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## Introduction

This demolinguistic portrait of the French-speaking population in Ontario was undertaken with the financial support of Canadian Heritage's Official Languages Secretariat. It is the first of a series of portraits of officiallanguage minorities in Canada, prepared by Statistics Canada's Language Statistics Section.

This study paints a general statistical portrait of the official-language minority in Ontario based on data from the Census of Population and the Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities in Canada, conducted in 2006. The purpose of such a portrait is to present a set of characteristics, behaviours and perceptions of the official-language minority population, exploiting the analytical opportunities contained in the data.

This document is intended to be neither a mere collection of tables nor an in-depth study of the demolinguistic dynamics of the French-speaking population in Ontario. It presents a range of information on a set of themes and issues that are of interest to official-language minorities and anyone interested in the past, present and future of official-language minority populations in Canada.

Section 1 of this demolinguistic portrait concerns the choice of criteria for defining the French-speaking population in Ontario, to be used for the purposes of this study. It also provides a brief description of the data sources used.

Section 2 presents varied information on how the French-speaking population has evolved and its geographic distribution and concentration in Ontario. This information is accompanied by a series of maps, appendices and a detailed table on the number, relative weight and distribution of the French-speaking population in Ontario.

Section 3 concerns the main factors that affect or are affected by changes over time in this province's Frenchspeaking population: fertility; the transmission of mother tongue and the effect of exogamy; the age structure; intragenerational linguistic mobility; and interprovincial and international migration. It also provides information on the use of French in the public sphere and on how the ability to conduct a conversation in that language has evolved in groups with a mother tongue other than French or English.

Section 4 of this portrait looks at a few sectors essential to the vitality of official-language minority communities, as identified in the Roadmap for Canada's Linguistic Duality 2008-2013: health; justice; education; and the media, the arts and culture. It also provides statistics on community participation, employment and income characteristics, and the use of French at work.

The last section of this portrait presents statistics on Francophones' identity, their perceptions regarding the presence of French in their community, the provision of services in French by the federal government, the respect for linguistic rights, and the perceived importance that people work on developing the Francophone community.

## Section 1 Definitions of Ontario's French-speaking population

This statistical portrait of Ontario's official-language minority contains information drawn from Canadian census variables. The census includes no fewer than six questions or sub-questions that provide information on official languages, namely knowledge of official languages, language spoken most often at home, other languages spoken on a regular basis at home, mother tongue, language used most often at work, and other languages used on a regular basis at work.

What is the definition of the official-language minority group in Ontario? What defines who is a Francophone? There is no established definition of Francophone. For historical reasons, Statistics Canada has generally used the criterion of mother tongue, that is, the first language learned at home in childhood and still understood at the time of the census. Statistics based on mother tongue have the advantage of being roughly comparable going back more than half a century.

Other criteria are also used, opening the way for either more inclusive or more restrictive definitions of Frenchspeaking persons. Thus, does the definition of a Francophone in Ontario apply to some 510,000 persons with French as their mother tongue ${ }^{1}, 540,000$ persons with French as their first official language spoken, or 544,000 persons ${ }^{2}$ who speak French most often $(322,000)$ or on a regular basis $(222,000)$ at home? Or should a broader definition be considered? Such a definition might include all of the approximately 1.4 million French speakers, or indeed more if we include young children who do not speak French, but who have at least one parent whose mother tongue is French.

Also, in choosing a strategy for estimating a language group, it is important to take account of two main considerations. On the one hand, if the objective is to enumerate the population considering all language groups on an equal basis-in other words, treating them symmetrically and creating mutually exclusive categories for estimating them (e.g., English, French, Other), then this implies an appropriate allocation of multiple responses. In this case, the French mother tongue population of Ontario would become 510,240 persons. On the other hand, if the objective is to focus on a single language group (e.g., Francophones), the criteria for inclusion can be broadened without being concerned about the implicit overlaps between language groups. In this case, the number of French mother tongue persons in Ontario will attain 533,000.

In this statistical portrait of Ontario Francophones, two criteria will mainly be used: mother tongue and first official language spoken. ${ }^{3}$ The latter criterion is now used increasingly as a criterion for defining language groups in studies on official-language minorities. The reason for this is that shifts over the years in the composition of the Canadian population tend to call for a redefinition or broadening of the concept of Francophone group or community, since a significant number of persons whose mother tongue is neither French nor English nevertheless use French either predominantly or commonly in their daily lives.

A number of considerations lay behind the creation of the concept of "first official language spoken." Firstly, the substantial increase in immigration since the mid-1980s has had the effect of increasing the size of the population with a mother tongue other than French or English ( $20 \%$ in 2006). Such persons are often designated by the term "allophones."

Since an allophone cannot become a Francophone on the basis of mother tongue, but can become one by adopting French as the language used most often at home or in the public sphere, the question arises as to how to designate individuals' first official language, or, more specifically, how to allocate allophones between French and English based on the reported knowledge of one and/or the other of the official languages.

[^0]Questions of this type led to the development of different variants of the concept of first official language spoken (Statistics Canada, 1989) ${ }^{4}$. This concept echoes the spirit of the current version of the Official Languages Act (1988) which specifies, in section 32(2), that the government may have regard to "the English or French linguistic minority population of the area served by an office or facility, the particular characteristics of that population and the proportion of that population to the total population of that area."

The concept of first official language was chosen by the federal government, in December 1991, in the Official Languages (Communications with and Services to the Public) Regulations. Section 2 of the Regulations describes the method used to determine "the first official language spoken," namely the first of the two variants presented in Statistics Canada (1989), a method that successively takes account of the responses to the questions on knowledge of official languages, mother tongue and language spoken most often at home. The "first official language spoken" variable is thus not a census question but is instead derived from three questions in the language module of the census.

The concept of first official language spoken (FOLS) serves to allocate the Canadian population between the country's two main language groups. Thus, in Canada, just over $97 \%$ of the population has either English or French as its first official language spoken. The residual portion is comprised of persons who cannot conduct a conversation in either English or French (1.6 \%) and persons who know both official languages and who cannot be assigned one or the other of the two official languages on the basis of the three census variables used for this purpose (1.1\%).

Unlike with the population with French as a mother tongue, French FOLS excludes persons for whom French is the mother tongue who reported being unable to conduct a conversation in French at the time of the census. Also, the Francophone population (based on FOLS) includes persons with an "other" mother tongue (i.e., other than French or English) who speak French most often at home as well as those who, while having a non-official language as the main home language, can also conduct a conversation in French but not in English. It also includes half the persons who can conduct a conversation in French and English and who speak another language or both official languages most often at home.

This report will draw a statistical portrait of Ontario Francophones, primarily using the FOLS criterion, but also, when relevant, information on mother tongue ${ }^{5}$. Following the practice of the Treasury Board Secretariat, Ontario's Francophone population will refer here to persons having only French as their first official language spoken (FOLS) and half of those persons who have both French and English as FOLS, that is, persons for whom it is not possible to assign either French or English based on responses to the three variables mentioned above.

[^1]
## Data sources

This portrait of the French-speaking population in Ontario contains information drawn from Canadian censuses from 1951 to 2006 and the Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities (SVOLM) ${ }^{6}$ conducted in 2006 by Statistics Canada.

Census: The census data contained in this report are drawn from the long census questionnaire, completed by $20 \%$ of households and including 61 questions of which 7 are language-related.

Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities (SVOLM): This is a cross-sectional sample survey. Respondents to the SVOLM were selected from the sample of persons who completed the long questionnaire in the 2006 Census.

The survey focuses on Canada's official-language minorities, namely French-speaking persons outside Quebec and English-speaking persons in Quebec. The data can be used to gain a deeper understanding of the current situation of individuals belonging to these two groups on subjects as varied as education in the minority language, access to different services in the minority language (the health care sector in particular), language practices in daily activities both in the home and outside the home, and matters of linguistic identity.

[^2]
## Section 2 Evolution of the population by mother tongue and first official language spoken

### 2.1 Evolution of the population by mother tongue

Ontario's population with French as its mother tongue stood at 510,240 persons in 2006 compared to 341,500 in 1951, an increase of $49.4 \%$. By comparison, the population with English as its mother tongue grew by $121 \%$ to $8,313,880$ in 2006 while the population with a mother tongue other than French or English more than quintupled (growing by $540 \%$ ), totalling 3,204,770 persons in 2006 compared to slightly more than 500,000 in 1951.

Table 2.1.1
Population by mother tongue, Ontario, 1951 to 2006

|  | Mother tongue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Total |  | French |  | English | Other languages |  |
|  | number | number | $\%$ | number | $\%$ | number | \% |
| 1951 | $\mathbf{4 , 5 9 7 , 5 4 2}$ | 341,502 | 7.4 | $3,755,442$ | 81.7 | 500,598 | 10.9 |
| 1961 | $\mathbf{6 , 2 3 6 , 0 9 2}$ | 425,302 | 6.8 | $4,834,623$ | 77.5 | 976,167 | 15.7 |
| 1971 | $\mathbf{7 , 7 0 3 , 1 1 0}$ | 482,350 | 6.3 | $5,967,725$ | 77.5 | $1,253,035$ | 16.3 |
| 1981 | $\mathbf{8 , 5 3 4 , 2 6 0}$ | 465,335 | 5.5 | $6,611,990$ | 77.5 | $1,456,940$ | 17.1 |
| 1991 | $\mathbf{9 , 9 7 7 , 0 5 5}$ | 503,345 | 5.0 | $7,443,540$ | 74.6 | $2,030,170$ | 20.3 |
| 1996 | $\mathbf{1 0 , 6 4 2 , 7 9 0}$ | 499,689 | 4.7 | $7,777,734$ | 73.1 | $2,365,367$ | 22.2 |
| 2001 | $\mathbf{1 1 , 2 8 5 , 5 5 0}$ | 509,264 | 4.5 | $8,041,997$ | 71.3 | $2,734,289$ | 24.2 |
| 2006 | $\mathbf{1 2 , 0 2 8 , 8 9 0}$ | 510,240 | 4.2 | $8,313,880$ | 69.1 | $3,204,770$ | 26.6 |

Note(s): Except 1951 to 1971 censuses, the multiple responses were equally redistributed among the three main linguistic groups. Source(s): Statistics Canada, censuses of population, 1951 to 2006.

Table 2.1.2 shows the average annual growth rate for the population of each mother tongue group since 1951. It indicates that during the postwar period (1951-1961), the population with an "other" mother tongue grew by an average of nearly $10 \%$ annually because of the strong surge in international immigration, compared to an average annual growth rate of less than $3 \%$ for the rest of the population. It also shows that the average annual increase in the French-mother-tongue population has been consistently quite low, or even negative, since the early 1970s. By contrast, the average annual growth of the population with an "other" mother tongue has stayed between $3 \%$ and $4 \%$ since the mid-1980s.

Table 2.1.2
Yearly average population growth rate by mother tongue, Ontario, 1951 to 2006

|  | Mother tongue |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Period | French | English | Other |
|  | percentage |  |  |
| 1951 to 1961 | 2.45 | 2.87 | 9.50 |
| 1961 to 1971 | 1.34 | 2.34 | 2.84 |
| 1971 to 1981 | -0.35 | 1.08 | 1.63 |
| 1981 to 1991 | 0.82 | 1.26 | 3.93 |
| 1991 to 1996 | -0.15 | 0.90 | 3.30 |
| 1996 to 2001 | 0.38 | 0.68 | 3.12 |
| 2001 to 2006 | 0.04 | 0.68 | 3.44 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, censuses of population, 1951 to 2006.

The French-mother-tongue population outside Quebec is mainly concentrated in the two provinces bordering Quebec. The provinces of New Brunswick and Ontario alone account for $76 \%$ of all Francophones living outside Quebec. Ontario is the province with the largest share of the French-mother-tongue population outside Quebec. Moreover, that share has grown over time, going from $47.3 \%$ in 1951 to $52.3 \%$ in 2006.

Table 2.1.3
Number of persons with French mother tongue and relative weight of Ontario Francophones within the overall Franchophone population outside Canada, 1951 to 2006

|  | French mother tongue |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | $\begin{array}{r}\text { Ontario } \\ \text { Relative weight of }\end{array}$ |  |  |
|  | Canada less Quebec |  |  |
| Ontario Francophones |  |  |  |$)$ percentage | number |
| :--- |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, censuses of population, 1951 to 2006.

### 2.2 Evolution of the population by first official language spoken

As described in Section 1, the criterion of first official language spoken offers a more inclusive definition of the Francophone population. As a result, the relative share of this population within the overall population of Ontario stands at $4.5 \%$ ( 538,000 persons), compared to a proportion of $4.2 \%$ when the criterion of French as mother tongue is used to define this population $(510,000)$.

Table 2.2.1
Population by first official language spoken, Ontario, 1971 to 2006

| Year | First official language spoken |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total number | French |  | English |  | Fish and French $\begin{array}{r}\text { Neither English nor } \\ \text { French }\end{array}$ |  |  |  | French minority ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  |  | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% |
| 1971 | 7,703,105 | 488,920 | 6.3 | 7,013,835 | 91.1 | 30,260 | 0.4 | 170,090 | 2.2 | 504,050 | 6.5 |
| 1981 | 8,534,260 | 437,865 | 5.1 | 7,898,250 | 92.5 | 55,930 | 0.7 | 142,215 | 1.7 | 465,830 | 5.5 |
| 1991 | 9,977,055 | 483,445 | 4.8 | 9,255,865 | 92.8 | 52,410 | 0.5 | 185,335 | 1.9 | 509,650 | 5.1 |
| 1996 | 10,642,790 | 480,650 | 4.5 | 9,860,780 | 92.7 | 62,300 | 0.6 | 239,060 | 2.2 | 600,180 | 5.6 |
| 2001 | 11,285,585 | 489,920 | 4.3 | 10,493,685 | 93.0 | 75,610 | 0.7 | 226,370 | 2.0 | 527,725 | 4.7 |
| 2006 | 12,028,895 | 497,150 | 4.1 | 11,189,935 | 93.0 | 80,890 | 0.7 | 260,920 | 2.2 | 537,595 | 4.5 |

1. total of FOLS French and half of FOLS English and French

Source(s): Statistics Canada, censuses of population, 1971 to 2006.

According to the results shown in table 2.2.1 and chart 2.2.1, there is very little numerical difference between the population with French as its mother tongue and the population with French as the first official language spoken. However, the gap widened during the period 2001-2006, mainly owing to the fact that the French-mother-tongue group grew by only 1,000 persons, compared to an increase of nearly 10,000 persons-mainly immigrants with a mother tongue other than French or English-for whom French was the first official language spoken.

Chart 2.2.1
Number of persons with French as mother tongue and as first official language spoken, Ontario, 1951 to 2006


Note(s): The information on First official language spoken is not available before 1971 as the question on home language was introduced in the census for the first time in 1971.
Source(s): Statistics Canada, censuses of population, 1951 to 2006.

### 2.3 Geographic distribution of the population with French as first official language spoken

Although Ontario is the province with the largest number of Francophones outside Quebec, we have seen that their proportion within the Ontario population is less than $5 \%$. However, nearly six Franco-Ontarians in ten live in regions bordering Quebec, in which they represent a much higher proportion of the population. Thus, not only do Francophones in the Ottawa census division comprise $25 \%$ of the Franco-Ontarian population and those in the North-East region comprise 23\%, but their relative share of the population of their region is respectively $17 \%$ and $25 \%$. As to the South-East region, while only $14 \%$ of the province's Francophones reside there, their relative weight within that region is $41 \%$.

As will be seen further on, the proportion that these Francophones represent within these regions directly influences their language behaviours.

Table 2.3.1
Number and distribution of Francophones (in \%) within the province and proportion of Francophones within the region of residence, Ontario, 2006

| Region | Francophones within Francophones within <br> the province |  | Proportion of <br> the region |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Francophones | percentage |  |
| number | 14.4 | 41.3 |  |
| Ottawa | 77,439 | 25.2 | 16.9 |
| North-East | 135,225 | 23.0 | 25.1 |
| Toronto | 123,519 | 8.7 | 1.9 |
| Rest of Ontario | 46,710 | 28.8 | 1.9 |
| Ontario | 154,702 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | 4.5 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

### 2.4 Relative proportion within municipalities of residence and geographic concentration index

In this statistical portrait of Ontario Francophones, we will not content ourselves with merely presenting information based on one or the other of the large regions of residence. Except for the Ottawa and Toronto census divisions (CDs), the geographic boundaries of which are for all practical purposes the same as those of the census subdivisions (CSDs) or municipalities of the same name, the other three regions shown in table 2.3.1 are composed of several CDs and CSDs. Since Francophones are not distributed equally among these various geographic entities, and since the proportion that they constitute in those entities varies from one CD or CSD to another within the regions, it is quite useful for the purposes of this study to provide statistics showing their relative share within their municipality of residence. In other words, the proportion that Francophones represent within their municipality has more influence on their perceptions and their linguistic practices than on their proportion within a larger region.

We therefore examined the distribution of Francophones according to the relative weight of their language group within their municipality of residence (see table 2.4.1). This revealed a distribution that casts a new light on the minority/majority relationship. The vast majority of Ontario Francophones live in municipalities where they account for less than $30 \%$ of the population. In fact, slightly fewer than 200,000 Francophones, or $36 \%$, live in municipalities were they account for less than $10 \%$ of the population of their municipality, compared to 225,000 , or $42 \%$, who live where their relative weight is between $10 \%$ and $29 \%$. Only $14 \%$ of the province's Francophones live in municipalities where they constitute the majority.

Table 2.4.1
Distribution of Francophones by the relative weight of this language group within the municipality of residence, Ontario, 2006

| Relative weight within the <br> municipality | Francophones |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | number | percentage |
| 0 to 9\% | 195,295 | 36.3 |
| 10 to 29\% | 225,504 | 42.0 |
| 30 to 49\% | 41,063 | 7.6 |
| 50 to 69\% | 40,276 | 7.5 |
| 70\% and over | 35,187 | 6.5 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 3 7}, \mathbf{3 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.
This relative weight of Francophones within their municipality of residence is quite variable in the South-East, North-East and Rest of Ontario regions (see chart 2.4.1). In South-East Ontario, for example, home to $14 \%$ of the province's Francophones, 25\% of Francophones live in municipalities where they represent between 10\% and $29.9 \%$ of the population, while $28 \%$ live in municipalities were their relative weight is between $50 \%$ and $69.9 \%$, and a little over $32 \%$ live in a municipality where the members of their language group constitute $70 \%$ and over of the population.

In the North-East region, home to $23 \%$ of the province's Francophones, nearly one Francophone in two lives in a municipality where the weight of the Francophone group is between $10 \%$ and $29.9 \%$, while nearly one Francophone in four lives in a municipality where this language group constitutes between 30\% and 49.9\% of the population. Finally, it is in the rest of the province, where nearly three Franco-Ontarians in ten reside, that their relative weight is lowest: more than nine Francophones in ten live in a municipality where they constitute less than $10 \%$ of the population, while $7 \%$ live in a municipality where their relative weight is between $10 \%$ and 29\%.

Tables A-1 and A-2 provided in Appendix A and the maps for 2006, shows the relative weight of the Francophone population in each region and census division and selected subdivisions within them.

## Chart 2.4.1

## Distribution of Francophones in three Ontario regions by their relative weight of Francophones within the municipality of residence, 2006



Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Information on the proportion of Francophones within their municipality of residence is quite useful in analysing Francophones' perceptions and language behaviours. However, the municipalities vary in size, and in the case of large metropolitan areas, for example, this information does not reveal whether Francophones are distributed sparsely across the area as a whole or are instead concentrated in certain specific regions.

