

Evaluation of the “Intergovernmental Cooperation” Component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program

Final report

Prepared for:
Department of Canadian Heritage

Prepared by:
Goss Gilroy Inc.

October 22, 2003



Canadian
Heritage

Patrimoine
canadien

Canada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	12
1.1 Description of program	12
1.2 Evaluation methodology	15
2.0 FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	19
2.1 Relevance	19
2.2 Success	24
2.3 Design and delivery	56
3.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	61
3.1 Summary and conclusions	61
3.2 Recommendations	65

ANNEX A - Actual expenditures 1993-94 to 2002-03

ANNEX B - Data collection tools

ANNEX C - List of informants

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. OBJECTIVE

This report is the evaluation of the “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program that the federal government agreed to evaluate in order to report the results of its implementation.

B. PROFILE AND BACKGROUND OF THE PROGRAM

Section 43 of the *Official Languages Act (OLA)* directs the Department of Canadian Heritage to take measures to encourage and assist provincial and territorial governments to support the development of English and French linguistic minority communities and in particular to offer provincial and municipal services in their language in areas other than education.

Following the adoption of the new *OLA* in 1988, the “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program was created in order to meet the Department’s commitment. Through federal-provincial/territorial agreements, the Department seeks to help provincial and territorial governments offer services in English or French to their minority communities in such areas as health care, the economy, justice, recreation, and social and community services.

There are currently agreements with nine provinces and three territories, but excluding Quebec, which decided in 1999 to suspend intergovernmental cooperation in respect to services for the English-speaking community, claiming that it did not need federal assistance to deliver services in English. The federal government’s annual budget for this program is approximately \$13 million. The federal contribution is combined with a provincial contribution, and the relative sizes of these contributions vary depending on the provisions in the agreement. In the case of the territories, the federal government assumes the total costs. In 2002-03, Canada’s contribution varied between \$320,000 and \$2,200,000 per agreement. Around \$2 million of the annual budget is set aside for special projects, the criteria for which differ from those for the main agreement.



Using the 2002-03 year as a reference, the following table indicates the size of federal contributions for each of the participating jurisdictions, the size of the target minority community, the proportion of the contribution from each level of government and the year when the first agreement was signed.

Jurisdiction	Federal \$	Fed/P-T	Population ¹	First agreement
Ontario	1,1 M	50/50	527,708	1988
Manitoba	1,3 M	50/50	43,383	1990
Saskatchewan	342,000	50/50	16,553	1988
Alberta	320,000	50/50	58,823	1997
British Columbia	688,000	66/33	59,373	2001
New Brunswick	2,2 M	50/50	238,453	1987
Nova Scotia	525,000	50/50	33,768	1989
Prince Edouard Island	1,2 M	75/25	5,275	1988
Newfoundland and Labrador	451,000	75/25	2,098	1993
Nunavut	1,4 M	100/0	415	1999
Yukon	1,4 M	100/0	883	1988
NorthWest Territories	1,7 M	100/0	915	1985

Approximately one third of program funding is allocated to the three territories, which represent 0.2% of the country's French-speaking minority.

C. METHODOLOGY

This evaluation is largely based on in-depth interviews with 55 representatives from the Department, provincial and territorial governments and the minority communities. In addition, case studies were conducted in three jurisdictions that have been part of the program since its

¹ Official Languages Support Programs, PCH, data based on a sample representing 20% of the population from the long census questionnaire of 2001- Statistics Canada 2002.

creation, namely, Ontario, Manitoba and New Brunswick. The evaluation covers the period from 1993 to the present.

D. RESULTS

Relevance

The federal government reiterated its commitment to the development of Canada's English- and French-speaking minority communities in the 2002 Throne Speech and followed through on this commitment with the Action Plan for Official Languages, which provides \$14.5 million of additional funding over five years for the intergovernmental cooperation program.

It is generally agreed that provinces and territories still require federal funding to provide English- or French- language services to their minority communities, although the need for such financial support varies. Some provinces are in the early or developing stages of providing such services and invest moderate sums on services for their minority communities; others invest more significant sums and offer a more significant level of services. In all provinces, however, federal funding serves as an important financial and political incentive. In the territories, the situation is somewhat different. French is recognized as an official language on the understanding that the federal government will cover the entire cost of French-language services.

The context in which this program operates has changed recently. Some federal departments, including Health Canada, Human Resources Development and Justice Canada, received funding under the Action Plan for Official Languages to address official languages issues. Although the Department of Canadian Heritage has filled a void in this regard for a long time, as mandated in Section 43 of the *OLA*, the question is now to determine how the Department's involvement will change to reflect new players in this area. A number of projects funded under this component of the program were related to the mandate of these other departments.

Although the partners agree to acknowledge Canada's contribution to activities funded under the agreements, less than one third of Canadians know that the federal government works with the provinces and territories to improve services to minority communities.

Success of the Program

The lack of expected results for this program and lack of performance indicators has made it difficult for us to determine how successful the program has been. It was not possible to establish a direct causal link between contributions made under the agreements and the progress made in each jurisdiction, since the cooperation agreements are not the only effort made by the various orders of government and other stakeholders to improve services to Canada's minority communities in their own language.

Our hypothesis that a long-term intervention in a province or territory should, in principle, significantly improve services to minority communities could not be confirmed for each jurisdiction that received this level of intervention.

In short, some provinces have made significant progress, for example, Manitoba, which has been a model in this regard. Another example is Prince Edward Island, which has a *French Language Services Act* that was introduced partly with the help of the federal government. The performance of some provinces and territories, such as Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan, has been rather disappointing. The situation is somewhat different in Quebec and Ontario, where the federal contribution is more symbolic and is a form of political leverage. In New Brunswick, the only officially bilingual province, the results show that federal funding has a major impact. Lastly, it should be noted that Alberta and British Columbia's recent signing of agreements is a victory in itself for the program, and there is every reason to believe that this will have a positive impact on services in these provinces.

Overall, the program has had varying degrees of success depending on the province or territory and the area of activity. A number of provinces indicated that the progress that has been made is in large part due to federal-provincial cooperation. Although acceptable progress has been made in most jurisdictions through contributions, the results in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut are not evident. The level of service that can realistically be offered in these jurisdictions, which have very small minority communities, is questionable.

Design and delivery

The Department of Canadian Heritage funds activities through the provincial/territorial

agreements which are the responsibility of other federal departments and agencies, particularly in the areas of justice and health care.

The program funds numerous activities such as language training, translation (documents, Internet sites and signage) and community services. Although most participants in this evaluation believe that the investments were well targeted, questions were raised concerning the capacity of certain activities to maximize results. These activities are:

- specific projects that have little or no long-term structural impact; some of these are special projects (i.e. 2001 Games of la Francophonie; *Congrès mondial acadien*);
- economic development projects that directly benefit a clientele other than the program's target clientele (e.g. tourists);
- community projects for which other sources of funding are available, for example, through the Canadian Heritage Support for Official-Language Communities Program;
- language training, the effectiveness of which is questionable given the results in certain jurisdictions (Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador).

An envelope representing 15% of program funding is allocated to the funding of special projects. Some of these projects are for activities similar to those found in provincial and territorial action plans. We have to wonder why these activities were not funded through regular budget funding. The funding criteria for these projects are not clearly defined and are largely discretionary.

With regard to accountability, the action plans are a step in the right direction. However, there is a lack of consistency in the plans, performance indicators are not provided, and results when specified are difficult to measure. The annual reports produced by the provinces and territories lack consistency and are not yet really results-based.

Given the percentage of Canadians who are aware of federal-provincial/territorial cooperation with regard to the delivery of services to minority communities, more could be done to raise awareness of the federal government's participation.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the results, the following recommendations are made:



Recommendation 1: Given the lack of evidence of results in some jurisdictions, especially the Northwest Territories and Nunavut, and despite major contributions sometimes over a long period, the Department's strategy in these jurisdictions should be reconsidered.

Recommendation accepted - The Department recognizes that the results achieved in certain jurisdictions are difficult to identify at times. The action plan approach, introduced in 1999-2000, is designed to ensure a clearer statement by the provinces and territories of the anticipated results, the measures to be taken to achieve them and the performance indicators to be used to measure their success in attaining them.

The Department intends to use the renewal of agreements as an opportunity to improve the action plan approach, specifically to be in a better position to evaluate the impact of its investments under the program, in all provincial and territorial jurisdictions. The Department will use this opportunity to examine the specific problems of the three territories.

Implementation schedule - The recommendation will be implemented during discussions leading to the renewal of federal-provincial/territorial agreements on minority-language services and the related action plans.

Recommendation 2: The Department should gradually withdraw from areas that are the responsibility of other federal departments and agencies. In the short term, and under its mandate set out in Section 42 of the *OLA*, the Department should work closely with federal departments, particularly those that received funding under the Official Languages Action Plan, in order to prevent possible overlaps. One possibility would be signing multipartite agreements with respect to official languages with key federal departments (Health, Justice, Industry, Human Resources and Canadian Heritage).

Recommendation accepted - In response to the *Action Plan for Official*



Languages, the Department will continue with its federal partners to examine various potential avenues for action to ensure that federal initiatives are complementary in such areas as health, early childhood, justice, Francophone immigration, etc. In the event of any potential overlap between the role to be played by Canadian Heritage and that of other federal departments in the context of federal-provincial/territorial cooperation, measures will be taken to avoid duplication, such as the co-signing of agreements with other departments or the signing of sectoral agreements setting out the responsibilities of each party.

Implementation schedule - The Department intends to pursue discussions relating to this recommendations with its federal, provincial and territorial partners throughout the implementation period of the *Action Plan for Official Languages*.

Recommendation 3: The Department's role should be more focussed in order to produce long-term benefits.

The Department should focus on funding activities:

- related to its own mandate;
- implemented only by the provinces and territories, by possibly extending funding to municipalities, which are directly responsible for delivering certain services;
- that involve more than one jurisdiction, for example, interprovincial projects.

The Department should ensure that community organizations cannot accumulate funding from Canadian Heritage for the same activities. As well, the funded activities should directly benefit the program's clientele.

The funding of language training for provincial/territorial government employees that seems to have had disappointing results in a number of jurisdictions should be reconsidered. If it does not target front-line



workers or address the need to fill bilingual positions, the provinces must demonstrate that language training is warranted.

Recommendation accepted - During the upcoming negotiations, the Department will examine the measures to be implemented to guarantee that its intervention is more focussed, that it reflects the development stage of each province and territory, that it does not open the door to stacking of funding and that it provides tangible benefits to the program's clientele. These measures will include a clause regarding stacking of funding or the clearer statement in agreements and/or action plans of targeted results, program objectives, target clienteles and the merits of the activities proposed.

Implementation schedule - The recommendation will be implemented during discussions leading to the renewal of federal-provincial/territorial agreements on minority-language services and the related action plans.

Recommendation 4: Overall accountability must be improved. Future agreements should clearly specify the expected results and performance indicators to be used to measure results.

Recommendation accepted - The Department intends to take advantage of the renewal of federal-provincial/territorial agreements on minority-language services to improve the action plan approach, specifically to ensure greater accountability. During the upcoming negotiations, the Department will wish to ensure that the expected results are realistic and measurable, that the planned activities are clearly linked to the results to be achieved, and that the performance indicators are more relevant. The Department will also implement a framework allowing it to report to Canadians regularly on the results achieved by the program.

Implementation schedule - The recommendation will be implemented during discussions leading to the renewal of federal-provincial/territorial agreements on minority-language services and the related action plans.



1.0 INTRODUCTION

Section 43 of the *Official Languages Act* gives the Department of Canadian Heritage a mandate to take any action “to encourage and assist the provincial and territorial governments to support the development of English and French linguistic minority communities and in particular to offer provincial and municipal services in their language” in areas other than education.

After the new *Official Languages Act* was passed in 1988, the “Intergovernmental cooperation”² component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program was created in order to meet the Department’s commitment by. Through federal/provincial-territorial agreements, the Department supports the provincial and territorial government, in offering services in French and English to minority communities in such areas as health care, the economy, justice, recreation and social and community services, and to promote the recognition and use of both official languages, as well as stimulating the development of both communities.

The Government of Canada committed itself to evaluating this component of the program as a way of reviewing the results obtained. This document constitutes the final report of this evaluation.

The report is divided into three sections. The first section gives a brief description of the program and the methodology used in the evaluation. The second section presents the evaluation findings arranged by topic, ie, relevance, success and design and delivery of the program. The final section summarizes the main conclusions of the study and the recommendations emanating from it.

1.1 Description of the program

1.1.1 Evolution of the “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component

The initial Agreements were signed in 1988 following the passage of the new *Official Languages Act*. Agreements currently exist with nine provinces and three territories, the exception being Quebec which decided in 1999 to suspend intergovernmental cooperation with the Government of Canada in respect of services to the Anglophone community, claiming that it did not need federal assistance to deliver services in English. However, the provinces and territories did not all join the program at the same time and are at different stages of development.

² For simplicity’s sake, the term “program” will be used from time to time in the text to designate this component of the program.



The Agreements can be divided into three categories: those that are at the initial stage, comprising the provinces that have only recently committed themselves to delivering services in French (Alberta and British Columbia); those that are at the development stage, including the provinces which have made some commitments and which offer some services (Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan); and lastly, those which are at the consolidation stage, ie, the provinces/territories which have substantial commitments and in which a considerable range of services are offered, including in some cases policies on minority language services (New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba, Yukon, North West Territories and Nunavut).

1.1.2 Level of investment

The annual budget allocated by the federal government to this component of the program is approximately \$13 million. The federal contribution is augmented by a contribution from the province, in which the federal/provincial ratio varies depending on the provisions of the Agreement. In the case of the territories, the federal government assumes the total costs itself. The federal government's actual expenses for each jurisdiction for the period covered by the evaluation are set out at Annex A.

The federal-provincial/territorial Agreements stipulate that the federal government may grant additional funding for special projects. These projects are attached to the Agreements and constitute an integral part thereof. The criteria and administrative provisions governing the approval of these special projects are different from the main Agreements. Approximately \$2 million is allocated from the overall budget to these projects annually.

1.1.3 Target areas of intervention

Since 1999-2000, action plans have been prepared by the provinces and territories which set out the type of activities that will be funded during the period covered by the Agreement. Although these activities differ from one jurisdiction to the next, the following areas are the most common:

- translation of legislation, regulations and government documents (paper and electronic);
- language training for provincial and territorial public servants;
- first line services (including single windows);
- support to school-community centres (implemented by associations and organizations representing the communities) or for community programming;
- support for bilingual signage;



- support for the development of tourism (promotion campaign, translation of documents, etc).

1.1.4 Expected results

The results expected by the federal government from the implementation of this component have never been set out or communicated to the partners. Agreements are generally negotiated on a multi-year basis with each partner and have since 1999-2000 depended on the action plans of the provinces and territories. These action plans include objectives, activities, expected results and performance indicators. The Agreements currently in progress will end at the end of the 2003-2004 fiscal year.

