reading the minutes of the committee meetings, I have learned that some provincial departments are getting a cheque for francophone education and that they are spending it on other priorities that do not necessarily fall under francophone education. This is extremely troubling. At present, not only is the federal government failing to meet its obligations under the act, but the province is too. When it comes to the transfer payments, we must first ensure that there is a very clear linguistic clause. If money is given to a province for francophone immigration, that is what it must go to.

The federal government says that the situation with the provinces is not always easy. It is not easy either for a francophone community that has to fight to get a portion of the funding it should have gotten to be told that there are more Ukrainians than francophones in the province. I think it is unacceptable for the money to go elsewhere. I have nothing against Ukrainian, but it is not an official language like French.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Dionne Labelle, you have the floor.

Mr. Pierre Dionne Labelle (Rivière-du-Nord, NDP): Thank you.

I find Mr. Trottier's concern interesting, but the question he asked you is whether you prefer to be educated in French or receive medical care in English, or receive care in French and be educated in English. You answered that the vitality of a francophone community is expressed as a whole and in many dimensions. One of the important dimensions is demographics. Given our demographic difficulties, we need foreigners to come and be part of this community. That is why immigration issues are extremely important. They are in Quebec, where there are not enough babies to ensure our survival, and they are surely important to you as well.

You talked about immigration and the integration of people in francophone communities as a national priority. I would like you to tell us more about this. How important is this issue in the Roadmap?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: Destination Canada is the only way we have of recruiting and promoting francophone and Acadian communities. Many people think Destination Canada is limited to Paris and Brussels, but that is not the case. It also allows employers, provinces and communities to go to Tunisia, for example, to recruit workers such as welders. I myself participated in the last edition of Destination Canada. It is our only means of promotion and recruitment.

Earlier, I talked about the competition from Quebec. It is healthy competition, but they have more resources than we do. Six or seven people from Quebec live in Paris permanently to do recruitment. When I arrive in Paris, I'm not told that I am Fransaskoise. People talk to me about Quebec, poutine, woven sashes and Céline Dion. That is the truth. When I tell them that I am Fransaskoise, they don't know what a Fransaskois is. It is the same thing for Alberta and the Northwest Territories. I have to fight a predominant presence to recruit people who will come to live in our communities.

Destination Canada works. I told you I was at the last edition. Over 1,500 jobs were offered in francophone and Acadian communities and we were recruiting on site. They say there were 100 from 2006 to 2008. I admit I find the numbers startling. I don't know why we talked about them, but those numbers are not realistic.

In our province, there is a very strong Moroccan community and many people come from the Ivory Coast. The number of people who have arrived over the past five years is probably much higher than 100. I talked about a percentage of 13% coming from immigration. It is one of the only tools we have and it has just been taken away from us, even though the government says there is a target. I interviewed Minister Kenney and he told me that the target remains the same, except that we no longer have the means to reach that target. It is therefore very difficult for us to reach it and that is why we are asking questions and trying to meet the minister.

•(1030)

Mr. Pierre Dionne Labelle: Without immigration, will franco-phone communities outside Quebec survive?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: No.

Many schools, just in eastern Ontario, would be closed today if it weren't for immigration.

Mr. Pierre Dionne Labelle: Thank you.

Your suggestions are interesting. You talked about learning both official languages at no cost. Quebec's students would be pleased to hear that. You also talked about subcontracting. You said that the Official Languages and Bilingualism Institute would become the government's reference for training its public servants, now that it no longer wants to train them internally.

I think your suggestion has some merit, if the government is planning to privatize English or French courses. I hope it won't be done using just any linguistic institutes, where the language learned is what's commonly spoken, whereas our public service needs to learn a much more specialized French. I'd like to hear your thoughts on this.

Mr. Richard Clément: We already play that role a bit, but we do it less for the public service for historic reasons. Our goal is not necessarily to corner the market, but to coordinate it. It is a function the institute has been fulfilling under other aspects for a few years now. We would just like to extend the institute's scope by using our skills towards that end.

