



Commissioner
of
Official
Languages

Fourth
Annual
Report

1973 • 1974

H. C. COULTER
16 Nov 78



Commissioner
of
Official
Languages

Fourth
Annual
Report

1973 · 1974



COMMISSIONER OF OFFICIAL LANGUAGES
Ottawa K1A 0T8 Tel.: (613) 996-6368

©
Information Canada
Ottawa, 1975
Cat. No. SF1-1974

The Speaker,
Senate,
Ottawa

Madam Speaker,

Pursuant to Section 34(1) of the Official Languages Act, I hereby submit to Parliament through your good offices the fourth annual statement relating to the discharge of my duties under this Act, covering the period from April 1st, 1973, to December 31, 1974.

Yours respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Keith Spicer". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Commissioner of Official Languages

March 1975

The Speaker,
House of Commons,
Ottawa

Mr. Speaker,

Pursuant to Section 34(1) of the Official Languages Act, I hereby submit to Parliament through your good offices the fourth annual statement relating to the discharge of my duties under this Act, covering the period from April 1st, 1973, to December 31, 1974.

Yours respectfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Keith Spicer". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Commissioner of Official Languages

March 1975

CONTENTS

Preface

Chapter I

SOME SLIGHTLY PREJUDICED VIEWS ON JUST ABOUT EVERYTHING 1

- A** **Bureaucracy Bedamned, Said the Treasury Board
and the Public Service Commission (A Little
Incest in the Upper Classes) 1**
- 1 **The Treasury Board: Would You Believe This
Is the Pepsi Generation? 2**
- 2 **The Public Service Commission: Merit Is Never
Having to Say You're Bilingual 6**
- B** **Language Training: Let's Fret Less About Cock-
tail Bilingualism and More About Coffee-
Break French 8**
- 1 **Excusez-moi: I Think I Left My French Back
at Language School 8**
- 2 **Duty Calls: Shall We Slip Over to Hull for a
Skin-flick? 11**
- C** **French as a Language of Work . . . and Other
Unidentified Flying Objects 13**
- 1 **The Treasury Board As Yogi: It Knows All the
Positions 13**
- 2 **A Question of Method—We Got Rhythm, but
Maybe There's a Pill for Bilingualism 16**
- 3 **The Recruitment of Francophones, or the Art of
Crawling at Breakneck Speed 20**

- D Information: Between Goebbels and Gobblede-
gook, There Must Be a Few Friendly
Facts 21
- 1 How the Blind Lead, or Mislead, the Blind 21
- 2 Some Final, No Doubt Futile, Grumblings 25
- E Scolding the Schools: on Passing the Bucks to
the Next Generation 27
- 1 The "National Disaster" Area Revisited 29
- 2 Ottawa and the Provinces: Consenting Adults
Can Do Satisfying Things Even in Public 31
- 3 Some Unfanatical Hints for Budget-Wise Bilin-
gualism 33

CHAPTER II THE GORY DETAILS: OR MEASURING
THE GLACIER'S ADVANCE 37

- A Madness in Our Method 37
- 1 More Than Your Average Faith Healers: the
Special Studies Gang 38
 - a) On the Move 38
 - b) *Mens sana in corpore sano* 38
 - c) *Quis custodes custodiet?* 39
 - d) Everything Else Is Housekeeping 39
 - e) Ryan's Other Daughter 39
 - f) Not by Bread Alone 39
 - g) Our Brother's Keepers 40
 - h) Language of Work: Can Johnny Really Read
French? 40
 - i) Can Your Boss Swear in English? 40
 - j) Bringing in the Sheaves: Follow-up 41
- 2 The Ombudsman: a "Public Protector", but
Hardly a Cop 43
 - a) Is Something Bothering You? 43
 - b) Various Categories of Pettifoggery 43
 - c) If Necessary, Send Us a Carrier Pigeon 44
 - d) And for Those Who Like Statistics . . . 44
 - e) How We Are Saving Paper This Year 53
- B A Bilingual Baedeker for the Hurried, and
Possibly Worried, Gourmet 55