1.1.5 English and French linguistic minority communities

English and French linguistic minority communities exist in every province and territory. The size and geographical dispersion of these communities vary from one region to the next, with large, concentrated populations in some regions and with small, dispersed populations in others. By way of information, Table 1 gives the size of the official language linguistic minority population in Canada, by province and territory, in 2001.

Table 1 Official language linguistic minority community population 2001

Province/territory	Population
Canada	1,906,598
Newfoundland and Labrador	2,098
Nova Scotia	33,768
Prince Edward Island	5,275
New Brunswick	238,453
Quebec (Anglophones)	918,955
Ontario	527,708
Manitoba	43,383
Saskatchewan	16,553
Alberta	58,823
British Columbia	59,373
Northwest Territories	915



Yukon	883
Nunavut	415

Source: Statistics Canada Census 2001 - data based on a sample representing 20% of population from the long census questionnaire of 2002
 Note 1: Official language is defined as the first language spoken

1.2 Evaluation methodology

1.2.1 Evaluation questions

The evaluation is summative and seeks essentially to determine what progress has been made over the past decade as a result of the implementation of this program. The evaluation was guided by the three following questions:

- **Relevance:** is the program still compatible with the priorities of the Department of Canadian Heritage and the federal government as a whole? Does it address a real need?
- **Success:** to what extent has the program achieved the expected results?
- **Design and delivery:** does the program use the most appropriate and effective means to achieve the expected results, without undesirable effects? Would it be appropriate to consider other forms of design and implementation?

Table 2 lists all the evaluation questions.

Table 2: Evaluation questions	
RELEVANCE	
1.	Is the “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program consistent with the federal government’s priorities? Does it meet the strategic objectives of the Department of Canadian Heritage and in what way?
2.	This component of the program has existed since 1988. It is still necessary to maintain federal assistance to the provinces/territories in order to offer services to official language minorities? Is it necessary to maintain it in all the provinces/territories that want it? Why? To what extent would the activities implemented under the program have occurred in the absence of federal funding?
3.	Does the Minister of Canadian Heritage, under the Agreements with the provinces/territories, fund activities that are within the mandate of other federal government departments or agencies, in accordance with their mandate and Section 41?
4.	To what extent is the contribution of the Government of Canada acknowledged? To what extent do Canadians support the objectives of this program? What have the federal government and provinces/territories done to publicize Canada’s contribution in this field?



SUCCESS	
5.	To what extent have the activities funded under the federal-provincial/territorial agreements for the promotion of official languages made possible the enhancement of minority language service delivery by provincial/territorial and municipal governments? Were the activities well targeted? Did they generate maximum opportunity for advancing the cause? What has changed since the start of program implementation? What factors can explain the level of progress achieved?
6.	To what extent have federal-provincial/territorial agreements contributed to strengthening federal-provincial/territorial cooperation in the area of services to official language minorities?
7.	To what extent did the program contribute to: - access by the minority communities to the services they need? - the full recognition and use of French and English in Canadian society? - the development of minority communities in Canada? - the strengthening of social cohesion and a feeling of belonging to Canada?
DESIGN AND DELIVERY	
8.	Has the action plan approach, initiated in 1999-2000, fulfilled its promise (improved planning and results-based management)? What have been the main benefits to date?
9.	Is the distribution of funding adequate? Are the processes for negotiating agreements and special projects effective?
10.	Are there strategic areas of intervention that would warrant greater investments? Areas that should be reconsidered? If so, which and why? - Would it be advisable to involve other federal partners?
11.	Has this component of the program had unexpected impacts, positive or negative, that were not anticipated by the partners or the target clientele?
12.	In the absence of a multilateral agreement, have the initiatives to bring about cooperation between the provinces/territories borne fruit? Are there obstacles to this collaboration? How could it be strengthened? What happens to decisions that emerge from fora involving the political level and officials?
13.	Do the bilateral agreements, as currently designed, address the principles of governance set out by the Auditor General of Canada in Chapters 5 (April 1999) and 23 (November 1999)? Are the principles of governance for these agreements applied so as to ensure effective accountability? What, if anything, will need to be improved in the next series of agreements?
14.	Are there other, more effective mechanisms to maximize the results? Are the roles and responsibilities for the delivery of this program well defined? Is there scope for improvement? Why?

1.2.2 Research methods

The evaluation is based on in-depth interviews with departmental representatives (headquarters and regional offices), representatives of the provincial/territorial governments and representatives of the minority communities. A total of 55 people were interviewed. The

interviews were completed in person, with the exception of 15 representatives of the communities, who were consulted by telephone. The data collection tools are listed at Annex B.

Case studies were carried out in three jurisdictions: Ontario, New Brunswick and Manitoba. While an average of two to three people were interviewed per province and territory, approximately ten people were consulted in the provinces for which case studies were done.

The evaluation was also based on a review of documentation and on analysis of a recent survey conducted by the Official Languages Support Programs Branch among a representative sample of Canadians.

The evaluation covers the period from 1993 to the present.

1.2.3 Limits of the evaluation

An evaluation is guided largely by the expected results of the program under study. In this case, it should be emphasized that the federal government had not identified specific results, accompanied by performance indicators, for this component of the program. The results, presented in Table 3, were formulated for the purposes of this evaluation.

Table 3: Expected results of the “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component
<p>Immediate results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reinforce federal-provincial/territorial cooperation in the area of services (other than education) to official language minorities and improve understanding of the shared concerns of the governments of Canada and the provinces/territories in this field. - Enhance the capability of the provinces/territories to develop, improve and deliver services to official language minorities.
<p>Intermediate results:</p> <p>Provide official language minority communities with an expanded range of services provided by their provincial/territorial and municipal governments to enable them to participate more actively in the social, cultural and economic life of Canada.</p>



End results:

- The obtaining, by the minority communities, of the services they need in their own language from provincial/territorial and municipal governments;
- Full recognition and use of French and English in Canadian society.

Since this evaluation is based in large measure on in-depth interviews, the analysis of the results is qualitative in nature. This type of analysis is appropriate when the responses are based on facts or on exhaustive knowledge of the subject on the part of the respondents. In order to mitigate the subjectivity of some responses, an outside expert (a university researcher and analyst with long experience of official languages issues) was asked to examine the analysis of the responses and give his verdict on the accuracy of the conclusions.

This evaluation is limited by the attribution issue. In several jurisdictions, investments in the implementation of services to official language minority communities are not limited to the investments stipulated in the Agreements with the federal government. It is consequently difficult to determine the impact of this component of the program on the current availability of services to minority communities in several jurisdictions.

2.0 FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

The methods used in this evaluation revealed a number of findings and observations regarding this component of the program. The aim of this section is to summarize this information.

2.1 Relevance

2.1.1 Federal priorities and strategic objectives

The federal government has recently reiterated its desire to support minority official language communities, specifically by ensuring that the members of these communities have access to services in their own language.³ To some extent, the Official Languages Action Plan, tabled in March 2003, confirms the commitment of the Government of Canada in this regard. This plan provides the Department of Canadian Heritage with an additional \$14.5 million to support its “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component.

The “Intergovernmental Cooperation” program contributes to one of the strategic objectives of Canadian Heritage, namely “active citizenship and community participation”, which aims, among other things, to enhance opportunities to participate in life in Canadian society.

2.1.2 The rationale behind federal support

Overall, the participants in the evaluation were of the opinion that federal government support for the delivery of services to official language minority communities is still both necessary and essential. The following paragraphs set out certain findings on this issue from across the country.

³ In the speech from the Throne in September 2002, the federal government stated that it would “support the development of French and English minority language communities and make services in their own language more accessible in fields such as health care.”

In **New Brunswick**, the new provincial *Official Languages Act* and the new official languages policy in the municipalities create new obligations, accompanied by costs. In view of the precarious financial state of this province, federal support is considered essential. The benefits from the joint federal-provincial effort in the area of language rights go far beyond the borders of the province. New Brunswick is viewed as a source of inspiration in the development of minority communities across Canada.

In **Prince Edward Island**, French enjoys a degree of recognition as a result of the *French Language Services Act*. The federal government plays a key role in the implementation of the Act, which requires a certain level of investment for its implementation.

In **Nova Scotia and Newfoundland**, the needs are great and current levels of investment merely “scratch the surface”. Further investment is required to bring services in French to an acceptable level. The Government of Newfoundland recognizes the economic importance of services in French.

In **Ontario**, the federal contribution is minimal in relation to the money invested by the province. The funds expended under the Agreements have compensated for budget reductions imposed by the provincial government since 1995. It is thought that, in the absence of the program, the provincial government would invest in public services, but not in the priority activities specified in the agreements.

In **Québec**, the respondents mentioned the importance of the program in financial terms, as well as its symbolic value, since federal-provincial collaboration sends a signal of support to the Anglophone community. In financial terms, although the provincial investments have been maintained since 1999, the year in which the province terminated the partnership, the province has not managed to fill the financial gap left by the withdrawal of federal funding. Some services, specifically the regional coordinator positions, which provide for liaison between the Anglophone community and the health care system, have been abolished.

In **Manitoba**, the respondents consulted were unanimous in stating that the Canada-Manitoba agreements are essential to the delivery of services in French in that province. Without the agreements, a number of activities and services would end, especially in the field of economic development, for the municipalities have not reached the same level of responsibility



for and commitment to bilingual services as the provincial government. That said, the vigour of the community and the scale of the gains made mean that a certain level of services would be maintained, even without federal funding.

In the **Prairie provinces and British Columbia**, the respondents underscored the great need for the program. In British Columbia, it is not a question of “preaching to the converted” and the Agreement provides an effective way of promoting services in French. In Saskatchewan, the Office of Francophone Affairs, which provides a translation service for the provincial public service and facilitates the linkage with provincial departments in the delivery of services in French, would not exist without the federal program. According to all the respondents, without the Office, these translation services would cease to exist and the departments would have no incentive to provide services in French. The Fransaskois are few in number and geographically dispersed, and government support is considered necessary in order to reverse the process of assimilation. In Alberta, there is general recognition of the merits of and the need to continue the program, which has resulted in the completion of several major projects, specifically in the health care field, which would otherwise have never come to fruition.

The Territories are in a unique situation. In the wake of pressure from the federal government and legal conflicts over the responsibilities of the territorial governments towards Francophone communities, each of the territories passed official languages legislation. French is recognized as an official language, with the implicit agreement that the federal government will provide financial assistance to help them in this area. Despite these agreements and legislation, the governments of the Northwest Territories and Nunavut have difficulty justifying the provision of services in French, in view of the majority representation of Aboriginals (Indians and Inuit) in their population. The relevance of federal-provincial cooperation in the area of services in French in these jurisdictions with a very limited Francophone population, slightly less than 1,000 persons, was questioned. The government of the Yukon, for its part, displays a greater degree of openness on this issue.

On an annual basis, the federal contribution to the program is on the order of \$13 million dollars. Once this investment is divided up among the provinces and territories, the amounts involved are modest, varying between \$315,000 and \$1,600,000 per jurisdiction. According to the respondents, federal assistance to services for English and French linguistic minority



communities in Canada is still necessary in all provinces and territories, albeit to varying degrees. Some provinces, like Saskatchewan, are still at the development stage and are investing very modest sums in the delivery of services in French. Others, such as Manitoba and Ontario, contribute relatively large sums. In both cases, however, the program has a significant leverage effect. If the leverage effect is financial in certain provinces and territories, it is also political in others where the funding of services in French is less well accepted by the majority. In those provinces, federal government support becomes an “alibi”, a justification for provincial investment. This takes tangible form in major investment by the province, resulting, in part, from a federal incentive.

In the absence of federal funding, some provinces, such as Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, would maintain services in both languages, albeit at a lower level. In the case of Manitoba, for example, the vigour of the community, the receptivity of the population to bilingualism and the scale of the progress to date would guarantee that some services would be maintained, even in the absence of federal support. In each of these territories, it is felt that without federal assistance, the territorial governments would do very little to provide Francophones with services in their own language.

2.1.3 The evolution of the federal situation

The situation has evolved within the federal government. Pursuant to Section 43 of the *OLA*, responsibility is delegated to the Department of Canadian Heritage to help the provinces and territories offer services to linguistic minority communities in their own language. However, other federal departments have, through the recent Action Plan for Official Languages, obtained funding to help them meet their obligations arising out of Section 41 of the *OLA*, in such areas as health care, justice and human resources development. While the Department of Canadian Heritage has for a long time filled a void in this area, the issue is now what will be the nature of its future involvement, in view of the fact that other departments will henceforth be directly involved. A number of respondents take the view that a sizeable number of activities, currently funded by the Department, fall within the mandate of other departments. Such departments as Health and Justice Canada are, moreover, already funding activities in the Territories.

2.1.4 The support of Canadians

One of the aims of the evaluation is to identify the extent to which the federal contribution to assistance to the provinces and territories in the area of services in both official languages is acknowledged by the Canadian people and whether Canadians support the principle that governments should cooperate with a view to improving such services.

Most of the agreements signed between Canada and the provincial and territorial partners underscore the importance of informing the public of the existence of such agreements and take measures deemed appropriate to ensure consultation with the interested parties. According to the interview results, the provinces and territories inform primarily the representatives of the communities about federal participation, specifically on the occasion of the signing of agreements with the organizations they represent. As far as the public at large is concerned, little effort is made to draw attention to this participation. Some exceptions are worthy of note, including New Brunswick, where federal participation is known via the Website of the Department of Intergovernmental and International Relations, in speeches and at public events. The logos also inform users of the participation by the federal government in single window services in Manitoba.

An opinion survey⁴ carried out on behalf of the Department of Canadian Heritage covering the perception of official languages by Canadians, shows that only approximately one-third of members of minority anglophone (33%) and francophone (36%) linguistic communities said that they were aware of the existence of these federal/provincial-territorial agreements. This percentage drops to 25% for members of English and French-speaking majority communities.

⁴ Attitudes and Perceptions with regard to Official Languages in Canada, January 2003

2.2 Success

This section will evaluate the extent to which intergovernmental collaboration has achieved the expected results, as set out at Table 3 of this document. The results are presented in three parts, based on the development stages of the provinces and territories:

- Consolidation stage:
 - Ontario (1988), New Brunswick (1987) and Manitoba (1990), for which case studies have been carried out;
 - Prince Edward Island (1988), Quebec (1989), Northwest Territories (1985), Nunavut (1999), and Yukon (1988);
- Development stage: Newfoundland (1993); Nova Scotia (1989) and Saskatchewan (1988);
- Initial stage: British Columbia (2001) and Alberta (1997).

2.2.1 Case studies for Ontario, Manitoba and New Brunswick

Starting from the hypothesis that long-term involvement should on principle yield significant results and progress in the availability of services to official language minority communities, we examined in greater detail the cases of three provinces which joined the program at an early stage, Ontario, Manitoba and New Brunswick.