You are absolutely correct. Public servants need a type of language skills that are adapted to their duties. The curriculum must allow them to increase their skills. I think institutes that are part of universities have the necessary knowledge to do that type of work.

The Chair: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Gourde, you have the floor.

Mr. Jacques Gourde: My question is for the University of Ottawa's representative, given his studies.

I think awareness of linguistic duality in our country will improve from generation to generation. I come from a unilingual francophone family and I have a basic knowledge of English. However, I asked my children to take the time to learn English because it was important. I brought them movies in English, which allowed them to learn the language. They are now teenagers and young adults and they almost always watch movies in English just to perfect their knowledge of the language. One of my daughters is studying languages.

In the federal public service, we have the beginning of the second generation of public servants. They are no doubt better than those of the first generation were at their age. Of the first public servants, some were bilingual, but others had to learn a second language, whether it was French or English. The young people who start in the public service now are practically all bilingual. They are better than their predecessors were and I am convinced that their children will be even better. The new generation of Canadians does not perceive a confrontation between English and French because it is naturally bilingual. Some even learn a third language, as you said earlier, such as Spanish, Portuguese, German or Mandarin, given economic development.

There are economic advantages to speaking two, three or four languages. That could encourage more young Canadians to take the time to learn another language for their career or to travel, depending on their goals and what they want to do in life. It is a clear advantage to speak two languages in Canada and to stand out in the global economic community. Canada is a gateway to francophone communities, and English, which is the language of the global economy, is also spoken here.

Is the next generation of young Canadians aware of the advantage it has in having this linguistic duality?

•(1035)

Mr. Richard Clément: You are asking me a question that would require research.

Mr. Jacques Gourde: If you could do it, that would be great.

Mr. Richard Clément: I notice that more and more young people, certainly in university, are interested not only in English and French, but also in other languages. We have a globalization and modern languages program, for example, which is extremely popular.

I completely agree with you. I think the new generation sees beyond English and French. Now, how do we promote that? It might be necessary to create a national campaign that would present Canada as a world player that has tentacles everywhere.

There isn't any promotion of that type currently, but that could be a way of doing it. The reasons we could present would certainly be very pragmatic. Young people understand that pretty quickly, but we also need to present other reasons that will sustain their motivation. As I was saying, this motivation is more about culture or integration than pragmatism.

Mr. Jacques Gourde: Other organizations of course still defend minority francophone or anglophone communities, but almost all of your members are bilingual and their children are more naturally bilingual. Given this advantage they naturally have, how do they see the future of our country?

I understand that it is important, within a community, to defend minority francophones and vice versa, but they have an advantage. Are they aware of the advantage they have in their community and the fact that they can provide other advantages to their community and to each province?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: In our communities, there is the whole issue of passing on the language. There are many families with exogamous unions, where one parent is anglophone and the other is francophone. It is very difficult. There are some myths, but I have to tell you that in a number of our communities, there are awareness campaigns that promote education in French for rights-holders.

We say that we want our children to speak English, but they will learn it on the fly from their environment. They won't need to learn it because it is spoken everywhere, at the bank, on the street, at the corner store. So education in French is important. There are awareness campaigns done provincially or locally to promote francophone schools for rights-holders, but also for immersion schools for non-rights-holders, that is anglophones.

We have already told the committee that it would be important, as was said, to have a national strategy to promote linguistic duality and to tell rights-holders across the country, in Quebec and outside it, that they have a right to education in French or in English in Quebec, that they have a right to education in the other language, in immersion or through different programs. It is important both for our youth and for young anglophones who want to learn French.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

Ms. Éline Michaud: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I have questions for the representatives of the University of Ottawa. I found your presentation very interesting. It fits with some presentations we've heard over the past weeks that mentioned, of course, the importance of research.

One of those witnesses was Mr. Éric Forgues, of the Canadian Institute for Research on Linguistic Minorities. He spoke among other things about the importance of creating a culture of research into official languages within the different levels of government.

