

~~25R-3002~~

PREFACE

This paper is one of a continuing series of occasional papers to be published by the Institute of Intergovernmental Relations. Their purpose is to provide a relatively quick and inexpensive means of communicating to practitioners, scholars and other students of federalism the results of work in progress. While many of the papers will emanate directly from work being undertaken in the Institute, we also hope to draw on work being done by others, and we invite readers to submit contributions. Subjects may range over any aspect of federalism. Papers published reflect the Institute's judgement that the subject is worthy of discussion in a wider audience. Views taken do not, unless specifically noted, constitute a statement of position by the Institute.

In these days of heady constitutional debate, and of escalating feuding between federal and provincial governments over division of powers, institutional change, or fiscal control, certain types of questions about the practice of intergovernmental relations become lost in the fray. In our preoccupation with which level of government wins or loses, we tend to lose sight of the significance of government policy for those groups and parties it is meant to serve. How then, has the public responded to the development of our federal system? This paper demonstrates that by analysing the direct experience within the federal system of a specific group with substantive policy interests, much may be learned about the broader underlying social and economic dimensions of our political system.

David Phillips, who is now completing his M.A. in political studies at Queen's University, examines

the impact of federal-provincial relations upon the goals and strategies of the french-speaking population of Ontario. His paper is both a timely assessment of the most recent federal and provincial government's language policies and a contribution to our understanding of the role of interest groups in the policy-making process. Mr. Phillips shows how very difficult it has been for interest groups to influence the political system, given intergovernmental cross-currents. The development of language policy in the last few years illustrates clearly how progress in achieving satisfactory policies for a particular interest group depends largely upon the mechanisms of co-operation between the governments concerned, and on the ability of interest groups to understand and to penetrate the federal political process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	LANGUAGE POLICIES IN INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS	5
	(a) Federal-Provincial Arrangements	7
	(b) Federal and Ontario Programmes	12
III	INTEREST GROUP ACTIVITY IN LANGUAGE REFORM	18
IV	INTEREST GROUP ACTIVITY AND INTER-GOVERNMENTAL INTERACTION	28
V	CONCLUSION	36
	NOTES	39
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	46

I INTRODUCTION

Language policies in multilingual societies represent government efforts to regulate the relations among the component linguistic communities. As a mechanism of system maintenance, a language reform programme is implemented in order to mitigate the destructive effects of the linguistic cleavage. The strategic options and the availability of instruments are a function of two over-arching determinants: (1) the nature of the social, economic, and political forces that coalesced and created the need for government action; and (2) the structural framework of the state-society relationship.

In the Canadian context, language policy plays a significant role in the federal government's efforts to secure national unity. The language reform programme¹, introduced in the form of the Official Languages Act of 1969, constitutes the federal response to the changing nature of French-Canadian nationalism in Quebec during the 1960's. A number of developments in this period served to heighten French-English tensions within Quebec and across Canada. The findings of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism demonstrated the grossly unequal status of French-speaking Quebecers in the economic hierarchy. Also, the increasing demographic concentration of French-Canadians and the growing political isolation of Quebec² contributed to the divisiveness of the linguistic cleavage. Reacting to these developments,

federal elites developed an assertive approach to the language issue in order to manage the changing relationship between the anglophone and francophone communities in Canada. The extent of the federal response however was constrained by the federal nature of the Canadian political system. The division of powers between the two levels of government limits the capacity of the federal government to institute language reform. Provincial language programmes based on similar objectives are necessary in order to implement the principle of language equality in all public policy sectors. Hence, provincial cooperation constitutes an essential ingredient in the effective operation of a national language reform programme.

Federal as well as provincial language policies are confronted by economic and social forces of francophone assimilation that strike with especial severity the French language group outside of Quebec. The wide discrepancy between the number of persons of French origin within English Canada (1,417, 265 in 1971) and the number of French-speakers (675,210) is attributable to the dispersed character of the non-Quebec francophone community which renders it highly vulnerable to the assimilationist powers of urbanisation and economic development. In addition, the proportionate size of French Canada as a whole suffers from immigration that favours the anglophone community. The capacity of the state to turn the tide of francophone 'minorisation' remains doubtful. In the nine predominantly anglophone provinces, federal grants to francophone groups for cultural development and the extension of French language rights are insufficient tools to counteract the full force of assimilation that is rooted in the economic development of Canadian society.

The intergovernmental dimension of the federal government's language policy since 1969 is one of two foci for this analysis of the policy-making process. At the provincial level, attention is drawn to the case of Ontario in federal-provincial relations. References are made to other provinces but the divergencies among the provinces with respect to language policy-making render an inclusive discussion and analysis impractical. Ontario is chosen for reasons not only of economy but also because of the high political profile of the province in the 'national unity debate'. The economic and political clout of Ontario, its close links with the Quebec government, and the existence of a large francophone population within its boundaries³ explain the importance attached to the role of the Ontario government. Also, the significance of Ontario's participation in language policy-making is a function of the aggressive independence of the provincial government. The principle of provincial autonomy and the reality of divided jurisdiction are key determinants of intergovernmental interaction in language reform, resulting in a high degree of both conflict and cooperation.

In conjunction with an examination of the relations between Ottawa and Queen's Park, this paper also considers - as a second focus of analysis - the role of interest groups in the policy-making process. Despite the dramatic shift towards positivist state intervention in the field of language, the existing structures and processes have proven themselves highly resistant to change that would allow the institutional framework to reflect the new orientation. As a consequence of bureaucratic conservatism, the federal and Ontario governments' policies for the promotion of French Language

rights have evolved in response to different sets of pressures. At each level of government, the interests of francophones are confronted with the particular bureaucratic and political structures and vested interests that are reluctant to alter the policy process even in the midst of a policy revolution. Within both the Ontario and federal governments, the input of those groups that are most directly affected by language reform has been limited essentially to advisory functions. While the stage is set differently in each government, neither the federal francophone organization - La fédération des francophone hors Québec (FFHQ) - nor the Ontario body - L'association canadienne-française de l'Ontario (ACFO) - has achieved an integral role in the language policy-making process.

For the purposes of this analysis, the time frame is restricted to the period 1970-1978 in which the federal language reform programme has been implemented and the Ontario language policy has taken shape. Furthermore, emphasis is placed on an evaluation of events and developments in the language debate since the Quebec electoral victory of the Parti Québécois in November 1976. The increased political salience of the minority language rights issue has exacerbated the tension in the relations between Ottawa and Queen's Park. Also, the threat of Quebec independence has altered dramatically the goals and strategies of organised francophone interests. By relating the language issue more directly to national unity, the effect of the PQ victory has been to enhance, in the short run, the bargaining power of francophone groups in relation with the federal and Ontario governments. In the long run, the future of English Canada's francophone population is contingent upon the course which the Quebec electorate will choose to follow in a referendum on Quebec's membership in the Canadian federation.

Our objective is to determine the relationship between (1) the activities of the FFHQ and ACFO, and (2) the interaction between the federal and Ontario governments in the language policy field. Underlying this analysis is the question of the extent to which Canada is able to implement a language policy that meets the needs of French and English-speaking minorities, as well as contributing to national unity, while simultaneously operating within the institutional and constitutional parameters of Canadian federalism.