Case study: Ontario

Since 1993, two agreements have been signed between Canada and Ontario. The first agreement covers the period from 1993-94 to 1998-99. The second agreement, which is still in force, covers the period from 1999-2000 to 2003-04. Between 1993 and 2003, the federal government incurred actual expenditures on the order of \$11.6 million for this province under the program. See Annex A of this document for the annual amounts.

The current agreement aims to “provide multi-year funding to continue the development and improvement of quality services in their own language to the Francophone community in Ontario, in accordance with the *1986 French Language Services Act* of Ontario” (section 2.1). This includes (section 3.1):



- the delivery of quality services in French by provincial ministries and their service providers in designated regions of the province;
- the participation of Francophones in the social, cultural and economic life of the province, while preserving their language and culture;
- the recognition and promotion, as an asset, of the economic and social advantages of a bilingual workforce and resources in French in Ontario.

Background

According to the 2001 Census⁵, 4.3% of the population of Ontario reported that French was their mother tongue. In 1996, this percentage was 4.5%.

The *French Language Services Act* (1986) gives the people of Ontario the right to use French to communicate with government departments and agencies and to receive services in French in 23 designated regions⁶. The Act covers all services offered to the public by government departments and agencies, but does not apply to all public organizations such as hospitals, children's aid societies and group homes. The municipalities are not subject to the Act; the decision whether or not to offer services in French rests with municipal councils. However, when services are transferred by the province to a municipality, a memorandum of understanding must, on principle, guarantee the maintenance of services in French⁷.

The Office of Francophone Affairs (OFA) was established under the *French Language Services Act*. It serves as the Ontario Government's main source of information on francophone affairs and French language services. It is responsible for coordinating the government-wide delivery of French language services. It is the respondent of the Government of Ontario for the Canada-Ontario Agreement. The OFA produces a plan of activities identifying its thrusts and priorities.

⁵ Statistics Canada

⁶ This paragraph is based on an information brochure published by the Ontario Office of Francophone Affairs.

⁷ Five other Ontario statutes mention the right to public services in French: the 2001 Municipalities Act, the 1991 Regulated Health Professions Act, the 2002 Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Act, the 2000 Social Housing Reform Act and the 1990 Judicial Review Procedure Act.

A review of a sampling of OFA reports for the years 2000-01, 2001-02 and projections for 2002-03, reveals that the Canada-Ontario Agreement provides for the implementation of 25 to 30 projects a year, involving 7 to 8 ministries. Table 6 summarizes the use of funds by fiscal year:

Table 6 - Use of federal funds from 2000-01 to 2002-03 - Ontario

Ministry	2000-01		2001-02		2002-03 (projections)	
	# projects	federal \$	# projects	federal \$	# projects	federal \$
Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs	1	30,000	2	37,500	1	30,000
Solicitor General	4	130,310	5	88,905	4	250,000
Citizenship	3	165,000	1	38,000	4	105,000
Community, Family and Childhood Services	8	247,735	9	127,649	8	198,188
Economic and Commercial Development	–	–	1	25,000	–	–
Business, markets and innovation	–	–	–	–	2	62,159
Health and Extended Care	4	237,500	6	351,570	5	315,000
Northern Development and Mining	–	–	–	–	1	7,500
Office of Francophone Affairs	3	115,344	1	117,876	1	147,153
Tourism and Recreation	2	189,111	5	328,500	–	–
Total	25	1,115 M	30	1,115 M	26	1,115 M

In 2000-01 and 2001-02, the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation received a substantial proportion of federal funding because of the holding in Canada of the Games of la Francophonie. Four projects have received significant funding over the past three years:

- approximately \$580,000 in federal money was invested in Ontario's participation in the Games of la Francophonie in 2001 (out of an envelope of \$2.2 million for 2000-01 and 2001-02);
- approximately \$250 000 in federal money was invested in 2000-01 and 2001-02 in a database project for Francophone products sponsored by the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation;



- \$200,000 in federal money was invested in 2002-03 on Francophone centres to help the victims of sexual assault.

Impact of achievements

According to those questioned, the funding provided by the program has produced an important leverage effect by encouraging provincial government departments to support projects that they would undoubtedly not otherwise have considered. Once the departments are involved, they have a tendency to continue their efforts, even if federal funding stops - since the program is designed to provide ad hoc funding rather than long-term support.

It is, however, generally believed that the situation with regard to public services in French has deteriorated in Ontario since 1995. Furthermore, development plans intended to implement Francophone health care services have not seen the light of day. Budget cuts have hit services to Francophones hard (eg, the counselling services provided by the Ministry of Agriculture). There are nonetheless some exceptions, specifically in the legal field, where some progress has been noted (for example, legal aid clinics) and in the area of community health care (pre-natal and peri-natal services).

Participants in the study generally held the view that the priority given by the government of Ontario in recent years to funding the operating costs of projects is not conducive to long-term solutions for the development of the Franco-Ontarian community, in comparison with projects that have a structural impact benefiting the community.

A number of respondents criticized the relevance and effectiveness of many economic development projects funded over the years. For example, criticism was directed at the funding of a colloquium on international economic development. They argued in favour of a balance between the extremes represented by direct services and international economic development.

All the respondents interviewed indicated that they had very limited expectations regarding the impact of the Agreement because of the level of investment approved. In their view, the proportion of the federal envelope allocated to Ontario was out of all proportion to the size of the minority Francophone community in the province. For example, for the period 1999-2000 to 2003-04, Ontario received funding almost equal to that of Manitoba and Prince



Edward Island separately, whereas Ontario has more than ten times the Francophone population of these two provinces combined. Ontario receives in *broad terms* 10% of program funding, whereas it alone is home to half of all Francophones outside Quebec.

The Government of Ontario has adopted a policy of not using money provided under the Agreement to fund routine activities of the Government of Ontario under its *French Language Services Act*. Were federal participation to be withdrawn, Ontario would continue to abide by the requirements of its *French Language Services Act*, but would reduce its efforts to provide services in French outside the strict frame of its own law. The impact of this would be felt, among other things, in a significant reduction in the funding currently allocated to community projects (community health centres).

In short, the respondents in the communities evaluate the services in French in this province as follows:

- **Health care:** services vary depending on the region; they are good in the National Capital Region, passable in the North and mediocre in Southern Ontario
- **Justice:** passable to adequate
- **Economic development:** mediocre to passable
- **Culture:** passable

In their responses to the opinion survey carried out by Canadian Heritage in January 2003, Canadians belonging to minorities in Ontario gave a score of 7.35 out of 10 (10 being the maximum) regarding their degree of general satisfaction with services that are provided in the province in the minority language.

Consultations

The feeling most frequently encountered among those who were interviewed is that the Canada-Ontario Agreement does not have to reproduce the consultation protocol put in place under the Canada-Community Agreement. It is generally recognized that the Canada-Ontario Agreement is aimed primarily at government and that ministries are required to identify projects which match their own priorities, within the framework provided by the OFA. The information gathered indicates that the projects receiving funding are relevant to the community, while at the same time meeting ministerial priorities.

The OFA nonetheless intends to improve the focussing of its own action plan on community priorities.

Section 41 of the *OLA*

Under Section 41 of the *Official Languages Act*, all federal departments and agencies are responsible for encouraging the development of official language minority communities. According to the testimony received, there is still strong resistance in federal departments to assuming this responsibility, the general perception being that it is a responsibility that is incumbent upon the Department of Canadian Heritage. However, the funding in Ontario of projects and services by federal departments other than Canadian Heritage is improving. Some community organizations have established lasting relationships with other sources of federal funding.

Conclusion

The Intergovernmental Cooperation program has had a leverage effect and has made it possible to stanch the loss of services to Francophones who might have been even more severely hit by budget cuts. To some extent, these cuts have undermined the sustained efforts of federal-provincial collaboration. Services in French, with few exceptions, have declined in the province since 1995.

The relevance of some investments in the economic field and the long-term impact of funding operating costs related to specific projects have been raised. The communities have low expectations regarding the impact of the agreements because of the small amounts of money invested.

Case study: Manitoba

The Canada-Manitoba Agreement on the promotion of official languages aims “to provide multi-year funding and establish a cooperation mechanism between Canada and Manitoba in order to ensure the continued development, enhancement and implementation of quality services in French as per Manitoba’s French-language Services Policy and to contribute to the development and vitality of the Francophone community”. This objective was essentially the same for the previous two agreements.

During the period covered by the evaluation, three agreements were signed between Canada and Manitoba. The first was signed in 1990 for a period of four years. Between 1993 and 2003, the federal government’s expenditures for this province under this program were on the order of \$12.2 million. See Annex A for the annual amounts.

Context

Section 23 of the *Manitoba Act* of 1870 confirms the equality of the status of French and English in the Legislature and before the courts in the province. In 1985, the Supreme Court of Canada declared all the laws of the province of Manitoba “unconstitutional” because they were unilingual (English), and granted the province a five-year stay to translate its statutes and regulations. In the press of events, the Government of Manitoba also established a policy on French-language services in 1989. This is designed to provide bilingual government services in designated regions where the French-speaking population is concentrated.

Manitoba has 43,383 Francophones⁸, approximately 5% of the province’s population. Francophones are found in the City of Winnipeg (which includes St-Boniface) as well as in a number of other municipalities in the province.

The Franco-Manitoban community organizations maintain harmonious relations with the federal and provincial governments and with the Anglophone community. In addition, the French fact and the investment of public funds in minority language service delivery is strongly supported by the population of Manitoba. Although there are still some “islands of resistance”,

⁸ Data based on a sample of 20% of the population based on the 2001 long census questionnaire, Statistics Canada 2002



the individuals consulted on this point all testify to a positive change of attitude towards the French fact in Manitoba over the past decade.

The provincial policy on services in French is implemented by the French Language Services Secretariat (FLSS) and a network of French-language services coordinators working in each provincial department. An investigation was conducted by Judge Richard Chartier into the success of this implementation approach. His report, which was tabled in May 1998, is entitled *Above all, Common Sense; Report and Recommendations on French Language Services within the Government of Manitoba* (Chartier Report), found that government services in French were not always commensurate with the needs and expectations of the Francophone community and that few services in French were available from designated bilingual offices that were located in regions not designated bilingual. The report also underlined the fact that only 4% of positions in the provincial public service were designated bilingual and that only 3% were in fact occupied by bilingual individuals.

Impact of achievements

The Canada-Manitoba Agreement currently in force is accompanied by an action plan setting out in detail the priorities, grouped into four areas of activity:

- 1) **Government infrastructure:** To facilitate the development, coordination and implementation of services in French offered by the various administrative branches of the government, specifically through language training, translation, bilingual Web sites, signage in French, etc.
- 2) **Health and Social Services:** To support and facilitate the development, coordination and implementation of services in French by designated health care institutions, social services agencies and the Regional Health Offices. This includes, specifically, translation, language training and assistance in the recruiting of bilingual health care resources.
- 3) **Support to municipalities designated bilingual:** To help municipal governments and agencies to formulate, coordinate and implement activities and programs designed to ensure service delivery in French in bilingual municipalities. This includes, specifically, translation services, language training, signage in French and economic development

assistance to bilingual municipalities.

- 4) **Community development:** Facilitate the development and the vitality of Manitoba's francophone community through partnerships between community agencies and departments, specifically in the areas of culture, heritage, tourism and national and international exchanges.

As an indicator, Table 7 sets out the use of funds for the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 fiscal years.

Table 7 - Distribution of funds under the Canada-Manitoba Agreement for 2000-01 and 2001-02

Category of activities	Actual expenditures (federal and provincial)	
	2000-01	2001-02
Government infrastructure	\$301,380	\$539,646
Social and health care services	\$478,620	\$517,102
Support to municipalities designated bilingual	\$710,000	\$608,287
Community development	\$310,000	\$347,858
Sub-total	\$1,800,000	\$2,012,893
Special projects:		
- support to departments	\$270,000	\$242,459
- single window project	\$304,720	\$350,882
- promotion of services in French	\$25,290	\$11,126
Sub-total projects	\$600,000	\$604,467
Total	\$2,400,000	\$2,617,360

The most important achievements stemming from the Canada-Manitoba Agreements, by areas of activity, are as follows:

Health and Social Services

Although there is still work to be done in this field, the availability of health care services in French in Manitoba has improved substantially. Today, a score of small rural municipalities have access to health care services in French, whereas there were none 10 years ago.

The main achievements in this field include the establishment by the Government of Manitoba of the *Santé en français* [Health care in French] initiative, a resource service set up in 1992 to facilitate the planning and delivery of services in French in health care institutions and programs, regional health care offices and social services offices designated bilingual in Manitoba. *Santé en français* helps these institutions to develop plans for services in French, provides language training to their employees, provides translation services, develops bilingual resources (documentation, information, etc), and promotes existing services in French. Administered jointly by Saint-Boniface Hospital and the FLSS, the service is guided by a consultative committee that includes a range of government and community organizations.

Support to municipalities designated bilingual

One of the most striking achievements of the past 10 years is the designation of 16 bilingual municipalities across the province and, for each municipality, the adoption of a policy on bilingualism and the creation of Community Development Corporations (CDCs). The CDCs are responsible for the community and economic development of their municipalities. Using funding generated by the Agreement, most have acquired French-language materials for libraries, bilingual municipal signage, and the delivery of municipal services in both languages. Funds have also been granted to encourage businesses to post signs in French and the creation of corporations - sports and leisure - in some municipalities. Manitoba's bilingual municipalities are home to approximately 95% of the Francophone population.

Agreement funds, allocated to the development of bilingual municipalities, have been negotiated and are managed by the Manitoba Bilingual Municipalities Association (MBMA). MBMA itself receives part of its funding to provide technical support to bilingual municipalities, such as the production of bilingual forms and documents and a translation service.

The development of bilingual municipalities is also supported by the Economic



Development Council for Manitoba Bilingual Municipalities (CDEM), an organization set up by AMBM in 1996 to encourage, stimulate and organize economic development in the bilingual municipalities. The CDEM helps with the implementation of economic development plans, offers a range of consulting services for entrepreneurs, and stimulates business development to meet local needs and respond to economic opportunities.

According to all the respondents, the creation of bilingual municipalities would never have happened without the support of the Agreement, and without that support, the delivery of services in French would decline.

Government infrastructure

According to activity reports produced in relation to the Agreement, Manitobans' access to services in French has increased as a result of an increase in the number of provincial government employees capable of communicating in French. This increase is attributed to the language training given to approximately 200 public servants in 2000-1 and to 175 public servants in 2001-02. The number of trained employees represents a 60% increase over previous years. In addition, the volume of material translated, distributed and posted on the Internet in French has increased substantially since 1999. Similarly, the number of French signs in public places has increased as a result of the Agreement, and the provincial government has acquired computer equipment and French-language software to facilitate the work of its public servants.

Although these achievements were mentioned by the individuals consulted for the purposes of this evaluation, they are not regarded as having contributed substantially to improving overall access by Manitobans to services in French. The only exception to this observation: the symbolic impact of French-language signage, and particularly traffic signs, which have helped to make French more visible to the general public.