C The Top Thirty on the B. and B. Hit Parade
(from Rocketman to Rock Bottom) 58

Agriculture	“Green, Green, the Grass Is Green” 58
Air Canada	“Come Fly with Me, Come Fly, Come Fly” 62
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	“I Heard You Talking in Your Sleep” 92
Canadian National Railways	“Chattanooga Choo-Choo” 97
Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation	“Gimme Shelter” 107
Chief Electoral Officer	“There’s Gotta Be Something Better than This” 109
Communications	“Call Me” 112
Environment	“On a Clear Day” 115
External Affairs	“I Left My Heart in San Francisco” 126
Farm Credit Corporation	“Brother, Can You Spare a Dime?” 131
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	“Indian Love Song” 131
Industry, Trade and Commerce	“I’m in the Money” 139
Information Canada	“Baby, Hang up the Phone” 143
Manpower and Immigration	“I Hear You Knocking” 148
National Arts Centre	“There’s No Business like Show Business” 166
National Capital Commission	“Bridge Over Troubled Water” 170
National Defence	“You’re in the Army Now” 172
National Health and Welfare	“Smoke Gets in Your Eyes” 185
National Library	“Forget All Your Books” 199
National Museums of Canada	“How Much Is That Doggy in the Window?” 200
National Research Council	“Switched-on Bach” 203
National Revenue (Customs and Excise)	“I’ve Grown Accustomed to Your Face” 205
National Revenue (Taxation)	“Pennies from Heaven for You and Me” 210
Parliament	“The Folks Who Live on the Hill” 220
Post Office	“Please, Mr. Postman” 224

Public Service Commission	“A Man and (this year at least) a Woman” 242
Public Works	“I’ll Build a Stairway to Paradise” 257
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	“Back in the Saddle Again” (but who’s that girl riding Dobbin?) 272
Secretary of State	“A Million Dollar Baby . . . in a Five and Ten Cent Store (?)” 290
Statistics Canada	“Who (or where) Is Sylvia?” 292
Supply and Services	“Tea for Two” 295
Transport	“Promises, Promises” 300
Treasury Board	“The Great Pretender” (The Platters, of course) 322
Unemployment Insurance Commission	“Can You Give It All To Me?” 325

D	Chart-Bound, If Not Always Duty-Bound 333
	Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. 333
	Bank of Canada 334
	Canadian Consumer Council 334
	Canadian International Development Agency 334
	Canadian Overseas Communications Corporation 335
	Canadian Pension Commission 336
	Canadian Radio-Television Commission 336
	Canadian Transport Commission 337
	Canadian Wheat Board 344
	Commissioner of Official Languages 345
	Consumer and Corporate Affairs 345
	Defence Construction (1951) Limited 348
	Economic Council of Canada 348
	Energy, Mines and Resources 348
	Federal Court of Canada 351
	Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario 351
	Finance 352
	Food Prices Review Board 353
	Governor General 353
	Justice 353

	Labour	355
	National Energy Board	355
	National Film Board	362
	National Harbours Board	363
	Northern Canada Power Commission	363
	Northern Transportation Co. Ltd.	364
	Public Archives	365
	Regional Economic Expansion	365
	St. Lawrence Seaway Authority	365
	Solicitor General	366
	(1) Canadian Penitentiary Service	367
	(2) National Parole Board	367
	Urban Affairs	368
	Veterans Affairs	368
	Yukon Territorial Government	371
E	Non-Federal and Other Heavenly Bodies	374
Madrigal		390
Appendix	A Few Figures for Doctoral Candidates	391

Preface

Nothing in the Official Languages Act, as far as I can see, obliges parliamentarians to plough through another Annual Report as long as last year's. That 3 lb. 12 oz. (1.701 kilos?) bilingual brick was scarcely the slim volume of poetry statesmen needed for contemplative promenades in the Gatineau Hills — even though, say some, it proved impressive as a door-jam, paper-weight and bookend-cum-curio.

This year, my colleagues and I have tried to write a report both shorter and handier. We hope thus to lend a bit of help to busy ministers and administrators in their efforts to follow up Parliament's urgings under the Act with more active personal leadership, serious directives and closer monitoring. We also aimed to assist critics facing the Treasury Benches, or waiting patiently behind them, to shape their probings from reasonably reliable materials.

Year by year, it is true, and in spite of well-known alarums and excursions, one can sense an intangible but undeniable improvement in the countrywide climate of language debate. This less prejudice-polluted environment, along with a gradual relaxation of earlier tensions within the public service, should encourage all who wish a sane and civilized Canada.

Yet a certain gloom about the slow pace of concrete progress still seems necessary. Services in French continue to be denied citizens in many parts of our country, particularly on State travel networks and in post offices. It also remains extremely difficult to exercise the right to work in French in federal institutions, even in parts of Quebec. Indeed, federal job openings for French-speaking Canadians risk leaving the expression "equal opportunity" in the realm of rhetorical piety: in 1974, apart from bilingual and optional-language jobs, a mere 11.8 per cent of the 124,799 positions filled under the Public Service Employment Act called for French only, while 62.9 per cent required English only.