II LANGUAGE POLICIES IN INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The federal and Ontario governments exercise their powers over language use and linguistic rights interdependently and independently. At the federal level the language reform programme as it applies to the federal administration is enunciated in the 1969 Official Languages Act. Section two of the Act provides that,

The English and French languages are the official languages of Canada for all purposes of the Parliament and Government of Canada, and possess and enjoy equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all the institutions of the Parliament and Government of Canada.⁴

The remainder of the Act outlines the method and means by which the government puts into practice the principle of language equality: reform of the public service, establishment of bilingual districts, and creation of the office of a Commissioner of Official Languages.⁵

While implementation of the Official Languages Act has proceeded since 1969, other elements of the federal policy for the extension of official language

minority rights has taken on increasing importance. The federal government has developed a variety of programmes which assist the provinces and individuals in supporting the francophone presence outside of Quebec and the English minority within Quebec. These programmes include federal-provincial arrangements for second-language and minority-language education in elementary and secondary schools, coordination for the provision of official minority language services in the court system, bursaries to individuals for immersion courses in either official language, and financial support to provincial and federal official minority language associations.⁶

The Ontario government has cooperated with the federal government by its acceptance of and participation in federal-provincial arrangements. As well, inter-governmental interaction in the language policy field has taken on the additional feature of interprovincial bargaining since the election of the PQ in Quebec, in particular as a result of Bill 101. Nonetheless, the Ontario government has adopted an independent and particularistic approach to language reform as it applies to provincial jurisdiction. While refusing to legislate the principle of linguistic equality (as exemplified by federal and New Brunswick official languages acts⁷), the Davis government has provided for French language education where the demand has met certain criteria. Also, the government has extended French language services on an 'ad hoc' basis within the provincial public administration in various policy sectors.⁸

The interaction and independent action of the federal and Ontario governments has produced an array of uncoordinated mechanisms and conflicting strategies. Because Ottawa requires provincial cooperation for the provision of French language services, any confrontation with the Ontario government counteracts the full

achievement of Ottawa's language reform programme.

(a) Federal-Provincial Arrangements

The federal Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (whose recommendations constituted the basis for the subsequent language policy) had extended its review and proposals into fields of provincial jurisdiction.⁹ The Commission had argued that provincial policies in support of both the French and English languages was essential for securing linguistic equality for anglophones and francophones across the country. In adopting the commitment to language reform in the late 1960's, the Trudeau government also acknowledged the need for close interaction with the provinces.

Language reform entered the realm of intergovernmental relations with the federal-provincial accord for 'bilingualism in education' in September 1970. The arrangements were worked out through a series of meetings between the federal Secretary of State and the provincial ministers of education. The Ministerial Committee on Official Languages for the Constitutional Conference also contributed to the discussion of a federal-provincial language policy in education. Subsequent bilateral meetings between the federal government and each of the provinces culminated in the agreement.¹⁰

The objectives of the programme were "de permettre, dans la mesure du possible, aux Canadiens de faire éduquer leurs enfants dans la langue officielle de leur choix, et aux élèves d'apprendre, comme langue seconde, l'autre langue officielle du Canada."¹¹ The agreement consisted of a series of formula payments from the federal government to the provinces. Federal subsidies of minority language education constituted 9 per cent of the average cost of educating a full-time student at the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary (but non-university) levels. Second language education funding was established at 5 per cent of the average cost. Also, a subsidy of 1.5

per cent was extended to the provinces as the federal contribution to the increased administrative costs resulting from the new measures.

While the formula has remained unchanged since 1970¹², the federal-provincial arrangements in education were extended in 1972 to include universities. New federal aid to provincial governments equalled 10 per cent of the provincial subsidy to universities providing access to an official language minority. From the perspective of the federal government, the accord signified the flexibility of the Canadian federal system without distorting constitutional principles.

Les modalités de cet accord rendent possible l'aide fédérale sans empiètement sur la compétence des provinces en matière d'éducation. Aussi, les subventions seront-elles remises aux gouvernements provinciaux, qui se chargeront de les distribuer.¹³

The provision of provincial control over the distribution of federal funds applied also to other federal initiatives in the field of education announced in 1972. Indirect federal support was extended in the form of: (a) travel allowances for students of a minority official language to study outside one's province, (b) financial aid for the construction of language training centres (as part of the educational system), and (c) bursaries to secondary and post-secondary students to learn the second official language.¹⁴

The development of these measures and the two-year delay in including university-level education in federal-provincial arrangements may be explained by the degree of conflict between the objectives of the federal government and the principle of provincial autonomy. With respect to elementary and secondary schools, the need or demand for education in French or English is a highly localised issue: it depends on the size of a minority linguistic community within a

limited area. Language reform as it applies to education thereby falls within the powers of the provincial level of government. Not only is education a field of exclusive provincial jurisdiction, but also "bilingualism in education" at the elementary and secondary levels meets the criterion of clearly being intraprovincial. For these reasons, provincial control over federal funds in this component of the federal language policy was likely a non-issue in the inter-governmental negotiations. The bargaining centred most certainly on the percentages and amounts of money involved.

However, with respect to university education, the federal government was interested in promoting access to universities by English Canadians in Quebec and French Canadians elsewhere. This objective of encouraging interprovincial mobility (Quebec/rest of Canada) underlay the federal interest in supporting official minority language education at the university level. Although the division of powers excludes Ottawa from direct involvement in education, previous federal subsidisation of universities¹⁵ and the element of interprovincialism in language policy complicated and prolonged negotiations. It is not unlikely that the federal government sought a degree of control over the distribution of funds. While, in the end, the provincial autonomy principle was upheld, it should be noted that federal funds for the Second Language Bursary Programme are paid through the Council of Ministers of Education to the provincial departments of education.¹⁶

The 'bilingualism in education' programme was renewed in 1974 for a five-year period (until March 31 1979) and discussions between the two levels have begun for the renegotiation of the accord. Between 1970-71 and

1976-77 approximately \$575 million in formula payments were granted to the provinces by the federal Department of Secretary of State (\$133.1 million in 1976-77 alone).¹⁷

The success of the programme is difficult to measure. In English Canada, enrolment in French second language instruction at the elementary level has increased steadily between 1970-71 and 1977-78 from 28.4 per cent to 42.5 per cent while at the secondary level, enrolment has decreased from 55.8 per cent to 39.9 per cent during the same period.¹⁸ The tables are turned however with respect to minority language education (viz. instruction in French rather than of French) in the nine provinces of English Canada. Enrolment has decreased somewhat at the elementary level since 1970-71 but has increased slightly at the secondary level.¹⁹ None of these trends however provides a clear indication of the impact of the federal-provincial arrangements. The effect cannot be isolated from the influence of other factors including: a decreasing birthrate, the deletion of French as a compulsory subject from the secondary school curriculum, and the absence of French as a university entrance requirement.²⁰

Quantitative measures then constitute inadequate indicators of the success or failure of the "bilingualism in education" accord. But language reform in general operates on a level that cannot easily be operationalised for the purpose of statistical analysis. Language reform affects the relationship between individuals and groups belonging to different linguistic communities: its most direct impact lies in the attitudes and actions of each language group towards the other. In the Canadian context, particularly affected is that group for which the goal of linguistic equality was adopted - the francophone minority. From the beginning of the language reform programme, part of the federal government's efforts

have been directed toward supporting the existence and vitality of the French-speaking minority outside of Quebec. Lacking constitutional jurisdiction in the field of education, Ottawa has relied upon financial incentives to provincial governments in order to increase the availability of French language instruction. The significance attached to education in one's mother tongue for cultural survival accounts for the emphasis placed upon federal-provincial arrangements for minority language instruction.

Only recently, the federal strategy of promoting French language rights outside of Quebec has included intergovernmental cooperation in the field of justice - where both levels of government exercise constitutional authority. In June 1978, the House of Commons gave third reading to amendments to the Criminal Code that provide for the right of French and English-speaking Canadians to criminal court proceedings in their mother tongue.²¹ Because the administration of courts is a provincial responsibility, the federal legislation, in order to be implemented, requires each province to pass complementary legislation. The provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec already provide court services for their official language minorities and Ontario is in the process of implementing the necessary changes (see below). As the other provinces 'opt' into the federal policy, the principle of language equality will be extended into the field of justice and the non-Quebec francophone community in particular will benefit (perhaps more symbolically than otherwise) from an additional component of the federal language reform programme.