Community development

According to the activity reports produced on this Agreement, the funds granted for this component of the Agreement were dedicated to supporting a number of projects in the fields of arts and culture, tourism, interaction with other Francophone communities in Canada, the development of young people in rural areas, the development of services for senior citizens and heritage research. Specifically, funds were granted to support projects of the Centre culturel

franco-manitobain (CCFM).

This category of activities under the Agreement is the one in which the respondents reported the least impact. It is, furthermore, difficult to distinguish between the overall results of these activities and those of activities funded by the Canada-Franco-Manitoban Community Agreement.

Bilingual Service Centres (single windows)

Following the recommendations of the Chartier Report regarding the creation of bilingual service centres, Manitoba instituted a single window service that has no precedent in Canada. This service (which receives special funding under the Agreement) brings together under one roof services of the three levels of government, direct services, referral or information services. These bilingual service centres facilitate the active delivery of services in French in those areas of Manitoba where the French-speaking population is concentrated. Six regions have been designated as sites for these centres. Three are already open in Saint-Pierre-Jolys, Notre-Dame-de-Lourdes and Winnipeg and the opening of three others is imminent. An evaluation, currently under way, will attempt to determine whether this new mode of service delivery is useful and effective, and if it is worth continuing.

In short, the community respondents evaluated the services as follows:

- **Health care:** passable to adequate, with notable progress
- **Justice:** passable, the emphasis having been placed elsewhere
- **Economic development:** adequate
- **Culture:** mediocre to passable

Relevance of funding

In comparison with most other Canadian provinces, the scale of the progress means that much of it will be maintained even in the absence of federal funds. If the Canada-Manitoba Agreements have contributed to the development of services in French in the province, other factors have also made a sizeable contribution, such as the bilingual status of the province, the French Language Services Policy, the Chartier Report, the vitality of the Franco-Manitoban community, the receptivity of the population to bilingualism, and a good, cooperative

relationship between the federal and provincial representatives responsible for its implementation.

However, the officials consulted are of the opinion that the Agreements have a leverage effect and encourage provincial departments to devote a portion of their budgets to delivering services in both languages. The inflow of federal funds provides a convincing argument for provincial decision-makers that delivery of services in French will not entail a substantial increase in their own costs.

The officials consulted are unanimous that the Canada-Manitoba Agreements are essential to the delivery of services in French in the province. Without these Agreements, some activities and services would be eliminated, especially in the economic development field, since the municipalities have not reached the same level of empowerment and commitment to bilingual services as the provincial government. In all areas, the interruption of funding would have the effect of slowing progress and reducing what is currently offered.

Consultations

The minority community organizations were not consulted during the formulation process of the Agreement's action plan. Although the participants in this study feel it desirable to consult the community, the province is concerned with preserving its authority and retaining the flexibility to implement activities that do not necessarily incorporate the priorities of the community (such as bilingual signage). For its part, Canadian Heritage would like to see a firm link between the priorities of the community and those of the province, but remains aware of the need to respect the concerns of its partner.

The community's development priorities are established under its overall development plan, which is an integral part of the Canada-Franco-Manitoban Community Agreement. For some parties, this mechanism is inadequate in the context of the implementation of the Canada-Province Agreement in the area of intergovernmental cooperation.

Section 41 of the *OLA*

Very few interdepartmental initiatives have been implemented in Manitoba in connection with the delivery of services in French. Apart from the single window project, which draws on funding from Treasury Board Secretariat and the coordination of the Manitoba Council of Senior Federal Officials, the Department of Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) transfers funds to the province to provide employment and employment development services in both official languages under their devolution Agreement. The contributions of other federal departments are negotiated directly between the departments and community organizations. For example, Industry Canada granted \$25,000 to the Economic Development Council for Manitoba Bilingual Municipalities (CDEM) to develop tourism in French.

Suggestions for optimising the approach

The following suggestions were submitted by respondents from the province:

- include a clause in the Agreements obliging the provincial government to consult with the communities in formulating the action plan;
- avoid potential duplication between activities funded under the Agreement and those supported by other funding or other departments, for example, the funds provided for health care under the new Official Languages Action Plan;
- increase the funds available to meet growing demands from provincial departments interested in developing bilingual services;
- consider the priorities of the municipalities in addition to those of the province and the communities;
- improve the action plans. Although the introduction of action plans is viewed as “a step in the right direction”, they should include more specific performance indicators if they are to be truly useful; such indicators would make it possible to measure progress over time (targets). They should be harmonized between jurisdictions.

Lastly, the comment compiled during this evaluation would indicate that the funds from the Canada-Manitoba Agreement, as well as those from the Canada-Community Agreement, could be better targeted if a mechanism existed for coordinating decision-making that affects the community.

Conclusion

The funds invested by the federal government in the delivery of services in French in Manitoba have undoubtedly contributed to the current level of services, especially in the fields of the economy and health care. While this is not the only factor that has contributed to the development of services in French, the program has played an essential leverage role with the provincial departments and the municipalities in encouraging them to devote a portion of their budgets for this purpose. By investing their efforts in the designated regions, where there is a high concentration of French-speaking inhabitants, those who crafted the Agreements have ensured that a large number of Franco-Manitobans benefit from the new services that are available.

Case study: New Brunswick

The existing Canada/New Brunswick Agreement on the promotion of official languages aims to “encourage progress toward the equality of status and use of the two official languages in New Brunswick and to promote the development and equality of the two official language communities by establishing a framework and procedure for cooperation between Canada and New Brunswick in consultation, coordination and joint planning, and in the definition and implementation of the measures to be taken for this purpose.”

The first Canada/New Brunswick Agreement dates back to 1988. Further agreements followed until the signing of the most recent one on October 18, 1999, which has a five-year term. Between 1993 and 2003, the federal government has incurred actual expenses totalling \$16.4 million for this province under this program. See Annex A for the annual amounts.

The current Agreement assigns priority to the following objectives:

- advance the equality of status and use of the two official languages in New Brunswick through promotion and development;
- encourage the coordinated implementation of measures intended for the development of the French-speaking communities served by the school-community centres of New Brunswick in order to facilitate the participation in French of these communities in the various facets of Canadian society;
- encourage progress toward the equality of status and use of the two official languages within the government of New Brunswick.

The Agreement is accompanied by an action plan which describes activities in three main areas: the community, the school-community centre and governmental.

It should also be stressed that in fact, the Agreement covers only a portion of the provincial government’s obligations in the area of official languages. The extent of these obligations is described in the following section.



Background

In the 2001 Statistics Canada Census, almost 240,000 people indicated that French was the first official language they spoke. New Brunswick is Canada's only officially bilingual province. This unique status stems from New Brunswick's passage of its first *Official Languages Act* in 1969. English and French were in it declared to be the official languages of the province, enjoying "equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use".

We should also mention that, in 1981, New Brunswick passed the Act which officially recognized the existence and the equality of the two official language communities, affirming "equality of status and equality of rights and privileges" of these two communities and their right "to distinct institutions where cultural, educational and social activities can take place".

In 2002, the New Brunswick *Official Languages Act* was updated to allow the legislature and the government to discharge their respective constitutional obligations under the Charter and the case law. The broad outlines of the new Act can be summarized as follows:

- fair and reasonable thresholds for the designated municipalities, which must meet the obligations set out by the Appeal Court in its Charlebois v. The City of Moncton decision;
- a formal mechanism for redress through the creation of an Official Languages Commission;
- access to health care available through the provincial network of health care institutions in both official languages;
- confirmation of the power of hospitals and health care institutions to determine their normal working language;
- an official review mechanism.

Impact of investments

According to most of the individuals interviewed, the Agreement has resulted in many achievements in many fields. In the words of the respondents, the greatest progress stems from the passage of the *Official Languages Act* in 1969, and its updated version in 2002. According to representatives of the provincial government, the stabilization of the assimilation rate in New Brunswick testifies to the progress achieved. A majority of respondents agreed that the



Agreement constitutes a significant factor contributing to progress towards equality of status and use of the two official languages in the province. For the purposes of this case study, three examples of achievements are set out in the fields of health care, economic development and justice.

Health care

The Agreement seeks to assist regional health authorities in offering services in both official languages in accordance with the province's legislative framework. The Agreement anticipates the following strategies:

- encourage the use of additional, innovative ways of ensuring the delivery of services in both official languages;
- provide high quality documents in both official languages;
- promote and facilitate the learning and use of the second language by employees of the regional health authorities;
- promote retention through activities in the workplace.

In its activity report for the fiscal year 2000-01, special emphasis is placed on the translation of documents and language training in the health care field. For example, \$20,746 was granted to the Fredericton Regional Authority for the review and production in both official languages of education documents for patients. This contribution made it possible to offer a range of useful information to clients, in the language of their choice, thereby improving the quality of care.

In the field of language training, \$162,090 was granted for an advanced training program in French as a second language, for a term of five years, available to employees of the Moncton, Saint-John, Fredericton and Miramichi regional health authorities. As a result of this training, 30% of participants achieved a degree of bilingualism that was sufficient to deliver health care services in both official languages.



Economic development

In the field of economic development, the Agreement stresses initiatives designed to encourage the private sector to use French as a language of communication with the public. The Agreement contributed financially to the Francisation Acadie-Beauséjour campaign in the south-east of the province. The aim of this campaign was to encourage Francophone consumers to use French as a language of communication with Francophone and Anglophone businesses in the service sector, and vice-versa. According to the project's promoters, although much still remains to be done, there has been a general improvement in services in French in Greater Moncton. For example, it was noted that six of the eight recipients of last year's Citron prizes improved their services in French from poor to passable.

Justice

In the legal field, the respondents pointed to a special project for the review, re-writing and modernization of the Statutes of New Brunswick in conformity with the new legal language in French in the province. This initiative thus aims to standardize the legal technology used in the statutes of New Brunswick. According to the respondents, this initiative will result in many benefits for the public. Specifically, it will allow the French-speaking minority to use modern legislative language that reflects its socio-legal identity. It will also make it possible to mobilize the tools needed for the achievement of full linguistic equality. Lastly, the on-going progress in New Brunswick in the area of equality of access to justice will encourage other provinces to look to New Brunswick for expertise in legal writing in both languages.

The respondents also highlight the translation of the proceedings of the legislative assembly and legal training for judges. The legal services are considered adequate by community workers, even if waiting times are sometimes longer for trials in French.

Despite much positive testimony from respondents regarding the achievements of the Agreement, it remains difficult to demonstrate objective, quantifiable results. The performance indicators stipulated in the Action Plan are not accompanied by mechanisms that allow for ongoing performance measurement. As a result, those responsible are not in a position to confirm that the resources have been optimized.

Overall, the community respondents evaluate the quality of services as follows:



- **Health care:** the situation varies according to region. Health care services in French are excellent in the northern part of the province and in the Moncton area. In the Saint John area, they are adequate, whereas they tend to be mediocre in the sub-regions.
- **Justice:** mediocre to adequate.
- **Economic development:** adequate, except in rural communities
- **Culture:** adequate
- **Recreation:** passable

Relevance of funding

There is a broad consensus among respondents regarding the relevance of the Agreement in the New Brunswick context. Everyone testifies to its value. Some respondents note the specific features of the province of New Brunswick and the scope of its *Official Languages Act*. The province is viewed as a leader in Canada in the area of language rights and minority language services. It can thus serve as a source of inspiration for many minority Francophone communities throughout Canada. The respondents provide examples of achievements in the three (3) main sectors targeted by the Agreement: the community, government and school-community centres. These are the examples which elicit the largest number of comments. In the community sector, the Agreement has allowed the provincial government to support activities in the context of major meetings of la Francophonie (such as the Francophonie Summit). In the government sector, sustained support by the provincial government for the regional health authorities is noted. Lastly, the school-community centres are doing a tremendous job, thanks to the support of both levels of government.

The respondents did not respond positively to the theoretical prospect that the federal government might abandon the program. Although there is some disagreement regarding the short-term impacts, opinion is unanimous that, in the long run, withdrawal by the federal government would result in a substantial slow-down of activities. Some respondents went further, stating that New Brunswick would regress in the area of minority language services. The virtually immediate shortfall in funding for the school-community centres and its impact on cultural development activities was especially noted.

Consultations

Most respondents were not aware of the mechanisms used in preparing the initial action plan. At the time of the last review, the province held closed consultations with la Société des Acadiens et des Acadiennes du Nouveau-Brunswick and the school-community centres. The parties responsible for the Agreement also regularly engage in discussions with the provincial departments. Furthermore, the respondents in the community generally held the view that the activities met the needs of the communities. It was noted nonetheless that the objectives and activities set out in the Agreement do not always coincide with the community's "Overall Development Plan".

Section 41 of the *OLA*

The government representatives highlighted a number of interdepartmental cooperative projects, such as cooperative projects with Industry Canada, Human Resources Development Canada and the Atlantic Canada Economic Development Agency. They cited the following projects: Francommunautés virtuelles, Capacadie.com and le Centre international pour le développement de l'Inforoute en français.

These projects notwithstanding, the general impression is that federal departments are not sensitized to official languages issues and their programs are not designed to address the needs of official language communities. Some respondents claimed that in areas such as health care, economic development and innovation, a number of projects could be taken over by Health Canada or Industry Canada. Administrative complexity was also noted as the main stumbling block.

Suggestions to improve the approach

The respondents made a number of suggestions for improving the Program:

- that Canadian Heritage managers in the region meet, in the same way as provincial officials, to share knowledge, experience of best practices and to be plugged in to the information circuit;
- that the New Brunswick Department of Intergovernmental and International Relations be more strategic and demand greater accountability from other



- provincial departments. More substantial reports from departments would ensure greater transparency, better management and greater accountability to the public;
- that the criteria for ad hoc projects be more specific;
 - greater rigour, equity and uniformity in the distribution of funds at the Canada-wide level;
 - better coordination of consultation mechanisms;
 - greater emphasis on communication and on publicising success stories.

Conclusion

Although it covers only a portion of the provincial government's obligations in the area of official languages, we can conclude that the Canada-New Brunswick Agreement contributes significantly to the delivery of services to the official-language minority in this province. It helps significantly to contributing substance to the bilingualism structure that was installed in the province in 1969 and has been improved since then.

The interviews revealed a broad consensus on the relevance and benefits of the Agreement. While it is viewed as a good way of assisting progress towards equality of status and use of the official languages within the provincial government, optimization of its resources remains difficult. The performance indicators and evaluation mechanisms currently in place do not appear to make possible an objective analysis of the results.



2.2.2 Other provinces and territories at the consolidation stage: Prince Edward Island (1988), Quebec (1989), the Northwest Territories (1985), Nunavut (1999) and the Yukon (1988)

The following paragraphs present the findings for the other provinces and territories that signed on to the program at an early date: Prince Edward Island, Quebec, the Northwest Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon. Annex A displays the actual expenditures incurred by the federal government for these provinces and territories during the period covered by the evaluation. Since they were not analysed as case studies, the information obtained for these jurisdictions is less exhaustive than that for Manitoba, New Brunswick and Ontario.