As we have already mentioned, the Francophones live in regions bordering Quebec and within these regions, their proportion within municipalities is variable. It is also useful to distinguish between municipalities within which Francophones are geographically concentrated in a specific part of the area and those in which there is no particular concentration of them. The geographic distribution of Francophones within a given area can also be illustrated by means of a concentration index ${ }^{7}$. Table 2.4.2 shows the usefulness of such a concept, especially for the municipalities of Ottawa and Toronto.

Such information is highly useful in that the concentration of a language group within a given area, like its relative weight, will influence the potential language practices of its members.

[^3]Table 2.4.2
Distribution of Francophones within the region of residence according to the average concentration index, Ontario, 2006

|  | Concentration in the municipality |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Region | Weak | Average | Strong | Total |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |
| South-East | 0.4 | 23.8 | 75.8 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Ottawa | 7.4 | 46.4 | 46.2 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| North-East | 3.0 | 18.1 | 78.9 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Toronto | 68.4 | 29.4 | 2.3 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Rest of Ontario | 87.4 | 10.7 | 1.8 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Ontario | $\mathbf{3 4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

The information that can be derived from such an index of concentration is useful when being compared with that presented in Chart 2.4.1. For example, this chart reveals that in the north east part of the province, nearly $49 \%$ of Francophones live in municipalities where they represent between $10 \%$ and $29 \%$ of the population, and that only $23 \%$ live in municipalities where they comprise $50 \%$ or more of the population. However, with the help of this index of concentration, we observe that in this large area, the vast majority of Francophones, i.e., $79 \%$, are highly concentrated within their municipality. Thus, while Francophones in Ottawa comprise 17\% of that city's population, $46 \%$ of them are highly concentrated in one part of the territory, particularly in the east.

## Section 3 Factors influencing the evolution of the population with French as a mother tongue

The evolution of the language groups in a given province or region depends on the combined effect of the factors of natural increase-fertility and mortality-on the one hand and the factors of internal and international migration on the other hand. An additional component is intergenerational linguistic continuity, whereby the mother's mother tongue is passed on to her children. ${ }^{8}$ Another factor will also be described in this section, namely intragenerational linguistic continuity, or its obverse, language transfer or substitution. The latter, while it does not directly influence how a language group evolves in the short term, can nevertheless have a major longterm influence in that the language predominantly used in the home is generally the one transmitted to the children.

In this section, much of the information provided will focus on the French-mother-tongue group in Ontario. However, in some cases, in particular the case of interprovincial migration and international immigration, the analysis will also cover the population with French as the first official language spoken.

### 3.1 Fertility

During the first half of the twentieth century, fertility differences between language groups partly accounted for the growth or maintenance of the population of some groups in relation to others. In Ontario, the French-mothertongue population continued to exhibit higher fertility than the "other"-mother-tongue group until 1966 and the English-mother-tongue group until 1981.

During the period 1956-1961, for example, the fertility level of women with French as their mother tongue was 4.6 children per woman ( 4,600 children per 1,000 women) compared to 3.56 and 3.13 for those with English as a mother tongue and those with another mother tongue respectively. Starting in 1981, the total fertility rate of Francophones was lower than that of the other two groups, reaching its lowest level during the period 1996-2001 at 1.47 children per woman.

Demographers have determined that in the current conditions of low mortality, the replacement level corresponds to a rate of 2.1 , that is, 2,100 children per 1,000 women. As may be seen in table 3.1 , starting in the period 1971-1976, the fertility level of Francophone and Anglophone women was below this replacement level, while for women with another mother tongue, fertility dropped below the 2.1 threshold during the period 19811986. The table also shows that the fertility level of "other"-mother-tongue women declined less rapidly that that of women in the other language groups. Between 2001 and 2006, it was still higher than theirs. However, as will be seen below, the effect of a higher fertility rate for a given language group does not necessarily mean that the population of this group will increase in relation to other groups. For mothers with French as their mother tongue, as with mothers with a mother tongue other than French or English, the transmission of another mother tongue to their children-generally the majority language in their living environment-is a major phenomenon.
8. Of course, a language is also transmitted from fathers to their children, but it is usually the mother's language that predominates.

Table 3.1
Total fertility rate by mother tongue, Ontario, 1956 to 2006

|  | Children per woman |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :--- |
| Five-year period | All <br> languages | English | French | Other |
|  | number |  |  |  |
| 1956 to 1961 | 3.53 | 3.56 | 4.60 | 3.13 |
| 1961 to 1966 | 3.30 | 3.29 | 4.03 | 3.11 |
| 1966 to 1971 | 2.40 | 2.30 | 2.64 | 2.67 |
| 1971 to 1976 | 1.93 | 1.84 | 2.00 | 2.67 |
| 1976 to 1981 | 1.66 | 1.59 | 1.66 | 2.22 |
| 1981 to 1986 | 1.63 | 1.61 | 1.54 | 1.75 |
| 1986 to 1991 | 1.63 | 1.63 | 1.53 | 1.67 |
| 1991 to 1996 | 1.69 | 1.66 | 1.63 | 1.81 |
| 1996 to 2001 | 1.58 | 1.54 | 1.47 | 1.70 |
| 2001 to 2006 | 1.59 | 1.54 | 1.53 | 1.73 |

Note(s): The method used to calculate the fertility rate is taken from Lachapelle, R (1988), Changes in Fertility Among Canada's Linguistic Groups, Canadian Social Trends, no 10, Fall 1988, catalogue no 11-008 E, pp. 2-8.
Source(s): Statistics Canada, censuses of population, 1956 to 2006.

### 3.2 Transmission of mother tongue and the effect of exogamy

Although the total fertility rate provides useful information on the number of births within different mother-tongue groups, it does not provide any information on the mother tongue transmitted to children. The tendency to transmit a language to one's children varies according to a number of factors; one of the most important of these is the geographic concentration of the population comprising a given language group. As will be seen below, this factor also influences the propensity to form an exogamous couple, that is, a couple in which the partners do not have the same mother tongue. Also, the lower the geographic concentration or the relative weight of a language group in a given community, the lower the propensity of parents to transmit the minority language. As chart 3.2.1 shows, the proportion of couples with at least one French-mother-tongue partner who transmit French as a mother tongue to their children varies considerably from one region to another in Ontario. In the South-East of the province, French was passed on as a mother tongue to nearly three children in four, compared to one child in two for the province as a whole. It is in Toronto and the "Rest" of the province that these proportions are the lowest at $36.5 \%$ and $29.1 \%$ respectively.

## Chart 3.2.1

Proportion of children with French as mother tongue among families where at least one of the parents has French as mother tongue by region, Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

The proportion of Francophones within a given region, or indeed their level of geographic concentration, leads to different propensities to form linguistically mixed or exogamous couples. In 1971, exogamous couples in Ontario accounted for nearly $38 \%$ of parental couples with at least one French-mother-tongue partner and with children under 18 years of age (chart 3.2.2). In 2006, this proportion had risen to more than $59 \%$.

Chart 3.2.2
Percentage of couples with at least one parent of French mother tongue and with children under 18 years of age in the household, by partner's mother tongue, Ontario, 1971 and 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 1971 and 2006 Censuses of Population.

The proportion of exogamous couples varies considerably whether these couples live from one region of the province to another (see chart 3.2.3). The propensity to form endogamous unions (i.e., in which the partners have the same mother tongue) was greatest in the South-East (59\%) whereas in Toronto and the "Rest" of the province, the corresponding proportions were $19 \%$ and $15 \%$ respectively. It is worth noting that while only $2 \%$ of the population of Toronto has French as a mother tongue, the propensity of Francophones to form exogamous unions (English-French) is roughly the same as observed in Ottawa (56\%) and the North-East of the province $(52 \%)$. At the same time, Toronto stands out from the other regions in that nearly one couple in four there consists of one partner with French as a mother tongue and another with a mother tongue other than French or English.

## Chart 3.2.3

Percentage of couples with at least one parent of French mother tongue and with children under 18 years of age in the household, by partner's mother tongue, Ontario and regions, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.
Because of the strong increase in the proportion of French-English exogamous couples between 1971 and 2006, one might expect to observe a decrease in the rate of transmission of the minority language (in this case, French) to children. But whereas French had been passed on to $11 \%$ of children under 18 years of age of French-English exogamous couples in 1971, the corresponding proportion was $23 \%$ in 2006 (see chart 3.2.4). There was also an increase in the transmission of French to the children of French-"other"-language exogamous couples, from $17 \%$ to $25 \%$ during the same period.

Chart 3.2.4
Mother tongue of children less then 18 years of age by parent's mother tongue, Ontario, 1971 and 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 1971 and 2006 Censuses of Population.

Women are proportionally more likely to pass on their mother tongue than men. In 2006, 33\% of French-mothertongue mothers whose spouse had English as a mother tongue transmitted French to their children, compared to only $12 \%$ of French-mother-tongue fathers living with a spouse whose mother tongue was English. This gap was much larger in 2006 than it was in 1971; the transfer rates of mothers and fathers who form exogamous couples were $12 \%$ and $9 \%$ respectively.

The transmission of French by French-mother-tongue mothers is even greater when only children under 5 years of age are considered (chart 3.2.5). In 1971, French had been passed on to children in this age group in only $16 \%$ of cases, compared to $38 \%$ in 2006. The corresponding proportions were $19 \%$ and $35 \%$ respectively for children of couples in which one partner is French-speaking and the other has a mother tongue other than French or English.

## Chart 3.2.5

## Percentage of children under five years of age, where both the mother's and the child's mother tongue is French, by mother tongue of the father, Ontario, 1971 and 2006



Source(s): Statistics Canada, 1971 and 2006 Censuses of Population.

Table 3.2.1 shows that between 1971 and 2006, there was an increase in the proportion of spouses with a mother tongue other than French who could conduct a conversation in French and English. Thus, the increased transmission of French to children living in French-English exogamous families goes hand in hand with an increase in the French-English bilingualism of non-Francophone spouses. This increase was especially notable among female spouses with English as their mother tongue; they registered a French-English bilingualism rate of $25.4 \%$ in 2006 compared to $17 \%$ in 1971. Among male English-mother-tongue spouses in French-English exogamous couples, the level of knowledge of French increased more modestly, going from $22.5 \%$ to $24.3 \%$.

It is also worth noting that in 1971, 11.4\% of French-mother-tongue women living with an English-speaking male partner spoke French most often at home, compared to $7 \%$ of French-mother-tongue males living with a Frenchspeaking female partner. Thirty-five years later, in 2006, the corresponding proportions were $17.4 \%$ and $9.9 \%$ respectively.

Table 3.2.1
Proportion of partners with a mother tongue other than French who have knowledge of both official languages by type of couple, Ontario, 1971 and 2006

|  |  | $\mathbf{1 9 7 1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Type of couple | 2006 |  |
| English male partner and French female partner | 22.5 | 24.3 |
| French male partner and English female partner | 17.0 | 25.4 |
| Other language male partner and French female partner | 26.6 | 35.0 |
| French male partner and Other language female partner | 21.2 | 32.5 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, censuses of population, 1971 and 2006.

### 3.3 Age structure

It is instructive to examine how the age structure of Ontario's Francophone population has evolved, so as to be able to update part of the past demographic history of that population while getting an indication of its future course. Between 1971 and 2006, the change over time was essentially the result of a major decline in the Francophone fertility rate. Added to this was incomplete transmission of the mother tongue to children, although as will be seen further on, the level of transmission has not changed much in 35 years. At the time of the 2006 Census, French had been transmitted to one of every two children under age 18 of couples in which at least one of the spouses had French as a mother tongue.

How a population evolves demographically mainly depends on whether it maintains its numbers, which is mainly done through births, international immigration and, to a certain extent, interprovincial migration. Chart 3.3.1 shows how the age structure of the French-mother-tongue population in Ontario has changed over time. In the past 35 years, international immigration had very little effect on the evolution of this population, because its contribution was marginal. Since 1971, the number of French-mother-tongue population in Ontario registered a small increase ( 27,890 persons), going from 482,350 to 510,240 . The increase in this population was mainly among persons aged 35 and over, whereas the number of persons under 35 declined substantially, mainly because of a fertility rate below the replacement level.

In 2006, the number of children under 5 years of age $(18,750)$ was much smaller than the number of adults aged 30 to $34(30,887)$, the average age of childbearing, with a ratio of 0.62 . By comparison, in 1971 the corresponding ratio was 1.06 ( $34,995 / 32,895$ ). Also, as chart 3.3 .1 shows, the baby boom generation (born between 1946 and 1966), which corresponded to the age cohorts 5 to 9 years to 20 to 24 years in 1971, is nearly identical in size to the 40 to 44 years to 55 to 59 years age cohorts 35 years later.

Chart 3.3.1
Age structure of the French mother tongue population, Ontario, 1971 and 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, censuses of population, 1971 and 2006.

The small size of the youngest cohorts in 2006-combined with the fact that in the coming decades a number of cohorts will pass the over-65 years mark-will in the future produce an especially elderly age structure for the population with French as its mother tongue.

While the aging of the population is mainly due to a low fertility rate, it also seems clear that in addition it results from the French mother tongue not being passed on to children. As noted above, although the rate of intergenerational transmission of French increased in families headed by French-English exogamous couples between 1971 and 2006, it is nevertheless true that more than seven children in ten under 18 years of age and living in these families were transmitted English as their mother tongue.

But overall, intergenerational linguistic continuity remained stable over this period. This phenomenon is measured by determining the ratio of the number of French-mother-tongue children under 5 years of age to the number of children whose mother has French as her mother tongue. ${ }^{9}$ In Ontario, this index was 0.72 in 1971 and 0.74 in 2006 (data not shown). While the index remained stable, intergenerational transmission is nevertheless unfavourable to the French-mother-tongue population, since the intergenerational continuity index is less than $1 .{ }^{10}$ An index of 0.7 means that three French-mother-tongue women in ten do not pass that language on to their children. Because of a low fertility rate and a linguistic continuity index of this order, Lachapelle and Lepage (to be published) estimate that the number of births of children with French as their mother tongue will decrease by nearly $50 \%$ every thirty years.

[^4]The steep drop in births exhibited by the French-mother-tongue group in the past 35 years is not unique to this language group. Chart 3.3 .2 shows the age structure of the main mother-tongue groups in 2006. As may be seen, while the relative share of cohorts under 35 years of age within the English-mother-tongue group is greater than in the other two groups, the consequences of a fertility rate below the replacement level are also apparent in this language group. But unlike the French-mother-tongue and "other"-mother-tongue groups, the Anglophone group benefited from the contribution of intergenerational linguistic mobility from the other two groups. In 2006, the intergenerational linguistic continuity index of the Anglophone group was 1.15

It should also be noted that the over-representation of the "other"-mother-tongue group in the cohorts aged 25 to 45 is mainly due to immigration policies that tend to favour the immigration of working-age persons.

Chart 3.3.2
Age structure of French, English and Other mother tongue populations, Ontario, 2006 (Rate per 1000)


Note(s): Multiples responses were equally redistributed among the groups.
Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Finally, the age structure of the Francophone group in Ontario must also be examined in light of information on the first official language spoken. We have shown that the population with French as a first official language spoken was 538,000 , compared to 510,000 for the population with French as a mother tongue. The differences in age structures as shown in chart 3.3.3 are slight. However, there is a somewhat larger number of French FOLS persons in the cohorts aged 4 to 9 years and 50 to 54 years, with a larger spread in the group aged 10 to 19 years. These differences, while slight, result primarily from the contribution of international immigration of "other"-mother-tongue persons with French as an FOLS.

Chart 3.3.3
Number of French mother tongue and French first-official-language-spoken populations, Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

### 3.4 Language transfers or intragenerational linguistic mobility

Language transfers, also sometimes called language shifts, refer to the phenomenon where the main language used at home differs from the individual's mother tongue. This language mobility phenomenon has no direct bearing on the evolution of language groups defined according to mother tongue. However, since the language that dominates in the home is generally the one that is passed on to the children, it influences the long-term future of language groups. Also, when the criterion used to define language groups is the first official language spoken, the language spoken most often at home has a direct influence on the size of the Francophone group. For example, according to this criterion, persons who have knowledge of both official languages and who have both French and English or an other language as a mother tongue are part of the English-speaking group if they speak English most often at home. By the same token, persons with an "other" mother tongue who know both official languages and who speak French most often at home are part of the group with French as the first official language spoken.

Through successive censuses, there has been an increase in language transfer for persons with French as a mother tongue in Ontario. Thus, in 1971, approximately 30\% of Francophones with French as a mother tongue reported using another language, usually English, most often at home. Among persons with a mother tongue other than French or English, the corresponding proportion was nearly $41 \%$. Thirty-five years later, $42 \%$ of French-mother-tongue persons reported speaking another language than French most often at home. Among persons with a mother tongue other than French or English, the proportion of language transfers remained roughly stable, mainly owing the strong immigration of such persons to the province, especially since the mid1980s.

Chart 3.4.1
Rate of Language Transfer by mother tongue, Ontario, 1971 to 2006

|  | Mother tongue |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | French | English | Other |
|  | percentage |  |  |
| 1971 | 30.3 | 1.0 | 40.6 |
| 1981 | 29.5 | 0.6 | 39.8 |
| 1991 | 37.2 | 0.5 | 41.7 |
| 2001 | 40.8 | 0.7 | 39.4 |
| 2006 | 42.3 | 0.7 | 38.8 |

Note(s): With the exception of 1971, only single responses were considered for mother tongue, but all responses to the home language where the language is mentioned.
Source(s): Statistics Canada, 1971 and 2006 Censuses of Population.

A linguistic continuity index can also be used as a corollary of the language transfer rate. This index is the ratio of the number of persons with a given home language to the number of persons with the corresponding mother tongue. When the index is greater than 1, this means that the group comes out ahead in exchanges with other language groups while an index lower than 1 indicates an unfavourable situation for the group in question.

According to the statistics presented in table 3.4.2, Ontario's English-mother-tongue group saw its linguistic continuity index go from 1.10 to 1.17 between 1971 and 2006, while that of the Francophone group went from 0.73 to 0.61 . In other words, although the number of persons with French as a mother tongue increased by nearly 30,000 persons during that period, the number with French as their main home language declined by nearly 48,000 persons.

Table 3.4.2
Population by mother tongue, language spoken most often at home and linguistic continuity index, Ontario, 1971 and 2006

| Linguistic characteristics | 1971 |  |  | 2006 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | French | English | Other | French | English | Other |
|  | number |  |  |  |  |  |
| Language spoken most often at home | 352,465 | 6,558,060 | 792,580 | 304,725 | 9,789,940 | 1,934,235 |
| Mother tongue | 482,350 | 5,967,725 | 1,253,035 | 510,240 | 8,313,880 | 3,204,770 |
| Linguistic continuity index | 0.73 | 1.10 | 0.63 | 0.61 | 1.17 | 0.60 |

Note(s): after equal redistribution of multiple responses in 2006.
Source(s): Statistics Canada, censuses of population, 1971 and 2006.

The continuity index of 0.61 for the French-mother-tongue group takes account of the fact that in Ontario, nearly 11,000 persons have an "other" mother tongue and speak French most often at home (table 3.4.3). It also takes account of the fact that more than 10,200 persons with English as their mother tongue have French as their main home language.