In a nutshell, this report adds scant credence to those who still see the Act as an assault on the divine right of the English language to dominate, yesterday, today and tomorrow, all things bright and federal. It adds, alas, some comfort to others who question the seriousness of the Government in promoting a reasonably rapid and basic, as well as humane, reform of this historical inequity.

A small avowal of uncharacteristic zeal: this year's report, though designated "annual", covers 21 months, from April 1st, 1973, to December 31st, 1974. Such stretching of paper-time may well offend some constitutional purists who live, make love and die within fiscal years. But it seemed worthwhile to make this report a "catching up" one, and to base future reports on calendar, rather than fiscal years, so that from now on, my colleagues and I might deliver our bilingual bile and bouquets to Parliament no later, if possible, than three months after the period reported on.

As a result, we hope that the sometimes reassuring reproaches of betrayal or messianism we occasionally enjoy may now include the accusation of being a little more up to date.

K.S.

Chapter I

SOME SLIGHTLY PREJUDICED VIEWS ON JUST ABOUT EVERYTHING

In the nasty, brutish and short tradition of these reports, one chapter tries to offer a leisurely walk around the bilingual waterfront. For people too busy (or not foolhardy enough) to leap into the shark-infested depths of department-by-department assessments in Chapter II, this stroll along half a dozen pathways of common curiosity may lead to a few questions worth recalling, or reasking, in months ahead.

In spite of efforts to be thorough, none of this report, a glance will confirm, claims unfailing “scientific” accuracy. But this first chapter holds even less than the rest such lofty pretensions. What follows now is no more than cautious impressions—based on the best facts that cajolery and bureaucratic piracy could readily provide, but impressions still. Forewarned, one trusts, is forearmed with a tolerant skepticism.

A. Bureaucracy Bedamned, Said the Treasury Board and the Public Service Commission (a Little Incest in the Upper Classes)

In previous years, sketches of Ottawa’s bureaucratic jungle of bilingualism had to depict the roles of half a dozen departments muddling more or less congenially through a morass of fuzzy jurisdictions. This year, the amateur Gauguin can get away, perhaps, with a few brush strokes delineating the prowesses of two tenderly interlocking central management and staffing agencies, the Treasury Board and the Public Service Commission. The family of linguocrats may not really be smaller, but now we may find it a little easier to fabricate scapegoats.

1. The Treasury Board: Would You Believe This Is the Pepsi Generation?

With its famed gift for effervescent acronyms, the Treasury Board has again favoured aficionados with some trendy code-words: following passage of Quebec's Official Language Act (more affectionately known as Bill 22), the Board coined the terms QOLA for the Quebec law's abbreviation and COLA for Canada's Official Languages Act. While mandarin lovers of gin tonics and Campari sodas may resent these subtle inroads of tamer drinks, they should not conclude that the Board plots to slosh water into bilingualism's wine. Indeed, for the first time, one can praise the Board for inventing a management tool to make the Official Languages Act a reality, as well as a slightly stale myth, within the public service.

Before hazarding a short comment on the Board's accomplishments and future tasks, it may be worthwhile recalling the mandate of the Board's Official Languages Branch, the preliminary steps it has taken to implement Parliament's language Resolution of June 1973, and some new measures it promises for handling the visual aspects and monitoring of linguistic reform.

The Board's mandate remains the same as in 1973 when it gave management responsibility for the Official Languages Act to a full-fledged branch in its Secretariat. With a staff of about 75 reporting to a Deputy Secretary, the Branch is "to develop and communicate the federal government's policies and programs for the application of the Official Languages Act within the Public Service and to monitor their implementation and evaluate their effectiveness". In sum, the Board masterminds, for the Government, the whole process of making the Official Languages Act work.

Known to itself, and a few others, as the "go-go group", the government's top team of linguocrats has taken hold of its job in the past year with enthusiasm and tenacity. Perhaps its most useful contribution to date, apart from rising Phoenix-like from the cinders of earlier, less high-powered administrations, has been its effort to give effect to the June 1973 parliamentary resolution.