(b) Federal and Ontario Programmes

In the fields of education and justice and in the central public service, federal support of the official minority language communities has been of an indirect nature. But the federal policy goes beyond legislating and promoting language rights; it includes direct financial assistance to francophone groups in English Canada.

Through the Official Language Minority Groups Directorate in the Secretary of State's office, the federal government awarded a total of \$3,625,000 in grants during 1976-77,

to promote the social, cultural and linguistic development of the official language communities where they exist as minorities; to foster a better understanding between the two official language groups throughout the country; and to implement projects that stress cooperation between the two groups.²²

The majority of the funds were allocated to the provincial organisations of francophones in the nine English-speaking provinces. The case of Ontario illustrates some interesting features of the programme. Eighty per cent of the total federal funds distributed in Ontario in 1976-77 were allocated to vaguely-defined categories of 'social animation' and 'cultural activities'.²³ Because animation and cultural promotion programmes constitute the 'raison d'être' of ACFO, the monies for these categories were granted almost exclusively to the provincial association and distributed by ACFO to its regional bodies and affiliated groups. It is particularly interesting that the federal government also subsidises the operational budget of ACFO (a \$35,000 grant in 1976-77), thereby supporting the organisation's lobbying

campaign against the provincial government. Thus, in Ontario ²⁴ the administration of the federal efforts to promote the francophone minority is largely in the hands of a single interest group organisation: ACFO.

Apart from federal-provincial and exclusively federal programmes in linguistic reform, the language policy of the Ontario government has experienced its own distinctive evolution. During the 1970's, and particularly since the Parti Québécois electoral victory in Quebec in November 1976, the Ontario government has been subject to pressure from both the federal government and the provincial francophone organisations to provide for the extension of French language services at the provincial level. The results have been two-fold: (a) a gradual increase in the availability of services to Franco-Ontarians in education, health, and justice especially and, (b) a steadfast refusal on the part of Premier William Davis to legislate a global language policy that would recognise guarantees for minority language rights.

The present language policy of the Ontario government originated in 1967 with the establishment of the Ministerial Committee on French Language Schools in Ontario.²⁵ The committee's recommendations supporting the right of French language instruction were adopted in the form of amendments to the Department of Education Act in 1968. The action by the Robarts government represented a recognition of French language rights that previously had been clearly absent. In 1971, William Davis extended Robarts' efforts by committing the Ontario government to provide wherever feasible public services in the two official languages of Canada.²⁶ Since that time, Ontario has experienced a wide array of studies and reports. The establishment of various commissions, task forces, advisory councils and committees has had the

cumulative impact of slow but steady progress in the extension of French language services.

In education policy, the establishment in 1972 of the Council of French Language Schools within the Ministry of Education²⁷ was followed by legislative reform for the provision of minority language education. In 1973 the amendments to the Education Act provided for the establishment of French Language Advisory Committees to Boards of Education and the creation of French language units, schools or classes in Boards where ten or more French-speaking ratepayers of a secondary school district apply to the Board (or where the Board requests). The results have been an increase in the availability of French language education. Between 1971 and 1977 the number of French language secondary schools in Ontario has risen from twenty to twenty-four and the corresponding student enrolment has increased from 17,561 to 21,456. In addition, as of 1977, there were 10,054 francophone students enrolled in thirty-six bilingual schools (intermingled with 24,167 anglophone students). The Ontario government's actions have complemented the federal-provincial 'bilingualism in education' accord to the extent that a legal basis was established for francophone services in education "where practicable". Thus, within a specific but significant field, Ontario has moved to implement the principle of minority language rights that underlies the federal language reform programme.²⁸

In the administration of justice, the Ontario government passed amendments to the Judicature and Juries Acts in April 1978 that will serve as the necessary complementary legislation for the federal policy respecting language rights in court trials. The Ontario government had requested such federal legislation and in 1975 had initiated a series of experiments providing

French language services in the provincial courts (criminal and family divisions) in designated regions of the province where such services were "required and feasible".²⁹ In the health field, the government has recently appointed a full-time Coordinator of French-language Services within the Ministry of Health "to identify the needs of Francophones and to advise the Deputy Minister with respect to the implementation of policies aimed at improving Health Services in the French language".³⁰ A 1976 report on French language health services (the Dubois Task Force Report) had documented the lack of adequate services for Franco-Ontarians who were sick, mentally ill, or handicapped. The Dubois Committee recommendations constitute the basis of an implementation plan for the provision of French-language health services which is being prepared by the Ministry of Health.³¹

Another major component of the Ontario government's language policy is the Office of the Coordinator on Bilingualism which was created in 1970. Donald Stevenson, the present coordinator, describes his role as follows:

to coordinate and advise ministries and the government on all aspects of bilingualism, and to make appropriate recommendations to the Government as to ways and means of implementing policy more effectively.³²

The Coordinator's position contrasts sharply with that of the federal Commissioner of Official Languages. Mr. Stevenson does not act as a 'linguistic ombudsman', overseeing Ontario citizens' language rights, nor does he perform the function of an 'Auditor-General', monitoring the provincial departments from the viewpoint of language and reporting back to the Legislature. Rather,

Mr. Stevenson, as an assistant deputy minister, reports to the Cabinet.³³ In the absence of a language policy articulating minority language rights, the relative weakness of the Coordinator's position is understandable. Within these limitations, the role of the coordinator has been complemented in recent years by the appointment of ministerial coordinators in various policy sectors, including Health, Attorney General, Community and Social Services, Northern Affairs and Recreation. An interministerial committee, chaired by Mr. Stevenson, provides the mechanism for the coordinators to coordinate their efforts in the development of French language services.

Advice and review are provided by two other bodies whose role has assumed increasing importance since November 1976. The Council of Franco-Ontarian Affairs, established in 1974, witnessed an expansion of its mandate in the fall of 1977. Initially limited to advising the government in the fields of culture and education in relation to the needs of Franco-Ontarians, the Council can now extend its advisory function to cover any or all ministries of the government. Also, the chairman of the Council, Omar Deslauriers (a former president of ACFO) has been appointed to the government's Committee of Advisors on Bilingualism (CAB). The CAB was established in 1970 to assist the Coordinator on Bilingualism in policy review and the consideration of alternatives.³⁴

The central thrust of the Ontario government's language policy is the extension of French language services through administrative steps in the major policy

sectors. The Ontario approach to language reform represents a rejection of Ottawa's strategy as embodied in the 1969 Official Languages Act. Reacting to increased pressures to enact guarantees for French language rights, Premier Davis has explicitly refused to legislate an official status for the French language in Ontario. His condemnation of federal strategy serves to distinguish clearly the lines of division in federal-provincial relations respecting language reform.

The method of federal implementation was so obtuse and shortsighted that it served almost to threaten the principle of bilingualism itself---Many in the Federal Government---forget the division caused by the excesses of their programs---Ontario will not be lured into either duplicating Ottawa's mistakes or responding in anger to uninvited and harmful federal interventions in this matter--- Ontario has chosen moderation, careful progress and practical programming in this area. Our approach is directly opposed to the ill-fated federal implementation.³⁵

Despite the forcefulness of Davis' remarks, the rhetoric of federal-provincial conflict in this case should not be interpreted as an indication of fundamental disagreement. In recognising the need to improve the status of francophones within Canada, the federal and Ontario governments are one. It is not the principle of language reform that is debated, but rather the method or strategy of achieving equality of rights for the two linguistic communities.³⁶ One need only consider the seemingly irreconcilable cleavage in Ottawa-Quebec relations in the language field in order to appreciate the degree to which federal interaction with Ontario in the pursuit of language reform is harmonious and constructive.