Table 3.4.3
Population by mother tongue and language spoken most often at home, and linguistic continuity index, Ontario, 2006

|  |  | Language spoken most often at home |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Mother tongue |  |  | Other |  |  |
|  |  | French | English | languages | Total |
| English | number | 10,217 | $8,161,961$ | 58,528 | $\mathbf{8 , 2 3 0 , 7 0 6}$ |
|  | percentage | 0.1 | 99.2 | 0.7 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| French | number | 275,056 | 211,134 | 2,624 | $\mathbf{4 8 8 , 8 1 4}$ |
|  | percentage | 56.3 | 43.2 | 0.5 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Autres langues | number | 10,821 | $1,296,498$ | $1,826,726$ | $\mathbf{3 , 1 3 4 , 0 4 5}$ |
|  | percentage | 0.3 | 41.4 | 58.3 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Total | number | $\mathbf{2 9 6 , 0 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 , 6 6 9 , 5 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 8 7 , 8 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 , 8 5 3 , 5 6 4}$ |
| Linguistic continuity index | 0.61 | 1.17 | 0.60 | $\ldots$ |  |
| Note(s): With equal redistribution of multiple responses to the language spoken most often at home question |  |  |  |  |  |
| and single responses to the mother tongue question. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population. |  |  |  |  |  |

Because individuals' main home language may differ from their mother tongue, the concept of language transfer has often been seen as a phenomenon indicating abandonment of one's mother tongue. But since 2001, the Canadian census has included a question on languages, other than the main language, that are spoken on a regular basis at home. Although it may be difficult to judge how respondents interpret this new question, qualitative tests conducted on respondents as well as survey results (SVOLM) have shown that respondents usually consider it to refer to daily use of that language.

Based on the census results for this question, a distinction can be made between partial and complete language transfer. As a corollary to this distinction, there is a need to nuance the concept of linguistic continuity, since using one's mother tongue on a regular basis at home cannot be interpreted as linguistic discontinuity.

In 2006, 289,000 Ontarians spoke French as the only main language at home, while 32,500 persons reported speaking that language most often in combination with English or another language (table 3.4.5). Thus, nearly $2.7 \%$ of Ontarians reported having French as a main language. Data drawn from the census also show that 248,000 Franco-Ontarians reported speaking French on a regular basis at home, although not as their main home language. In short, French was spoken either most often or on a regular basis at home by $4.7 \%$ of the population. ${ }^{11}$

Table 3.4.4
Population by mother tongue, language spoken most often at home and other languages spoken regularly at home, Ontario, 2006

| Type of answer | Mother tongue |  | Language spoken most often at home |  | Other language(s) spoken regularly at home |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% |
| Single responses | 11,853,565 | 98.5 | 11,756,485 | 97.7 | 1,785,929 | 14.8 |
| French | 488,815 | 4.1 | 289,035 | 2.4 | 201,183 | 1.7 |
| English | 8,230,705 | 68.4 | 9,655,830 | 80.3 | 856,986 | 7.1 |
| Other | 3,134,045 | 26.1 | 1,811,620 | 15.1 | 727,760 | 6.1 |
| Multiple responses | 175,330 | 1.5 | 272,410 | 2.3 | 30,783 | 0.3 |
| French and English | 32,690 | 0.3 | 26,050 | 0.2 | 5,187 | 0.0 |
| English and Other | 131,290 | 1.1 | 239,895 | 2.0 | 9,488 | 0.1 |
| French and Other | 7,785 | 0.1 | 3,065 | 0.0 | 15,984 | 0.1 |
| English and French and Other | 3,565 | 0.0 | 3,405 | 0.0 | 124 | 0.0 |
| Total | 12,028,895 | 100.0 | 12,028,895 | 100.0 | 12,028,895 | 100.0 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

## Table 3.4.5

Number and proportion of persons with French as mother tongue, first official language spoken, language spoken most often at home and language spoken regularly at home, Ontario, 2006

| French language | number | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Mother tongue (single and multiple) | 532,855 | 4.4 |
| First official language spoken (single and multiple) | 578,040 | 4.8 |
| Language spoken at least regularly at home (single and multiple) | 569,630 | 4.7 |
| $\quad$ Language spoken most often at home (single and multiple) | 321,555 | 2.7 |
| Language spoken regularly at home (single and multiple) | 248,075 | 2.1 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Information on the regular use of French as a secondary language in the home serves to distinguish complete language transfers from partial language transfers. Thus, based on single responses to the question on the first language learned and still understood at the time of the 2006 Census (usually called the mother tongue), table 3.4.6 shows that for Ontario as a whole, 23\% of persons with French as their mother tongue do not use French at least regularly at home (complete transfer), whereas $19 \%$ use it on a regular basis (partial transfer).

[^5]As was already seen in Section 2.3, Francophones are fairly concentrated geographically in Ontario, and consequently, their language behaviours are influenced by the relative share that they represent within their community. For example, the language transfer rate in the South-East region is $26 \%$, including $11 \%$ complete transfers and $15 \%$ partial transfers. Conversely, the Toronto region and the Rest of Ontario register transfer rates of $59 \%$ and $67 \%$ respectively, with the rates for complete transfer being $34 \%$ and $43 \%$.

Table 3.4.6
Rate of complete and partial language transfers by region, persons of French mother tongue, Ontario, 2006

|  | French mother tongue |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region | Complete <br> transfer | Partial <br> transfer | Total |
|  | percentage |  |  |
| South-East | 10.7 | 15.1 | $\mathbf{2 5 . 7}$ |
| Ottawa | 14.2 | 18.2 | $\mathbf{3 2 . 4}$ |
| North-East | 16.9 | 19.1 | $\mathbf{3 6 . 0}$ |
| Toronto | 34.2 | 25.0 | $\mathbf{5 9 . 2}$ |
| Rest of Ontario | 43.0 | 23.9 | $\mathbf{6 6 . 8}$ |
| Ontario | $\mathbf{2 3 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 3}$ |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

We also know that language transfer rates of Franco-Ontarians vary by age group (table 3.4.7). As well, Francophones under 15 years of age have a greater tendency to speak French most often at home than those in other age groups. In fact, the linguistic paths of Franco-Ontarians who live in a minority situation are influenced by their life paths (type of educational institution attended, main language of friends, work environment, spouse's language group, etc.). According to 2006 statistics, the Franco-Ontarians most likely to have made a complete language transfer are those aged 55 or over. However, it is among Francophones aged 25 to 34 that partial language transfers are proportionally most numerous (26\%). Consequently, French is not the main language used at home for nearly one Francophone in two aged 25 or over.

Table 3.4.7
Rate of complete and partial language transfers by age group, persons of French mother tongue, Ontario, 2006

|  | French mother tongue |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| Age group | Complete <br> transfers | Partial <br> transfers | Total |
|  | percentage |  |  |
| 0 to 14 years | 5.4 | 11.4 | $\mathbf{1 6 . 8}$ |
| 15 to 24 years | 14.6 | 20.7 | $\mathbf{3 5 . 3}$ |
| 25 to 34 years | 20.4 | 25.9 | $\mathbf{4 6 . 2}$ |
| 35 to 54 years | 25.7 | 22.2 | $\mathbf{4 7 . 9}$ |
| 55 to 64 years | 30.8 | 18.2 | $\mathbf{4 9 . 1}$ |
| 65 years and over | 31.8 | 13.6 | $\mathbf{4 5 . 3}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 3 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 3}$ |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.


#### Abstract

Exogamy is often associated with language transfer for Francophones outside Quebec. Indeed, 81\% of Francophones who live in an exogamous union with an English-mother-tongue partner speak English most often at home. However, the 2006 SVOLM data serve to better document the link between exogamy and language transfer among Francophones. In many cases, language transfer is found to have taken place well before a union was formed with an Anglophone partner: approximately 64\% of Francophones who live in an exogamous situation began to speak English most often at home before age 21 and $39 \%$ before age 15. Among Francophones between 25 and 44 years of age-those likely to have young children-the corresponding proportions were $69 \%$ and $46 \%$ respectively. Thus, it is not so much exogamy that has a direct bearing on the fact that a Francophone speaks English most often at home. In fact, these results suggest that living in a highly minority situation increases the use of the majority language in daily activities and influences the main language of Francophones in the medium term and ultimately affects the propensity to choose an English-speaking spouse. In any event, the relationship between exogamy and home language definitely operates in both directions.

Data drawn from the Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities (SVOLM) shed light on the association that tends to be established between language transfer and anglicization. The survey includes a question on respondents' main language, that is, the language in which they are most at ease in speaking. As may be seen from the results presented in table 3.4.8, a sizable proportion of Francophones have either English or both official languages as their main language. These proportions vary by region of residence, and consequently by the proportion that Francophones represent within their municipality.


Table 3.4.8
Percentage of persons with French as their first official language spoken by main language and region of residence, Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

When the statistics presented in this table are compared to those concerning language transfer (table 3.4.6), it emerges that depending on the region, the proportion of Francophones who report speaking English most often at home (including both complete and partial language transfers) is larger than the proportion who report being more at ease in English than in French. For example, 50\% of Toronto Francophones report being more at ease in English than in French, while 67\% report speaking English most often at home. Similarly, in the South-East region of the province, 15\% of Francophones report being more at ease in English than in French, while 26\% report speaking English most often at home (including complete and partial transfers).

### 3.5 Use of French in the public sphere

Statistics from the Census of Population shed light on the use of languages in the private sphere (at home) and, as will be seen in the section dealing with the labour force, the use of languages in the workplace. But what do we know about the use of languages-French in particular-in areas of interaction other than in the home?

The Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities includes a number of questions on the use of languages in various domains in the public sphere such as stores, health care institutions (which will be examined in detail in the next section), volunteer activities, social support, community or sports activities, etc. Some questions in the survey also deal with domains on the borderline between the private and public spheres, such as the language spoken with friends outside the home and the language in which various media are "consumed." Just like in other domains, media consumption in French depends not only on individual choices but also on the degree to which the various media are accessible in this language, since the internet has significantly improved things to this regard.

The use of French outside the home varies from one domain to another in the public sphere. The statistics provided in chart 3.5 .1 show that the presence of French is lowest in the consumption of the different cultural media (radio, television, newspapers, books, Internet). About 34\% of Francophones in the province use French most often (alone or with another language) in this domain. Only $12 \%$ use it predominantly.

Outside the family sphere, where French is spoken most often (either alone or with another language) by 60\%, French is most widely used by Francophones in their interactions with friends. Here, 34\% of them report mainly using French while 16\% report using as much French as English. The extent to which French is used at work is fairly similar to what is observed in institutions and stores. However, it should be noted in this regard that the use of French in stores specifically is even lower (data not shown), with scarcely more than $15 \%$ of the province's Francophones reporting that they use French with employees of the stores that they visit most often.

Chart 3.5.1
Proportion of Francophones by language use in various domains of the public and private spheres, Ontario, 2006


Note(s): A note on the construction of the indices for use of language in daily activities is found in Appendix C.
Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

Just as was seen in the previous sections, the use of French in the various domains of the public sphere (media, institutions and stores, work, immediate network and friends outside the home) varies from one region to another within the province. ${ }^{12}$ Thus, French is the main language used (alone or with another language) by more than $80 \%$ of Francophones residing in the South-East of the province. Excluding cases where French is used equally with English, French is used predominantly by 53\% of Francophones in that region.

The predominant use of French is similar in Ottawa and the North-East of the province. However, French is used more in the national capital if cases where it is used equally with English are included.

Chart 3.5.2
Proportion of Francophones by the general language use index in various domains of the public sphere, Ontario and regions, 2006


Note(s): Please refer to Appendix B to obtain quality indicators (coefficient of variation (CV)) for the estimates used to produce this chart. Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

[^6]
### 3.6 Knowledge of French

When persons for whom French is not the first official language spoken have knowledge of French, this can give those for whom it is the main language more opportunities to use it outside the family home.

While 4.4\% of Ontario's population report French, either alone or together with another language, as a mother tongue, and while a similar proportion have French as a first official language spoken, 11.9\% of the population report that they are able to conduct a conversation in French. In 2006, whereas $88 \%$ of persons with French as a mother tongue reported knowing both official languages, the corresponding proportion was only $8.6 \%$ for persons with English as a mother tongue and $6.7 \%$ for persons with another mother tongue. Among the latter, $8.2 \%$, most of them recent immigrants, reported that they were unable to conduct a conversation in either French or English.

Table 3.6.1
Knowledge of official languages by mother tongue, Ontario, 2006

| Mother tongue | Knowledge of official languages |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | English | English and English nor |  |  | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |
| English | 91.4 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| French | 3.5 | 8.4 | 88.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 84.9 | 0.2 | 6.7 | 8.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 85.9 | 0.4 | 11.5 | 2.2 | 100.0 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

For persons for whom French is not the first official language spoken, the ability to conduct a conversation in French depends on a number of factors, including how interested they are in learning the language and the perceived importance, utility and status of the language. Additionally, the demographic characteristics of the population considered and the demolinguistic context play a preponderant role. Charts 3.6 .1 and 3.6 .2 show that the level of knowledge of French by non-Francophones greatly depends on the region in which they live and, consequently, on the proportion of the French-speaking population in that region.

Province-wide, around 8\% of non-Francophones can conduct a conversation in French. However, this proportion rises to $29 \%$ in the South-East region and to $27 \%$ in Ottawa. Non-Francophones in the North-East of the province register a lower level of knowledge of French, namely 15\%, while those residing in Toronto and the Rest of Ontario post similar proportions, below or around the provincial average.

## Chart 3.6.1

Rate of English-French bilinguism among the non-Francophones with English as their first official language spoken by region, Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Another way to bring out the link between place of residence and knowledge of French among nonFrancophones is to arrange the statistics according to the relative weight of the Francophone minority within the municipality of residence. In municipalities where Francophones represent less than $10 \%$ of the population, a situation experienced by $36 \%$ of Franco-Ontarians, the rate of French-English bilingualism among nonFrancophones scarcely exceeds $6 \%$. In those where they represent between $10 \%$ and $30 \%$ of the population of their municipality, which is the case for $42 \%$ of Franco-Ontarians, the level of knowledge of French among nonFrancophones climbs to more than $23 \%$. Thus, the greater the relative share of Francophones within their municipality, the greater will be the knowledge of French among non-Francophones. A fact worth noting is that even when Francophones represent $70 \%$ or more of the population in their community of residence, the level of knowledge of French among non-Francophones barely reaches 45\%.

Chart 3.6.2
Rate of English-French bilingualism among persons with English as their first official language spoken by the proportion that Francophones represent within the municipality of residence, Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Knowledge of French among non-Francophones is usually more widespread among persons with English as their mother tongue than among those with a mother tongue other than French or English, except for the 10 to 14 age group. Knowledge of French is also much more widespread among young persons, because of their attending programs of French immersion or French as a second language. Because the learning of French usually takes place at school, the bilingualism rate peaks in the 15 to 19 age group, which covers the period when young people are completing their secondary education.

## Chart 3.6.3

## Proportion of persons with a mother tongue other than French who can conduct a conversation in English and in French in each five-year age group, Ontario, 2006



Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

However, while knowledge of French appeared to have slightly advanced between 2001 and 2006 within the Anglophone population, it continued to decline among youths aged 15 to 19. Thus, from a level of $18 \%$ in 1996, the French-English bilingualism rate of young English-speaking Ontarians lost ground, dropping to $16 \%$ in 2001 and $13.7 \%$ in 2006.

Furthermore, the ability of young Anglophones to maintain their knowledge of French as a second language diminishes over time. As may be seen in chart 3.6.4, when we consider youths aged 15 to 19 in 1996, we observe that their bilingualism rate as reported in that census ( $18 \%$ ) falls to $14.8 \%$ in 2001, whereas this cohort are aged 20 to 24 years, and to $13.2 \%$ in 2006 when the same cohort is aged 25 to 29 years. A similar trend is observed among youths who were 15 to 19 years of age in 2001 and who are between 20 and 24 years of age five years later.

## Chart 3.6.4

## Proportion of persons with English as their mother tongue who can conduct a conversation in English and in French in each five-year age group, Ontario, 1991, 1996 and 2006



Source(s): Statistics Canada, censuses of population, 1991, 1996 and 2006.

It is difficult to identify the exact causes of this decline in the ability to conduct a conversation in French among young, English-mother-tongue Ontarians aged 15 to 19 years. As table 3.6.2 shows, enrolments in immersion programs, while they fluctuated slightly from year to year, remained relatively stable between 2000 and 2006. However, it is noteworthy that enrolments declined $3 \%$ between 2000 and 2003 but returned to their initial level three years later. Moreover, statistics for the year 2006-2007 stand out sharply with a $3.7 \%$ increase in enrolments in immersion programs.

Table 3.6.2
Number of children registered in French immersion and in a regular French programme at the primary and secondary levels in public schools, Ontario, 2000-2001 to 2006-2007

| Year | French immersion <br> programmes ${ }^{1}$ |  | Regular French <br> language programme |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | variation in <br> $\%$ |  | number | variation in |
| $\%$ |  |  |  |  |

1. Ontario, 2000-2001 to 2006-2007. Includes immersion promammes and extended French programmes Source(s): Brockington, Riley (2009), Summary Public School Indicators for the Provinces and Territories, 2000/2001 to 2006/2007, Statistics Canada, catalogue no 81-595-M.

### 3.7 Migration (interprovincial and international migratory movements)

The mobility of Francophones within Canada and the contribution of international immigration are factors that greatly influence the evolution of the French-speaking population of Ontario.

### 3.7.1 Place of birth

The place of birth of Ontario Francophones is presented in table 3.7.1. In 2006, $64 \%$ of persons with French as a mother tongue were born in Ontario, compared to nearly $60 \%$ of those for whom French is the first official language spoken. Depending on the criterion used, the proportion of Franco-Ontarians born in another Canadian province or territory was between $27 \%$ and $29 \%$, with the vast majority of them coming from Quebec. As to foreign-born persons, most of them immigrants, ${ }^{13}$ they comprised $7 \%$ of the population with French as a mother tongue and $14 \%$ of the population with French as a first official language.

Table 3.7.1
Place of birth of Francophones by mother tongue and first official language spoken, Ontario, 2006

| Place of birth | French mother tongue |  | French first official language spoken |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | number | \% | number | \% |
| Born in Ontario | 327,222 | 64.1 | 320,568 | 59.6 |
| Born in another province in Canada | 147,753 | 29.0 | 143,618 | 26.7 |
| Born in Quebec | 119,124 | 23.3 | 117,112 | 21.8 |
| Born in New Brunswick | 16,234 | 3.2 | 15,111 | 2.8 |
| Born outside Canada | 35,266 | 6.9 | 73,246 | 13.6 |
| Total | 510,241 | 100.0 | 537,432 | 100.0 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

[^7]These results vary greatly depending on which region of the province is being considered. Thus, while less than one person in five residing in the South-East region and approximately one in six in the North-East region was born in another province or territory in Canada (primarily in Quebec), the corresponding proportion is roughly $28 \%$ in Toronto and Ottawa, and $38 \%$ in the "Rest" of the province. As to foreign-born persons, chart 3.7.1 clearly shows that Francophone immigration in Ontario, like non-Francophone immigration, is concentrated in the large urban centres. In fact, half the Francophone population of Toronto consists of persons born outside Canada, whereas in Ottawa and the "Rest" of the province, the corresponding proportions are $15 \%$ and $18 \%$ respectively.