Results

Prince Edward Island

The implementation of the Agreement in this province forms part of a political and legislative recognition of services in French. According to the respondents, the policy and the *French Language Services Act*, as well as the creation of the Francophone Affairs Division, constitute major victories and turning points in this province. The Agreement provides essential support to the implementation of the Act.

According to the respondents, the Agreement contributed to setting up the Centre scolaire-communautaire Carrefour de l'Isle-St-Jean, the development of a translation service for documentation intended for the public and the establishment of French-language libraries. The Agreement has also had a positive impact on the relations between the Acadian community and the political class and the rest of the community. By way of an example, a project for a school-community centre in Souris is apparently very well received by the Anglophone population of the community. This was not the case when the Carrefour was established in Charlottetown in the late 1980s.

On the health care services side, we note substantial variations from one area of the Island to another. In the county of Prince East, we note one bilingual community health centre which dispenses good services. Services are, however, mediocre in the remainder of the province. Mention must nonetheless be made of the establishment of the Réseau de services de santé, a grouping of 16 representatives who work to coordinate the delivery of health care services in

French more effectively in the province.

In the area of justice, services in French are regarded as mediocre. Only one judge in the province speaks French, and legal aid is virtually non-existent. The waiting list is long and in most cases, trials in French are conducted through an interpreter. Pre-trial mediation services are not available in French.

Economic development services are growing strongly. The provincial government is effectively promoting the Acadian areas in Quebec. Considerable emphasis is placed on cultural tourism. A large number of employees in the tourism offices are bilingual and offer service in French. Many of the brochures and other promotional materials have been translated. It was noted, however, that services to business in French are underdeveloped.

In the cultural field, services are rated passable to adequate. Acadian cultural organizations have access to funds in two provincial cultural development envelopes. One envelope is devoted exclusively to the development of Acadian culture. The province has hired a full-time officer in charge of cultural development. On the recreational side, services are mediocre to passable: mediocre in the case of municipalities, who are in large measure responsible for recreation, and which are not sensitized to the issue of services in French; passable for services offered by community organizations specially funded for the purpose by the province.

Quebec

The most recent Agreements in this province were concluded in the legal and health care fields. Overall, although the situation has not progressed since 1999, notable progress has been made in the health care field since the early '90s. In the legal field, a major reform has been undertaken in the area of legal training and ten judges will soon graduate from this program.

The study reveals that the Agreement has provided a means of forging ties between the Anglophone communities and the health and social services system, particularly where the Anglophone population is small and scattered, and where community infrastructures are fragile. The presence of "English-Language Services Coordinators" in each regional access board has been the key factor in the success of this initiative. Almost 1,200 documents have also been translated.

Also in the health care field, a consultation involving Anglophone community groups, which took place in 1993, nonetheless revealed gaps in some regions and institutions. To date, information activities by means of documents and media have proved most useful in militating the lack of contact between the Anglophone communities and the regional health care planning authorities. One of the results of the Agreements has been an increase in the number of Anglophones on regional boards and other regional institutions.

There are nonetheless sharp variations between regions. Primary health care services are accessible in Montreal, but not in the Gaspé, the Magdalen Islands or the Lower North Shore. Some improvement in Anglophone services was noted over the course of the past decade, as a result of the legislative framework which obliges regional authorities to address the needs of Anglophones, and the Agreement made it possible to hire regional coordinators to provide liaison between the community and the regional councils. However, the end of the Agreement in 1999 terminated most of the regional coordinator positions. Although sufficient momentum has been built up to maintain the level of services, little progress has been made since 1999.

In the justice field, the representative of the Conseil de la magistrature [Council of the Magistracy] notes that the results of the Agreement are just beginning to be visible, partly due to a recent (2001) revision of the language training program for Quebec judges. Since this revision, training is better targeted and the results are measured more effectively. The aim is to give them the tools to preside over criminal trials in English. Ideally, it is hoped that they would also be able to write their judgements in English.

Northwest Territories (NWT)

French and English have been recognized as official languages in the NWT since 1984. According to the Final Report of the Special Committee on the review of the *Official Languages Act* (NWT, 2003) services in French were expanded between 1991 and 1994. The study reveals that the situation in the NWT has improved since 1997 in the publications field, since the federal government has contributed to the translation of numerous government forms and documents. However, the situation in all other areas has been stagnant.

Person-to-person service delivery is especially critical for all government services. Although a substantial investment has been made in the area of language training, service delivery in French is extremely limited and fragmentary. Bilingual staff are not often identified



as such and there are no positions designated bilingual.

In the areas of economic development and health care, the services are considered non-existent. One person acts as an interpreter in the capital's hospital, but that person is not always available for the purpose. The situation is less critical in the legal field, where services are judged "passable". The statutes are translated and the Clerk is bilingual. In the cultural field, the funding received from the Government of the NWT for community radio is appreciated. With regard to recreational activities, services are delivered by the municipalities, exclusively in English.

L'Association Franco-Ténoise has made an offer to the government to assume responsibility for delivering services in French on its behalf. In 1991, the Association was given a mandate to offer services in French via a toll-free line, but this service was abolished in 1996. According to the departmental respondent, there are three challenges in this area. The first is to negotiate with the various departments and to identify which services can be delegated to this single window. The second challenge is to offer a level of services equivalent to those available in English. The third challenge is to deliver services within a reasonable time. Health, justice and social services would be excluded.

Nunavut

The most recently created of the territories signed an Agreement with the federal government in 1999, the year it was established. The distinguishing feature of Nunavut is the high percentage of Inuit (85%) in its population.

Overall, the respondents say that the Agreement has had little impact to date. The funds have been used essentially to translate statutes, documents and to support projects organized by the community. Translations have been produced primarily in the areas of justice (the NWT statutes transferred to Nunavut had to be revised and translated) and health care. One person working in the Office of Francophone Affairs can answer questions in French. Negotiations are under way between the two governments for the creation of a single window.

In all other fields, the policy of the Government of Nunavut is to offer services in Inuktitut as a priority. Overall, services in French are considered mediocre. In the health care field, one interpreter and several Francophone nurses are available at the hospital, but these resources are



Canadian
Heritage

Patrimoine
canadien

Canada

far from adequate. According to one respondent, health care services are too specialized to be provided by a single interpreter in the institution. In the justice field, an interpreter can travel to translate proceedings on site. For criminal trials, a bilingual judge travels from one community to another.

The cultural field is perhaps the one in which the impact is most visible. Funds have been used to establish a Francophone centre and to make available cultural programming, including a radio station which broadcasts on a daily schedule, theatrical plays and social evenings attended by all members of the community, including Inuit and Anglophones. The centre has become a genuine meeting place in the town. It contributes to increasing the fund of goodwill on the part of Inuit and Anglophones. Evening courses are offered there in French and apparently cannot keep up with demand. Support provided by the Agreement helps to give the Association credibility as a spokesperson.

The feeling nonetheless is that nothing would have been done without federal support. It must be said that the Agreement caused tensions within the government and a degree of dissent on the part of the Inuit population. This impact was to some extent unexpected.

Yukon

In the Yukon, a succession of territorial governments that were sympathetic to this issue contributed to shaping excellent cooperation between the Francophone community and the government. The leadership exercised by the head of the French Language Services Office and his advantageous position within the administration also resulted in positive decisions in this area.

According to the representative of the Office, there was virtually nothing in the way of services in French prior to 1988. Not a single form had been translated, whereas today, all the government's forms are available in French. Signage in the departments is also bilingual, as are a substantial number of government letters and communications. Bilingual positions have been designated and the government Web site is presented in both languages (which is not the case in the NWT). The representative of the community believes that, without the Agreement, there would be fewer services and the community would feel threatened with assimilation.

The main challenge is to maintain the pace and continue the work that has been begun.

Under current circumstances, the need is to maintain the support of the highest levels of government. Elections were held recently and the initial signals emanating from the new government were less positive on this issue.

As was mentioned earlier, the strong aboriginal presence in the Yukon is an important dimension of life in the Territory. In the past, this presence was used to justify inaction on the part of the government. According to the representative of the Francophone community, the Francophone association has not yet managed to establish close ties with the Aboriginal community.

In specific fields, services are deemed mediocre to passable. In the health care field, many Francophones work at the Whitehorse hospital, including a part-time services coordinator. The unfortunate thing is that the services are not continuous: “If you’re lucky, you’ll receive service”. In the justice field, services are also deemed passable: the Statutes have been translated and the Clerk is a Francophone. There is also an interpretation service.

Services in the area of economic development are considered mediocre. No services are provided in person, and only translated documentation is available. In the cultural field, services are also deemed mediocre. A passing grade is given to recreational services, where funding is available for activities in French.

2.2.3 The provinces at the development stage: Newfoundland and Labrador (1993), Nova Scotia (1989) and Saskatchewan (1988)

Annex A shows actual expenses incurred by the federal government in these jurisdictions during the period covered by the evaluation.

Results

Newfoundland and Labrador (Nfld)

In Newfoundland and Labrador, the Agreement is used primarily to fund translation, language training and a community centre. According to a representative of provincial government, activities did not really get under way until 1995. In the training field, several hundred public servants have taken part in training activities (200 in 1999-2000, 75 of whom were enrolled in advanced courses). Despite this number, the feeling is that this is merely “scratching the surface”: the need for and interest in training are enormous. According to representatives of the government, there is a constant turnover of staff, which necessitates training on a continuous basis, and there is an increasing recognition of the importance of French - especially in economic terms. With bilingual public servants, the Government of Newfoundland is in a position to offer health care services in French and to engage in dialogue with officials and business people from outside the province. To this extent, there is a feeling that the impact is significant, even if it has still not reached its full potential. No positions are designated bilingual and there is a problem of turnover with front line personnel. However, public servants can receive a bilingualism bonus.

Translation is an essential service and the Agreement is used to pay the cost of translating documents for public use. An Agreement to this end has been signed with the federal government’s Translation Bureau.

Generally speaking, the provincial government is aware of the advantages inherent in the Agreement, but it is highly unlikely that it would make up the difference if the federal government were to withdraw.

In the health care field, services in French are considered passable, even though, according to the representative of the community, there is no access to them in some towns. In the justice



Canadian
Heritage

Patrimoine
canadien

Canada

field, services are rated passable. Lawyers and judges are bilingual, although there is a problem with support staff.

In the economic development field, the province is considered, overall, to lag far behind. On the cultural side, no resources are allocated, apart from infrastructure, and hence there is no service. Services for recreational programs are mediocre.

Nova Scotia

Progress in Nova Scotia is modest, when compared to other provinces. The Agreement gave rise to an awareness on the part of provincial public servants of the needs of the official language minorities and the creation of school-community centres. The legal battles generated the greatest advances in the area of services in French in the province.

In the health care field, the emphasis has been placed on language training. Every year, over 300 public and para-public sector employees undergo training, including 110 from the health care field. However, services remain mediocre. A few information brochures are available in French. The Agreement does not fund any positions designated bilingual and services in French are marginal. The most striking example is the IWK children's hospital, where a single employee is assigned to translation for patients. The hospital nevertheless has a mandate to serve all the Atlantic provinces and is accordingly funded by all four.

In the area of legal services, services in French at the Criminal Court are considered adequate. At the Family Court, they are considered passable, while legal aid services are mediocre. Services in French in the area of economic development are considered passable. Le Conseil de développement économique de la Nouvelle-Écosse, an Acadian organization, acts as liaison between the provincial government and the economic sector. Some effort appears to have been made to promote Acadian cultural tourism.

In the area of culture and recreation, services are deemed mediocre to passable. Nova Scotia apparently once had a cultural officer, but this position was eliminated. The provincial government does not see the justification for funding French-language shows and cultural events. The government's only contribution in the recreational field is some modest help for participants in Les Jeux de l'Acadie. Services in French are virtually non-existent in most other sectors.

Saskatchewan

The respondents maintain that significant progress has been made in Saskatchewan in recent years. According to the representative of the provincial government, relations between l'Association franciskoise and the Departments have improved and significant progress has been made in the availability of services in French over the past three years. The French Language Services Coordination Office provides an active translation service. The budget and the Throne Speech were translated in the last fiscal year and an initiative is under way to translate the statutes. A single window project is being explored to expand the service further.

In health care, bilingual services are available in communities where the Francophone population is concentrated, and “substantial” progress has been made, according to the community representatives. Nonetheless, the dispersal of the Francophone population over a large geographic area means that many Francophones do not have access to services in their own language.

Significant progress has also been made in the justice field, due specifically to guaranteed access to trials in French in all the province's courts. Little progress has been noted in the area of economic development and culture, although relations with the Department of Culture are considered good.

In the view of community representatives, what progress that has been made is due entirely to the Agreement and to other sources of federal support for bilingualism. Health Canada and Justice Canada have also contributed to progress in their respective areas.

2.2.4 The provinces at the initial stage: British Columbia (2001) and Alberta (1997)

The federal government has very recently concluded Agreements with British Columbia and Alberta, the last two provinces to join the program. The actual expenditures incurred by the federal government in these jurisdictions during the period covered by the evaluation are set out at Annex A.

Results

British Columbia (BC)

As one of the respondents put it aptly, the Agreement in BC is taking its first faltering steps. Judging by the results, efforts have been concentrated in the legal field and on the translation of documents. The “Newcomers Guide to BC” has been translated, as has a guide for farm workers produced by the Centre culturel francophone de l’Okanagan. Several other major projects are also under way. The “BC Health Guide” is being translated. It is also expected that other provinces will make use of this translation. The production of a tourist brochure and the updating of the French-language tourism Web site are also under way.

In terms of services, some observers have noted that the greatest progress has been made in the legal field, due to a number of legal decisions. Criminal trials may be held in French and the office of the Ombudsman also accepts complaints in both official languages. Following discussions with other provinces, an attempt is currently being made to create a health telephone help line in French covering the western provinces.

The emphasis on translation and justice means that the Agreement has had little impact since it was signed in terms of person-to-person services. In the health care field, services in French are rated mediocre to passable by the respondents. There are a few French-speaking doctors, although little effort has been made to identify and coordinate these professionals to make them visible and accessible to the Francophone population. Following the work of a sectoral panel on health care, recommendations were formulated to establish services in French. According to the respondents, the province is, however, hesitant to follow through on the recommendations, fearing the impact of a potential withdrawal of the federal contribution. The provincial government would prefer to invest in specific ad hoc projects, such as document

translation.

Services in the justice field are considered mediocre. As was mentioned above, it is possible to obtain the services of an interpreter when a request is made to the criminal justice authorities. Such requests frequently involve long delays. French-speaking lawyers are also rare, despite the existence of some demand, according to a community representative.

Services in the field of economic development are also deemed mediocre. The tourism offices apparently make little effort to serve tourists in French. La Société de développement économique francophone de la Colombie-Britannique has deployed one of its counsellors to the Okanagan region, where Francophone entrepreneurs now have access to this resource for business information and advice. As far as culture is concerned, the services are considered passable. The Associations assist the government in this field by organizing artistic and cultural events. Services in the recreational field are considered mediocre.