While the two governments conflict in the choice

of strategy, it is the substance of policy and the structures of the policy-making process that are criticised by francophone interest groups at both levels of government. ACFO and, since its creation in 1975 the FFHQ, have become increasingly vociferous in demanding more French language services and guarantees for the recognition of official language minority rights. Each has directed its efforts primarily toward the Ontario and federal governments respectively but their demands and actions possess a clear intergovernmental character.

III INTEREST GROUP ACTIVITY IN LANGUAGE REFORM

An examination of the role of interest groups in the policy process poses two central questions: (1) to what extent are the interests of those affected by the policy subordinated to the interests of the governments themselves (in either intergovernmental or intragovernmental policy-making),³⁷ and (2) to what extent are the interest group organisations representative of their constituencies. In other words, do the demands of the organisations match the needs of the groups and individuals or are their policies and tactics designed more for organisational self-interest?³⁸ In applying these questions to the language reform policy, one finds that Ontario francophones have benefitted from intergovernmental interaction but that their organisations have had virtually no input into the decision-making process at either level. One also notes that although they are closely related, la fédération des francophones

hors Québec and l'association canadienne-française de l'Ontario diverge sharply in representing the francophone interest. ACFO and the FFHQ each articulates distinctive demands and advocates different solutions while together they pursue their common goal: linguistic equality for French-speaking Canadians in English Canada.

The very existence of the FFHQ illustrates some interesting features of government/interest group relations in Canada. The provincial francophone organisations have existed for various lengths of time (ACFO, for example, dates back to 1910)³⁹ Also, interprovincial groups which included Quebec have developed for the promotion of the common interests of francophones. The most important of these latter groups is perhaps l'Association canadienne d'éducation de langue française (ACELF), founded in 1948, which consists of 250 organisations and 500 individuals as members. However, the sudden appearance of an aggressive federal policy affecting language rights in the late 1960's created the need for a distinctively federal body that would represent the francophone interests in Ottawa.

In 1972 the provincial francophone associations outside Quebec joined together in a 'liaison and action committee' established by ACELF.⁴⁰ The committee received financial support from the federal government while attempting to create a role for itself in advising the Secretary of State. In their relations with Hugh Faulkner however, the committee members became increasingly bitter at their ineffectiveness and at Faulkner's personal disregard for the francophone organisation.⁴¹ A task force was established by the Secretary of State in lieu of an advisory committee for the purpose of identifying the needs of the francophone community. The move satisfied none of the demands of the ACELF committee. The liaison and action committee had become

disillusioned by the lack of liaison and action in the Secretary of State's office. In November 1975 (coinciding with the publication of the task force report, "C'est le temps ou jamais"), the committee adopted a more aggressive strategy by transforming itself into la fédération des francophones hors Québec. While federal funding continued for the new body, the FFHQ was established to allow for a public campaign that would generate support for the demands of francophone organizations.

Since its creation, the FFHQ has articulated consistently two general objectives:

- (1) d'assurer l'élaboration et la mise en oeuvre d'une politique globale de développement des communautés de langue et de culture françaises";
- and (2) d'assurer la participation à part entière de la communauté francophone hors Québec à l'élaboration d'une telle politique et à la mise en oeuvre de la politique globale, au sein d'une commission permanente au Conseil Privé.⁴²

A global policy is demanded because the federation considers the existing efforts of the government in promoting the presence of francophone minority groups to be uncoordinated and lacking a long-term approach. Accordingly, these deficiencies could be overcome through membership of the FFHQ in a permanent commission of the PCO which would provide a mechanism of input for the francophone organization within the structure of government.

During 1976 relations between the Secretary of State department and the FFHQ were peaceful as both parties were preoccupied with internal matters. The department of the Secretary of State was being reorganized and a new minister, John Roberts, was appointed to replace Faulkner. The FFHQ on the other hand was in the

process of compiling data and analyses in preparation for a detailed evaluation of the francophone situation in English Canada. This study appeared in April 1977 entitled, 'Les héritiers de Lord Durham' (volume one).⁴³

Using statistics from the decennial censuses, the FFHQ presented a despairing analysis of the past, present, and future development of the francophone population in English Canada. 'Les héritiers' is replete with tables of numbers and percentages. The analysis however is narrowly defined and clearly slanted in order to underline the urgency of the demands. Ottawa's institutional reform as enunciated in the 1969 Official Languages Act is used as a 'straw man' in a condemnation of all existing government efforts in the language field. The Act, which the FFHQ admits "ne touche que très indirectement la vie des francophones vivant à l'extérieur du Québec",⁴⁴ is attacked as insufficient to counter the demographic trend of assimilation and the socio-economic inequalities from which French-speaking Canadians suffer. No acknowledgement or evaluation is presented of the federal measures to support the francophone communities and organizations (including the FFHQ).⁴⁵ The report fails to consider the federal government's shift in policy whereby language reform in the public service is de-emphasised in favour of programmes promoting the francophone presence in English Canada. In concluding that "la politique du bilinguisme institutionnel devra se transformer en une politique de développement des communautés dans tous les domaines qui relèvent de sa compétence",⁴⁶ the FFHQ completely ignores federal moves in this direction.

Nonetheless, the one-sided nature of the document can be understood in the context of pressure group politics. The forcefulness of the arguments and the convincing quality of the statistics brought media attention to 'Les héritiers' and to the FFHQ. The resulting public awareness of the plight of francophones

in English Canada was a prerequisite in the attainment of the FFHQ's objectives. It was necessary to publicise the situation in order to convince French-speaking Canadians outside of Quebec to pursue their linguistic rights through political activism.

As a member organization of the FFHQ, the Ontario francophone organization (ACFO) also favours greater political activism on the part of francophone groups and individuals. However, the different historical background of ACFO and its provincial setting have resulted in a strategy and a set of objectives that diverge from those of the FFHQ. From its founding in 1910, ACFO's efforts have been oriented heavily toward its social animation and coordination functions. The association defines itself as an "organisme de coordination et de concertation de l'activité franco-ontarienne".⁴⁷ ACFO's role is a reflection of its structure; it is an umbrella organization encompassing fifteen provincial associations and eighteen regional councils. While ACFO has attained the status as the principal spokesman for Franco-Ontarians, the organization has only recently undertaken a distinct leadership role in its relations with the Ontario government.⁴⁸

As noted above, the founding of the FFHQ in late 1975 reflected a general feeling among francophone groups that an overtly political campaign was required in order to participate effectively in the public debate over language issues. The Quebec's government's language legislation of 1974, known as Bill 22, had acted as a catalyst in this development. The controversy within Quebec heightened the political salience of the minority rights issue in general throughout Canada. Yet the decisive factor which explains the high level of activism on the part of all francophone groups is the

Quebec electoral victory of the Parti Québécois on November 15, 1976. The political independence of Quebec⁴⁹ would remove the essential rationale for the promotion of French language rights in English Canada. Canada without Quebec would not contain a significant francophone community, either in terms of numbers⁵⁰ or in terms of possessing levers of power.⁵¹ An aura of insecurity then is shared by non-Quebec French Canadians in particular. This has generated a sense of urgency among francophone interest groups for the securing of linguistic rights. Suddenly, the close relationship between language policy and national unity has become readily apparent to the general public while, to the francophones outside of Quebec, it is perceived as central to their cultural survival. The net result of these developments is an important source of legitimacy for the Trudeau government's efforts to achieve linguistic equality and to support official language minority groups.