Chart 3.7.1
Place of birth of persons with French as first official language spoken by region, Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

### 3.7.2 International immigration

Ontario is the province that receives the greatest number of international immigrants. Thus, in 1971, $52 \%$ of immigrants to Canada lived in that province, only slightly less than in 2006 (55\%). The same is true for Frenchspeaking immigrants outside Quebec: 69\% of all French-speaking immigrants settling outside Quebec live in Ontario, especially in the Ottawa and Toronto metropolitan areas.

Francophone immigration in Ontario is not a recent phenomenon. However, because of the strong growth of international immigration that Canada has experienced since the mid-1980s, the French-speaking immigrant population of the province grew $54 \%$ between 1991 and 2001. Most of these immigrants have a mother tongue other than French or English and have either French or both official languages as their first official language spoken.

The immigrant population with French as its first official language spoken accounts for a very small proportion of the province's immigrant population. In 2006, its relative share was $2 \%$. Furthermore, whereas the relative weight of the immigrant population within the province's Francophone population was approximately $14 \%$ in the last census, the relative weight of the immigrant population with English as its first official language spoken was roughly 30\% of the Anglophone population (table 3.7.2.1).

Table 3.7.2.1
Number, percentage and relative share of French and English immigrants, Ontario, 1971 to 2006

| Immigrant | 1971 | 1981 | 1991 | 2001 | 2006 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | number |  |  |  |  |
| Number of French immigrants | 32,342 | 33,692 | 39,857 | 61,323 | 68,254 |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion of French speaking immigrants within the immigrant population | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Share of French speaking immigrants in Ontario within all French speaking immigrants outside Quebec | 59.9 | 60.2 | 66.5 | 69.9 | 69.1 |
| Proportion of immigrants within the French speaking population | 6.4 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 11.7 | 12.8 |
| Proportion of the immigrant population within the Anglophone population | 22.0 | 23.5 | 23.8 | 26.6 | 27.8 |
| Relative share of immigrants in Ontario within all of Canada | 51.8 | 52.4 | 54.6 | 55.6 | 54.9 |

Note(s): The populations are defined by first official language spoken criteria.
Source(s): Statistics Canada, 1971 to 2006 Censuses of Population.

French-speaking immigrants in Ontario come from various countries. However, a large proportion of them come from a limited number of countries. Data from the 2006 Census reveal that nearly three immigrants in ten come from the African continent, an additional 30\% come from Western Europe and approximately 10\% from the Caribbean. Table 3.7.2.2 shows the main countries of origin of immigrants residing in Ontario. As may be seen, France is by far the country from which the greatest number of French-speaking immigrants come, followed by Haiti and the Democratic Republic of Congo. The twelve countries shown in this table account for $54 \%$ of French-language immigration in Ontario. Including Mauritius, four African countries alone account for more than $16 \%$ of all French-speaking immigrants, compared to $12 \%$ for France.

Table 3.7.2.2
Main countries of origin of French-speaking immigrants, Ontario, 2006

|  | French-speaking <br> immigrants |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Country | number | $\%$ |
| France | 8,706 | 11.9 |
| Haiti | 4,562 | 6.2 |
| Congo, Democratic Republic of the | 3,880 | 5.3 |
| Lebanon | 3,748 | 5.1 |
| Romania | 3,396 | 4.6 |
| Mauritius | 3,234 | 4.4 |
| Morocco | 2,646 | 3.6 |
| Egypt | 2,149 | 2.9 |
| China, Poeple's Republic of | 1,923 | 2.6 |
| Italy | 1,843 | 2.5 |
| Belgium | 1,709 | 2.3 |
| Viet Nam | 1,590 | 2.2 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

### 3.7.3 Interprovincial migration

Since 1981, net migration between Ontario and the other provinces and territories has been positive. Except at the peak reached between 1986 and 1991, a period when 35,000 Francophones left Ontario to go to other provinces, departures for other provinces have generally ranged between 25,000 and 30,000 during any given five-year period. As to migration to Ontario, it was at its highest level between 1981 and 1986 (at more than $38,000)$, whereas its lowest level was reached between 2001 and $2006(25,600)$. Ontario's positive net migration of 11,000 Francophones between 1996 and 2001 came primarily from Quebec.

Table 3.7.3
Interprovincial migration between Ontario and other provinces and territories by first official language spoken, 1981 to 1986, 1986 to 1991, 1991 to 1996, 1996 to 2001 and 2001 to 2006

| Period | First official language spoken |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | French | English |
|  | number |  |  |
| From Ontario to other provinces |  |  |  |
| 1981 to 1986 | 186,166 | 25,786 | 159,961 |
| 1986 to 1991 | 223,025 | 35,150 | 187,089 |
| 1991 to 1996 | 241,032 | 31,517 | 208,289 |
| 1996 to 2001 | 190,610 | 24,587 | 164,943 |
| 2001 to 2006 | 212,705 | 28,864 | 182,702 |
| From other provinces to Ontario |  |  |  |
| 1981 to 1986 | 285,522 | 38,320 | 246,037 |
| 1986 to 1991 | 269,983 | 34,061 | 234,225 |
| 1991 to 1996 | 194,020 | 26,715 | 165,711 |
| 1996 to 2001 | 242,496 | 35,560 | 205,108 |
| 2001 to 2006 | 185,786 | 25,566 | 158,673 |
| Net migration (arrivals minus departures) |  |  |  |
| 1981 to 1986 | 99,356 | 12,535 | 86,076 |
| 1986 to 1991 | 46,959 | -1,089 | 47,136 |
| 1991 to 1996 | -47,012 | -4,802 | -42,579 |
| 1996 to 2001 | 51,886 | 10,973 | 40,165 |
| 2001 to 2006 | -26,919 | -3,298 | -24,029 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 1986 to 2006 Censuses of Population.

Charts 3.7.3.1 and 3.7.3.2 show migratory movements between Ontario and the other provinces and territories between 2001 and 2006. As may be seen, of the approximately 26,000 Francophones who came from other provinces and territories to settle in Ontario, 75\% had been living in Quebec in 2001, compared to 6\% in New Brunswick and Alberta. By the same token, of the 29,000 Francophones who were living in Ontario in 2001 and who migrated to other provinces, three-quarters settled in Quebec.

Chart 3.7.3.1
Origin of Franchophones who lived in other provinces and territoires in 2001 and who moved to Ontario between 2001 and 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

## Chart 3.7.3.2

Destination of Francophones who left Ontario between 2001 and 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

## Section 4 A few key sectors for the vitality of official-language minority communities

The Roadmap for Canada's Linguistic Duality 2008-2013 invests in key sectors, including the following five: health, justice, arts and culture, economic development and immigration. The last of these sectors was briefly discussed in a previous section and was dealt with in an analytical report released by Statistics Canada in April 2010. This section will present statistics on the other four key sectors identified in the Roadmap. Also, the Roadmap includes financial support for education in the minority language. This sector was identified as being of great importance for the future of official-language minorities in Canada; ${ }^{14}$ therefore, a section will be devoted to it.

Drawing on data from the Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities (SVOLM) and the census, we will provide information on the presence of French and the situation of Francophones in each of these sectors.

### 4.1 Health

A common language between patients and health care professionals is one of the key elements of access to health care services and the effectiveness of the services provided. Language barriers can mean that some members of minority Francophone communities are less well served by health care services. From this perspective, it is important to examine the situation of Ontario's Francophone communities regarding various aspects of access to health care services.

In the 2006 Census, $23 \%$ of doctors working in Ontario, or 3,495 , reported being able to conduct a conversation in French, while $7 \%$ reported using French at least regularly ${ }^{15}$ in their work. ${ }^{16}$ For nurses, the number is 11,698 , and corresponding proportions are $12 \%$ and $7 \%$ respectively.

The proportion of health care professionals who can conduct a conversation in French and, to a lesser extent, the proportion of those who use that language at least regularly, is much higher than the relative share of Francophones in Ontario. Nevertheless, the Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities results show that the majority of Ontario Francophones report using English when consulting the different health care professionals about whom information was collected in that survey, namely family doctors, nurses, telephone health line or telehealth service professionals and professionals in other places that people go to in order to obtain care. Table 4.1 shows the languages used with health care professionals.

Table 4.1
Percentage of Francophones in Ontario by language used with different health professionals and region, 2006

| Region | Family doctor |  | Nurse |  | Telephone health line |  |  | "Other" place |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | English French and French | English | English <br> French and French | English | French | English and <br> French | English | English French and French | English |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South-East | 73 5 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 20 | $62 \quad 12$ | 22 | 65 | x | $21^{\text {E }}$ | $54 \quad 7 \mathrm{E}$ | 36 |
| Ottawa | $48 \quad 6{ }^{\mathrm{E}}$ | 45 | $40 \quad 18^{\mathrm{E}}$ | 39 | 44 | x | 49 | 23 12E | 62 |
| North-East | $37 \quad 6{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 57 | $40 \quad 9 \mathrm{E}$ | 50 | 38 | F | 56 | 2912 | 59 |
| Toronto | $8^{\mathrm{E}}$ ( $\quad \mathrm{F}$ | 84 | $x$ x | 90 | x | x | 71 | X X | 95 |
| Rest of Ontario | $F \quad F$ | 83 | $8^{\mathrm{E}} \quad \mathrm{F}$ | 77 | F | x | 79 | $3^{\mathrm{E}}$ ( $\quad \mathrm{x}$ | 93 |
| Ontario | 35 4 | 58 | 3211 | 53 | 36 | $4^{\text {E }}$ | 57 | 23 8 | 67 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

[^8]As the table shows, English is prevalent in interactions with these health care professionals, in all regions of Ontario except the South-East, where French appears to predominate.

Lack of knowledge of French by health care professionals, as perceived by the respondents, is the main reason cited by Francophones to explain why they are not served in that language during their visits/consultations. Also, a sizable proportion of Francophones-between $13 \%$ and $35 \%$, depending on the professional consultedreported being more at ease in the majority language. This has a major influence on the main language used in interactions.

Overall, the results of the SVOLM and the census clearly show that the proportion of Francophones in a municipality of residence, the availability of professionals with knowledge of French and the main language of those requesting service are three important factors that affect the extent of use of one language or the other with health care professionals.

While the South-East region stands out from the other regions of Ontario, this is mainly due to the strong representation of Francophones living there: slightly more than $60 \%$ of Francophones in that region live in a municipality where their language group's relative share is at least $50 \%$. Thus, as described in the section on use of languages in the public sphere, the greater the proportion of Francophones in a given region, the more extensive the presence of French in the public sphere and consequently, the greater the opportunities for using it in daily activities.

Apart from how the proportion of Francophones in a given region influences the use of French with health care professionals, the availability of such professionals able to conduct a conversation in that language is obviously an important factor to consider. According to statistics from the 2006 Census, the Ottawa and South-East regions have the highest proportions of doctors ( $42 \%$ and $40 \%$ respectively) and nurses ( $44 \%$ and $58 \%$ respectively) who can conduct a conversation in French. ${ }^{17}$ These two regions also have the largest proportions of Francophones who report communicating in French with health care professionals. The presence of Francophone professionals as well as professionals able to conduct a conversation in the minority language is not only likely to increase the accessibility of health care services in that language, but it can also be conducive to a stronger presence and more widespread use of that language in this key sector of the public sphere.

In light of these results, it is also important to examine whether Francophones who report having French as their main language were more likely to use French in their interactions with health care professionals than those with English as their main language. It seems clear that the lack of use of the minority official language by Francophones for whom French is the main language-that is, the language in which they are most at easedoes not depend on the same factors as in the case of Francophones who have made a language shift with the result that English is now the language in which they feel most at ease.

In general, the results of the SVOLM show that Francophones whose main language is French are proportionally more likely to be served in French when they go to different health care professionals than Francophones who have English as their main language. For example, 55\% of the former reported using French during interactions with their regular medical doctor compared to $9 \%$ of the latter.

Information drawn from the SVOLM clearly shows that for Francophones, obtaining health care services in the language of their choice does not necessarily mean obtaining services in French. For the 35\% of Ontario Francophones who have English as their main language, it would not be surprising if French were not their "language of choice" for obtaining health care services.

[^9]
### 4.2 Justice

An examination of the Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities results concerning the justice field also sheds light on the extent to which French is present in institutions that ensure its use in the public sphere and consequently bolster its status. By measuring access to French-speaking professionals in this field and to those who are able to converse in French, it is possible to document a phenomenon perceived as being vitally important to the future of Francophone minority communities. With regard to this, the Canadian government, in the Roadmap for Canada's Linguistic Duality 2008-2013, undertook to ensure that Canadians will have better access to justice services in the minority official language.

In Ontario, the Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities results show that access to these services in French appears to be valued by Francophones in that $50 \%$ feel that if they had to use the services of a lawyer, it would be "very important" or "important" for the lawyer to be able to speak French. Also, approximately $70 \%$ of French-speaking adults reported that they would feel at ease speaking French if they were dealing with the police.

It should be noted that interactions with justice system and its representatives, including lawyers and the police, are not widespread in the population. Of Ontario's 440,110 adult Francophones, 30\% reported that they had used the services of a lawyer, while less than one Francophone in five had dealt with the police, either to obtain services or because of an offence: $17 \%$ had had contact with the municipal police, $10 \%$ with the provincial police and $2 \%$ with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP).

Because the language barrier can hinder access to justice, the Canadian government has made it a priority to train professionals who can provide service in the minority official language. According to the 2006 Census, Ontario had 9,470 lawyers or notaries able to conduct a conversation in French, representing 30\% of all lawyers in the province. As to Ontario police officers, $16 \%$ reported that they were able to conduct a conversation in French. Of course, on this score, regional differences are observed, with the South-East and Ottawa regions having the largest proportions of lawyers and police officers able to conduct a conversation in French.

In addition to these statistics on availability or the potential pool of justice system professionals who are able to use French when interacting with Ontario Francophones, tables 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 show the knowledge of French by professionals and the use of this language in their work.

Table 4.2.1
Knowledge and use of minority language by police officers (excludes senior management), Ontario and regions, 2006

| Region | Total population of police officers | French - First official language spoken |  | French - Language used most often at work |  | French - Language used regularly at work |  | French - Language used at least regularly at work |  | Knowledge of French |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | number | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% |
| South-East | 720 | 295 | 41 | 120 | 16 | 325 | 45 | 440 | 61 | 480 | 67 |
| Ottawa | 2450 | 630 | 26 | 170 | 7 | 875 | 36 | 1045 | 43 | 1330 | 54 |
| North-East | 1340 | 255 | 19 | 80 | 6 | 260 | 19 | 340 | 25 | 440 | 33 |
| Toronto | 2040 | 85 | 4 | 25 | 1 | 60 | 3 | 80 | 4 | 300 | 15 |
| Rest of Ontario | 21400 | 410 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 425 | 2 | 440 | 2 | 1930 | 9 |
| Ontario | 27945 | 1675 | 6 | 405 | 1 | 1940 | 7 | 2345 | 8 | 4475 | 16 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Table 4.2.2
Knowledge and use of the minority language by lawyers, Ontario and regions, 2006

| Region | Total population of lawyers | French - First official language spoken |  | French - Language used most often at work |  | French - Language used regularly at work |  | French - Language used at least regularly at work |  | Knowledge of French |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | number | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% |
| South-East | 270 | 140 | 52 | 60 | 23 | 105 | 39 | 170 | 62 | 210 | 78 |
| Ottawa | 4045 | 735 | 18 | 380 | 9 | 1225 | 30 | 1605 | 40 | 2490 | 62 |
| North-East | 500 | 75 | 15 | 40 | 8 | 60 | 12 | 100 | 20 | 160 | 32 |
| Toronto | 14790 | 330 | 2 | 90 | 1 | 550 | 4 | 635 | 4 | 4280 | 29 |
| Reste of Ontario | 1235 | 160 | 1 | 40 | 0 | 400 | 3 | 440 | 4 | 2335 | 19 |
| Ontario | 32040 | 1440 | 4 | 610 | 2 | 2340 | 7 | 2950 | 9 | 9475 | 30 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

In the 2006 Census, less than $10 \%$ of Ontario lawyers reported using French on a regular basis at work. The proportion is less than $5 \%$ in regions with small proportions of Francophones, namely the Toronto region and the Rest of Ontario. The same is true for police officers: In each region of Ontario, the rate of use of French at work is lower than the proportion of police officers who are able to conduct a conversation in French ${ }^{18}$.

Interestingly, census data show that the number of lawyers and police officers who use French in their work in Ontario is greater than the number of Francophone lawyers and police officers. Thus, a sizable number of nonFrancophones reported using French as a language of work, which suggests that there is a potential pool of professionals likely or able to provide services in French.

This said, the Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities results show that Francophones' interactions with both municipal and provincial police ${ }^{19}$ generally take place in English, even in the South-East and Ottawa regions, where French is generally more present (see charts 4.2 .1 to 4.2.3). Thus, 10\% of Francophones used only or mainly French in their interactions with the municipal police and $26 \%$ with the provincial police. The same patterns are observed with respect to use of a lawyer's services.

Although English is the predominant language in interactions with professionals in the justice system, there is nevertheless a link between the proportion of French-speaking persons in the municipality of residence and the use of French with police officers and lawyers. Thus, the South-East region has the largest proportions of French being used with the municipal police (18\%), the provincial police (35\%) and lawyers ( $85 \%$ ).

[^10]Chart 4.2.1
Proportion of Francophones by language used with municipal police, Ontario, 2006


Note(s): Please refer to Appendix B to obtain quality indicators (coefficient of variation (CV)) for the estimates used to produce this chart. Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

## Chart 4.2.2

## Proportion of Francophones by language used with provincial police, Ontario and regions, 2006



Note(s): The data for Toronto has been suppressed because of the very small number of members of the official-language minority who had contact with the provincial police.
Please refer to Appendix B to obtain quality indicators (coefficient of variation (CV)) for the estimates used to produce this chart. Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

## Chart 4.2.3

Proportion of Francophones by language used with lawyer, Ontario and regions, 2006


Note(s): Please refer to Appendix B to obtain quality indicators (coefficient of variation (CV)) for the estimates used to produce this chart. Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

### 4.3 Education

### 4.3.1 Children

Access to French-language schools and management of the educational systems of the Francophone minority have long been burning issues for Francophones outside Quebec. Ontario in particular has been marked by struggles to guarantee education at all levels, from preschool to post-secondary, and to obtain the management of these schools. In many provinces excluding Quebec, the education of Francophones in their own language was greatly limited by the fact that most French schools received no government funding, until the early 1970s. ${ }^{20}$ Owing to the efforts of various boards and committees, French-language secondary schools began to emerge in 1969.

In a minority situation, French schools are assigned special status because of their role as an agent of socialization to French culture, transmission of the French language to children and maintenance of skills in that language. School is a public Francophone environment which, along with the family, can contribute to the development and blossoming of Francophone community life.

[^11]It is therefore important to be able to measure the extent to which French-language schools are attended by children eligible to attend them, along with the factors that influence decisions concerning children's language of instruction. The Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities data shed light on this particular aspect of the school situation of children of Francophone parents in Ontario, since they can be used to estimate the number of children eligible for education in French who attend a French-language school or who are enrolled in an immersion program. Additionally, these data can be used to examine the link between attending a Frenchlanguage school and the use of languages, in particular at home and with friends.

In Ontario, of the 128,620 children of Francophone parents enrolled in school at the time of the survey, approximately $57 \%$ were attending a French-language elementary or secondary school (chart 4.3.1). When the $11 \%$ enrolled in an immersion program in an English-language school are included, it can be estimated that approximately 68\% of children of Francophone parents in Ontario receive an education in French.