Alberta

Alberta was the last province to sign an Agreement under the program (2002). For some respondents, the signing of an Agreement is itself an indication of progress, even if few results are visible one year later. Nevertheless, projects are recorded in the areas of health care, justice and tourism.

In health care, a project is under way to develop services in French in the Peace River District. The project will develop a model that can be used in other regions of Alberta or of Canada. Services elsewhere are non-existent, as a result of which the overall level of service is considered mediocre at this point.

Services in the justice field are passable. According to one of the respondents, citizens generally have access to the legal system in their own language in Alberta. In the economic field, services are considered passable. A pass mark is also given to culture, where the government has recently loosened the purse strings, especially in music, theatre and the visual arts. Services in French in the recreational field are mediocre.

2.3 Design and delivery

Although this is a summative evaluation, information was gathered in the area of program design and delivery. This fourth section summarizes the points made in this regard.

2.3.1 Action plans and accountability

Action plans are developed by the provinces and territories to implement the agreements. According to most respondents, the action plans are useful and are followed. Among their strengths, we note that action plans establish a useful framework for compiling accounts, give common direction and provide an opportunity to consult the community. A number of respondents said that they appreciated the flexibility allowed by Canadian Heritage in terms of the implementation of the activities specified in the plan. In one case, it was also mentioned that the switch to overall objectives was far more useful than a mere list of projects.

Some respondents, however, felt that the content of the action plans was too abstract and that the results were difficult to measure. In two territories, it was noted that the action plans tend to be summaries or focussed on maintaining services. It must be noted that both cases reflect the overall immobility of the program in these territories. One federal public servant noted sharp variations between the provinces, with some plans being quite precise and others not.

According to the conditions of the Agreements, the provinces and territories are required to complete an annual report to account for the results. While some representatives of the federal government say that the provinces' reports are useful in identifying activities and results, others feel that this approach is inadequate for the purposes of effective accountability. More detailed results are needed. Two other respondents preferred more detailed reports covering the results over a five-year period, and less detailed annual reports.

Five of the provincial representatives stated that the requirements in terms of accountability were acceptable and met the needs of their province/territory. The others expressed some reservations about the process, including the following:

- two of the respondents said that the results of the program are difficult to quantify. They would respond favourably to better supervision and support on the part of Canadian Heritage in terms of the evaluation of results. It would be desirable, among other things, to improve the indicators. These questions should



be the topic of an increasing amount of discussion and consensus.

- it is mentioned, moreover, that the requirements of the Department seem to vary from one region to another. There is very little similarity.
- one provincial respondent deplored the lack of instructions for the performance reports and action plans. The expectations and roles were not clear.

However, some governments (including that of the Yukon), use the reports as a communications tool. Because of the flexibility allowed by the program, the Yukon government has designed a report in a CD-ROM format and on paper, which facilitates reading. The report has wide distribution, in particular to representatives of the community.

2.3.2 Use of funds

All the respondents on this evaluation were also questioned about the appropriateness of the use of program funds. Generally speaking, the provincial/territorial representatives were agreed that the activities and priorities were well targeted and distributed, at least within each jurisdiction. (It would have been surprising had they thought otherwise, since most of the activities were proposed by these parties). Some special projects, nonetheless, raised questions about their ability to advance the status of the minority communities, since they were ad hoc and not considered structural over the long term.

On an annual basis, some 15% of the federal funds devoted to this program are dedicated to special projects. These projects are selected on a case-by-case basis, and differ from those included in the action plans. According to one representative of the Department, they are designed, among other things, to respond to changing government priorities and to fund ad hoc events. Among others, we can cite the single window project in Manitoba, the study on the status of official languages in the Northwest Territories, the Games of la Francophonie 2001 and the *Congrès mondial acadien*.

The question of the selection criteria for projects was raised with the various parties. While the federal government believes that the selection criteria are satisfactory, the provincial government respondents expressed a number of reservations about these criteria. Some people say that they are lacking in clarity, while others did not know they existed. Most are agreed that the criteria are not clearly defined. Some believe that these projects respond to imperatives which go beyond the program framework. Some provinces say they have been well served by

this approach, while others say not. Some questioned the justification for these projects or their long-term structuring effect.

Furthermore, some representatives of Canadian Heritage questioned the relevance of funding community organizations. In their view, the program should be limited to activities administered by the provincial and territorial governments. The program should also leave other federal departments with responsibility for funding activities in sectors such as health care, which do not fall within the purview of Canadian Heritage. In this regard, a substantial number of those consulted also mentioned that the Department intervenes in action plans that fall under the purview of other federal departments or agencies. The possibility of duplication, especially with federal departments that are viewed as providers of funds under the new Official Languages Action Plan was raised frequently.

2.3.3 Federal-provincial/territorial cooperation and its mechanisms

As a general rule, we note that cooperation between governments - and the quality of the involvement by the provincial and territorial governments in general - depends on the good intentions and political parameters of the governments in place. Some are more open, others less so, and this can change as governments change. Ontario and Yukon are good examples of jurisdictions where the election of new governments substantially altered the status of Francophone affairs in those governments. Overall, there is agreement that cooperation between the levels of government is good.

Cooperation is sustained by meetings of ministers (Ministerial Conference on Francophone Affairs) and by meetings of the network of officials responsible for Francophone affairs (Responsables gouvernementaux des Affaires francophones). The former are annual meetings, whereas the latter are held approximately once every three months. Most respondents shared the view that these meetings are useful and that they improve from year to year:

- according to one federal government representative, the meetings of officials break down the isolation felt by those responsible for Francophone affairs in the small provinces. These meetings give officials an opportunity to discuss the range of challenges they have in their jurisdictions and to solicit advice from their colleagues. The position of National Coordinator of Francophone Affairs is highly effective and provides continuity between meetings.



- some respondents noted that the ministerial conference has improved over the past few years and is becoming more action-oriented. Meetings have resulted in inter-provincial cooperation projects (the Health Guide on the initiative of British Columbia, Ontario-Manitoba Cooperation on Health, Manitoba-Alberta in the field of education, etc). The ministers commit themselves to taking action and report to the meetings.
- one representative of Canadian Heritage was of the view that the Department's officials working in the field would benefit from national meetings to share experiences of the implementation of federal/provincial-territorial agreements in the area of services.

Very few comments were made in the course of the study about these meetings. One person said that the ministers could not speak on behalf of their Cabinets at these meetings, which was problematic because language involved all ministries. According to one of the Territorial respondents, the meetings are more effective for those provinces that have made progress. The Territories derive less benefit from the meetings because of the lack of political support on the part of their governments.

2.3.4 Alternative solutions

The evaluation also provided respondents with an opportunity to propose alternative solutions to current practice. These are listed below:

- a mechanism should be instituted to finance interprovincial projects;
- officials of the Department of Canadian Heritage in the regions should play a greater role in the process of planning and managing the agreement. They must be more proactive, results-oriented and given more responsibility;
- delays in payment are a problem and it would be beneficial if improvements could be made to the system;
- the process of applying for funding is cumbersome, with too much paperwork and too much zeal on the part of the federal bureaucrats;
- the provinces could accomplish more if the federal government would provide more money. This would help to generate greater momentum. At the very least, the current amounts should be indexed;
- special projects should be abolished. It would be preferable to see an increase in



Canadian
Heritage

Patrimoine
canadien

Canada

the amount of money allocated to the program.

3.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final section sets out the conclusions of the evaluation and the recommendations arising therefrom.

3.1 Summary and conclusions

3.1.1 Relevance

Generally speaking, the respondents believe that the program is compatible with the priorities of the federal government and those of the Department of Canadian Heritage.

It is generally agreed that provinces and territories still require federal funding to provide English- or French- language services to their minority communities, although the need for such financial support varies. Some provinces are in the early or developing stages of providing such services and invest moderate sums on services for their minority communities; others invest more significant sums and offer a more significant level of services. In all provinces, however, federal funding serves as an important financial and political incentive. In the territories, the situation is somewhat different. French is recognized as an official language on the understanding that the federal government will cover the entire cost of French-language services.

The context in which this program operates has changed recently. Some federal departments, including Health Canada, Human Resources Development and Justice Canada, received funding under the Action Plan for Official Languages to address official languages issues. Although the Department of Canadian Heritage has filled a void in this regard for a long time, as mandated in Section 43 of the *OLA*, the question is now to determine how the Department's involvement will change to reflect new players in this area. A number of projects funded under this component of the program were related to the mandate of these other departments.

Although the partners agree to acknowledge Canada's contribution to activities funded under the agreements, less than one third of Canadians know that the federal government works with the provinces and territories to improve services to minority communities.

3.1.2 Success of the program

The lack of expected results for this program and lack of performance indicators has made it difficult for us to determine how successful the program has been. It was not possible to establish a direct causal link between contributions made under the agreements and the progress made in each jurisdiction, since the cooperation agreements are not the only effort made by the various orders of government and other stakeholders to improve services to Canada's minority communities in their own language.

Our hypothesis that a long-term intervention in a province or territory should, in principle, significantly improve services to minority communities could not be confirmed for each jurisdiction that received this level of intervention.

In short, some provinces have made significant progress, for example, Manitoba, which has been a model in this regard. Another example is Prince Edward Island, which has a *French Language Services Act* that was introduced partly with the help of the federal government. The performance of some provinces and territories, such as Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan, has been rather disappointing. The situation is somewhat different in Quebec and Ontario, where the federal contribution is more symbolic and is a form of political leverage. In New Brunswick, the only officially bilingual province, the results show that federal funding has a major impact, especially in light of this province's precarious financial situation. Lastly, it should be noted that Alberta and British Columbia's recent signing of agreements is a victory in itself for the program, and there is every reason to believe that this will have a positive impact on services in these provinces.

Overall, the program has had varying degrees of success, depending on the province or territory and the area of intervention. A number of provinces indicated that the progress that has been made is in large part due to federal-provincial cooperation. Although acceptable progress has been made in most jurisdictions through contributions, the results in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut are not evident. The level of service that can realistically be offered in these jurisdictions, which have very small minority communities, is questionable.

Few unexpected impacts have been pointed out. The most significant was in Nunavut, where tensions have emerged within the political class, with a portion of it demanding more intervention in the development of services in Inuktitut. However, the social activities



organized by the community appear to be leading towards the building of solid links between language communities.

3.1.3 Design and delivery

The Department of Canadian Heritage funds activities through the provincial/territorial agreements which are the responsibility of other federal departments and agencies, particularly in the areas of justice and health care.

The program funds numerous activities such as language training, translation (documents, Internet sites and signage) and community services. Although most participants in this evaluation believe that the investments were well targeted, questions were raised concerning the capacity of certain activities to maximize results. These activities are:

- specific projects that have little or no long-term structural impact; some of these are special projects (i.e. 2001 Games of la Francophonie; *Congrès mondial acadien*);
- economic development projects that directly benefit a clientele other than the program's target clientele (e.g. tourists);
- community projects for which other sources of funding are available, for example, through the Canadian Heritage Support for Official-Language Communities Program;
- language training, the effectiveness of which is questionable given the results in certain jurisdictions (Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador).

An envelope representing 15% of program funding is allocated to the funding of special projects. Some of these projects are for activities similar to those found in provincial and territorial action plans. We have to wonder why these activities were not funded through regular budget funding. The funding criteria for these projects are not clearly defined and are largely discretionary.

With regard to accountability, the action plans are a step in the right direction. However, there is a lack of consistency in the plans, performance indicators are not provided, and results when specified are difficult to measure. The annual reports produced by the provinces and territories lack consistency and are not yet really results-based.

Given the percentage of Canadians who are aware of federal-provincial/territorial cooperation with regard to the delivery of services to minority communities, more could be done to raise awareness of the federal government's participation.

The respondents contributed a number of suggestions, of which we have retained the following:

- the accountability framework should be improved;
- the funding criteria for special projects should be set out in detail;
- care must be taken to ensure that the Official Languages Action Plan does not lead to duplication between departments;
- the needs of the cities must be considered, since some of them have larger populations than some provinces;
- greater emphasis on communication and on promoting the program's successes.

3.2 Recommendations

In light of the results, the following recommendations are made:

Recommendation 1: Given the lack of evidence of results in some jurisdictions, especially the Northwest Territories and Nunavut, and despite major contributions sometimes over a long period, the Department's strategy in these jurisdictions should be reconsidered.

Recommendation accepted - The Department recognizes that the results achieved in certain jurisdictions are difficult to identify at times. The action plan approach, introduced in 1999-2000, is designed to ensure a clearer statement by the provinces and territories of the anticipated results, the measures to be taken to achieve them and the performance indicators to be used to measure their success in attaining them.

The Department intends to use the renewal of agreements as an opportunity to improve the action plan approach, specifically to be in a better position to evaluate the impact of its investments under the program, in all provincial and territorial jurisdictions. The Department will use this opportunity to examine the specific problems of the three territories.

Implementation schedule - The recommendation will be implemented during discussions leading to the renewal of federal-provincial/territorial agreements on minority-language services and the related action plans.

Recommendation 2: The Department should gradually withdraw from areas that are the responsibility of other federal departments and agencies. In the short term, and under its mandate set out in Section 42 of the *OLA*, the Department should work closely with federal departments, particularly those that received funding under the



Official Languages Action Plan, in order to prevent possible overlaps. One possibility would be signing multipartite agreements with respect to official languages with key federal departments (Health, Justice, Industry, Human Resources and Canadian Heritage).

Recommendation accepted - In response to the *Action Plan for Official Languages*, the Department will continue with its federal partners to examine various potential avenues for action to ensure that federal initiatives are complementary in such areas as health, early childhood, justice, Francophone immigration, etc. In the event of any potential overlap between the role to be played by Canadian Heritage and that of other federal departments in the context of federal-provincial/territorial cooperation, measures will be taken to avoid duplication, such as the co-signing of agreements with other departments or the signing of sectoral agreements setting out the responsibilities of each party.

Implementation schedule - The Department intends to pursue discussions relating to this recommendations with its federal, provincial and territorial partners throughout the implementation period of the *Action Plan for Official Languages*.

Recommendation 3:

The Department's role should be more focussed in order to produce long-term benefits.

The Department should focus on funding activities:

- related to its own mandate;
- implemented only by the provinces and territories, by possibly extending funding to municipalities, which are directly responsible for delivering certain services;
- that involve more than one jurisdiction, for example, interprovincial projects.



The Department should ensure that community organizations cannot accumulate funding from Canadian Heritage for the same activities. As well, the funded activities should directly benefit the program's clientele.

The funding of language training for provincial/territorial government employees that seems to have had disappointing results in a number of jurisdictions should be reconsidered. If it does not target front-line workers or address the need to fill bilingual positions, the provinces must demonstrate that language training is warranted.

Recommendation accepted - During the upcoming negotiations, the Department will examine the measures to be implemented to guarantee that its intervention is more focussed, that it reflects the development stage of each province and territory, that it does not open the door to stacking of funding and that it provides tangible benefits to the program's clientele. These measures will include a clause regarding stacking of funding or the clearer statement in agreements and/or action plans of targeted results, program objectives, target clienteles and the merits of the activities proposed.