In the case of Ontario, ACFO has become a more activist pressure group since 1976 while continuing its cultural coordination role. In its contribution to volume two of 'Les héritiers de Lord Durham' (a compilation of analyses and demands by each of the provincial francophone organizations) - 'le plan d'action' -, ACFO articulated a distinctly political orientation in its activities.

Nous aimerions que les francophones de l'Ontario s'identifient comme Franco-Ontariens et, prenant conscience de leur situation, qu'ils soient fiers de leur culture et de leur langue en travaillant à améliorer celles-ci.⁵²

ACFO aspires to destroy the general sense of apathy that pervades the French-speaking population of Ontario. It hopes that by publicising the dangers facing Franco-Ontarians a stronger feeling of self-pride and a sense of group identity will develop. Thereby, the clear trend of demographic and linguistic assimilation⁵³ may

be countered and more effective pressure may be applied upon the Ontario government to reinforce the francophone presence in the province.

The theme of political activism in 'le plan d'action' underlies the developments in government/ interest group relations since 1976. During the Ontario election campaign of 1977, ACFO raised the issue of francophone rights and services with each of the major party leaders. William Davis, Stephen Lewis, and Stuart Smith of the Progressive Conservative, New Democratic and Liberal Parties respectively all publicly endorsed the development of the French language and culture in Ontario, although the specific policies remained largely undefined.⁵⁴ A central element in ACFO's electoral strategy is to secure the election or appointment of as many Franco-Ontarians as possible in Queen's Park. In this way, ACFO diverges sharply from the FFHQ. While the federal group seeks the establishment of a Cabinet-linked permanent commission with FFHQ membership, ACFO turns its back on bureaucratic or executive structural change as the means for achieving its ends. Instead, the provincial body relies on an increase in the francophone presence in the decision-making positions as they exist. It is striking to note that ACFO makes no demand for the organization's own direct input into the policy-making process. One explanation may lie in ACFO's continuing preoccupation with its coordinative role while another reason may simply be ACFO's status as a political neophyte. As it becomes more experienced the organization may recognise the need for structural change in order for the francophone interest to be articulated effectively in the policy process.

A major event in ACFO's campaign for political activism was its twenty-eighth general congress at Cornwall in August 1977. As a basis for discussion, the ACFO executive issued 'le nouveau départ' - a statement expressing an unusually aggressive tone in making demands upon the Ontario government.⁵⁵ In accepting the report, the congress adopted a series of resolutions, two of which constitute the core of ACFO's objectives:

Que l'adoption, par le Parlement de l'Ontario, d'une loi-cadre sur les langues officielles constitue le premier objectif des Franco-Ontariens.

Que la création en Ontario d'un réseau de conseils scolaires homogènes de langue française garantissant les droits religieux constitue l'objectif des Franco-Ontariens dans le secteur de l'éducation.⁵⁶

An official languages act is regarded as essential in order to provide both a base and a framework for the continued expansion of French-language services by the Ontario government. The progress of the past decade - especially in education - is not denied. But, as an Ontario Advisory Committee on Confederation noted, "the total result is an uneven level and incompleting range of French language public services in Ontario."⁵⁷ The second major objective has emanated from two sources: (a) the series of 'crises scolaires' throughout Ontario during the 1970's, and (b) the particular problems of education services for Franco-Ontarians in the Ottawa-Carleton region. In regards to the former, the fear of assimilation associated with bilingual schools has prompted francophone groups in various school districts to demand French language schools as opposed to classrooms. The Education Act amendments did not make a distinction between the two. Hence, the principle of school board autonomy has provoked a series of controversies as boards interpret according to their own discretion the need for French language education

services (beyond the minimum conditions specified in the Education Act.)

In Ottawa-Carleton, the inadequacy of French language education for the significant francophone population is reinforced by the need for a restructuring of the school board system in the region. Francophone grievances were acknowledged in particular by the Ontario government's Commission of Study into the Reorganization of Ottawa-Carleton (the Mayo Commission) which recommended the establishment of a single French-language board of education for the entire region.⁵⁸ ACFO has seized the recommendation as the means to resolve the problems of French-language education across the province. However, their demand for a separate network of French-language boards has received a cold reception in Queen's Park.

Since the Cornwall conference, ACFO has reorganized its central office in order to meet the requirements of the political campaign which is being waged. A full-time position was created in September 1977 for the purpose of organizing and coordinating relations with the media and the public. The present 'agent d'information' for ACFO cited the establishment of his post as proof that ACFO has become increasingly political and professional.⁵⁹

The development of ACFO into a "politicised" interest group and the creation of the FFHQ in 1975 are the consequences of language policies that only initiate linguistic reform. Neither the federal language reform programme nor the Ontario government's French language services programme fully implements (even where feasible)

the principle of equality of linguistic rights. Due to constitutional restraints, Ottawa requires provincial cooperation and action for the pursuit of French language rights. Otherwise, the federal government's own direct efforts for the protection of the francophone presence in English Canada can be only token measures. Ontario on the other hand must take into account the degree to which the anglophone population of the province is willing to accept even the principle of 'bilingualism' in the provincial public services. Premier Davis' vociferous defence of his administrative, incrementalist approach can be explained by his government's fear of an English 'backlash' in reaction to a more assertive policy. Ontario's history is blotted by a blatantly anti-French sentiment that reared its head most clearly in the form of Regulation 17 which, in 1913, rendered French language instruction illegal in the province. (It was repealed in 1927). On the other hand, one may question if Premier Davis' stance is politically necessary, given the support of Ontario's major opposition parties for francophone rights.

ACFO's campaign on behalf of the latter is based on the argument that Franco-Ontarians need assurance that Ontario's commitment to support French Language rights will continue. In the face of territorial unilingualism in Quebec's language policy and with the possibility of Quebec's separation from the rest of Canada, the representatives of Ontario's francophone minority consider the status of the French language outside of Quebec to be seriously threatened. As each provincial group experiences a similar insecurity, the

FFHQ has been articulating at the federal level the demand of all provincial francophone organizations for a national policy that can counteract the demographic trend of francophone assimilation. The conjuncture of these political and societal forces explains the nature of interest group activity in the language policy field at each level of government.

However, the success of the FFHQ and ACFO in achieving the implementation of their demands will require more than the articulation of the problems and dangers facing francophones. The francophone organizations must also confront and disrupt the existing structures and processes of policy-making at each level and between each level. The resulting frustration which both the FFHQ and ACFO have experienced illustrates the strength of the institutional forces in Ottawa-Ontario interaction in language reform. Despite the significance of the changed circumstances in francophone-anglophone relations, the two governments have retained an 'ad hoc' and fragmented approach to intergovernmental language policy-making while continuing to deny to francophone interest groups an integral role in the decision-making process.

IV INTEREST GROUP ACTIVITY AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL INTERACTION

Since November 1976 a number of major developments have occurred within the Ontario and federal governments affecting their relations in the language policy field. The federal government published a revised statement of its commitment to language reform, the Secretary of State established an interdepartmental committee to study francophone demands, interprovincial Premiers' conferences were held to discuss the minority

language rights issue, the Premiers accepted in principle a qualified form of equality of rights for the two linguistic communities, and Premier Davis battled publicly with federal ministers over the proper strategy for language reform.

These events have taken place simultaneously with a vigorous public relations campaign by the FFHQ and ACFO. The media constitute the most significant instrument or resource available to the francophone organizations. Their overwhelming reliance upon the media has developed because the channels of input into the policy process through the bureaucratic, executive, and legislative branches of government are closed to them. Also, the increased role of intergovernmental decision-making at the executive level only serves to reinforce the exclusion of the interest groups.