At the core of all the Board's management mechanisms is a newly completed computerized profile of the entire public service population, an instrument known as OLIS (Official Languages Information System). This constantly-revised census of some 288,000 jobs is supposed to offer language administrators, for the first time, a fact-filled read-out on the language requirements of every position in the public service. With this quality of data, the Board, departments and the Public Service Commission should be able to look forward to planning, programming, budgeting and reviewing of unprecedented precision. For example, OLIS

can show i) how many bilingual positions are needed, and where, to fulfil the Act's requirements, as interpreted by the Government, for language of service and work; ii) which mix of unilingual or bilingual positions, or of "hermaphrodite" positions (requiring either English or French indifferently) a given department needs in a particular office; iii) who needs language training, and on what priority; iv) who should take a language test; v) when and where the Act requires certain administrative measures or work instruments to achieve its goals; and vi) how many "double-banking" positions are needed to replace people on language training, and exactly where they must be provided to guarantee proper service to the public. In these and other ways, OLIS gives the Board a means not only to promote reform, but to measure it with care.

Another valuable contribution, by way of clarifying public discussion, is the OLIS-based statement to the House of Commons on November 21, 1974, by the President of the Treasury Board. Accompanied by preliminary tables on the breakdown of unilingual, bilingual and "hermaphrodite" positions, this statement allows Parliament, the press and public to assess independently several career-related issues which far too often have been left in the unprofitable realm of rumour-mongering. A follow-up pamphlet to federal employees, seductively entitled *Official Languages and You*, is likewise helping, in spite of a few obscurities, to lift a little anguish-laden fog.

A third area where the Board is moving from scarcely benign neglect concerns French as a language of work. For the past couple of years, these reports to Parliament have been sniping at the Government for ignoring this vital dimension of the Act which complements, and in many ways underpins, the Government's ability to serve the public in both official languages. A later part of this chapter looks with ever so barely posturing pessimism at this long-delayed policy which, one hears, may finally move from excruciating gestation to the last pages of the newspapers even before this report.

Another encouraging change in the Government's wicked ways of yesteryear affects its dealings with staff unions. Five, four or even three years ago, the Government tended to compound its predictable problems in getting public servants behind its policies by forgetting that to serve the public you need public servants. Cooking up, Macbeth-like, and usually in a defensive flap, a witches' brew of ill-defined but hot concoctions called clarifications or explanations, the Government would pour these without warning down the already tender gullets of its employees and end up with at least double, double the toil and trouble. In the past two years, the Treasury Board has developed a discreet and steady relationship with unions by institutionalizing consultative reform. The permanent channel for this is the Official Languages Committee of

the National Joint Council, a rather civilized sanhedrin of management and major unions which tries to inject a little pre-emptive decency into the class struggle. The committee has repeatedly been able to bring union advice to bear usefully on draft policies and thereby ensure ready support from union leaders when final policies emerge. One partly understandable weakness persists: the committee seems to be essentially preoccupied with the "hardships" and "concerns" of English-speaking public servants—still, it is true, about three-quarters of all such employees. Now that this very squeaky wheel has received generous doses of oil in the June 1973 Parliamentary resolution and subsequent directives, one hopes the no less important, but much less publicized, difficulties of French-speaking employees will get a higher priority.

Previous reports to Parliament have not been kind to the Government for its information programs. This year, as a later section here will explain, there seems no reason to pass from panning to panegyrics. However, it is only fair to note that the Board's actions, if not the persistently ponderous tone of its information programs, have done a good deal to strengthen acceptance of the Official Languages Act in the higher and middle echelons of the bureaucracy. On one hand, the long and immensely complex process of helping departments to identify the linguistic requirements of every job in the public service proved to many managers across the country that the Board's actions, this time, were not just the distant and pointless agitations of an ivory-tower clique in Ottawa. Daily co-operation between the Board and departments throughout this year-long task, combined with the Board's willingness to guide and advise departments in a tough but realistic way, has convinced senior officials at least that the Act can work and is here to stay. On the other hand, the Board's Information Division has taken on the work of training hundreds of officers in all departments in the voluptuous intricacies of OLIS and Treasury Board guidelines. In consciousness-raising sessions barely rivalled by the more zealous of Women's Libbers, the Board is briefing language administrators with films, slide presentations, kits and pamphlets of a sophistication to impress the initiate and intimidate the profane.

Beyond these early steps to carry out Parliament's resolution, the Board is gearing up, and perhaps it was time, for two other longer-term activities: bilingualizing "visual aspects" of the Act's implementation, and monitoring its general progress.

