

The Address—Mr. Francis

schools, special transportation, workshops, camps, residences, and a variety of other special services which are totally or partially financed through volunteer efforts. Increasingly, provincial governments and local school authorities are providing classes for the mildly and, to some extent, for the moderately retarded.

I should like at this point to offer congratulations to those who are engaged on a voluntary basis in this particular field. I can think of one of these projects which is going forward in my own constituency, in Sardis, British Columbia, where there is both a school and a hostel. I have had an opportunity of visiting it a couple of times. The people responsible are doing a tremendous work in the face of almost insurmountable obstacles and they are carrying on an effort which, I am sure, is being duplicated in many areas of Canada. Those who are in charge of the work there have pointed out to me the acute financial difficulties they are facing—how it is almost impossible to finance the operation mainly through voluntary subscriptions, as is the case at the present time.

The suggestion has been made that a system might be worked out under which the senior levels of government, both federal and provincial, could share to the extent of 90 per cent in the cost of these establishments, 10 per cent being found by the parents of the children attending them. Surely, some system could be worked out so as to encourage these organizations and individuals to carry on a work which, I am sure, every one of us realizes is of vital importance to our society in general. A request has been made for government assistance. As mentioned in the brief, such assistance is requested for the carrying on of various activities such as research and program evaluation, recreational therapy, training, home care and parent guidance, sheltered work and activity centres. These are matters which could well be taken into consideration because I believe that just as we have recognized our social responsibility in other fields so we must recognize it, accept it and discharge it as far as these unfortunate young people are concerned.

I bring these three matters to the attention of this house and of the government with the request that active consideration be given to them so as to facilitate the achievement of some of the objectives I have set out this afternoon.

[Translation]

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, first, in keeping with the custom in this house, I wish to congratulate the mover (Mr. Cote, Longueuil) and the seconder (Mr. Basford) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, as well as the new ministers and those

who have been assigned new duties. My congratulations also to the new member for St. Denis (Mr. Leblanc) and the new member for Laurier (Mr. Prud'homme).

I wish to extend special congratulations to my friend the hon. member for Longueuil, who expressed himself very well in both the official languages of Canada. He discussed current problems: national unity, the rights of all ethnic groups and the dangers of separatism, and he did so in a true Canadian spirit. When he says that Canada needs a distinctive flag, I agree with him. Our leader, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) promised us a distinctive flag within two years, that is before April, 1965. Today, I should like to speak about the problem of bilingualism in the public service of Canada.

[Text]

In the time remaining today in the house I wish to speak on a matter which, I think, is fundamental in the speech from the throne, namely, the strengthening of our national unity through co-operative federalism.

The instrument of public policy is the public service and I am much concerned about the measures which will be considered and adopted in the implementation of the policy of biculturalism in this area.

It is generally agreed by all parties in this house that there should be every effort made to promote the highest possible degree of bilingualism within the public service of Canada. Reference by one of my colleagues the other day to a study of the public service claimed that French speaking Canadians had only 13 per cent of senior posts of government. I have not seen the original statistical breakdowns, but it seems to me that in Ottawa, if we included all ranks of government service, the proportion would be higher than this. Studies by sociologists, such as Professor Porter of Carleton University, indicate that a higher proportion of French speaking persons occupy senior posts in the government service than is the case in industry generally across Canada.

There is at the present time, a private members' bill by the member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon) calling for a bilingual preference for employees of the public service and crown corporations. I would like, at this stage, to talk about the implications of an over-all bilingual preference policy in the public service of Canada and some of the areas that would have to be carefully examined in implementing such a policy.

The census of 1961 tell us that on June 1 of that year, 28.1 per cent of the population of Canada claimed French as mother tongue; 58.5 per cent claimed English and 13.4 per