While there has been formal contact between the FFHQ and Prime Minister Trudeau, the Prime Minister has demonstrated little interest in the organization. The FFHQ has met with Trudeau only once (May 31, 1977). Following the meeting, Trudeau announced the creation of an interdepartmental committee within the Privy Council Office ⁶⁰ to study the grievances outlined in 'Les héritiers de Lord Durham' and to propose a series of actions. At the time FFHQ president, Donation Gaudet, expressed satisfaction with the results of the meeting. ⁶¹ But the harmonious relationship soured noticeably once it became clear that the federal decision to establish the committee had been made prior to the Trudeau-FFHQ encounter. ⁶² The resulting cynicism of the FFHQ toward the consultation process has since been reinforced by the interest group's failure to obtain a second meeting with the Prime Minister. ⁶³

A similar relationship appears to exist between ACFO and the provincial leader. During 1977, the disregard on the part of the Ontario executive for the francophone organization had been aptly demonstrated by the failure of Davis' office to respond (with one exception and that very belatedly) to six letters from ACFO president, Gisèle Richer.⁶⁴ The first and only meeting between the Premier and ACFO in May 1978 provided no evidence of harmonious relations. Indeed, the Davis government's subsequent rejection of a private member's bill for a statutory base for French language services embittered the ACFO organization, provoking it to launch a major publicity campaign against the provincial government.⁶⁵

In June of 1977 the federal government published a comprehensive statement of its commitment to language reform in the form of a White Paper entitled, "A National Understanding/Un choix national". The most noteworthy aspect of the document lay in the greater emphasis placed on the federal-provincial element in the language reform programme. The federal government explicitly acknowledged the necessity of federal-provincial collaboration.

In reviewing its experience with the official languages policy to date, it is evident to the federal government that it cannot by itself ensure that the policy succeeds. The policy must have the active support of the provincial governments if it is to make its fullest impact on our country. To say this... is simply stating one of the major facts evident in the experience with the policy thus far.⁶⁶

The federal concern with provincial activity can be linked to the public debate over minority language rights in the provinces. Again, the catalyst was Quebec. The Parti Québécois government had recently introduced its language legislation, known as Bill 101, which restricted the right of language choice primarily to anglophones who were living in Quebec at that time. In this context, the federal White Paper was directed specifically at the nine provincial governments of English-speaking Canada in order to draw to their attention the significance of their actions in the language policy field. The interests of the francophone minority were central to the federal government's policy but constitutional niceties required their consideration from the perspective of provincial governmental activity.

The interests of the FFHQ were more directly affected by changes in the Secretary of State's department announced in December 1977.⁶⁷ The changes revolved around the creation of a 'mécanisme d'accueil' which is intended "to provide an opportunity for dialogue, communication and consultation with the French-speaking minorities."⁶⁸ Perhaps the most interesting feature of the 'mécanisme d'accueil' lay in the noticeable absence of FFHQ representation on the interdepartmental committee which will assist the government in language policy development and report to the Cabinet through the Secretary of State. The discrepancy between the federal move and the FFHQ's objective for direct input provoked a highly critical reaction by the fédération to the Secretary of State's announcement.⁶⁹ Whereas Secretary of State Roberts proposed francophone group participation and

consultation through regional field agents of the department, the FFHQ noted the past inadequacies of such an arrangement which provides only a "channel for communicating our problems and needs...at the lowest level".⁷⁰

The FFHQ case found support at the time in the resignation of the Secretary of State's regional coordinator of French language programmes for Ontario. Citing the reason for his resignation, the Franco-Ontarian, Richard Fitzgerald, explained that his feelings toward francophones outside of Quebec were incompatible with the federal policy: "A titre d'agent de liaison auprès de la communauté francophone, je dois donner l'image que le Secrétariat est très réceptif à leur endroit. Or ce n'est pas le cas".⁷¹ The 'mécanisme d'accueil' therefore represents only a reorganization of the Secretary of State's office with no provision for formal input by the FFHQ into the policy-making process. On that basis, the fédération rejected all aspects of the change and reiterated its demand for participation in a standing committee which would report directly to the Cabinet.⁷²

The consequences of FFHQ exclusion from the policy process can be ascertained in the federal-provincial renegotiation of the 'bilingualism in education' accord. In November 1977 the FFHQ obtained information concerning the three options under consideration by the federal government and the Council of Education Ministers. Under option A, the formula payments approach would be maintained but the amount allocated to second language instruction would rise from 5 per cent to 15.8 per cent (while federal subsidisation of minority language instruction would remain at 9 per cent).

Option B provided for provincial submissions to the federal government for the package of language subsidies and option C consisted of a tax point transfer approach.⁷³ The FFHQ condemned all three options while advocating the retention of the formula payments approach. Of particular concern to the federation was the proposal to increase financing of second language instruction: "A quoi va servir la connaissance du français comme langue seconde aux anglophones au Canada, si les francophones hors Québec continuent de s'assimiler?"⁷⁴

In reacting to the proposals submitted for discussion by the two governments, the FFHQ has contributed to the bargaining strength of the federal officials. Essentially, the federation rejects the three options because none resolves the central weakness of the federal-provincial arrangement: the lack of federal control over the expenditure of its funds by the provinces. The FFHQ advocates a stronger federal position through the establishment of conditions on the formula payments. Provincial governments, it is argued, have either failed to exploit the availability of the federal funds or have spent the money for purposes other than 'bilingualism in education'.⁷⁵ By presenting evidence of provincial mismanagement, the FFHQ has undermined the legitimacy of the position taken by the provincial education ministers that only more money is necessary for an improved language accord.

Secretary of State John Roberts has expressed agreement with the concerns of the FFHQ in this matter. A degree of federal control, he has argued, is essential in order to ensure that federal funds are utilised

effectively for second or minority language instruction.⁷⁶ Thus, while the FFHQ lacks input in the formulation of federal policy, its voice constitutes a valuable resource to the federal government in its negotiations with the provinces.

The involvement of the provincial francophone organizations in the education issue has not been limited to support of the FFHQ's demands in Ottawa. At the provincial level, both the Ontario government and ACFO cite the autonomy of local school boards as a major factor which inhibits provincial accountability for the expenditure of the federal funds. In many respects, the provincial government acts merely as an intermediary (or a funnel) for the distribution of the federal government's subsidies under 'bilingualism in education.' The Ontario government has moved to establish greater provincial supervision of school board expenditures in second and minority language instruction⁷⁷ but ACFO demands that the principle of school board autonomy - as it affects the language issue - be abandoned entirely.⁷⁸ Hence, while the FFHQ strengthens the hand of the federal government, ACFO encourages the centralization of decision-making at the provincial level.

The position of the francophone interest groups in interprovincial (as opposed to federal-provincial) interaction is less clearly discernible. Nonetheless, an examination of the provincial Premiers' discussions of reciprocal agreements for the protection of official language minority rights⁷⁹ does reveal the total isolation of the FFHQ from the interprovincial bargaining process. The Quebec proposal which constituted the

basis of discussion at two Interprovincial Premiers Conferences was rejected by the federal government as an alternative to constitutional entrenchment of minority rights. In the period between the St. Andrews (August 1977) and Montreal (February 1978) premiers conferences, various provinces including Ontario also refused the Quebec offer. Meanwhile, the FFHQ had argued in favour of reciprocity agreements in conjunction with constitutional entrenchment. Both elements were regarded as essential for the security of French language rights outside of Quebec. Yet in the compromise accepted at the Montreal conference, both reciprocity and constitutional entrenchment were abandoned in favour of a commitment in principle to the protection of minority rights. Le Devoir commented that,

Il s'agit d'un compromis qui, à première vue, donne des victoires honorables à chaque partie si l'on fait exception des minorités francophones...⁸⁰.

