

located in communities where the French language and Francophone culture are viable or potentially so. Francophones should not be compelled to join these units, nor should they be closed to fluently bilingual Anglophones. Language of service to the public should follow the proposals made in earlier reports.

Three types of French-language units are envisioned: those in decentralized or regional offices of federal departments; those at headquarters; and French-language clusters where complete French-language units are impractical although the function does break down organizationally into small work groups. To safeguard the rights of the minority, it may also be necessary to establish English-language units in regional offices in Quebec.

While the French-language units are being installed and consolidated, a strong Francophone voice will be required at the Centre. Appointments to the positions of Deputy Minister, Associate Deputy Minister, Assistant Deputy Minister and their equivalents should ensure effectively balanced Franco-phonie-Anglophone participation. The same applies to federal planning and advisory bodies.

Under the language regime of the new system, written and oral communication from the French-language units to other units in the Public Service would be in French. Communications to the French-language units could be in either language. This is not to confine the use of the French language but rather to provide a minimum level for its use.

The Commission realizes that such a language regime cannot be established overnight, but an emphasis on receptive bilingualism among supervisory and other staff coming into contact with French-language units should help in the short run. However, the French-language unit cannot be expected to do its work properly so long as important internal documents and manuals are not available in both languages. Employer-employee relations should be conducted in the language of the employee. Positions in the Public Service should be continuously reviewed to see what language or languages the incumbent would need to carry out his work. All positions should be classified as to language requirements and these requirements should be taken into account for salary purposes.

BILINGUAL GLOSSARY NEEDED

Clearly, a good deal of language training is going to be required among Anglophone public servants if the French-language units are to be viable, but the language-teaching program should be adapted to the needs of this system. In particular, there should be more emphasis on receptive bilingualism and on the teaching of a work vocabulary appropriate to the work needs of Canadian public servants. The maintenance of language integrity in the French-language units will require the organization of French-language improvement classes for those Francophones who have

been trained and have worked in English for a number of years, and for young Francophones unfamiliar with French administrative terminology. In this respect the development of a bilingual glossary of Public Service terminology is urgently necessary. The Commission affirms that all French used by the Public Service should be equal in quality to international French.

While institutional bilingualism is being developed, translators would be faced with an increased work load. It is therefore essential, first, that their time not be wasted in such unnecessary work as translation of letters for filing purposes; and second, that measures be taken to increase the number of qualified translators. To improve the quality of French in Government documents, more of these should be drawn up in French, rather than invariably being translated from an English draft.

RECRUITMENT

While the French-language unit system will help to attract more Francophones to the federal administration, its implementation is likely to strain existing resources of Francophone personnel. Transfers from regional offices to headquarters will ease but not eliminate the problem, a key factor being the general shortage of available Francophones. Training in public administration is not as highly developed in Canada as elsewhere. Further development of teaching and research programs in this field in both the French-language and the English-language universities is desirable. In seeking to recruit Francophones, the Government should not overlook the possibilities in France and other French-speaking countries. As well, with the increasing need for generalists to coordinate the work of specialist groups, the relatively greater stress on the humanities in the French-language universities should be viewed more positively. Closer contact between these universities, senior federal public servants, and federal recruiting agencies is also needed. Appraisal of an individual for recruitment or promotion must certainly become more sensitive to the language and cultural characteristics of Francophones, who must, in particular, be examined by public servants fluent in French, unless the candidate opts for English.

TRAINING PROGRAMS

In training and development sponsored by the Public Service, Francophones must have the same opportunities as Anglophones. In order to develop a thoroughly bilingual management, training and rotation programs should also expose each group to the language and culture of the other. To facilitate such rotation, and to increase staff mobility in general, the Commission also recommends educational allowances to defray the costs of sending children of Anglophone or Francophone public servants to schools of their own language where none exist locally. Broadly speaking, this latter proposal would