Chart 4.3.1
Percentage of children with at least one Francophone parent by language of school attended, Ontario, 2006


Note(s): Please refer to Appendix B to obtain quality indicators (coefficient of variation (CV)) for the estimates used to produce this chart. Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

The regional variations seen in this chart clearly show how these regions' particular demolinguistic characteristics likely influence the choice of the language of instruction for the children of Francophone parents. These characteristics include the proportion of Francophones in the municipality of residence and the parents' main language, both of which are important factors both in transmitting the French language to children and in choosing the language of instruction. For example, Toronto and the Rest of Ontario, when compared to the other regions of the province, have weak concentrations of Francophones and lower proportions of Francophones whose main language is French. Chart 4.3 .1 also shows that these two regions have the lowest proportions of children enrolled in a French-language school, at $45 \%$ and $38 \%$ respectively.

The Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities also highlights the fact that attending a Frenchlanguage school appears to be a more popular choice for the parents of the youngest children. The results suggest that there may be some abandonment of French school in favour of English school in the transition between elementary school and secondary school.

The results shown in table 4.3.1 thus reveal that the proportions of children enrolled in a French-language elementary school (60\%) are higher than for children enrolled in a French secondary school (51\%), in all regions of the province. For children who have previously attended a French-language school, the quality of the program is the main reason cited by parents to justify this change from one school system to the other.

Table 4.3.1
Number and percentages of children of Francophone parents by language of school and level of schooling, Ontario and regions, 2006

| Type of school attended by child ${ }^{1}$ | Prekindergarten and kindergarten |  | Primary$\text { (1 to } 8 \text { ) }$ |  | Secondary |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% |
| South-East | 1680 | 100 | 9280 | 100 | 5600 | 100 | 16820 | 100 |
| English school immersion program | 0 | 0 | $680{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $7{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $410{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $7{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 1,090 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | $7{ }^{\text {E }}$ |
| English school regular program | $390{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $23{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $650{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $7{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $850{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $15^{\text {E }}$ | 1930 | 11 |
| French school | 1210 | 73 | 7930 | 85 | 4170 | 74 | 13510 | 80 |
| Ottawa | 3620 | 100 | 16750 | 100 | 10040 | 100 | 30700 | 100 |
| English school immersion program | 0 | 0 | 3680 | 22 | 2,450 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 24 | 6130 | 20 |
| English school regular program | F | $15^{\text {E }}$ | 1,870 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | $11^{\text {E }}$ | 1,720 E | $17{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 4430 | 14 |
| French school | 3050 | 84 | 10880 | 65 | 5770 | 58 | 19700 | 64 |
| North-East | 2900 | 100 | 14370 | 100 | 9650 | 100 | 27300 | 100 |
| English school immersion program | 0 | 0 | 1,650 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | $12{ }^{\text {E }}$ | x | x | 1,920 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | $7{ }^{\text {E }}$ |
| English school regular program | x | x | 2040 | 14 | 2,770 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | $29{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 5380 | 20 |
| French school | 2440 | 84 | 10540 | 73 | 6190 | 64 | 19400 | 71 |
| Toronto | 1,740 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 100 | 5150 | 100 | 2960 | 100 | 9860 | 100 |
| English school immersion program | 0 | 0 | $570{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $11^{\text {E }}$ | $230{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $8{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $800{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $8{ }^{\text {E }}$ |
| English school regular program | $960{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 55 | 1680 | 33 | 1910 | 65 | 4550 | 46 |
| French school | $750{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $43{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 2910 | 56 | 740 E | $25^{\text {E }}$ | 4390 | 45 |
| Rest of Ontario | 7,220 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 100 | 24380 | 100 | 11990 | 100 | 43950 | 100 |
| English school immersion program | 0 | 0 | 2,820 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | $12{ }^{\text {E }}$ | F | F | 3,980 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | $9{ }^{\text {E }}$ |
| English school regular program | 4,160 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 58 | 11650 | 48 | 7170 | 60 | 23250 | 53 |
| French school | $3,020{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $42{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 9860 | 40 | 3,570 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | $30^{\mathrm{E}}$ | 16510 | 38 |
| Ontario | 17150 | 100 | 69930 | 100 | 40240 | 100 | 128620 | 100 |
| English school immersion program | 0 | 0 | 9400 | 13 | 4520 | 11 | 13920 | 11 |
| English school regular program | 6,520 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 38 | 17880 | 26 | 14420 | 36 | 39540 | 31 |
| French school | 10470 | 61 | 42110 | 60 | 20440 | 51 | 73510 | 57 |

1. children for whom responding parent has French as first official language spoken

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

Apart from the environmental characteristics mentioned above, other factors influence the choice of the language of the school attended by the child. In particular, the linguistic path of the parents in their own educational trajectory appears to have some influence on the choice of their children's language of instruction or school system. Thus, of the 114,680 children whose parents had their elementary and secondary education in French, approximately $68 \%$ were currently attending a French-language school and approximately $67 \%$ spoke French most often ( $46 \%$ ) or on a regular basis ( $21 \%$ ) at home. Also, $89 \%$ of children living with an endogamous couple with both parents having French as their mother tongue attended a French-language school, compared to $42 \%$ of children of French-English exogamous couples.

Finally, the Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities results point to a strong correlation between children's school attendance in French and various language behaviours. Children who attend a Frenchlanguage school are more likely to use French at home ${ }^{21}$ ( $75 \%$ compared to $12 \%$ of children in immersion), to speak French with their friends ( $77 \%$ compared to $19 \%$ of children in immersion) and to be able to conduct a conversation ( $99 \%$ compared to $72 \%$ of children in immersion).

### 4.3.2 Adults

### 4.3.2.1 Highest level of schooling

The highest level of schooling of Ontario Francophones in 2006 is an important indicator of the progress made since the 1971 Census, which was conducted shortly after the Dunton-Laurendeau Royal Commission completed its work. Based on statistics from the 1961 Census, the Commission's work described disparities observed between Francophones and Anglophones in Canada, with respect to education as well at to labour market status and various spheres of economic activity.

Notably because of compulsory education to age $16^{22}$ and the growing importance assigned to education by governments, employers and the general public, the disparities between Francophones and Anglophones have greatly diminished over time.

To illustrate the phenomenon, we will first examine the results shown in chart 4.3.2.1, which concerns the situation observed in 2006. As the chart shows, $24 \%$ of the Franco-Ontarian population had no certificate, diploma or degree, compared to $21 \%$ of the Anglophone population. The gap observed between the two language groups basically reflects the fact that Anglophones are proportionally more likely to have completed secondary school than their Francophone counterparts. Statistics on diplomas, certificates or degrees obtained at the post-secondary level show that gaps between the groups are very small or non-existent, indicating that much catching-up has occurred.

[^12]Chart 4.3.2.1
Highest certificate, diploma or degree obtained by first official language spoken, Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

The findings that emerge from a reading of the above chart cover the overall population aged 15 and over, and they therefore reflect both the present and the past educational situation of the language groups.

Once again, chart 4.3.2.2 clearly illustrates this point when we look at selected sub-populations defined by their age group. Focusing our attention on the 65 or over age group, we see that Francophones and Anglophones differ considerably in the proportions of persons having no diploma, certificate or degree. In this age group, one Francophone in two is in this situation, compared to $38 \%$ of Anglophones. At the other end of the spectrum, more than $11 \%$ of Anglophones have a university certificate, diploma or degree at or above the bachelor's level.

A sign of how trends in education level are evolving is that the situation observed for 25 to 34 -year-olds is the opposite. In this age group, there are proportionally more Anglophones (9\%) than Francophones (7\%) who have no diploma, while as regards the proportions of university graduates, Francophones (34\%) are slightly more likely to have a university diploma than Anglophones (33\%). For persons aged 35 to 54 , fairly similar results are observed, although there is a slightly larger proportion of university graduates among Anglophones and a slightly larger proportion of Francophones having no diploma.

Chart 4.3.2.2

## Highest certificate, diploma or degree obtained by first official language spoken and age group, Ontario, 2006



Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

An examination of the educational status of young adults must take an important factor into account, namely Francophones' place of birth. For example, among both Anglophones and Francophones, immigrants are known to be more likely to have a university diploma, one reason being that education level is one of the selection criteria for immigrants to Canada. In 2006, among Francophones aged 25 to $34,54 \%$ of those born outside Canada had a university diploma, compared to $40 \%$ of those born in another province (in more than $80 \%$ of cases, in Quebec) while 26\% of Francophones born in Ontario had such a diploma (see chart 4.3.2.3). At lower education levels, the corollary of this situation is observed, namely, Francophones born in Ontario were much more likely than other Franco-Ontarians to have a high school or college diploma as their highest education level.

## Chart 4.3.2.3

Proportion of Francophones (first official language spoken) aged 25 to 34 years by the highest certificate, diploma or degree obtained and place of birth, Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

One of the greatest changes resulting from the profound social transformations and educational reforms of the 1960s is undeniably the entry of large numbers of women into post-secondary educational institutions, especially universities. In 1971, the proportion of women holding a university degree was two to three times smaller than the proportion of men, depending on the age group. In 2006, among Ontario Francophones, the data show that for persons aged 65 and over, that is, those who were at least 30 years of age in 1971, the proportion of women holding a university diploma is $7 \%$, compared to just under $12 \%$ for men in this age group (see table 4.3.2.1). By contrast, among 20 to 24 -year-olds, the proportion holding such a diploma is only $9 \%$ for men whereas it is nearly $18 \%$ for women. In short, women under 45 years of age are proportionally more likely to have a university diploma or degree than their male counterparts, whereas the latter are proportionally more likely to have low education or to have a vocational or trade school diploma.

Table 4.3.2.1
Proportion of Francophones (first official language spoken) by the highest certificate, diploma or degree obtained, age group and sex, Ontario, 2006

| Certificat, diploma or degree | 20 to 24 years |  | 25 to 34 years |  | $35 \text { to } 44$ years |  | 45 to 54 years |  | 55 to 64 years |  | 65 years and over |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No certificate, diploma or grade | 7.7 | 12.4 | 5.5 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 12.0 | 13.9 | 19.6 | 27.9 | 28.0 | 52.1 | 46.1 |
| High school certificate or equivalent | 46.2 | 48.3 | 17.6 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 22.0 | 30.3 | 21.6 | 25.2 | 17.7 | 19.7 | 14.0 |
| Apprenticeship or trades certificate or diploma | 3.5 | 7.5 | 5.7 | 9.5 | 8.2 | 12.8 | 7.8 | 16.2 | 9.5 | 18.8 | 6.4 | 16.9 |
| College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma | 21.5 | 20.2 | 27.8 | 27.4 | 28.3 | 23.8 | 23.2 | 19.6 | 16.7 | 13.1 | 9.7 | 8.1 |
| University certificate or diploma below bachelor level | 3.5 | 2.5 | 4.6 | 3.3 | 4.5 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 5.9 | 3.8 | 5.3 | 3.2 |
| University certificate, diploma or grade at bachelor's level or above | 17.6 | 9.1 | 38.7 | 29.1 | 28.4 | 25.9 | 20.6 | 19.8 | 14.8 | 18.6 | 6.8 | 11.7 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

The propensity to be highly educated or less educated usually varies depending on whether individuals live in large urban centres or rural areas. For example, universities are generally located in large urban centres, as are employers who are likely to hire numerous university graduates.

Among Ontario Francophones in 2006, Toronto had the largest proportion of university graduates, namely 41\%, while Ottawa had more than $28 \%$ (chart 4.3.2.4). The North-East of the province had the lowest proportion of university graduates at $8 \%$ of the population. Conversely, in the North-East and South-East of the province, the proportions of the population with no certificate, diploma or degree were sizable at $34 \%$ and $29 \%$ respectively.

Chart 4.3.2.4
Proportion of Francophones (first official language spoken) by the highest certificate, diploma or degree obtained and the region, Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

### 4.3.2.2 Adults' language of instruction

The Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities results showed that in Ontario overall, 60\% of children with at least one French-speaking parent attended a French-language elementary school, while $13 \%$ were in a French immersion program. At the secondary level, the corresponding proportions were respectively $51 \%$ and $11 \%$. What about the language of instruction of adults who responded to the SVOLM? In responses to the various survey questions concerning the language in which respondents pursued part or all of their education in French, a decrease in the presence of French is observed from one age group to the next and from one education level to the next.

Thus, as table 4.3.2.2 shows, the proportion of adults who pursued all of their education in French is relatively high at the elementary level, ranging around $80 \%$ for those under 65 years of age, whereas it declines as the education level rises. Also, a major gap is observed between adults under age 45 and those 45 or over as regards attendance at a secondary school in French. This result must be interpreted in light of the fact that French-language secondary schools started coming into existence starting in 1969 in Ontario, at a time when those who are now 25 to 44 years of age had an opportunity to attend such schools.

The table also shows that the proportion of adults who attended a university program exclusively in French is nearly the same from one age group to another, namely $37 \%$, except for the 25 to 44 years age group, whose members are more likely to have had their university education in French (42\%). Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities data (not presented here) reveal that Ontario Francophones born in another Canadian province, primarily Quebec, are more likely to have had their post-secondary education in French. Among persons aged 45 or over, a larger proportion of those born in Quebec had their university education exclusively in French, while those born in Ontario are more likely to have had only part of that education in French.

Table 4.3.2.2
Proportion of Francophones (first official language spoken) who did all or part of their studies in French by age group and level of schooling, Ontario, 2006

| Age group | Level of schooling |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Primary studies |  |  |  | Secondary studies |  |  |  | Non-university post-secondary studies |  |  |  | University studies |  |  |  |
|  | All in French |  |  | Some in French | All in French |  | Some in French |  | All in French |  | Some in French |  | All in French |  | Some in French |  |
|  | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV |
| 18 to 24 years | 81,0 | 2.2 | 11,0 | 15.0 | 70,0 | 2.9 | 14,0 | 12.3 | 45,0 | 9.7 | F | F | 36,0 | 8.5 | 23,0 | 14.4 |
| 25 to 44 years | 78,0 | 2.7 | $11,0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 17.2 | 72,0 | 3.0 | 12,0 | 11.9 | 40,0 | 7.1 | $12,0^{\mathrm{E}}$ | 18.2 | 42,0 | 8.5 | 22,0 | 12.6 |
| 45 to 64 years | 77,0 | 2.5 | 13,0 | 12.9 | 55,0 | 4.0 | 19,0 | 8.4 | 40,0 | 8.4 | 9, ${ }^{\mathrm{E}}$ | 18.2 | 37,0 | 10.1 | 27,0 | 11.6 |
| 65 years or over | 68,0 | 3.2 | 18,0 | 9.8 | 51,0 | 5.2 | 21,0 | 10.0 | 38,0 | 15.4 | 9, ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 29.8 | 36,0 | 14.8 | 29,0 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 17.2 |

CV coefficient of variation
Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

### 4.4 Media, arts and culture

Support for the arts and culture is one of the key elements targeted by the Roadmap for Canada's Linguistic Duality, which recognizes the essential role that the arts and culture play in the development of minority officiallanguage communities.

The Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities targets six media for measuring access to cultural products in the minority language: television; the Internet; radio; newspapers; books; and live performances and arts events. These days, the Internet and cable television facilitate access to these media in various languages and from many countries, thereby increasing the availability of these various French-language cultural products throughout Canada.

The Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities results show that Ontario Francophones, like their Anglophone counterparts (data not shown) are big consumers of the various media, led by television (see table 4.4.1).

# Table 4.4.1 <br> Proportion of Francophones by use of certain media (all languages included), Ontario, 2006 

|  | Francophone |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | percentage |
| Watch television | 97 |
| Listen to the radio | 84 |
| Read books | 81 |
| Read newspapers | 79 |
| Use internet | 69 |
| Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006. |  |

However, access to French-language media is not the only factor that influences consumption in the minority language. The results show that despite today's technology, which facilitates access to French-language media, English predominates in the consumption of media. A majority of Ontario Francophones are more inclined to report that they watch television or listen to radio, read books and newspapers and access the Internet "only" or "mainly" in English. The media with the highest proportions of consumption "only" or "mainly" in French are books (19\%) and the radio (19\%) (see Table 4.4.2).

Table 4.4.2
Percentage of Francophones by language used with certain media, Ontario and regions, 2006

| Region | Radio |  |  | Television |  |  | Newspapers |  |  | Books |  |  | Internet |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Only or mainly in English | English <br> and <br> French | Only or mainly in French | Only or mainly in English | English and <br> French | Only or mainly in French | Only or mainly in English | English and French | Only or mainly in French | Only or mainly in English | English <br> and <br> French | Only or mainly in French | Only or mainly in English | English and French | Only or mainly in French |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South-East | 42 | 22 | 34 | 42 | 29 | 27 | 37 | 20 | 41 | 34 | 25 | 38 | 50 | 31 | 16 |
| Ottawa | 43 | 26 | 29 | 60 | 24 | 14 | 62 | 21 | 15 | 49 | 29 | 20 | 67 | 23 | $7{ }^{\text {E }}$ |
| North-East | 72 | 14 | 14 | 70 | 20 | 10 | 71 | 19 | 10 | 63 | 21 | 16 | 69 | 22 | $9{ }^{\text {E }}$ |
| Toronto | 70 | 15 | 13 | 61 | 22 | 13 | 85 | $9{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $4^{\text {E }}$ | 60 | 21 | 17 | 71 | 21 | $6{ }^{\text {E }}$ |
| Rest of Ontario | 79 | $6{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $8{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 72 | 15 | $8{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 87 | F | F | 63 | 18 | 13 | 74 | 15 | $5^{\text {E }}$ |
| Ontario | 62 | 16 | 19 | 63 | 21 | 13 | 70 | 15 | 13 | 55 | 23 | 19 | 68 | 21 | 8 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

These results suggest that it is not merely a matter of availability. While approximately $41 \%$ of Ontario Francophones reported that it is "easy" or "very easy" to obtain newspapers in French in their municipality, most newspaper reading (70\%) takes place in English. The same is true for the availability and reading of books. In general, Francophones are more likely to report good availability or easy access to a given medium in French than to report using that medium in French.

It should be noted that as regards the presentation of live performances and arts events in the two regions where the proportions of Francophones are the lowest, namely Toronto and the Rest of Ontario, the opposite situation is observed. There, Francophones are proportionally more likely to have attended a live performance or arts event in French in the last twelve months than to have reported that there are "always" or "often" live performances or arts events in French.

There therefore appears to be substantial support for the arts and live performances in regions were these events are less frequent. For example, in the region identified as the Rest of the province, $4 \%$ of Francophones reported that there are "always" or "often" live performances or arts events in their region, compared to $14 \%$ who reported having attended them. In the other regions and for the other media, the situation is reversed: participation in events is lower than the reported frequency.

The Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities results show once again that the region and the main language are important factors for explaining the choice of the language of consumption. Given the strong correlation between these two factors, it is not surprising to see that Francophones who live in regions with a higher concentration of Francophones, such as the Ottawa region or the South-East, are more inclined to report that their consumption of various media takes place "only" or "mainly" in French. For example, while 19\% of Francophones in Ontario read books "only" or "mainly" in French, this proportion rises to 36\% for Francophones whose main language is French and $49 \%$ for Francophones in the South-East region who have French as their main language. The same pattern is observed in each SVOLM region.

### 4.5 Community life

Individuals' involvement in their community and participation in community activities are generally recognized as dimensions of life in society that contribute to the creation and maintenance of social support networks. Also, "social capital (broadly defined as participation in social networks) is increasingly being understood as a key component of community development or a key aspect of the 'capacity' of a community to develop."23

The Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities data lend themselves to measuring several dimensions of Francophones' participation in community life. The statistics on participation in volunteer activities, membership in community organizations and informal caregiving can be used to examine the extent to which Francophones are engaged, through such forms of involvement, in the life of their community.

The Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities results show that approximately one-quarter of Ontario Francophones participate in one of the activities on which data were collected in this survey. More specifically, $24 \%$ of Francophone adults reported that they had been a member of an organization, network or association in the twelve months preceding the survey, while $26 \%$ reported doing volunteer work and $28 \%$ had provided unpaid assistance with everyday activities to someone not living in their household. Approximately 6\% of Francophones reported participating in all three types of activities.

A number of sociodemographic and economic factors influence community participation, including age, education level, community of residence, socioeconomic status, etc. However, to analyse these factors would go beyond the objective of this document.
23. Rothwell, Neil and Martin Turcotte (2006). "The Influence of Education on Civic Engagement:

Differences Across Canada's Rural-Urban Spectrum." Rural and Small Town Canada Analysis Bulletin, Vol. 7, No. 1, July, catalogue no. 21-006-XIE, page 1.

The type of community activities in which Francophones are involved varies little from one region to another. Their level of participation in these activities is nearly the same in all regions of Ontario. However, the language in which these activities take place varies, particularly according to the type of activity and the region. For example, the SVOLM results show once again that it is in regions where Francophones are more concentrated that French is most widely used in community activities. Accordingly, the South-East of the province has the largest proportions of Francophones using French when participating in community activities.

Chart 4.5.1
Proportion of Francophones by language used during community activities, Ontario and regions, 2006


Note(s): Please refer to Appendix B to obtain quality indicators (coefficient of variation (CV)) for the estimates used to produce this chart. Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

As regards the type of activity, French is used "only or mainly" by $52 \%$ of Francophones who assist with everyday activities, compared to $34 \%$ who use it in volunteer activities. It is worth noting that family members ( $50 \%$ ) and friends ( $27 \%$ ) are more often the beneficiaries of assistance with daily activities. Indeed, family and friends appear to be quite important in the networks of Ontario Francophones. For example, in case of illness, $49 \%$ report that they would turn to members of their family for support, while $23 \%$ would turn to their children. The use of French in social support activities therefore seems to be mainly associated with the private sphere.

The Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities reveals that $81 \%$ of Francophones report that it is "very important" or "important" to them that individuals or organization work at the development of the Francophone community. In this regard, variations are again observed by region and by the proportion and concentration of Francophones within the municipality of residence. In regions with a larger proportion of Francophones, a larger percentage of respondents report that they consider it "very important" or "important" that individuals or organizations work at the development of the Francophone community. For example, the percentages are lower in Toronto and the "Rest" of the province, both regions with lower proportions and concentrations of Francophones. Thus, the percentages vary from $73 \%$ in municipalities with less than $10 \%$ of Francophones to $93 \%$ in municipalities where their relative weight is $70 \%$ or more.

The same phenomenon is observed with respect to the concentration of Francophones within their municipality. The higher this concentration, the larger the proportion of those who consider it to be "very important or "important" that someone work at the development of the Francophone community. In municipalities with a low concentration, the proportion is $73 \%$; in those with a medium concentration, $83 \%$; and in those with a high concentration, $88 \%$.

While $81 \%$ of Francophones report that it is "very important" or "important" to them that individuals or organizations work at the development of the Francophone community, $32 \%$ of those who join organizations, networks or associations do so in order to promote the Francophone community. The latter proportion also varies depending on the proportion of Francophones within the municipality. Francophones living in a municipality where they represent $30 \%$ to $49.9 \%$ of the population ( $42 \%$ ) are the most inclined to report that they are involved in activities promoting the Francophone community. Also, as regards their level of geographic concentration, there is no statistically significant difference between Francophones who live in municipalities where their concentration is low or medium ( $29 \%$ and $30 \%$ respectively report being involved in this type of activity). However, Francophones who live in municipalities were they are highly concentrated are proportionally more inclined to report that they are involved in this type of activity, at 39\%.

### 4.6 Employment and income characteristics

Thus far, we have examined the size of differences in education level between the main language groups in Ontario. Data from both the census and the SVOLM can be used to examine the extent to which Ontario Francophones work in different industrial sectors than Anglophones. It is accordingly possible to identify similarities and differences in how the language groups are distributed among the various industrial sectors.

A brief analysis of 2006 Census data reveals that Francophones are proportionally more likely than Anglophones to work in the public administration and education services sectors. These two sectors employ respectively $13 \%$ and 10\% of the province's Francophones, compared to $5 \%$ and less than $7 \%$ of Anglophones. For their part, Anglophones are proportionally more likely to have jobs in manufacturing (14\%), retail trade (slightly more than $11 \%$ ) and accommodation and food services (nearly 7\%). By comparison, these three sectors employ respectively $10 \%, 10 \%$ and $5 \%$ of the province's Francophones. In most of the other major industry sectors, there are few differences between these two groups.

## Chart 4.6.1 <br> Proportion of workers by industry sector and first official language spoken, Ontario, 2006



Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

An examination of the data on the distribution of jobs by occupational group (not shown here) shows no major difference between the two language groups.

It should be noted, however, that while the relative share of secretarial and office personnel positions is slightly higher for Francophones than for Anglophones, there is no difference in the two groups' relative share of the positions of senior manager, manager, business and financial management professional, or professional or technical personnel in the natural and applied sciences. Such results suggest that the situation of Francophones has changed considerably since the 1960s, especially in light of the findings made by the members of the Dunton-Laurendeau Commission on the socioeconomic status of Francophones. As will be seen below, this transformation is also evident in the statistics on income.

### 4.6.1 Distribution among employment sectors by region of residence

The distribution of Francophones among the different employment sectors varies greatly from one region of the province to another. For example, it is hardly surprising that of all Francophone workers living in the Ottawa census division, $27 \%$ have a job in the public service compared to $8 \%$ of Francophones living in the other regions of the province. Conversely, as table 4.6 .1 shows, while there are proportionally few Francophone workers employed in the manufacturing sector in Ottawa (3\%) and Toronto (7\%), the relative share of these workers is larger in the South-East region and the Rest of the province, at $12 \%$ and $14 \%$ respectively. Also, $14 \%$ of Toronto Francophones work in the professional, scientific and technical services sector, nearly double the figure for Francophones in Ottawa and much larger than the figures for those in the other regions of the province.

Table 4.6.1
Distribution of Francophones workers (FOLS) among different industry sectors by the region of residence, Ontario,
2006 2006

| Industry sectors (NAICS) | South-East |  | Ottawa |  | North-East |  | Toronto |  | Rest of Ontario |  | Ontario number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% |  |
| Public administration | 4,968 | 10.8 | 22,433 | 27.0 | 4,663 | 6.8 | 1,741 | 5.9 | 6,974 | 7.4 | 40,778 |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting | 1,618 | 3.5 | 327 | 0.4 | 2,420 | 3.5 | 29 | 0.1 | 1,700 | 1.8 | 6,094 |
| Arts, entertainment and recreation | 670 | 1.5 | 1,555 | 1.9 | 1,005 | 1.5 | 754 | 2.5 | 1,705 | 1.8 | 5,689 |
| Other services (except public administration) | 2,236 | 4.9 | 4,094 | 4.9 | 3,614 | 5.3 | 1,360 | 4.6 | 3,763 | 4.0 | 15,067 |
| Retail trade | 5,355 | 11.7 | 6,655 | 8.0 | 8,078 | 11.8 | 2,141 | 7.2 | 8,470 | 9.0 | 30,700 |
| Wholesale trade | 1,479 | 3.2 | 1,817 | 2.2 | 1,919 | 2.8 | 1,271 | 4.3 | 5,459 | 5.8 | 11,945 |
| Construction | 4,327 | 9.4 | 3,636 | 4.4 | 4,926 | 7.2 | 1,152 | 3.9 | 6,411 | 6.8 | 20,452 |
| Mining and oil and gas extraction | 84 | 0.2 | 45 | 0.1 | 3,514 | 5.1 | 104 | 0.3 | 559 | 0.6 | 4,306 |
| Manufacturing | 5,450 | 11.9 | 2,599 | 3.1 | 6,516 | 9.5 | 2,128 | 7.2 | 13,526 | 14.3 | 30,218 |
| Finance and insurance | 1,211 | 2.6 | 2,563 | 3.1 | 1,740 | 2.5 | 2,859 | 9.6 | 4,743 | 5.0 | 13,117 |
| Management of companies and enterprises | 24 | 0.1 | 39 | 0.0 | 8 | 0.0 | 78 | 0.3 | 89 | 0.1 | 237 |
| Accommodation and food services | 1,972 | 4.3 | 3,588 | 4.3 | 4,216 | 6.2 | 1,382 | 4.6 | 5,111 | 5.4 | 16,269 |
| Information and cultural industries | 565 | 1.2 | 2,669 | 3.2 | 883 | 1.3 | 1,593 | 5.4 | 1,789 | 1.9 | 7,500 |
| Administrative and support, waste management and remediation services | 1,996 | 4.3 | 4,354 | 5.2 | 2,674 | 3.9 | 1,493 | 5.0 | 3,900 | 4.1 | 14,416 |
| Educational services | 3,970 | 8.6 | 7,489 | 9.0 | 7,250 | 10.6 | 3,335 | 11.2 | 10,169 | 10.8 | 32,214 |
| Real estate and rental and leasing | 644 | 1.4 | 1,089 | 1.3 | 776 | 1.1 | 662 | 2.2 | 1,435 | 1.5 | 4,605 |
| Professional, scientific and technical services | 1,605 | 3.5 | 6,600 | 7.9 | 1,664 | 2.4 | 4,158 | 14.0 | 5,686 | 6.0 | 19,713 |
| Utilities | 190 | 0.4 | 136 | 0.2 | 579 | 0.8 | 110 | 0.4 | 738 | 0.8 | 1,754 |
| Health care and social assistance | 4,981 | 10.8 | 8,238 | 9.9 | 7,960 | 11.7 | 2,080 | 7.0 | 7,685 | 8.1 | 30,944 |
| Transportation and warehousing | 2,603 | 5.7 | 3,115 | 3.8 | 3,880 | 5.7 | 1,312 | 4.4 | 4,635 | 4.9 | 15,545 |
| Total | 45,948 | 100.0 | 83,040 | 100.0 | 68,286 | 100.0 | 29,740 | 100.0 | 94,550 | 100.0 | 321,565 |

Note(s): NAICS = North American Industry Classification System
Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

### 4.6.2 Use of French at work by industrial sector

Of all Ontario workers aged 15 and over, $6 \%(411,360)$ use French "most often" or "on a regular basis" in their work. Among Francophones, the corresponding proportion is $70 \%$, namely $34 \%$ most often and $36 \%$ on a regular basis (that is, less often than the predominant language). ${ }^{24}$

As we just saw, Francophones who work in the public administration, education and health care and social assistance sectors account for nearly one-third (32\%) of the province's Francophones. What about the use of French by the Francophones in these sectors? It is hardly surprising that Francophones in the education sector are proportionally more likely to have French as their main language of work; 66\% use it most often while 15\% report using it on a regular basis. Francophones in the agriculture, forestry and hunting and fishing sectors, which account for only $2 \%$ of the province's Francophone workers, are a close second as regards the use of French at work, namely $58 \%$ most often and $19 \%$ on a regular basis. However, in the public administration sector, a larger proportion of Francophones report using French at least regularly at work, $32 \%$ most often and $54 \%$ on a regular basis.

[^13]
## Chart 4.6.2

Use of French most often or regularly at work among Francophones by industry sector, Ontario, 2006


1. administrative and support, waste management and remediation services Source(s): Statistique Canada, Recensement de la population de 2006.

### 4.6.3 Income differentials

Historically, Francophones in Canada have been economically disadvantaged. Franco-Ontarians were no exception. Since individuals' income level is highly dependent on their education level, their occupation and the industrial sector in which they work (to name only these factors), it would appear that the substantial changes that Francophone communities have undergone over the past forty years have had major effects on their income level.

It is beyond the purpose and scope of this report to analyse the factors that have influenced how income differentials between the language groups have evolved. However, statistics from the 2006 Census suggest that the status of Franco-Ontarians has greatly improved over time.

When the median and average incomes of Francophones and Anglophones are compared, a mixed picture emerges. The 2006 statistics show that the average income of persons with French as their first official language spoken is roughly equal to that of Anglophones, whereas Francophones' median income is $\$ 3,500$ higher than that of Anglophones. These findings suggest that income differences are larger within the Anglophone group than within the Francophone group, with a larger number of Anglophones reporting a high income. Also, the average and median incomes of persons with both French and English as first official languages spoken are much lower than those of the other two groups, owing to the fact that they are mainly immigrants. A number of studies have already shown that despite a higher education level, immigrants have a higher unemployment rate and lower income levels than their Canadian-born counterparts.

Table 4.6.2
Average and median income for male and female by first official language spoken, Ontario, 2006

|  | Male |  | Female |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| First official language spoken | Average <br> income | Median <br> income | Average <br> income | Median <br> income |
|  | dollar |  |  |  |
| English | 47,478 | 34,842 | 30,063 | 22,201 |
| French | 47,609 | 38,297 | 31,898 | 24,316 |
| English and French | 37,921 | 25,703 | 26,936 | 17,931 |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 6 , 9 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 , 4 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 , 7 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 , 6 6 9}$ |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

In light of the historical context described above, it is clear that the median income of the two language groups is age-related, with older Francophones having a lower median income than their Anglophone counterparts. The statistics shown in charts 4.6.3-a and 4.6.3-b reflect the fact that among persons aged 65 and over, the median income of Anglophones is higher than that of Francophones, for both men and women. By contrast, among 25 to 44 -year-olds, the median income of French-speaking women and men alike is approximately $\$ 5,600$ higher than that of Anglophones ${ }^{25}$.

It should finally be noted that like median income, the average income of members of the two main language groups varies according to the age of the individual (results not shown here). While the results on the population as a whole showed no disparity in average income, it may be seen that especially for men, Francophones aged 46 to 64 years and those aged 65 or over have lower incomes than their Anglophone counterparts, on the order of $\$ 4,000$ and $\$ 6,000$ respectively, even controlling for education level, region of residence, industrial sector and immigrant status. Among 25 to 44 -year-olds, it is instead the average income of Francophones that is more than $\$ 2,000$ higher than that of Anglophones.

[^14]Chart 4.6.3-a
Median income for females by age group and first official language spoken, Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Chart 4.6.3-b
Median income for males by age group and first official language spoken, Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistique Canada, Recensement de la population de 2006.

## 5. Subjective vitality

As has been seen thus far, Ontario Francophones do not necessarily form a homogeneous group. We have seen, for example, that they are distributed across various regions of the province, some bordering on Quebec; that they live in municipalities in which their proportion varies from one region to another of the province; and that the extent to which they use French in various domains of the private and public spheres depends on a number of factors, some of them of a demolinguistic nature. This said, the Survey on the Vitality of OfficialLanguage Minorities results bring out at least two key elements shared by most Francophones: a strong sense of double identification with the Francophone and Anglophone groups, and the value that they assign to the French language.

As regards the phenomenon of identity, the SVOLM results suggest that Francophones have a double ethnolinguistic identity: $52 \%$ of them report that they identify with both the Francophone and Anglophone groups, compared to $35 \%$ who report identifying "mainly" or "only" with the Francophone group. The degree of identification with the two main language groups varies slightly from one region of Ontario to another (see chart 5.1). More especially, only the South-East and Toronto regions exhibit proportions lower than those of the other regions of Ontario as regards the sense of double ethnolinguistic identification. In the former case, this reflects the fact that Francophones in the South-East region are proportionally more likely than those of other regions (except Ottawa) to identify mainly with the Francophone group, while Toronto Francophones are proportionally more likely than those of other regions (except the Rest of the province) to identify mainly with the Anglophone group.

Chart 5.1
Percentage of Francophones by identification to Franchophone and Anglophone groups, Ontario, 2006


Note(s): Please refer to Appendix B to obtain quality indicators (coefficient of variation (CV)) for the estimates used to produce this chart. Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

The sense of belonging and identity are highly complex concepts. Depending on the circumstances, people may identify with their country, their language, their culture, etc. The sense of double identification with the Francophone and Anglophone groups that is observed among Ontario Francophones suggests that in many cases, immersion in the primarily Anglophone culture may have contributed to the emergence of a phenomenon in which the Francophone cultural and linguistic heritage is valued and respected while linguistic practices are influenced by living within the dominant and pervasive Anglophone culture. However, to verify and analyse this hypothesis would go beyond the scope of this analytical report and the limitations of the SVOLM in this regard.

Nevertheless, a number of factors indicate that Ontario Francophones assign a definite value to the French language. A large proportion of them (79\%) report that it is important for them to be able to use French in their daily life. Also, they consider it important for individuals or organizations to work at the development of the French-speaking community ( $81 \%$ ), for government services to be provided in French ( $87 \%$ ) and for linguistic rights to be respected in their province ( $92 \%$ ) (see chart 5.2 ).

Chart 5.2
Percentage of Francophones by certain indicators of the value assigned to the French language, Ontario and regions, 2006


Note(s): Please refer to Appendix B to obtain quality indicators (coefficient of variation (CV)) for the estimates used to produce this chart. Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

It is worth noting that in examining the extent to which French is used in the various domains about which SVOLM asks questions, notably regarding interactions with health care and justice system professionals as well as access to the main mechanisms for transmitting culture, we observe a phenomenon that may, on the face of it, seem contradictory: valuing a language does not necessarily translate into using it a great deal. For example, we note that among Ontario Francophones who report that it is either very important or important to be able to use French in their daily life, 57\% watch television only or mainly in English, and 65\% read newspapers only or mainly in English. Even though French is valued and assigned great importance, the demolinguistic reality and the dynamics of the environment in which Francophones live may work against the use of that language.

We have already shown the extent to which the demolinguistic characteristics of the living environment play a major role in the use of the language. However, the SVOLM results suggest that these characteristics have less influence on the phenomenon of valuing the minority language than on language practices as such, notably owing to the fact that this phenomenon does not appear to be governed by the same factors as those affecting practices. The same may be said for the sense of belonging and double identification with the Francophone and Anglophone groups: the region of residence and the proportion of Francophones within their municipality appear to have little influence on this phenomenon. For example, although the results reveal some regional variations, double identification with the Francophone and Anglophone groups is consistently stronger than or equal to identification with the Francophone group, in every region.

The Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities survey collected data on subjective perceptions with regards to past and future evolution of the presence of the minority language in the municipality of residence as well as the perceived vitality of the Official-Language community. As regards these data, $38 \%$ of Francophones believe that the vitality of the French-speaking community in their municipality is strong or very strong, while $40 \%$ expect the presence of French to remain the same in their municipality over the next ten years (see chart 5.3).

## Chart 5.3

Percentage of Francophones by the perception of the evolution of French in the municipality of residence, Ontario and regions, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

Some regional variations are noted. For example, the largest proportions so Francophones who believe that the vitality of the French speaking community in their municipality is strong or very strong are in the South-East ( $67 \%$ ) and the North-East (57\%) (see chart 5.4). Perceptions of the French language, its vitality and its presence in the municipality of residence therefore seem more likely to be influenced by the demolinguistic characteristics of the living environment.

## Chart 5.4

Percentage of Francophones by the perception of the vitality of the French speaking community in the municipality of residence, Ontario and regions, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

## Conclusion

This demolinguistic portrait of Ontario Francophones contains considerable and varied information on the characteristics, practices and perceptions of this language group. Of all this information, what stands out? While the following items are not a complete list of the key points contained in this report, a general picture emerges from them.