The results of the Montreal conference demonstrated that the interests of the francophone minority in English Canada were displaced by the concern shared by the English-speaking Premiers to emerge united with Quebec while maintaining their disfavour toward any attempt to bargain for minority rights. The ineffectiveness of the FFHQ's efforts then is explained by the nature of intergovernmental negotiations. Richard Simeon's contention that interest groups tend to be 'frozen out' of the bargaining process is strongly substantiated in the interprovincial discussions concerning language rights.⁸¹

In the case of the federal-provincial renegotiation of existing arrangements, the demands of the interest groups concerned serves to a certain extent the interests of the governments themselves. Both the FFHQ

and ACFO advocate the strengthening of their governments in language policy-making. (It is noteworthy that ACFO's support for a stronger Ontario government in relation to the school boards does not conflict with the FFHQ's call for greater federal control in Ottawa's relations with the provincial governments.) Due to the nature of its demands, the FFHQ has been able to exercise an informal and indirect influence in federal-provincial relations. The case of the interprovincial discussions on the other hand illustrates the fragility of this limited form of input by the francophone interest groups. Because of the significance attached to reaching a consensus, the Premiers not only sacrificed their individual objectives with respect to protecting language minorities but also they ignored the needs and demands of francophones as articulated by the FFHQ,⁸² The conclusion which one draws from these developments is that intergovernmental interaction is open to the influence of those affected by the outputs only to the extent that the interest group demands coincide with and complement the bargaining strategies and objectives of the governments involved.

V CONCLUSION

The role of francophone interest groups in the formulation of language policy is a highly tenuous one. It is dependent upon the degree to which the activity of such organizations as the FFHQ and ACFO constitutes a support mechanism at each level or a bargaining tool of political elites in intergovernmental relations. While the potential for input does exist, it remains at the discretion of the governments and is a function of the environment in which policy-making operates or discussions take place. Given the high political

saliency of the language issue in Canada and the importance attached to managing the linguistic cleavage, it is striking to note that the interests of the francophone organizations are virtually ignored by government. An explanation, it is believed, can be found in the undeveloped nature of Canada's language reform programme.

Canada's language policy is one shared by two levels of government. Also, within each government, the policy is divided into programmes and measures affecting various aspects of government - the public service, sectoral policies, and special direct intervention. The initiative of language reform has been taken in the 1960's by the federal government but its implementation has required not only a series of federal efforts but also cooperative action by the provincial governments. If a national language policy is to counter the trend of francophone assimilation and minorisation, a linguistic dimension is required in the formulation and implementation of social and economic development policies. The preservation of francophone 'pockets' within English Canada is the central requisite for a successful political strategy that aims to reinforce the French presence outside of Quebec. The provision of French language schools and court services, as well as 'social animation' grants can contribute to the vitality of the minority language and culture where francophones are concentrated, but the economic health and social well-being of the French-language communities themselves represent the sine qua non of cultural survival and development.

Such a pervasive language policy cannot emerge within the existing institutional channels and processes of Canadian federalism. The incremental, piecemeal, and generally uncoordinated approach to the implementation of

a language reform programme is perhaps not uncharacteristic of intergovernmental policy-making in Canada, and it may be partly accounted for by the dramatic nature of the change in orientation towards French-English relations. Nonetheless, the effect has been to inhibit the development of an effective language policy while the language policy-making process continues to struggle with a division of responsibilities within each government and between the two levels of government.

The inchoate and fragmented nature of the Canadian version of language planning has hitherto prevented the system from incorporating a participatory role for interest groups in the policy-making process. The structures have not yet developed the formal channels of input or mechanisms to permit the involvement of the francophone organizations. Consequently, the interest groups must compete at a disadvantage with the 'vested interests'. The latter includes the bureaucracy, individual MP's, and Cabinet Ministers who have traditionally represented the interests of the francophone minority groups within government.⁸³ But these actors fit into a system that is compatible with a laissez-faire orientation to the language issue that no longer exists. The FFHQ and ACFO have only begun to force adaptation of the structures of decision-making so that the process may reflect the Canadian state's assertive role in language planning. Once this is accomplished, their input into decisions affecting the development of the francophone community outside of Quebec may be secured. In the meantime, the francophone interest group organizations are relegated to the sidelines of the policy process.

NOTES

1. The phrase "language reform programme" rather than "bilingualism policy" is used throughout this paper to describe the composite of federal efforts in the language policy field.
2. Richard Joy in Languages in Conflict discusses the growing concentration of francophones within Quebec and of anglophones elsewhere in Canada. Also, the special status option for Quebec (best exemplified by the opting-out formula) served to reinforce the distinctiveness of the province.
3. In 1971, the national census recorded 482,000 persons of French mother tongue in Ontario. This represented 6.3 of the total provincial population.
4. Canada. Official Languages Act 1968-69, c. 54.
5. See: V. Seymour Wilson, "Language Policy" in G. Bruce Doern; V. Seymour Wilson (eds), Issues in Canadian Public Policy.
6. For a list of these measures, see: Canada, A National Understanding (1977), pp. 62-63.
7. New Brunswick passed an act providing for the equality of the French and English languages prior to the federal act in 1969. The New Brunswick legislation however has been fully implemented only as of July 1977.
8. The Davis government is currently considering adopting a statutory base for the extension of French language services but rejects the possibility of making French an official language of the province. See below.
9. Book II of the report dealt exclusively with education. The commission issued forty-six recommendations for provincial, interprovincial and federal-provincial action in the field of education.
10. Canada, Secretary of State News Release , "Le bilinguisme en education - accord se fait avec les provinces touchant les octrois fédéraux" 9 sept. 1970.
11. Ibid.

12. The arrangements are in the process of renegotiation at the time of writing. See below.
13. Canada, Secretary of State, News Release, "Nouveaux accords dans le cadre programme fédéral-provincial des deux langues officielles en education" 20 janvier 1972.
14. Ibid.
15. In 1951 the federal government initiated a programme of grants to the universities on the recommendation of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. The programme ended in 1967 with the tax abatement agreement between Ottawa and the provinces for post-secondary education.
16. The interprovincial body thereby performs the redistributive function that is normally exercised by the federal government.
17. Canada, Secretary of State, Annual Report for the Year Ending March 31, 1977.
18. Canada, Commissioner of Official Languages. Annual Report 1977 March 1978 pp. 132-133
19. Canada, Secretary of State, op. cit. p. 25.
20. Ibid. p. 25
21. Bill C-42 to amend the Criminal Code, measure respecting language used in court trials. Third reading House of Commons, June 23, 1978.
22. Canada, Secretary of State. op. cit. p. 33.
23. \$702,000 of the total of \$876,500 was spent in these two categories.
24. Available figures indicate a parallel situation in each of the other English-speaking provinces.
25. At the same time, Premier Robarts announced equal financing of French language secondary schools. See: T.H.B. Symons, "Ontario's Quiet Revolution. A Study of Canage in the Position of the Franco-Ontarian Community" in R.M. Burns (ed.) One Country or Two?
26. "Declaration of the Hon. William G. Davis Premier of Ontario concerning the Ontario bilingualism programme." Monday 03 May 1971.