Bilingual signs, forms, plaques and panels fall in one sense into the area of tokenism. But when they remain unilingual more than five years after the Official Languages Act was passed, their conversion can resemble a dangerous contradiction of other, more substantial, reforms. If these physical, and often simple, elements of linguistic change cannot be handled readily, one wonders indeed how ever the

Government can cope with the infinitely more sensitive and complex problems of personnel management. Thus, at the risk of being accused of superficiality, the Treasury Board has at last begun to meditate upon a policy for bilingualizing visual aspects of federal services. To implement this policy, it plans to start with the National Capital Region, then Quebec, then its own "bilingual areas" (not to be confused with eventual "bilingual districts" which the Cabinet may or may not proclaim), then extend its efforts to the rest of the country as required. In matters of the Act, seeing may well be literally believing. Thus one hopes the Board will shape and pursue a policy which will convincingly show the federal flag of bilingualism without excessive resort to traditional excuses of translation overload, absence of uniform terminology, and interdepartmental boondoggles which, too often before, have blurred the citizen's icon-like image of Ottawa's bilingual reform.

A potentially deeper benefit should result from the Board's new opportunities for monitoring change. Now that OLIS has offered linguocrats a precise tool for measuring each department's linguistic performance, the Board should be expected to intervene, guide and direct with much greater authority than in the past. Perhaps the Board can now even find time to apply its considerable budgetary and managerial muscle to departments to get them to follow up more diligently on the two thousand-odd recommendations already made to them by the Commissioner. The latter, in his follow-up work, can appeal only to the tender terror of public opinion as a sanction; he would be happy, and thinks the taxpayers might be too, if the Board put to more frequent use the fifty-odd special studies his colleagues and he have made for Parliament as instruments for specific and systematic improvements. For the moment, he has the impression that these admittedly prosaic tomes fill several linear feet of shelf space at the Board without anyone bothering to use them as leverage to make departments move on obvious reforms.

Perhaps these murmurings of disappointment mirror only the classic symptoms of unrequited love. Yet pride and even constitutional niceties aside, and bearing in mind that this office's work is more than conceivably fallible, one can argue that the Board could help the common cause of Parliament's reform, and trim perhaps a little the general cost of bilingualism, by prodding mandarins for action on these "preventive medicine" blueprints. The Commissioner must of course continue his friendly harassment of departments on his own recommendations, and report on results to Parliament. But the Board, in its Olympian cajoleries for the executive, might ask from time to time whether it always has to reinvent the wheel.

In short, the Board has done much but still has much to do. Its early and near-obsessive role seemed until bare months ago to be the consolation and accommodation of long-term English-speaking public servants. That was fine and, in diplomatic terms, perhaps a little overdue. But what is far more delayed is the building of a structure and milieu in which the careers of French-speaking Canadians can flourish with a naturalness broadly equal to that enjoyed by English-speakers. Later paragraphs will talk of this. Yet more generally, for these short- and long-term goals, the Board, like President Ford, must (and no doubt will) master the miracle of walking and chewing gum at the same time.

2. *The Public Service Commission: Merit Is Never Having to Say You're Bilingual*

For more than a decade, the Public Service Commission, as Parliament's watchdog against patronage and nepotism in government hiring, has faced the spine-tingling task of meshing the "merit principle" with the need to respect Canada's two main languages. In reconciling professional and linguistic fair play, the Commission, and notably its Chairman, has shown an intrepid willingness to innovate and singular courage under fire. But only in the first months of 1974 did the Public Service Commission get around to putting its administrative house in order the better to put our two languages on an equal footing.

Parliament, in its resolution on official languages of June 1973, plainly implied that the Treasury Board and Public Service Commission should work in a more intimate tandem than some constitutional purists might like—the agencies' respective duties to the executive and the legislative theoretically preventing a too-cosy ménage à deux. But with this incitement to administrative incest, the Public Service Commission needed to ensure an orderly, indeed balanced, relationship by consolidating most of its linguistic responsibilities in a central office. This it did last year by creating the Office of the Co-ordinator of Official Languages.

Chapter II of this report will reveal a perhaps unhealthy curiosity about the detail of the Public Service Commission's impact on creating a realistically bilingual public service. Here we shall simply spell out the Co-ordinator's role and challenges in general terms.