Implementation schedule - The recommendation will be implemented during discussions leading to the renewal of federal-provincial/territorial agreements on minority-language services and the related action plans.

Recommendation 4:

Overall accountability must be improved. Future agreements should clearly specify the expected results and performance indicators to be used to measure results.

Recommendation accepted - The Department intends to take advantage of the renewal of federal-



Canadian
Heritage

Patrimoine
canadien

Canada

provincial/territorial agreements on minority-language services to improve the action plan approach, specifically to ensure greater accountability. During the upcoming negotiations, the Department will wish to ensure that the expected results are realistic and measurable, that the planned activities are clearly linked to the results to be achieved, and that the performance indicators are more relevant. The Department will also implement a framework allowing it to report to Canadians regularly on the results achieved by the program.

Implementation schedule - The recommendation will be implemented during discussions leading to the renewal of federal-provincial/territorial agreements on minority-language services and the related action plans.



Canadian
Heritage

Patrimoine
canadien

Canada

**Annex A: Actual expenditures
1993-94 to 2002-03**

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION

Actual expenditures (\$) 1993-94 to 2002-03

P/T	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	Total
Newfoundland	136,823	107,437	206,329	198,080	316,225	360,000	450,000	450,000	433,750	451,000	3,109,644\$
NW	355,649	342,200	404,457	347,000	278,033	257,000	450,000	340,000	515,000	525,000	3,814,339\$
PEI	1,607,000	1,526,650	1,381,000	1,243,050	1,104,000	1,104,000	1,526,500	1,793,500	1,486,650	1,562,500	14,334,850\$
NB	1,645,000	1,562,750	1,349,500	1,207,000	1,139,100	1,055,000	2,452,500	1,320,000	2,495,000	2,209,000	16,434,850\$
Quebec	500,000	517,750	465,000	415,000	379,000	379,000	20,000	0	0	0	2,675,750\$
Ontario	1,219,602	1,330,000	1,138,000	1,018,000	953,426	890,000	1,665,450	1,115,000	1,187,000	1,115,000	11,631,478\$
Manitoba	1,080,800	986,962	940,000	991,000	2,025,000	780,000	1,600,072	1,200,000	1,301,600	1,350,000	12,255,434\$
Saskatchewan	322,400	321,949	278,865	297,525	257,612	250,000	315,000	283,750	325,416	342,166	2,994,683\$
Alberta	0	0	0	0	125,000	125,000	0	165,000	215,000	320,000	950,000\$
BC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250,000	688,325	938,325\$
NWT	3,769,803	3,598,000	2,455,000	1,763,000	1,135,000	1,865,000	1,575,000	1,675,000	1,650,000	1,732,835	21,218,638\$
Yukon	1,698,410	1,539,000	1,381,000	1,232,000	1,163,000	1,076,000	1,557,500	2,424,000	1,470,000	1,425,600	14,966,510\$
Nunavut	0	0	0	0	0	0	574,200	1,255,000	2,326,000	1,450,000	5,605,200\$
Grand Total	12,335,487	11,832,698	9,999,151	8,711,655	8,875,396	8,141,000	12,186,222	12,021,250	13,655,416	13,171,426	110,929,701\$



Canadian
Heritage

Patrimoine
canadien

Canada

Annex B: Data Collection Tools



Evaluation of the Intergovernmental Cooperation component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program

Interview Guide with provincial and territorial community organisations (excluding Quebec)

An evaluation of the “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program must be carried out in the context of renewal of the Program. Established in 1988, this Program is aimed at supporting the provinces and territories in their efforts to provide services in their language to official-language minority communities, in fields other than education. The evaluation seeks to determine the results achieved or progress made by the provinces and territories, over the past 10 years, resulting from this federal-provincial/territorial cooperation.

Canadian Heritage has retained the services of our firm, Goss Gilroy Inc., an independent research company, to complete this evaluation. As part of this evaluation, we will carry out interviews with a certain number of key participants including provincial and territorial community organizations. Canadian Heritage has suggested your organization should be among those participating in this exercise. The person answering this questionnaire ought to be authorized to speak for the organization. All replies will remain confidential and will be reported in aggregate form only.

General information

1. What type of organization do you represent?
2. What are your role and responsibilities within this organization and how long have you performed these functions?

Relevance and justification of the Program

3. The “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program has existed since 1988. It seeks mainly to support provinces and territories in their efforts to provide services in their language to official-language minority communities, in fields other than education.
 - Are you aware of the federal government’s support in this area?
 - To what extent is this support from the government of Canada relevant in the current context within your province/territory? Why?
4. Theoretically, what might happen if the federal government decided not to continue this Program with your province/territory? To what extent would activities initiated under the Program have taken place in the absence of federal funding?
5. Would you say Canadians are aware the federal government assists provinces and territories in ensuring services are provided in their language to official-language minority communities, in areas other than education? Do you think Canadians support federal assistance in this area? On what do you base your response?

Progress/Success

6. In your opinion, what is the level of services offered to the official-language minority community in your province/territory in the following areas:



Canadian
Heritage

Patrimoine
canadien

Canada

Excellent

Adequate

Acceptable

Poor

Non-existent

Health

Justice

Economy

Culture

Recreation Sports

Other (specify)

7. In your view, has the provision of services to the official-language minority community improved, stabilized, or deteriorated within your province/territory over the past ten years.
8. In your opinion, in what areas has progress been achieved in your province/territory during the past decade?
9. In your view, to what extent the collaborative federal-provincial Program accounts for the progress achieved to date in your province/territory?
10. Do you think this Program has contributed to attaining the following ultimate goals:
 - full recognition and use of French and English in Canadian society;
 - the development of official-language minority communities in Canada;
 - the strengthening of social cohesion and sense of belonging to Canada.

Conception and Delivery

11. Does the provincial/territorial government recognize the contribution made by the federal government in the provision of services, other than education, in the language of the official-language minority community? How?
12. During the past decade, your province/territory has participated in the Program to finance activities related to _____. To what extent do you believe these activities respond to the pressing needs of the official-language minority community in your province/territory?
13. In your opinion, has the community been consulted in the formulation of the action plan included in the federal-provincial/territorial collaboration agreement? Who was consulted? Through what mechanism?
14. In your opinion, are there thrust areas calling for special attention? Which ones and why?
15. Do you think that agreements targeted at assuring services in their language to the official-language minority communities, in areas other than education, are an effective way to strengthen federal-provincial/territorial collaboration? Might it be done through other means?
16. In your view, did the Program have unexpected positive or negative impacts for the official-language minority community in your province/territory? What are they?



Canadian
Heritage

Patrimoine
canadien

Canada

17. In light of the questions we have just discussed, can you identify any changes likely to improve the effectiveness of the Program?
18. Would you like to express any other comment?

Many thanks for your participation.



Evaluation of the Intergovernmental Cooperation component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program

Interview Guide: Federal Government representatives

An evaluation of the “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program must be carried out in the context of renewal of the Program. Canadian Heritage has retained the services of Goss Gilroy Inc., an independent research company, to complete this evaluation.

Established in 1988, this Program is aimed at supporting the provinces and territories in their efforts to provide services in their language to official-language minority communities, in fields other than education. The evaluation seeks to determine the results achieved or progress made by the provinces and territories, over the past 10 years, resulting from this federal-provincial/territorial cooperation.

In carrying out this assessment, Goss Gilroy Inc. will conduct interviews with a number of key participants, yourself included, among Canadian Heritage Program managers. All information provided to Goss Gilroy Inc. will be held in strictest confidence and findings will be presented in aggregate form only.

General information

1. Please provide a brief description of your role and responsibilities within Canadian Heritage. How long did you perform these functions?
2. How familiar are you with the “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program?

Relevance and justification of the Program

Multi-year bilateral agreements between the federal government and the provinces and territories have as their goal:

- to assist the provinces/territories in offering services in their language to official-language minority communities;
 - to assist the provinces/territories in promoting the recognition and use of both official languages; and
 - to promote stronger ties among communities.
3. In your opinion, are these objectives compatible with federal government priorities? In what way do they contribute to the Canadian Heritage strategic objectives? Please explain your answer.
 4. The Program exists since 1988. In your view, is federal support still needed? Why? Is it necessary to maintain this support in all the provinces and territories interested in receiving it?
 5. Theoretically, what might happen if the federal government decided not to pursue this Program? To what extent would activities initiated under the Program have taken place in the absence of federal funding?
 6. Article 41 of the *Official Languages Act* states that all federal departments and agencies are responsible for the development of official-language minority communities. In your view, is the department financing activities linked to the mandates of other federal organizations?
-



7. Would you say Canadians are aware that the federal government assists provinces and territories in ensuring services are provided in their language to official-language minority communities, in areas other than education? Do you think Canadians support federal assistance in this area? On what do you base your response?
8. Has the department sought done to make Canadians aware of its involvement in the area? If yes, how? If not, why?

Progress/Success

9. In your view, in which provinces/territories and in what areas have significant progress been achieved as a result of the Program over the past decade?
10. In your view, were the activities implemented by the provinces and territories well targeted? Did they maximize opportunities to improve the level of services in their language to official-language minority communities?
11. How have the agreements contributed to strengthening federal-provincial cooperation in providing services in their language to official-language minority communities?
12. Can you explain how the Program contributes to the achievement of the following ultimate goals:
 - full recognition and use of French and English in Canadian society;
 - the development of official-language minority communities in Canada;
 - strengthening of social cohesion and sense of belonging to Canada.

Conception and Delivery

13. Is it easy to attract provinces and territories in participating to the Program? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the collaboration? How could it improved?
 14. Two intergovernmental bodies currently exist, one drawing together those responsible for policy (the Ministerial Conference on Francophone Affairs) and the other, the federal and provincial/territorial civil servants responsible for Francophone affairs.
 - At what frequency do these groups meet? Is the department represented at these meetings? By whom?
 - Is federal and provincial/territorial representation at these meetings adequate?
 - Do these intergovernmental bodies foster collaboration among provinces and territories? Can you provide specific examples resulting from this collaboration?
 - How might collaboration between the provinces/territories be strengthened?
 - What are the impacts of decisions taken in these forums? Do they influence action plans?
 - What value added does the federal government derive from creation of the post of National Coordinator of Francophone Affairs?
 15. A new action plan approach was adopted in 1999. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this approach to date? Should it be pursued?
 16. Given the objectives targeted by the Program, the financial envelope dedicated to its support is relatively modest. The level of development of services within provinces/territories varies significantly from one province/territory to another.
 - On what basis are funds allocated?
 - Is this approach adequate to address the most pressing needs?
-



- Are there thrust areas that merit increased investment? Which ones and why?
 - Are there activities that this Program should not fund (eg. school-community centres, community radio, etc.) since they can be funded through other existing programs?
17. The Program also has an envelope to fund special projects. In your view, are the criteria for selecting such projects adequate?
- Services to official-language minority communities apply in thrust areas such as health, the economy, tourism and justice.
18. Has the department discussed or given some thoughts about the eventual participation of other federal departments to the Program, mainly by contributing to some activities included in the provinces/territories actions plans?
19. If yes, what has been the level of success at securing the participation of other federal departments? If not, why not?
20. In your view, did the Program have unexpected positive or negative impacts for the partners or for the clients targeted? Which ones?
21. Do the bilateral agreements provide accountability mechanisms ? Which ones? In your view, are these mechanisms effective in informing Canadians about the results achieved by this Program? In the context of the renewal of the agreements, should these mechanisms be strengthened?
22. In light of the questions we have just discussed, can you identify any changes likely to improve the effectiveness of the Program?
23. Would you like to express any other comment?

Many thanks for your participation.



Evaluation of the Intergovernmental Cooperation component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program

Guide for interviews with representatives of provincial and territorial governments (excluding Québec)

An evaluation of the “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program must be carried out in the context of renewal of the Program. Canadian Heritage has retained the services of Goss Gilroy Inc., an independent research company, to complete this evaluation.

Established in 1988, this Program is aimed at supporting the provinces and territories in their efforts to provide services in their language to official-language minority communities, in fields other than education. The evaluation seeks to determine the results achieved or progress made by the provinces and territories, over the past 10 years, resulting from this federal-provincial/territorial cooperation.

In carrying out this assessment, Goss Gilroy Inc. will conduct interviews with a number of key participants among representatives of provincial and territorial governments, including yourself. All information provided to Goss Gilroy Inc. will be held in strictest confidence and findings will be presented in aggregate form only.

General information

1. Please assist us by providing a brief description of your role and responsibilities within your province/territory. For how long have you performed these functions?
2. How familiar are you with the “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program?

Please describe how the funds is coordinated within your province.

For case study only

3. Are their specific laws regulating the language of service for government services in your province? What are the key principles of these laws?

Relevance and justification of the Program

4. An “Intergovernmental Cooperation” agreement relative to the promotion of official languages has existed in your province/territory since _____. In your view, is it still necessary to maintain federal assistance in your province/territory? Why?
5. Theoretically, what might happen if the federal government decided not to continue this Program? To what extent would activities initiated under the Program have taken place in the absence of federal funding?
6. Would you say Canadians are aware that the federal government assists provinces and territories in ensuring services are provided in their language to official-language minority communities, in areas other than education? Do you think Canadians support federal assistance in this area? On what do you base your response?
7. What does your province/territory do to promote awareness of the contribution made by the federal government toward activities financed by the Program ?



Progress/Success

8. In your opinion, what progress has been achieved with respect to the delivery of services in French in your province/territory during the past decade?

For case studies - Gather information in the areas of law, health and economic development.

9. To what extent do you believe the collaborative federal-provincial Program accounts for the progress achieved to date?
10. Has your province spelled out an action plan specifying results targeted in keeping with the bilateral agreement?
11. In your view, do special projects and activities related to the action plan implemented in your province, contributed to maximizing the achievement of Program results? How?
12. How have the agreements contributed toward strengthening federal-provincial/territorial cooperation in matters relating to the supply of services in their language to official-language minority communities?
13. Has the program contributed to the following ultimate goals:
- Full recognition and use of French and English in Canadian society;
 - the development of official-language minority communities in Canada;
 - the strengthening of social cohesion and sense of belonging to Canada.

Design and Delivery

14. Is collaboration between the federal and provincial/territorial governments effective? What are its strengths and weaknesses? How might it be improved?
15. Two intergovernmental bodies currently exist, one drawing together those responsible for policy (the Ministerial Conference on Francophone Affairs) and the other, the federal and provincial/territorial civil servants responsible for Francophone affairs. In your view, have these groups attained their goals,? Why?

If time permits:

16. At what frequency do these groups meet? Is your province/territory represented at these meetings? By whom?
- Is federal and provincial/territorial representation at these meetings adequate?
 - Do these groups foster collaboration between your province/territory and other provinces/territories? Are you able to provide examples of the specific results achieved through this collaboration?
 - How might collaboration between the provinces/territories be strengthened
 - What are the impacts of decisions taken in these forums?
 - What value added accrues from the creation of the post of National Coordinator of Francophone Affairs for your province? On a national scale?
17. A new action plan approach was adopted in 1999. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this approach to date? Should it be pursued?
18. Were minority language groups in your province/territory consulted on the action plan? Who was consulted and by what means?