1. While the number of the population with French as a mother tongue in Ontario has grown by 169,000 since 1951, the proportion that it represents within the province has steadily declined and now stands at $4.2 \%$ of the population in 2006. The same is true for the population with French as the first official language spoken. However, the latter population is slightly larger, in terms of both its number and its relative share, than the French-mother-tongue population, mainly because of French-language immigration and the fact that some Francophones can no longer conduct a conversation in French.
2. Ontario Francophones are highly concentrated in particular regions of the province. For example, onequarter of Francophones reside in the city of Ottawa, a proportion almost similar to that in the North-East of the province. This distribution of the population affects Francophones' practices and perceptions.
3. The change over time in the age structure of the Franco-Ontarian population reflects the aging of the population, and it results from the combined effect of a fertility rate below the replacement level and incomplete transmission of the French language from parents to children. The language is passed on to a much greater extent in regions that have a larger proportion and concentration of Francophones.
4. Because of the strong increase in the proportion of French-English exogamous couples between 1971 and 2006, one might expect to see a decrease in the rate of transmission of French to children. Yet in 1971, 11\% of the children of such couples had had French transmitted to them, compared to $23 \%$ in 2006 . The rate of transmission is even higher when only children under five are considered.
5. Francophones' language transfer rate has grown steadily since 1981, reaching $42 \%$ in 2006. The proportion of transfers ranges from $26 \%$ in the South-East of the province to more than $60 \%$ in Toronto and the rest of the province excluding Ottawa and the North-East. Starting in 2001, census data make it possible to distinguish between partial transfers and complete transfers. According to data on respondent's main language from the Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities (SVOLM), many Francophones report that they are equally at ease in French and English although English is the main language used at home.
6. In 2006, $60 \%$ of persons for whom French was the first official language spoken had been born in Ontario. Nearly 27 \% had been born in another Canadian province (primarily Quebec) and $14 \%$ outside Canada. The foreign-born proportion was $2 \%$ in the South-East and the North-East, while it was $15 \%$ in Ottawa and $50 \%$ in Toronto.
7. The size of the French-speaking immigrant population was less than 34,000 in 1981 ; it exceeded 68,000 persons in 2006. Ontario is home to $69 \%$ of all French-speaking immigrants outside Quebec. Also, although the proportion of immigrants within Ontario's English-speaking population stood at 28\% in 2006, the proportion of immigrants within the French-speaking population was less than $13 \%$.
8. Whereas it is in the home and with friends that Francophones use French the most, they use it the least in their interactions with various institutions and stores and in their consumption of media. In the latter domain, the SVOLM data reveal that $67 \%$ of Francophones use mainly or only English. Of course, the use of French in the various domains of the public sphere varies from one region to another of the province, with the South-East region being the one where the use of French is the most widespread.
9. In 2006, $8.6 \%$ of persons with English as their mother tongue were able to conduct a conversation in both French and English. The corresponding proportion was $88 \%$ for persons with French as their mother tongue and $6.7 \%$ for persons with a mother tongue other than French or English. These proportions also vary depending on Francophones' place of residence. In fact, the higher the proportion of Francophones in their municipality of residence, the greater the knowledge of French will be among persons for whom English is the first official language spoken. However, even when Francophones account for $70 \%$ or more of the population of the municipality of residence, the level of knowledge of French by non-Francophones barely reaches $45 \%$.
10. Despite the relatively stable numbers of young people attending a French immersion program between 2000 and 2006, there has nevertheless been a drop in the proportion of young Anglophones aged 15 to 19 years who can conduct a conversation in French. This proportion was $13.7 \%$ in 2006, compared to $16 \%$ in 2001 and $18 \%$ in 1996.
11. Data from the 2006 Census reveal that while $23 \%$ of doctors working in Ontario reported being able to conduct a conversation in French, $7 \%$ reported using that language at least regularly at work. These results vary considerably from one region to another. The SVOLM results, in turn, indicate that a majority of Ontario Francophones report using English when consulting different health care professionals. The lack of such professionals able to conduct a conversation in French is often cited by Francophones to explain the lack of services in that language.
12. In the justice domain, the SVOLM results show that Francophones' interactions with both the municipal and the provincial police are generally in English, even in the South-East and Ottawa regions.
13. In education, $57 \%$ of the children of Francophone parents attend a French-language elementary or secondary school. Including the $11 \%$ who are enrolled in an immersion program in a French-language school, an estimated $68 \%$ of children receive an education in French. The SVOLM results also show that the proportion of children enrolled in a French-language elementary school ( $60 \%$ ) is higher than the proportion attending a secondary school in that language ( $51 \%$ ), in all regions of the province.
14. For adults, the gap that existed between Francophones and Anglophones in the 1960s has been practically closed, especially among the youngest. In the 25 to 34 age group, $34 \%$ of Francophones had a university diploma at or above the bachelor's level, compared to $33 \%$ of Anglophones. However, within the Francophone population, there is a sizable performance gap between men and women; the latter are now much more educated than their male counterparts.
15. Because Francophones have caught up in the education sphere, their median income is now higher than that of Anglophones. According to the 2006 Census data, one-third of Francophones are working in the public service, education and health care sectors.
16. A large proportion of Ontario Francophones report that they identify with both the Francophone and Anglophone groups. Also, while a large proportion of Francophones report using English as their main language outside the home, a number of SVOLM findings suggest that Francophones assign a definite value to the French language. In fact, $79 \%$ report that it is important for them to be able to use French in their daily life, $81 \%$ feel that it is important that individuals or organizations work at the development of the Frenchspeaking community and $87 \%$ report that it is important for government services to be provided in French.

## Geographic Maps

The maps presented in this section are of two types. Most of them illustrate the proportion that Francophones represent within a given geographic area, whereas those showing the Census Metropolitan Areas (CMA) of Ottawa and Toronto illustrate the distribution of this population on the whole territory of these CMA's.

## Map 1.1

Percentage of the population with French as first official language spoken (with random ${ }^{26}$ distribution of the English-French category) among census subdivisions, Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

[^15]Map 1.2
Percentage of the population with French as first official language spoken (with random distribution of the English-French category) among census subdivisions in the census division of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry (3501), Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Map 1.3
Percentage of the population with French as first official language spoken (with random distribution of the English-French category) among census subdivisions in the census division of Prescott and Russell (3502), Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Map 1.4
Percentage of the population with French as first official language spoken (with random distribution of the English-French category) among census subdivisions in the census division of Ottawa (3506), Ontario, 2006
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## Map 1.5 <br> Distribution of Francophones (FOLS) within the Census Metropolitan Area of Ottawa by Census Tract, 2006



Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Map 1.6
Percentage of the population with French as first official language spoken (with random distribution of the English-French category) among census subdivisions in the census division of Toronto (3520), Ontario, 2006


[^17]Map 1.7
Distribution of Francophones (FOLS) within the Census Metropolitan Area of Toronto by Census Tract, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

## Map 1.8

Percentage of the population with French as first official language spoken (with random distribution of the English-French category) among census subdivisions in the census division of Nipissing (3548), Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Map 1.9
Percentage of the population with French as first official language spoken (with random distribution of the English-French category) among census subdivisions in the census division of Sudbury (3552), Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Map 1.10
Percentage of the population with French as first official language spoken (with random distribution of the English-French category) among census subdivisions in the census division of Grand Sudbury (3553), Ontario, 2006
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## Map 1.11

## Percentage of the population with French as first official language spoken (with

 random distribution of the English-French category) among census subdivisions in the census division of Timiskaming (3554), Ontario, 2006

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Map 1.12
Percentage of the population with French as first official language spoken (with random distribution of the English-French category) among census subdivisions in the census division of Cochrane (3556), Ontario, 2006


Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

## Appendix A

Table A-1
Francophone population (first official language spoken) in Ontario by region, census division and census subdivision, 2006

| Region, census division and census <br> subdivision | Proportion of <br> Francophones | Number of <br> Francophones |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| South-East |  |  |
| Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry | $\mathbf{2 2 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 , 5 5 5}$ |
| Glengarry Sud | 28.6 | 3,660 |
| Stormont Sud | 12.4 | 1,538 |
| Cornwall | 27.7 | 12,443 |
| Dundas Sud | 3.0 | 315 |
| Dundas Nord | 6.8 | 750 |
| Stormont Nord | 24.8 | 1,665 |
| Glengarry Nord | 40.4 | 4,198 |
| Prescott et Russell | $\mathbf{6 7 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 , 8 8 3}$ |
| Hawkesbury Est | 63.4 | 2,130 |
| Hawkesbury | 79.3 | 8,328 |
| Champlain | 66.5 | 5,720 |
| Alfred et Plantagenet | 79.5 | 6,715 |
| La Nation | 70.6 | 7,383 |
| Clarence-Rockland | 67.0 | 13,710 |
| Casselman | 83.5 | 2,653 |
| Russell | 45.5 | 6,245 |
| Ottawa | $\mathbf{1 6 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5 , 2 2 3}$ |
| Toronto | $\mathbf{1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 , 7 1 0}$ |

## Table A-1 <br> Francophone population (first official language spoken) in Ontario by region, census division and census subdivision, 2006 (continued)

| Region, census division and census <br> subdivision | Proportion of <br> Francophones | Number of <br> Francophones |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| North-East |  |  |
| Nipissing | $\mathbf{2 4 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 , 5 6 8}$ |
| South Algonquin | 0.8 | 10 |
| Papineau-Cameron | 24.5 | 260 |
| Mattawan | 6.7 | 10 |
| Mattawa | 42.3 | 825 |
| Calvin | 16.4 | 100 |
| Bonfield | 36.0 | 725 |
| Chisholm | 15.5 | 205 |
| East Ferris | 26.5 | 1,105 |
| North Bay | 14.9 | 7,923 |
| Nipissing Ouest | 67.0 | 8,833 |
| Temagami | 5.9 | 55 |
| Nipissing 10 | 10.6 | 150 |
| Nipissing, Unorganized, Partie Nord | 18.8 | 330 |
| Sudbury | $\mathbf{2 7 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 7 4 5}$ |
| Riviere des Français | 56.6 | 1,485 |
| St.-Charles | 48.9 | 580 |
| Markstay-Warren | 33.1 | 820 |
| Sables-Spanish Rivers | 11.1 | 355 |
| Espanola | 16.2 | 850 |
| Baldwin | 8.1 | 45 |
| Nairn and Hyman | 10.1 | 50 |
| Whitefish Lake 6 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Mattagami 71 | 5.4 | 10 |
| Duck Lake 76B | 0.0 | 0 |
| Chapleau 75 | 10.5 | 10 |
| Chapleau (Canton) | 32.4 | 755 |
| Sudbury, Partie Nord, Unorganized | 0.0 | 783 |
|  |  |  |

## Table A-1 <br> Francophone population (first official language spoken) in Ontario by region, census division and census subdivision, 2006 (continued)

| Region, census division and census <br> subdivision | Proportion of <br> Francophones | Number of <br> Francophones |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Grand Sudbury | 27.6 | $\mathbf{4 2 , 9 9 3}$ |
| Timiskaming | 24.5 | $\mathbf{8 , 0 3 5}$ |
| Coleman | 18.6 | 80 |
| Latchford | 12.5 | 55 |
| Cobalt | 18.8 | 230 |
| Harris | 39.8 | 205 |
| Temiskaming Shores | 30.1 | 3,170 |
| Hudson | 30.6 | 95 |
| Kerns | 10.8 | 35 |
| Harley | 40.0 | 220 |
| Casey | 71.4 | 275 |
| Brethour | 13.0 | 15 |
| Hilliard | 20.0 | 45 |
| Armstrong | 65.4 | 755 |
| Thornloe | 30.0 | 30 |
| James | 44.6 | 185 |
| Charlton and Dack | 8.1 | 50 |
| Evanturel | 12.8 | 60 |
| Englehart | 4.5 | 65 |
| Chamberlain | 6.2 | 20 |
| Matachewan 72 | 0.0 | 0 |
| McGarry | 62.7 | 420 |
| Larder Lake | 34.0 | 250 |
| Gauthier | 7.4 | 10 |
| Kirkland Lake | 14.7 | 1,178 |
| Timiskaming, Unorganized, Partie Ouest | 14.8 | 475 |

Table A-1
Francophone population (first official language spoken) in Ontario by region, census division and census subdivision, 2006 (continued)

| Region, census division and census <br> subdivision | Proportion of <br> Francophones | Number of <br> Francophones |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Cochrane | 47.2 | 38,415 |
| Black River-Matheson | 36.7 | 955 |
| Timmins | 38.7 | 16,440 |
| Iroquois Falls | 44.6 | 2,075 |
| Abitibi 70 | 8.7 | 10 |
| Cochrane | 44.2 | 2,400 |
| Smooth Rock Falls | 70.1 | 1,010 |
| Fauquier-Strickland | 78.1 | 445 |
| Moonbeam | 83.7 | 1,080 |
| Kapuskasing | 68.0 | 5,678 |
| Val Rita-Harty | 84.6 | 795 |
| Opasatika | 85.7 | 240 |
| Hearst | 90.6 | 4,990 |
| Mattice-Val Côté | 85.7 | 660 |
| Cochrane, Unorganized, Partie Nord | 64.7 | 1,578 |
| Constance Lake 92 | 0.0 | 0 |
| New Post 69A | 0.0 | 0 |

## Table A-1 <br> Francophone population (first official language spoken) in Ontario by region, census division and census subdivision, 2006 (end)

| Region, census division and census <br> subdivision | Proportion of <br> Francophones | Number of <br> Francophones |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Algoma | 6.7 | 7,765 |
| Jocelyn | 7.3 | 20 |
| Hilton | 0.0 | 0 |
| Hilton Beach | 0.0 | 0 |
| St. Joseph | 1.8 | 20 |
| Laird | 1.9 | 20 |
| Tarbutt and Tarbutt Additional | 2.6 | 10 |
| Johnson | 2.1 | 15 |
| Plummer Additional | 2.4 | 15 |
| Bruce Mines | 1.8 | 10 |
| Thessalon 12 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Thessalon | 3.3 | 40 |
| Huron Shores | 2.4 | 40 |
| Blind River | 19.0 | 705 |
| Spanish | 26.7 | 195 |
| North Shore | 20.0 | 110 |
| Elliot Lake | 16.2 | 1,848 |
| Additional | 1.0 | 15 |
| Sault Ste. Marie | 3.8 | 2,843 |
| Prince | 3.1 | 30 |
| Sagamok | 0.0 | 0 |
| Serpent River 7 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Mississagi River 8 | 3.6 | 15 |
| Garden River 14 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Rankin Location 15D | 1.8 | 10 |
| Michipicoten | 18.8 | 600 |
| Goulais Bay 15A | 0.0 | 0 |
| Gros Cap 49 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Dubreuilville | 83.6 | 635 |
| White River | 15.5 | 130 |
| Algoma, Unorganized, North Part | 4.2 | 240 |
| Hornepayne | 15.8 | 190 |

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

Table A-2
Francophone population (first official language spoken) in Ontario by region, census division and main census subdivision, 2006

| Region, census division and main census | Proportion of <br> Francophones | Number of <br> Francophones |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Rest of Ontario | $\mathbf{1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 4 , 7 1 5}$ |
| Leeds and Grenville | 3.0 | 2,975 |
| Lanark | 3.7 | 2,343 |
| Frontenac | 3.2 | 4,548 |
| Kingston | 0.0 | 4,153 |
| Lennox and Addington | 1.7 | 685 |
| Hastings | 2.3 | 2,945 |
| Prince Edward | 1.4 | 345 |
| Northumberland | 1.1 | 873 |
| Peterborough | 1.1 | 1,473 |
| Kawartha Lakes | 1.0 | 755 |
| Durham | 1.9 | 10,440 |
| York | 1.4 | 12,358 |
| Peel | 1.6 | 18,005 |
| Mississauga | 0.0 | 12,145 |
| Dufferin | $\mathbf{1 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 3}$ |
| Brampton | 0.0 | 5,268 |
| Wellington | $\mathbf{1 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 6 0 8}$ |
| Halton | $\mathbf{2 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 , 1 0 3}$ |
| Hamilton | $\mathbf{1 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 5 9 0}$ |
| Hamilton | 0.0 | 8,750 |
| Niagara | $\mathbf{3 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 , 1 3 8}$ |
| Welland | 0.0 | 5,710 |
| Haldimand-Norfolk | $\mathbf{0 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 8}$ |
| Brant | $\mathbf{1 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 9 3}$ |
| Waterloo | $\mathbf{1 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 1 5 5}$ |
| Perth | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 5}$ |
| Oxford | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 1 0}$ |
| Elgin | $\mathbf{0 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 8}$ |
| Chatham-Kent | $\mathbf{2 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 6 5 0}$ |
|  |  |  |

Table A-2
Francophone population (first official language spoken) in Ontario by region, census division and main census subdivision, 2006 (end)

| Region, census division and main census <br> subdivision ${ }^{1}$ | Proportion of <br> Francophones | Number of <br> Francophones |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Essex | 3.3 | 12,980 |
| Windsor | 0.0 | 7,695 |
| Lambton | 2.1 | 2,698 |
| Middlesex | 1.5 | 6,338 |
| London | 0.0 | 6,670 |
| Huron | 0.6 | 328 |
| Bruce | 0.8 | 498 |
| Grey | 0.9 | 775 |
| Simcoe | 2.5 | 10,525 |
| Muskoka | 1.3 | 738 |
| Haliburton | 1.5 | 233 |
| Renfrew | 5.0 | 4,800 |
| Parry Sound | 2.8 | 1,120 |
| Manitoulin | 2.8 | 365 |
| Thunder Bay | 3.8 | 5,603 |
| Rainy River | 1.4 | 288 |
| Kenora | 2.0 | 1,310 |

1. where the number of Francophone are highest

Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

## Appendix B

Table 3.5.2
Proportion of Francophones by the general language use index in various domains of the public sphere, Ontario and regions, 2006

| Language | South-East |  | Ottawa |  | North-East |  | Toronto |  | Rest of Ontario |  | Ontario |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV |
| French only | 15.0 | 8.3 | 4,0 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 18.6 | 4,0 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 17.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | X | X | 4.0 | 7.1 |
| Mainly French | 38.0 | 4.7 | 15.3 | 9.4 | 15.1 | 8.4 | x | x | F | F | 13.9 | 5.8 |
| English and French | 27.5 | 6.2 | 38.5 | 5.4 | 31.6 | 5.6 | 15.1 | 13.3 | 9.5 | 16.1 | 24.8 | 3.6 |
| Mainly English | 15.4 | 9.0 | 34.3 | 6.4 | 38.3 | 4.9 | 41.1 | 6.6 | 45.4 | 6.6 | 36.4 | 3.2 |
| English only | 4, $0^{\text {E }}$ | 20.0 | 8.0 | 16.3 | 11.1 | 12.1 | 41.6 | 6.5 | 41.3 | 7.2 | 20.9 | 4.9 |

CV coefficient of variation
Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