The Co-ordinator acts as the Public Service Commission's full-time worrier over things linguistic, and has moved with tactful effectiveness to harness several previously dispersed responsibilities. On a day-to-day basis, he must advise the PSC Chairman and the latter's two fellow

Commissioners on incipient triumphs or disasters somehow related to language. In advising the PSC triumvirate on official languages policy, the Co-ordinator must debug and develop supporting measures with the Treasury Board Secretariat. Within the Commission itself, he must try to keep on the same wavelength a number of independently managed activities (including recruitment and training), and promote smooth co-operation, or at least reduce foul-ups, with other federal departments, staff unions and provincial governments. As for language training, he must ensure that the PSC defines properly the level of the second-language skill required for some 288,000 jobs, that it offers and corrects sound language-knowledge tests, and, with suitable appeals procedures, passes along results to employees within a reasonable time. On a long-term basis, he must monitor and evaluate the progress of bilingualism within the PSC's mandate for equitable hiring and promotion. Finally, he is to inform, or not too alarmingly misinform, the public and public servants on just how just the Commission's policies may be proven by an indulgent history.

In sum, the Co-ordinator brings together most of the language-related activities which the PSC before left scattered to the winds of modest change. The only important operations escaping this overdue exercise of bureaucratic imperialism are staffing and training, which represent a fiefdom only still stronger barons could crack. At the beginning of 1975, the Co-ordinator commanded about one hundred front-line troops, split with impressive logic into three divisions.

As of now, and in spite of all his Kissinger-like coups for the PSC's internal peace, the Co-ordinator must meet two main problems. One is to maintain with the Treasury Board a constructive complicity which, while keeping the Commission's constitutional sanctity intact, will allow it to work sensibly, in the citizen's and taxpayer's interest, in harmony with the Board. The other is to work more closely, if and as really needed, with older language empires within the Public Service Commission, such as the Staff Development Branch: a sane diplomacy must recall that not every Rome is worth a Rubicon. The Co-ordinator will still no doubt have to pursue some guerilla actions to fashion, and extend the use of, more accurate language tests. But his main challenge, judging from his hard work with the Treasury Board in offering the Cabinet a policy for language of work, will remain giving leadership and coherence to the language activities of the Public Service Commission itself.

No one can accuse the PSC of lacking guts or brains on language. But even Rommel had a chief of staff. And now, with the Commission geared up in loose but friendly tandem with the Treasury Board, partisans of thoughtful, fair reform should perhaps expect a blitzkrieg in which both linguistic sides will win.

B. Language Training: Let's Fret Less About Cocktail Bilingualism and More About Coffee-Break French

In recent months, residents of Ottawa have heard titillating tales of an élitist fringe benefit known as "cocktail bilingualism." This charming caper, cited not without sympathy in our *Second Annual Report* in January 1973, offers free language courses to wives of senior civil servants who, in the course of duty, may be called upon to handicap potential 5 to 7 p.m. flirtations on the politico-diplomatic circuit by bringing along their better, and preferably bilingual, halves. But language learning in the capital deserves a nobler fate than a catchy slogan about such marginal, and rather easy to mock, "refinements".

The language courses our government provides for civil servants are an important part of Canada's linguistic reform. It took courage to start them in 1964, and imagination to develop the novel and varied teaching techniques which today enable serious students to learn French or English as living Canadian languages. The question we might now ask concerns the on-the-job use made of second-language skills civil servants are acquiring at public expense.

For the past two or three years, many observers of the federal language scene have wondered whether Canada's taxpayers, through the language training, are really getting enough bilingualism for a buck. Estimates of costs for producing a certified bilingual civil servant range widely. Whatever choice one makes in the smorgasbord of statistics, one presumably hopes that beneficiaries of language training will in fact use their second language a reasonable part of the time they are working for the people who paid the piper. The tune taxpayers are supposed to be calling, after all, is known as functional bilingualism. Learning French, say, as a second tongue, then trotting it out at work only to play the good sport at coffee breaks would hardly meet this sensible goal.

1. Excusez-moi: I Think I Left My French Back at Language School

In the face of widespread doubts which risk turning soon to cynicism, it seems useful to take a look at the pay-off we are getting from government language-school graduates, in terms of concrete progress to the equal status of our two official languages as languages of service and work, as aimed for by the Official Languages Act. In early 1975, this Office has underway a full-scale survey, based on a detailed questionnaire, which will lead in next year's annual report to a comprehensive picture of language use patterns among all graduates who choose to co-operate. Meanwhile, by matching computer tapes from the Public Service Commission (in charge of providing language training) and the Treasury Board (responsible for managing the government's official

languages policy within the public service) we can get a preliminary picture, subject to caution and important recent changes, of the on-the-job use that graduates of the language courses are making of the language studied. Data are available for 4,134 of the 6,651 federal employees who "successfully" graduated from the government language schools between 1968 and August 1974. These 4,134 graduates, variously defined, comprise 2,483 graduates of the French course and 1,651 graduates of the English course.