19. Considering the Program objectives and level of funding, are there areas in your province/territory where additional investments would be desirable? Which ones and why?
20. The Program has funds to support special projects. Are the criteria to select such projects adequate?

Services to official-language minority communities apply in thrust areas such as health, the economy, tourism and justice.
21. How are these responsibilities shared between Francophone Affairs and the provincial/territorial departments overseeing these areas in your province/territory?
22. Under article 41 of the *Official Languages Act*, all federal departments and agencies are responsible for the development of official-language minority communities.

Has your province/territory already sought assistance from federal departments and agencies? If yes, what success have you enjoyed and with which ones? If not, why not?
23. In your view, has the Program produced unexpected positive or negative impacts for minority official language communities in your province/territory? What were they?
24. Do bilateral agreements contain accountability mechanisms? Which ones?
In your view, are these mechanisms efficient as a means of informing Canadians with respect to the results of this Program?
25. In light of the questions we have just discussed, can you identify any changes likely to improve the effectiveness of the Program?
26. Would you like to express any other comment?

Many thanks for your participation.



Evaluation of the Intergovernmental Cooperation component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program

Interview Guide for Government Representatives - Province of Quebec

- Council of the Magistrature*
- Department of Health and Social Services*

An evaluation of the “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program must be carried out in the context of renewal of the Program. The Department of Canadian Heritage has hired Goss Gilroy Inc., an independent research company, to conduct this evaluation.

Established in 1988, the Program is aimed at supporting the provinces and territories in their efforts to provide services in their language to official-language minority communities in areas other than education. Two agreements were concluded in Quebec under this Program during the period covered by the evaluation, that is, 1993-1994 to 2002-2003:

- *the Canada-Quebec Agreement on Canada’s contribution to Quebec’s initiatives promoting access to health and social services for English-speaking persons in their own language (1989-1994 and 1994-1999);*
- *the Cooperation agreement between the Government of Canada and the Quebec Council of the Magistrature (1992-1997).*

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the results achieved or progress made by the provinces and territories over the last decade, resulting from this federal-provincial/territorial collaboration.

In carrying out this evaluation, Goss Gilroy Inc. will conduct interviews with a number of key participants, including provincial- and territorial-government representatives such as yourself. All information provided to Goss Gilroy Inc. will be held in strictest confidence and findings will be presented in aggregate form only.

General information

1. For our information, briefly describe your role and responsibilities within your agency or department?
2. How familiar are you with the collaboration agreements concluded with your province since 1993 with regard to services provided to the minority English-speaking community of Quebec in areas other than education?

Relevance of, and justification for, the Program

The Intergovernmental Cooperation Program was created in 1988. Its principal aim is to assist provinces and territories in providing services to official-language minority communities in their language in areas other than education.

3. Do you believe that this Program is relevant?



4. In your opinion, are Canadians aware that the federal government assists the provinces and territories in delivering services to official-language minority communities in their language in areas other than education? In your opinion, do Canadians support federal assistance in this area? On what do you base your response?

Progress/success

5. What activities have been carried out under the collaboration agreements concluded with the *Council of the magistrature/the Department of Health and Social Services*?
6. In your view, what were the benefits of these activities for the English-speaking community of Quebec?
7. In your opinion, would these activities have taken place if it had not been for the federal government's involvement?
8. Were the activities in question continued, and to the same extent, after the agreement expired?
9. In your view, have these agreements had unexpected positive or negative outcomes for the English-speaking minority of Quebec? Which ones?
10. In your opinion, does the Program contribute to the achievement of the following final outcomes:
- full recognition and use of French and English in Canadian society;
 - the development of official-language minority communities in Canada;
 - greater social cohesion and a stronger sense of belonging to Canada.

Design and delivery

11. To what extent did the activities carried out under the collaboration agreements concluded with the *Council of the magistrature/ the Department of Health and Social Services* meet the essential needs of the minority English-speaking community of your province?
12. Has the minority community been consulted? If so, who took part in this consultation process, and how were these consultations carried out?
13. Has the collaboration between the federal government and the province been effective? What were the strengths and weaknesses of the process?



14. Since 1999, there has been no agreement in force in Quebec under this Program. To what extent would federal assistance to your province in this area still be relevant in the current situation? Why?
15. Assuming there were to be collaboration between your province and the federal government with regard to the delivery of services to the minority community in the future, are there areas to which special attention should be paid? Which ones, and why?
16. Further to the matters we have just discussed, are there any other aspects of intergovernmental collaboration that you would like to raise at this time?

We thank you for your participation.



Evaluation of the Intergovernmental Cooperation component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program

Interview Guide with provincial community organizations in Quebec

An evaluation of the “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program must be carried out in the context of renewal of the Program. Established in 1988, this Program is aimed at supporting the provinces and territories in their efforts to provide services in their language to official-language minority communities, in areas other than education. Two agreements were concluded in Quebec under this Program during the period covered by the evaluation, that is, 1993-1994 to 2002-2003:

- the *Canada-Quebec Agreement on Canada’s contribution to Quebec’s initiatives promoting access to health and social services for English-speaking persons in their own language* (1989-1994 and 1994-1999);
- the *Cooperation agreement between the Government of Canada and the Quebec Council of the Magistrature* (1992-1997).

The evaluation seeks to determine the results achieved or progress made by the provinces and territories, over the past 10 years, resulting from this federal-provincial/territorial cooperation.

Canadian Heritage has retained the services of Goss Gilroy Inc., an independent research company, to complete this evaluation. In carrying out this evaluation, Goss Gilroy Inc. will conduct interviews with a number of key participants, including provincial- and territorial-community organizations. Canadian Heritage has suggested your organization should be among those participating in this exercise. The person answering this questionnaire ought to be authorized to speak for the organization. All replies will remain confidential and will be reported in an aggregate form only.

General information

1. What type of organization do you represent?
2. What are your role and responsibilities within this organization and how long have you performed these functions?
3. During the past decade, two agreements were concluded, one the Quebec Council of the Magistrature to.....and one with the Ministry of Health and Social Services to.....What is your level of knowledge of these agreements?

Relevance and Justification of the Program

4. The “Intergovernmental Cooperation” component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program has existed since 1988. It seeks mainly to support provinces and



territories in their efforts to provide services in their language to official-language minority communities, in fields other than education.

- Are you aware of the federal government’s support in this area?

5. Would you say Canadians are aware the federal government assists provinces and territories in ensuring services are provided in their language to official-language minority communities, in areas other than education? Do you think Canadians support federal assistance in this area? On what do you base your response?

Progress/Success

6. In your opinion, what is the level of services offered to the official-language minority community in your province/territory in the following areas:

Excellent Adequate Acceptable Poor Non-existent

- Health
- Justice
- Economy
- Culture
- Recreation Sports
- Other (specify)

7. In your view, has the provision of services to the official-language minority community improved, stabilized, or deteriorated within your province/territory over the past ten years.

8. In your opinion, in what areas has progress been achieved in your province/territory during the past decade?

9. In your view, to what extent the collaborative agreements concluded with the Quebec Council of the Magistrature to.....and the Ministry of Health and Social Services contributed contributed to the progress achieved?

10. In your opinion, did these agreements have unexpected positive or negative impacts for the Quebec anglophone minority community? Which ones?

11. Do you think this Program has contributed to attaining the following ultimate goals:

- full recognition and use of French and English in Canadian society;
- the development of official-language minority communities in Canada;



- the strengthening of social cohesion and sense of belonging to Canada.

Conception and Delivery

12. During the past decade, your province has participated in the Program to finance activities related to health and social services and to develop the capacity of judges to speak english. To what extent do you believe these activities respond to the pressing needs of the official-language minority community in your province?
13. Has the anglophone community been consulted in the selection of these activities? Who participated? Through what mechanism?
14. In 1999, the collaboration Program with the province of Quebec came to an end. Given the context, to what extent the support from the federal government in your province could still be relevant? Why?
15. Are there thrust areas calling for special attention? Which ones?
16. Do you think that agreements targeted at assuring services in their language to the official-language minority communities, in areas other than education, are an effective way to strengthen federal-provincial/territorial collaboration? Might it be done through other means?
17. In light of the questions we have just discussed, would you like to express any additional comments?

Many thanks for your participation.



Canadian
Heritage

Patrimoine
canadien

Canada

ANNEX C : LIST OF INFORMANTS



EVALUATION OF THE “INTERGOVERNMENTAL COLLABORATION” : INFORMANTS

INTERVIEWS IN PERSON

Category of Stakeholders	Name and Title	Address
Canadian Heritage Managers	Hilaire Lemoine, Director General, Official Languages Support Programs	15 Eddy Street 7 th Floor
	Hélène Cormier, Director, Policy	15 Eddy Street 7 th Floor
	Guylain Thorne, Director, Operations	15 Eddy Street 7 th Floor
	Jean-Claude Racine, Manager, Policy	15 Eddy Street 7 th Floor
	Monic Albert, Manager, Operations	15 Eddy street 7 th floor
	Lucie LeBouthillier, Manager, Atlantic Region	3, 1045 - Main Street, Unit 106 Moncton, NB E1C 1H1
	Suzanne Lafleur, Manager, Quebec Region	6 th floor, Complex Guy-Favreau, 200 René-Lévesque Blvd., West Tower Montreal, Quebec H2Z 1X4
	Michel Ruest, Rachel Gauvin, Denis Laforest, Managers, Ontario Region	330, 350 Albert Street Ottawa, Ontario K1A 1K5
	Louis Chagnon, Diane Dorge, Managers, Prairie and Northern Region	C.P. 2160 - 275 Portage Avenue Winnipeg, Manitoba R3C 3R5



Category of Stakeholders	Name and Title	Address
	Linda Johnston, Manager, Western Region	4th Floor, 300 West Georgia Street Vancouver, BC V6B 6C6
Provincial/Territorial Government Representatives	Natalie Mathews, Veronica Bricout	Confederation Building 7 th Floor, Bloc East C.P. 8700 St. John's (Newfoundland and Labrador) A1B 4J6
	Donald DesRoches Director Intergovernmental Division of Francophone and Acadian Affairs	C.P. 58 Wellington (Prince- Edouard Island) C0B 2E0
	<i>Other participant :</i> Mona Richard Administrative Assistant	
	Réal Samson Special Advisor Acadian Affairs	7th Floor Provincial Bldg. 1723, Hollis Street C.P. 187 Halifax (Nova Scotia) B3J 2N3
	Nathalie Dubois Principal Policy Advisor Official Languages and Intergovernmental Francophone Affairs N.-B.	C.P. 6000 Fredericton (New Brunswick) E3B 5H1
	<i>Other senior manager</i> Mireille Cyr Assistant Deputy Minister Francophonie and Official Languages	



Category of Stakeholders	Name and Title	Address
	Me Jean-Pierre Marcotte Secretary Conseil de la magistrature	Palais de justice 300, Jean-Lesage Blvd. Office 5.12 Quebec (Quebec) G1K 8K6
	Pierre-Paul Veilleux Director General Ministerial and Extraministerial Affairs	Ministry of Health and Social Services 1075, chemin Ste-Foy 2 nd Floor Quebec (Quebec) G1S 2M1
	Jacqueline Frank Director General Office of Francophone Affairs	4th Floor, Mowat Building 900, Bay Street Queen's Park Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1C2
	<i>Other participant:</i> Anne Premi Director Policy and Services to Ministries	
	Guy Jourdain Special Advisor Secretariat French Language Services	Palais législatif 450, Broadway Office 46 Winnipeg (Manitoba) R3C 0V8
	<i>Other participant:</i> Hélène Fisette Coordinator Planning and Programs	



Category of Stakeholders	Name and Title	Address
	Edmond LaBossière National Coordinator Intergovernmental Francophone Affairs	131, Provencher Blvd. Office 204A Saint-Boniface (Manitoba) R2H 0G2
	Florent Bilodeau Director Coordination Office of Francophone Affairs Ministry of Governmental Relations and Aboriginal Affairs	1855, Victoria Ave Regina (Saskatchewan) S4P 3V7
	<i>Other senior manager :</i> Brent Cotter Assistant Deputy Minister Governmental Relations and Aboriginal Affairs	
	Denis Tardif Director Alberta Francophone Secretariat	10055 - 106 ^e Street Office 500 Edmonton (Alberta) T5J 1G3
	Louise Goulet Director Framework Agreement Canada-B.C. on Official Languages Intergovernmental Relations Secretariat	421, Menzies Street, 2 ^e Floor Victoria (British Columbia) V8V 1X4
	<i>Other participant</i> Pierrette Maranda Senior Federal-Provincial Advisor, Intergovernmental Affairs Relations Secretariat	
	Ron Janusaitis Director Office of French Services Yukon Government	C.P. 2703 Whitehorse (Yukon) Y1A 2C6



Category of Stakeholders	Name and Title	Address
	Robert Galipeau Chief Division Official Languages Services Ministry of Education, Culture and Training	GTNO/GNWT C.P. 1320 Yellowknife (North West Territories) X1A 2L9
	<i>Other participant :</i> Janet Grinsted Director, Education Operations and Development	
	Chris Douglas Director Official Services Culture, Language, Elders and Youth Government of Nunavut	C.P. 800 Iqaluit (Nunavut) X0A 0H0



TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

Category of Stakeholders	Name and Title	Address
Provincial/Territorial Community Organizations	Federation of Francophone of Newfoundland and Labrador	
	Federation of Francophones Parents of Newfoundland and Labrador	
	Carrefour de l'Isle-Saint-Jean	
	Société Saint-Thomas d'Aquin	
	Community Concil of Grand Havre	
	Acadian Society of New Brunswick and New Brunswick Concertation Forum of Acadian Organizations	
	Community Centre Samuel-de-Champlain	
	Community Health and Social Services Network (CHSSN)	
	Quebec Community Groups Network (QCGN)	
	Association of Francophone stakeholders in health and social services of Ontario (RIFSSSO)	2, Gloucester Street, Office 205 Toronto (Ont.) M4Y 1L5
	Association of Ontario French Jurists (AJEFO)	
	Franco-Manitoba Society	
	Association of Bilingual Municipalities of Manitoba	
	Assemblée communautaire fransaskoise	
Association of French Jurists of Saskatchewan		



Category of Stakeholders	Name and Title	Address
	ACFA provincial	ACFA provincial office: 8627, Marie-Anne-Gaboury Street Room 303 Edmonton (Alb.) T6C 3N1
	Medical Family (leader of the health file in Alberta)	
	La Boussole	Community Centre Society 504, Broadway est Vancouver (C.-B.) V5T 1X5
	Women-Network British Columbia	
	Fédération Franco-Ténoise	
	Yellowknife Franco-cultural Association	
	Nunavut Francophone Association	