Table 4.2.1
Proportion of Francophones by language used with municipal police, Ontario and regions, 2006

| Region | Language used with municipal police |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | English only |  | More English than French |  | English and French equally |  | More French than English |  | French only |  | Unknown |  |
|  | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV |
| South-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 35.0 | 15.3 | x | x | $17.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 29.4 | x | x | $27.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 18.0 | x | x |
| Ottawa | 100.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 7.2 | $7.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 30.2 | $13.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 24.7 | x | x | $12.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 22.6 | x | x |
| North-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 70.0 | 6.4 | $8.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 32.8 | $10.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 28.9 | x | x | $7.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 30.7 | x | x |
| Toronto | 100.0 | 0.0 | 94.0 | 2.5 | x | x | x | x | 0.0 | 0.0 | x | x | x | x |
| Rest of Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 89.0 | 3.7 | x | X | x | x | 0.0 | 0.0 | x | x | x | x |
| Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 71.0 | 3.1 | $5.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 18.2 | 8.0 | 16.3 | $2.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 30.6 | 9.0 | 13.8 | $5.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 24.6 |

CV coefficient of variation
Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

Table 4.2.2
Proportion of Francophones by language used with provincial police, Ontario and regions, 2006

| Region | Language used with provincial police |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | English only |  | More English than French |  | English and French equally |  | More French than English |  | French only |  | Unknown |  |
|  | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV |
| South-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 21.0 | 16.4 | $10.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 26.3 | $16.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 20.3 | $8.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 27.6 | 39.0 | 10.8 | X | X |
| Ottawa | 100.0 | 0.0 | $37.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 20.1 | x | X | x | X | x | x | $24.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 31.4 | X | X |
| North-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 54.0 | 10.9 | $14.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 31.5 | $10.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 29.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $20.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 24.9 | X | X |
| Toronto | 100.0 | 0.0 | x | x | x | x | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | x | x | x | X |
| Rest of Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 73.0 | 10.7 | x | X | x | x | x | x | X | X | X | X |
| Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 48.0 | 7.3 | $10.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 17.9 | 8.0 | 16.2 | $4.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 25.1 | 23.0 | 11.8 | $8.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 25.1 |

CV coefficient of variation
Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

Table 4.2.3
Proportion of Francophones by language used with lawyer, Ontario and regions, 2006

| Region | Language used with lawyer/notary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | French only |  | More French than English |  | English and French equally |  | More English than French |  | English only |  | Other |  |
|  | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV |
| South-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 58.0 | 6.4 | $10.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 20.9 | $10.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 20.1 | x | x | $13.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 17.5 | x | x |
| Ottawa | 100.0 | 0.0 | 29.0 | 11.4 | $4.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 29.7 | $7.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 23.3 | $8.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 27.8 | 48.0 | 8.2 | x | x |
| North-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 27.0 | 11.8 | $5.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 27.7 | $10.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 20.7 | $6.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 31.0 | 51.0 | 7.6 | x | x |
| Toronto | 100.0 | 0.0 | x | x | x | x | X | x | F | F | 69.0 | 8.1 | X | x |
| Rest of Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | F | F | x | x | F | F | F | F | 72.0 | 8.7 | F | F |
| Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 26.0 | 8.3 | 4.0 | 15.0 | 8.0 | 12.6 | 5.0 | 15.9 | 53.0 | 4.5 | $4.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 23.0 |

CV coefficient of variation
Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

Table 4.3.1
Percentage of children with at least one Francophone parent by language of school attended, Ontario, 2006

| Region | Language of school attended by the child ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | French school |  | English school: immersion |  | English school: regular |  | Other language school |  | Don't know |  |
|  | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV |
| South-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 80.0 | 2.6 | $7.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 17.6 | 11.0 | 14.6 | X | X | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Ottawa | 100.0 | 0.0 | 64.0 | 4.0 | 20.0 | 10.6 | 14.0 | 13.3 | x | x | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| North-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 71.0 | 3.3 | $7.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 17.3 | 20.0 | 11.0 | $2.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 31.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Toronto | 100.0 | 0.0 | 45.0 | 8.3 | $8.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 18.8 | 46.0 | 8.0 | x | x | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Reste of Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 38.0 | 8.6 | $9.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 21.3 | 53.0 | 6.3 | x | X | x | x |
| Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 57.0 | 2.6 | 11.0 | 8.4 | 31.0 | 4.8 | $1.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 20.1 | x | x |

1. children which respondents have French as first official language spoken

CV coefficient of variation
Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

Table 4.5.1
Proportion of Francophones by language used during community activities, Ontario and regions, 2006

| Region | Language used when volunteering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | Only or mainly French |  | English and French |  | Only or mainly English |  | Other ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV |
| South-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 5.8 | 23.0 | 13.7 | 17.0 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Ottawa | 100.0 | 0.0 | 36.0 | 10.0 | 29.0 | 14.3 | 34.0 | 11.2 | x | x |
| North-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 39.0 | 8.5 | 29.0 | 10.8 | 30.0 | 10.6 | x | x |
| Toronto | 100.0 | 0.0 | $19.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 22.8 | x | x | 71.0 | 7.0 | x | x |
| Reste of Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | $18.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 29.7 | $11.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 24.6 | 65.0 | 8.8 | x | x |
| Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 34.0 | 5.6 | 22.0 | 7.8 | 42.0 | 5.0 | x | x |
| Language used with organizationse/associations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 64.0 | 6.1 | $11.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 20.7 | 20.0 | 15.3 | x | x |
| Ottawa | 100.0 | 0.0 | 43.0 | 9.1 | $16.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 18.7 | 38.0 | 10.0 | x | x |
| North-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 59.0 | 6.2 | $14.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 18.2 | 27.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Toronto | 100.0 | 0.0 | 41.0 | 13.9 | F | F | 49.0 | 11.8 | x | x |
| Reste of Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | $28.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 17.8 | F | F | 57.0 | 10.6 | x | x |
| Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 45.0 | 5.2 | 13.0 | 12.4 | 39.0 | 6.1 | $3.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 31.2 |
| Language used when assisting someone with everyday activities - regrouped |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 74.0 | 4.3 | $9.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 20.6 | $12.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 19.3 | x | x |
| Ottawa | 100.0 | 0.0 | 66.0 | 5.4 | $9.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 21.6 | 21.0 | 14.3 | x | x |
| North-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 52.0 | 7.3 | 19.0 | 15.7 | 27.0 | 12.7 | x | X |
| Toronto | 100.0 | 0.0 | $29.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 17.6 | $13.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 28.1 | 47.0 | 11.4 | F | F |
| Reste of Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | $31.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 21.4 | $11.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 27.0 | 50.0 | 12.6 | F | F |
| Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 52.0 | 4.3 | 12.0 | 10.6 | 31.0 | 6.8 | $5.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 23.4 |

1. for volunteering, includes unknown responses (for example, "don't know" and "refusal") as well as mentioning only a language other than English or French
CV coefficient of variation
Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

Table 5.1
Percentage of Francophones by identification to Franchophone and Anglophone groups, Ontario, 2006

| Region | Respondent's sense of belonging |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | Only to Franchophone group |  | Mainly to Francophone group |  | Both groups equally |  | Mainly to Anglophone group |  | Only to Anglophone group |  | None / refusal / don't know |  |
|  | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV |
| South-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 8.0 | 31.0 | 5.8 | 45.0 | 4.4 | $4.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 18.6 | x | x | X | x |
| Ottawa | 100.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 8.9 | 30.0 | 6.7 | 46.0 | 4.9 | 8.0 | 14.5 | X | x | X | X |
| North-Est | 100.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 10.4 | 25.0 | 6.6 | 57.0 | 3.5 | $5.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 17.5 | X | x | X | x |
| Toronto | 100.0 | 0.0 | $9.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 18.9 | 21.0 | 10.9 | 42.0 | 6.6 | 17.0 | 12.0 | $4.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 23.6 | $6.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 29.0 |
| Reste of Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | $10.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 23.2 | 12.0 | 15.0 | 60.0 | 5.2 | 13.0 | 14.8 | F | F | F | F |
| Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 13.0 | 6.7 | 23.0 | 3.9 | 52.0 | 2.4 | 9.0 | 7.6 | $2.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 20.5 | $1.0{ }^{\mathrm{E}}$ | 18.3 |

CV coefficient of variation
Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

Table 5.2
Percentage of Francophones by certain indicators of the value assigned to the French language, Ontario and regions, 2006

| Region | Importance that individuals or organizations work at the development of community |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | Very important |  | Important |  | Somewhat important |  | Not very Not important at important |  |  |  | Refusal |  | Don't know |  |
|  | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV | \% | CV |
| South-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 54.0 | 3.6 | 35.0 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 15.2 | $2.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 23.0 | $2.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 26.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | x |  |
| Ottawa | 100.0 | 0.0 | 51.0 | 4.3 | 34.0 | 6.3 | 10.0 | 14.4 | $3.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 23.9 | $2.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 28.6 | x | x | x |  |
| North-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 45.0 | 4.4 | 38.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 12.2 | $4.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 19.7 | F | F | 0.0 | 0.0 | x |  |
| Toronto | 100.0 | 0.0 | 42.0 | 7.3 | 37.0 | 8.1 | 12.0 | 14.9 | $5.0{ }^{\mathrm{E}}$ | 21.8 | $4.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 27.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | x |  |
| Rest of Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 30.0 | 9.1 | 45.0 | 7.3 | 15.0 | 16.4 | $5.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 24.4 | $4.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 27.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | X | x |
| Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 44.0 | 2.6 | 38.0 | 3.2 | 11.0 | 8.0 | 4.0 | 11.9 | 3.0 | 15.2 | x | $\mathbf{x}$ | $1.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 23.5 |
| Importance that gouvernment services are offered in minority language |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 68.0 | 2.7 | 23.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 15.5 | $2.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 23.9 | x | x | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Ottawa | 100.0 | 0.0 | 67.0 | 3.1 | 24.0 | 8.1 | 6.0 E | 18.6 | 2.0 E | 25.1 | 1.0 E | 31.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | x |  |
| North-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 56.0 | 3.4 | 32.0 | 6.1 | 7.0 | 14.4 | 3.0 E | 23.3 | F | F | 0.0 | 0.0 | X |  |
| Toronto | 100.0 | 0.0 | 59.0 | 4.7 | 28.0 | 9.0 | 7.0 E | 19.5 | 4.0 E | 25.4 | F | F | 0.0 | 0.0 | x |  |
| Rest of Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 49.0 | 6.6 | 35.0 | 9.4 | $10.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 22.2 | 3.0 E | 30.0 | 3.0 E | 30.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | x |  |
| Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 59.0 | 2.0 | 29.0 | 4.1 | 7.0 | 10.3 | 3.0 | 12.5 | $2.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 17.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | F | F |
| Importance that linguistics rights are respected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 72.0 | 2.5 | 23.0 | 7.3 | $4.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 18.9 | F | F | x | x | 0.0 | 0.0 | x |  |
| Ottawa | 100.0 | 0.0 | 74.0 | 2.8 | 20.0 | 9.6 | $5.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 21.7 | x | X | X | x | 0.0 | 0.0 | X |  |
| North-East | 100.0 | 0.0 | 64.0 | 3.0 | 29.0 | 6.5 | $5.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 19.5 | F | F | x | x | 0.0 | 0.0 | x |  |
| Toronto | 100.0 | 0.0 | 69.0 | 3.7 | 24.0 | 10.3 | $3.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 22.8 | X | X | x | x | 0.0 | 0.0 | x |  |
| Rest of Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 58.0 | 5.8 | 32.0 | 10.0 | $5.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 27.3 | F | F | F | F | 0.0 | 0.0 | X | x |
| Ontario | 100.0 | 0.0 | 66.0 | 1.9 | 26.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 11.8 | $1.0{ }^{\mathrm{E}}$ | 19.6 | $1.0{ }^{\text {E }}$ | 22.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $1.0{ }^{\mathrm{E}}$ | 24.3 |

CV coefficient of variation
Source(s): Statistics Canada, Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities, 2006.

## Appendix C

## Note on the construction of the language use indices

The indices used in this section were developed in the following manner. Whether it comes to the use of English or French, in all cases where people use only the language of the majority, they are assigned a value of 1, while those who use only the language of the minority are assigned a value of 5 . In general, the large majority of questions consisted of a scale with five levels. For certain questions, there were only three possible categories: "French", "English and French", and "English". The median category therefore corresponds to a value of 3.

Two approaches were used to present the results covering each of the indices: one on language categories, another by average level of use of languages. The second approach consisted essentially of summing the values obtained from each of the questions and dividing this sum by the number of questions answered by the respondent. For the first type, the average scores obtained were regrouped into five categories. However, given that the results obtained consisted of a continuous scale from 1 to 5 , we identified thresholds which allowed us to redistribute the values among the following five language categories: "Only the majority language", "Mainly the majority language", "Both languages equally", "Mainly the minority language", "Only the minority language". The corresponding thresholds for these categories are as follows: " 1 to 1.49 ", " 1.50 to 2.49 ", " 2.50 to 3.49 ", " 3.50 to 4.49 " and " 4.50 to 5.0 ". Since no perfect solution exists to carry out such a distribution, this approach has the advantage of centering the values on either side of the median category and cutting down the range of values at the extremities of the scale.

Finally, the general language use index was drawn up not by using the average of values for all 23 variables, but by adding the value obtained for the question on languages used with friends to the average values obtained on each of the four following indices: languages at work, immediate contacts, institutions and media. Such an approach offers the advantage of not assigning too much importance to a domain made up of numerous questions to the detriment of another composed of fewer questions.

Lastly it should be noted that information covering language used at home was used in the same manner as that regarding friends. By using both the information on language spoken most often and language spoken regularly, the variable created is made up of the same five categories explained above.

## Appendix D

## Description of concentration index

Dissemination area: a small, relatively stable geographic unit. All dissemination areas have roughly the same number of residents, namely 400 to 700 persons. For a complete definition, see the 2006 Census Dictionary

The definition of concentration takes account of both the proportion and the number of the official-language minority within a dissemination area. A high concentration of the minority group exists when the Francophone population within a dissemination area constitutes at least $50 \%$ of the overall population or at least 200 persons. A medium concentration refers to a situation where the proportion is at least $10 \%$ but less than $50 \%$ and the number of Francophones is equal to or more than 50 but less than 200. Finally, the concentration of Francophones is considered to be low when their proportion within the dissemination area is less than $10 \%$ or their number is less than 50.

Once a concentration class (ie. low, average or strong) was assigned to all the dissemination areas in a given municipality (or census subdivision), we chose to assign to the Francophone population of that municipality the concentration class (or level) containing the largest proportion of the minority population. The total, which represents the largest portion of the total Francophone population of the municipality, tells us the concentration class assigned to Francophones of that municipality. In other words, when $75.8 \%$ of the Francophones living in the South-East region are highly concentrated within their municipality of residence, this means that $75.8 \%$ of them live in municipalities where, in the majority of cases, either their number exceeds 200 persons or their proportion exceeds $50 \%$ of the population within their dissemination area of residence.

For the census divisions (CD) of Toronto and Ottawa, this method would lead us to find that in the case of the former city, the majority of Francophones represent less than $10 \%$ or fewer than 50 persons in the dissemination area in which they reside, and in the case of the latter, that the majority of Francophones live in dissemination areas where their relative weight is between $10 \%$ and $30 \%$ or they number fewer than 200 but at least 50 . However, as table 2.4 .2 shows, since the area of this DR correspond with municipality of the same name, we chose to present the information differently for these two municipalities by providing the actual distribution within each class instead of selecting the modal class (the most frequent class) as was done for the other regions.


[^0]:    1. The number is 533,000 if all single and multiple responses mentioning French are included.
    2. This number includes all single or multiple responses mentioning French.
    3. In June 2009, the Ontario government adopted a new, inclusive definition of the Francophone population (IDF) (formerly defined according to the criterion of mother tongue). This definition is fairly similar to the one based on first official language spoken, except that it also includes persons with French as a mother tongue and who understand French but can no longer conduct a conversation in that language. Thus, it covers 532,850 persons with French as a mother tongue (single and multiple responses), 13,225 persons with an "other" mother tongue (i.e., neither French nor English) and French as a first official language spoken (FOLS) and half of the 73,210 persons (or 36,605 ) with an "other" mother tongue and both French and English as their FOLS.
[^1]:    4. Statistics Canada, Population Estimates by First Official Language Spoken, Ottawa, Statistics Canada, Housing, Family and Social Statistics Division and Language Studies, 1989.
    5. Except where specifically referring to Francophones based on the mother-tongue criterion, this document uses first official language spoken to designate the Francophone or French-speaking population. In that sense, the target population in this document differs slightly from that in the report on the initial findings of the SVOLM released in December of 2007.
[^2]:    6. For information on the SVOLM, the reader is invited to consult the Statistics Canada website at: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/cgi-bin/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey\&SDDS=5099\&lang=fr\&db=imdb\&adm=8\&dis=2.
[^3]:    7. Refer to Appendix $D$ for a description of concentration index and the concept of dissemination area.
[^4]:    9. To establish this ratio, demographers generally look at children living in a two-parent family or a one-parent family headed by a woman, which account for more than $97 \%$ of children in this age group.
    10. For a more in depth approach, refer to Lachapelle and Lepage, Languages in Canada: 2006 Census, Statistique Canada and Canadian Heritage (to be published).
[^5]:    11. The sum of the proportions associated with the language spoken most often and the language spoken on a regular basis in Table 3.4 .5 is slightly different (4.8\%) because of rounding of the values associated with each of these two variables.
[^6]:    12. See Appendix $C$ for a description of the general language use index in the public sphere.
[^7]:    13. Foreign-born persons include immigrants, non-permanent residents and Canadians born abroad.
[^8]:    14. Report on Government of Canada Consultations on Linguistic Duality and Official Languages, February 2008.
    15. In other words, most often or on a regular basis.
    16. On this subject, see Table 2.1 of the report entitled "Health Care Professionals and Official-Language Minorities in Canada: 2001 and 2006," by C. Blaser, 2006, Catalogue no. 91-550-X.
[^9]:    17. The proportion of medical doctors for whom French is the first official language spoken in these two regions is $14 \%$ and $32 \%$ respectively, while for nurses the corresponding proportions are $23 \%$ and $31 \%$.
[^10]:    18. As in the case of health care professionals, the use of French by lawyers and police officers depends on a number of factors, including the proportion of Francophones in a given community. However, an analysis of these factors is beyond the scope of this statistical portrait.
    19. Because of the very small number of members of the official-language minority who had contact with the RCMP, no conclusions regarding them can be drawn from the data obtained in the Survey on the Vitality on Official-Language Minorities.
[^11]:    20. See Corbeil (2003), "30 years of education: Canada's language groups," in Canadian Social Trends, Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 11-008.
[^12]:    21. Either alone or with English.
    22. Ontario took the first step of introducing compulsory school laws in 1871. However, this obligation concerned children between the ages of seven and twelve and, in 1891, those between the ages of eight to fourteen and required children to attend school only at least four months a year. Furthermore, in 1954, the Schools Administration Act imposed a minimum school leaving age of 16 for all children in Ontario, but allowed adolescents over fourteen to work on a family farm, at home, or elsewhere, if doing so was necessary for subsistence. By 1970, these exemptions were removed. For more information, please refer to Canadian Compulsory School Laws and their Impact on Educational Attainment and Future Earnings, Philip Oreopoulos, Statistics Canada (2005), Catalogue no. 11F0019MIE.
[^13]:    24. The data of the Survey on the Vitality of Official-Language Minorities revealed that when respondents report using a language regularly in addition to the language that they speak most often, they are referring to using it daily.
[^14]:    25. A finding notably explained by the fact that Francophones from this age group are on average more educated than their Anglophone counterparts.
[^15]:    26. The random distribution of the "English-French" category was implemented with the help of SAS software (RANUNI command) to attribute half of this category to the "French" group.
[^16]:    Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

[^17]:    Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

[^18]:    Source(s): Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population.