27. The chairman of the Council has the rank of Assistant Deputy Minister.
28. The education provisions of the Ontario government with respect to French language rights are significant in comparison to the other provinces of English Canada (with the exception of New Brunswick).
29. In his June 1978 report, the Coordinator on Bilingualism recommends extension of French language rights to small claims courts and in the conduct of administrative and quasi-judicial tribunals in designated areas.
30. Ontario, "Notes for an address by D.W. Stevenson " November 25, 1977. (Every ministry has such a position but most are part-time. The four full-time coordinators are in the ministries of Health, Community and Social Services, Colleges and Universities (College Branch) and Culture and Recreation).
31. Ontario, "1977 Semi-annual Report of the Coordinator on Bilingualism."
32. Ontario, "Notes for an Address by D.W. Stevenson" November 25, 1977.
33. Mr. Stevenson's status of assistant deputy minister gives weight to the Office of the Coordinator, but one must note that he is only a part-time coordinator. He is also responsible for other government administration within the ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs and, according to an official source, he is able to devote little time to his position as Coordinator.
34. In the twelve month period following the PQ victory, the CAB met four times.
35. Ontario, "Notes for an address by the Hon. Wm. G. Davis" February 6, 1978.
36. Davis prefers to describe Ontario's policy as the "French language services programme".
37. R.E.B. Simeon in Federal-Provincial Diplomacy presents case studies documenting the extent to which interest groups are "frozen out" of the policy process.
38. David Kwavnick pursues an interest in this aspect of government/interest group relations. See: Paul A. Pross (ed.) Pressure Group Behaviour in Canadian Politics.

67. Canada, Secretary of State, "Announcement by the Secretary of State of the Measures Adopted by the Federal government to Ensure the Well-Being of Official Language Minorities" 20 December 1977.
68. Ibid.
69. FFHQ, Conférence de presse, 21 février 1978
70. FFHQ' "Comprehensive evaluation of "Measures to Ensure the Well-Being of Official Language Minorities" 21 février 1978. The federation rejected Roberts' invitation to attend his press conference at which he announced the 'mécanisme d'accueil' on the grounds that they were not consulted in the formulation of the policy.
71. Quoted in: Le Droit, 11 janvier 1978.
72. In 1977 the government of Prince Edward Island established a standing committee for the development of the PEI Acadian community. The committee is responsible for developing policies, setting priorities, and evaluation. It consists of three members of the Acadian community, one Acadian MP who is chairman, and a secretary. The committee reports directly to the provincial Premier. FFHQ, Press Release, 21 Feb. 1978.
73. FFHQ' "Communiqué de presse" 16 nov. 1977.
74. Ibid.
75. In the case of Ontario, it is asserted that since 1970 the province could have made use of \$185.2 million for elementary and secondary official minority language instruction. However, the provincial government has drawn only \$81 million from the federal-provincial arrangement. "Les provinces anglaises ne réclament que 40% des sommes disponibles", Le Droit 12 novembre 1977. See also: FFHQ Les Héritiers pp. 70-71.
76. Le Droit, 17 novembre 1977.
77. Le Droit, 22 juillet 1977.
78. ACFO, "Le plan d'action"
79. The reciprocal bilateral agreements were proposed by Premier Levesque. He offered to exempt from Bill 101's education provision English Canadians from other provinces in return for guarantees by the other provinces for French language instruction to Quebecers who leave the province.

80. "Les premiers ministres adoptent un compromis sur les droits linguistiques" Le Devoir, 24 février 1978, p. 1
81. See: R.E. B. Simeon, op. cit.
82. The FFHQ was to a certain extent allied with the Quebec government. However, the attempt by the federation to straddle both sides of the fence (by supporting both reciprocity and entrenchment) undermined the value of FFHQ support in the discussions.
83. See: "Comment les minorités ont failli obtenir la "participation réclamée", Le Devoir, 6 janvier 1978, p. 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Secondary Sources:

- Pross, A. Paul (ed.). Pressure Group Behaviour in Canadian Politics. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1975
- Simeon, Richard. Federal-provincial Diplomacy. The Making of Recent Policy in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972
- Symons, T.H. B. "Ontario's Quiet Revolution. A Study of Change in the Position of the Franco-Ontarian Community" in Burns, R.M. (ed.) One Country of Two? Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1971
- Wilson, V. Seymour. "Language Policy" in Doern, G. Bruce; Wilson, V. Seymour (eds). Issues in Canadian Public Policy, Toronto: Macmillan, 1974.

Government Publications:

- Canada. Commissioner of Official Languages. Sixth Annual Report 1976. Ottawa: 1977
- _____, Commissioner of Official Languages. Annual Report 1977 March 1978
- _____, Déclaration du Secrétaire d'Etat annonçant les mesures adoptées par le gouvernement fédéral pour assurer le mieux-être des minorités de langue officielle. le 20 decembre 1977.
- _____, A National Understanding, Statement of the Government of Canada on the official languages policy. Ottawa: 1977.
- _____, Official Languages Act, 1968-69, c. 54.
- _____, Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Volume I Report 1966; Volume II May 1968
- _____, Secretary of State. Annual Report for the Year Ending March 31, 1977, Ottawa: 1977.
- _____, Secretary of State News Release. "Le bilinguisme en education - l'accord se fait avec les provinces touchant les octrois fédéraux" le 9 sept. 1970.
- _____, Secretary of State News Release. "Nouveaux accords dans le cadre programme fédéral-provincial pour la promotion des deux langues officielles en education" le 20 janvier 1972

New Brunswick, Official Languages of New Brunswick Act, 1969, c. 14.

Ontario. "Déclaration de l'Honorable William Davis Premier
Ministre de l'Ontario concernant le programme de bilinguisme
du gouvernement de l'Ontario faite à la Legislature, le
lundi 3 mai 1971"

_____, "Notes for address by D.W. Stevenson to the Seminar for
Presidents and Executive Directors of Social Agencies on
Languages of Service Sponsored by the Social Planning Council
of Ottawa-Carleton" Friday November 25, 1977.

_____, "Notes for an address by the Honorable Williams G. Davis
Premier of Ontario to the Canadian Club, Royal York Hotel,
Toronto" Monday February 6, 1978.

_____, Office of the Coordinator on Bilingualism, June 1978
Report of the Coordinator on Bilingualism.

_____, Second Annual Report of the Advisory Council for Franco-
Ontarian Affairs 1976-77. Toronto: 1977.

Other Publications:

Advisory Committee on Confederation (Ontario). "French Language
Public Services in Ontario". July 1977.

Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario (ACFO).
Communiqué. "Le gouvernement Davis et les Franco-Ontariens:
une politique de compte-gouttes" le 25 novembre 1977.

_____, Dossier-Conseil Scolaire de Langue Française (préparé
par l'Association de Enseignants Franco-Ontariens) février 1978.

_____, Le bilinguisme et le système judiciaire ontarien. 1976

_____, "Résolutions adoptées au 28e Congrès Général de
l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario" Cornwall,
Ont. le 26 et 27 août 1977.

La Fédération des francophones hors Québec (FFHQ) Comprehensive
Evaluation of the "Measures to Ensure the Well-Being of
Official Language Minorities". February 21, 1978

_____, La Fédération des francophones hors Québec - son
origine, son orientation, ses membres, ses objectifs.
novembre 1977

_____, Les héritiers de Lord Durham Volume I, Volume II,
deuxième édition. 1977.

_____, "Notes pour l'allocution de Hubert Gauthier, Directeur Général de la FFHQ, prononcée au Club Richilieu de Hull" le 10 janvier 1978.

_____, Press release, "Considering....." February 21, 1978.

_____, Press Release. "Les gouvernements jouent avec l'éducation des minorités". le 16 novembre 1977.

_____, Escalation of Disappointments of the Francophone Communities outside Quebec with the Secretary of State 1968-1978.

1977 Second Semi-Annual Report of the Coordinator on Bilingualism (Ontario Cabinet Document) January 1978.

Newspapers:

Le Devoir; Le Droit; The Globe and Mail

Interviews with representatives of:

La Fédération des francophones hors Québec, 2 February 1978.

Ontario government Office of the Co-ordinator on Bilingualism (Ministry of Treasury, Economics and intergovernmental Affairs), 10 February 1978.

L'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario, 23 March 1978.