Even with the reservations the PSC cites in a footnote below, the figures churned out, and simplified for clarity, confirm many of the concerns of both linguocrats and linguophiles.¹ If we take into account all graduates—irrespective of the linguistic requirements of their positions—we find that at the time most of the computer forms were filled out, some 18 months ago, roughly 40 per cent of the graduates of the French course never used French when working. About 51 per cent of them used French occasionally. Approximately 9 per cent of them used French extensively.² A pessimist might deplore that roughly 40 per cent of all graduates in French never used that second tongue; an optimist might draw hope from noting that just under two-thirds of these graduates used French at least part of the time.

Among graduates of the English course one finds a substantial change from these figures. This reflects the massive and continuing inequality of French and English as "used" languages of work within the Federal Public Service. Roughly 10 per cent of all the graduates of the English course never used English when working. About 25 per cent of them used English occasionally. Approximately 64 per cent of them used English extensively.

If we concentrate on graduates in identified bilingual positions (in our sample, 77.6 per cent of the graduates of the French course and 66.1 per cent of the graduates of the English course), we find that roughly 37 per cent of the graduates of the French course never used

¹ The data in this section (for a full breakdown, see Table V in the Appendix) were checked for accuracy and fairness of interpretation with the PSC. The Commission prefers of course not to take responsibility for any of the judgements in this text, but wishes to put on record the following reservations:

- "1) The data used for this study are based on a questionnaire administered by the Treasury Board Secretariat and filled out by public servants during the summer of 1973. The Public Service's linguistic regime has since been substantially modified.
- 2) All positions in the Public Service were given a precise linguistic status in the fall of 1973; this has affected the use of the second language.
- 3) At the end of 1973, the Treasury Board Secretariat established an order of priority concerning individuals' access to language training. For example, priority is given to the successful candidates of bilingual competitions and the incumbents of positions identified as bilingual."

² In this context and for purposes of this chapter, *occasionally* means that graduates used their first language mostly; *extensively* means they used their second language as often as, or more often than, their first language, or sometimes even all the time.

French when working, 10 per cent used it extensively, and 53 per cent used French occasionally. Among graduates of the English course, one finds a marked change in these figures: roughly 5 per cent never used English when working, 73 per cent used it extensively and 22 per cent used English occasionally.

Since the senior executive category (SX) is at the apex of the six occupational categories within the Public Service, it is of particular interest to look at the linguistic profile of language-training graduates in this group. The proportion of graduates of the French course who are members of the SX category is roughly seventy times larger than the proportion of graduates of the English course in this category. No doubt many French-speaking SX's were forced by tradition to be bilingual before they reached this exalted rank. But this ratio of 70 to 1, apart from casting grave suspicions on the accuracy of fears of a "French takeover" in Ottawa, leads one to ask exactly how "bilingual" the SX universe can be in terms of granting each language anything even vaguely resembling equal status, much less use—especially since only about 11 per cent of the graduates of the French course who were SX's used French extensively when working and about 27 per cent never used it. English-speaking mandarins may sign, and send to each other, a few more letters in French drafted by French-speaking subordinates. Cosy and colourful as this political dadaism may seem, it does little to ensure that French becomes a believable language of the upper administration previously, and not even scurrilously, known as the English Establishment.

Yet hand-wringing over these preliminary figures may well, one hopes, prove premature, or better still, outdated. Serious changes seem to be occurring (at least in attitudes) in the organization and implementation of second-language training policy since the above figures were obtained. A well-intentioned linguistic agnostic might be allowed to pray that next year's full-scale, more up-to-date statistics will bless defenders of the bureaucratic faith, and show signs of the substantial progress they predict, over the next two or three years, in use of French as an acquired language.

In sum, neither organizers nor implementers of language training should feel mortally wounded at the temporary conclusions above. The linguocrats of yesteryear took up an immense and unpredictably complex challenge. The teaching aspects of their response, their remarkable pedagogical inventions, deserve only admiration. Indeed, on matters pedagogical, the Public Service Commission and the Treasury Board have shown the candour to convince the Cabinet to name an independent committee of experts to review their whole system of ingesting, and digesting, the unwillingly tongue-tied.

2. Duty Calls: Shall We Slip Over to Hull for a Skin-flick?

While awaiting fresher, more detailed data to either confirm or disprove the above first conclusions, perhaps we could suggest a few plausible measures to help remedy the apparent under-use of French by graduates of the French course. Being well aware that these remedies cannot bring about major changes without French assuming greater importance as a language of work than in the past, we offer them in the hope that they will at least partly improve a worrisome situation.