Could you share with us your point of view on the ways the roadmap could contribute to creating that culture in a future edition?

Mr. Richard Clément: My colleague will speak after me.

In general, we could certainly promote that type of research through activities like those we always do. There is the summer university for young researchers. Of course, it could include researchers who work for the federal government or provincial governments. A number of research companies would also be interested.

There are two reasons to do that. First of all, we have to bring them to the same place for a certain number of days or perhaps a few weeks to allow them to meet, exchange information and create a national network of language skills and research into languages in all aspects of linguistic duality, including learning and maintaining it. Then, we have to bring together the most competent people in the field, the top researchers, not only Canadians, but also people who would come from elsewhere in the world.

It's a start and that is how networks are created in other fields, like history or geography. People meet regularly by creating these types of links. Obviously, regular publication of academic journals that focus on these issues requires some financial support and infrastructure.

That is what comes to mind.

• (1040)

Mr. Hilaire Lemoine (Executive in Residence, Official Languages and Bilingualism Institute, University of Ottawa):

In the past, the federal government had much greater expertise in research and analysis within its offices. In the past five to eight years, the government has lost those skills. In my opinion, it should call on research institutes to acquire that expertise.

Furthermore, I will take this opportunity to come back to Mr. Gourde's question. It is true that there are more bilingual people than in the past. However, it does not make sense to me that after 40 years, Canada still has a rate of bilingualism of 18% or 19% among young people. It really does not make sense. I think we should have set a bilingualism target a long time ago. We cover that in our document. However, we should not just set a target, because there are consequences.

First, it must be done jointly with the people responsible for the education of the people concerned in the provinces. Then, there will also have to be a change of approach in our programs. Finally, we must make young people aware of the advantages of bilingualism. I haven't seen any such campaign for a number of years.

In my opinion, we shouldn't take for granted that there's more awareness of bilingualism or that the level of bilingualism is higher in Canada than it was 15 years ago. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

Ms. Éline Michaud: My next question is for the representatives of the FCFA.

During your presentation, you told us that the Roadmap had really focused on services to citizens, as we see in different levels of government, provincially as well as federally.

If I understood correctly, you haven't received additional funding to provide those services.

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: There was a very small amount of funding.

One thing must be remembered. When initiatives are added, whether it is the Roadmap or something else, we receive money for a specific project, for example hiring a person to lead the project, but in terms of the whole administrative aspect, there is very little strengthening of our capacities.

Ms. Éloise Michaud: Could you talk briefly about the additional constraints or obligations imposed on organizations by this focus on services to citizens?

Mrs. Marie-France Kenny: We are called on more and more. Senator Comeau was discussing it with me this week. Organizations like the FANE, in Nova Scotia, are called on more and more by citizens who want services. We offer those services.

Organizations don't necessarily have more employees. They may have received a little funding so a person can coordinate a project. Nevertheless, we haven't had capacity strengthening for everything that is done in terms of services to citizens or administration.

Ms. Éloise Michaud: We've just talked about research. Could you tell us what the importance of research would be in a future roadmap for your communities?

Ms. Suzanne Bossé: Research is essential and absolutely necessary. It is a major aspect. It is impossible for communities to

define the progress, the advances or the challenges that remain if there is no research or evidence with which to work.

To give you an example, after the census Statistics Canada published the post-censal survey, which required funding. This document allowed us to emphasize certain aspects of development, whether it be in health, in early childhood or in other sectors.

I therefore think it would be very important for the next roadmap to include research. This was shown over the course of the research symposium organized last fall by the Official Languages Secretariat.

• (1045)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Bossé.

Thank you to all of our witnesses for appearing.

I would also like to thank Mr. Bélanger for his work on the committee. I wish him good luck.

[*English*]

Thank you very much for all the work you've done on this committee. I wish you well.

Without further ado, this meeting is adjourned.

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this 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

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

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>