

*continued from page three*

would be completely free to use his own language without risking either ineffectiveness or affront. Clearly, this system depends heavily on the bilingualism of individuals, even though no other country with more than one language and culture has ever been able to place sole confidence in such procedure. The nearest approach is made in South Africa, but there the two linguistic groups are more nearly comparable in size, and the great majority of civil servants are bilingual. In the Canadian public service, because of the predominance of unilingual Anglophones coupled with the almost exclusive confinement of bilingualism to Francophones, the French language cannot develop in direct competition with English, no matter how effective recruitment and training programmes may be."

The Commission said changes must be made in the workings of the government as drastic as the changes from the patronage to the merit systems, adding that the present political situation demands that the changes be made in a hurry.

Most dramatically, it recommended that the government make parts of itself French.

[WHAT HAD TO BE DONE]

The Commission recommended that bilingual districts be established throughout Canada, and defined them as areas where the official-language minority is numerous enough to warrant linguistic recognition. These districts were designed to bring about linguistic co-operation in the services of existing governments. They further recommended that "any province whose official-language minority reaches or exceeds ten per cent declare that it recognizes French and English as official languages." (See map, below.)

The Commission also recommended that the federal government make French language units a basic principle in all departments and crown corporations — units where French would be the

basic language of work. Each department (for example, State, External Affairs, Post Office, Transport) would contain French language units, and in each department major internal services, such as personnel, administration, libraries, public information, legal services) would function in both languages. The French units must be built into the existing system and be essential to the working of the department — not simply make-work jobs. Within larger French language units, there would be smaller English units, where necessary.

Also:

— Employer-employee relations in the federal service and crown corporations should be in English or French, at the choice of the employee.

— Where appropriate, bilingual employees should be paid more than unilingual employees.

— Bilingual people should be rotated from one milieu to another.

— The federal government should recruit more qualified people from France and other French-speaking countries. Appointments to posts of deputy ministers, associate and assistant deputy ministers should be more balanced, although without quotas or ratios unless a more voluntary system fails.

— The practice of routinely translating all letters and documents into French should cease, and original drafting of documents in French should be encouraged — this to avoid wasting the time of translators.

— A public service language authority should be created — a language ombudsman.

These and many other recommendations were made in 1967 and 1968, as the six volumes were published. In July, 1969, after lengthy debate, Parliament passed the Official Languages Act, incorporating many of the Commission's legislative suggestions, including that for a linguistic ombudsman.

In late 1971, French language units began going into operation in the federal government.