First, one could urge much more stringently job-related training. A top-priority way of bringing general language training closer to each employee's vocational needs would be to round off the stay at government language school with a work period in a unit where the work is similar or close to the learner's usual job but where the only or predominant language is the student's second language. Basic grammar and fluency would thus be protected, and the student would soak up an invaluable amount of technical vocabulary from his own occupation. On the way, he might even come to understand better the mentality and methods of his other-language colleagues.

Part of this job-related approach of now too-general training would include preparation by the Translation Bureau of specialized vocabularies for each department or occupation. This idea, trundled out as long ago as our *First Annual Report* in November 1971, would enable language-school graduates immediately to apply their fancy far-out subjunctives to the practicalities of doing the job their department, and supporting taxpayers, expect them to do. It could also, in unison with the preceding proposal of end-of-study cross-cultural visits, give graduates the immensely motivating satisfaction of discovering that the second language learned at school was—*o mirabile dictu!*—actually useful on the job.

A second thought, probably in the category of post-operative prayers, would invite Deputy Ministers, Bilingualism Advisers, Language Requirements Co-ordinators and other front-line combatants for a more civilized linguistic universe to exhort, cajole or somehow insidiously convince all graduates of language training to use their new skills at every possible occasion on the job. For the moment, graduates seem bereft of administrative leadership on this score, no matter how well they scored back at the government's little red schoolhouses. Linguocrats of every ilk and rank really ought to consider part of their job as creating a positive climate and motivation for language grads, attacking the Brownie point syndrome of learn-and-forget diploma-grubbing—in sum, leading certified bilinguals to respect both their dearly-earned knowledge and the taxpayers' right to expect some lasting reform from their fiscal fidelity. Memos or directives to this effect

might well only add to paper pollution in certain corridors of bureaucratic power; on the other hand, some fleeting sign of interest, if not bloody-minded expectation, by those officers who send forth the public service troops to do bilingual battle might conceivably inspire many graduates to believe that silence, in an expensively learned second language, is not at all golden.

In counterpoint to this, one might petition, not without some sense of the absurd, the Francophones of Ottawa to try to speak . . . a little more French. Our *Second Annual Report* recalled that the role of French-speaking Canadians imprudent enough to venture to their “national capital” must surely mean more than serving as language monitors to English-speaking civil servants. But among many French-speakers, in particular those from outside Quebec, there seems a sorry tendency to cave in too automatically to English-speaking “minorities” in meetings where everybody (say, 14 out of 15) speaks French except one. If French is ever to strike the grads of government schools as a real as well as academic language, many more Francophones will have to plug one ear to Anglophones’ massacred phonetics and plunge on with them in slow, if painful, dialogue in the “second language.” A few years ago, Ottawa’s military men wore their uniforms one day a week for both morale and belly-moulding elegance. Maybe once a week, without loss of dignity, and with more than reasonable charity, Francophones in government could stand a little more firmly on their rights not only to speak, but to suffer from (in the mouths of Anglophones), the official language of their choice.

But in the end, hectoring of this kind can never replace a little old-fashioned personal initiative by individual graduates. Bearing in mind that public servants are getting language training, as they should, at government expense and on government time, it is perhaps fair to ask them to illustrate better the moral responsibility they owe to the taxpayers.

In the National Capital Region, where three-quarters of the graduates in our sample work, one can scarcely weep for newly-minted bilinguals who bemoan the “lack of opportunities” to practise, let us say, French. Roughly 37 per cent of the region’s population is of French mother tongue, and the area is blessed with a rich selection of television, radio, theatre and splendidly racy French movies—not to mention soothingly bicultural body-rub parlors—which should enable English-speaking graduates of French courses to reinvest a few minutes each day in protecting the public’s investment in them.

Such curious cosmetics as second-language monitors, who drop in to chat idly in French or English with mandarins worried about “retention” of a second language, have little to do with on-the-job use of the second language and should have no place in a sensible linguistic

reform. Many graduates, it is true, are trying hard to give the public full value for its investment. One cannot justly portray all language grads as linguistic layabouts, or even a majority of them. But one can observe without meanness that a bilingual who loses his second tongue in the Ottawa-Hull area requires an almost perverse penchant for audio-visual amnesia.

C. French as a Language of Work . . . and Other Unidentified Flying Objects

The last annual report in this series of sagas announced, with perhaps a tiny bit of optimism, that “unless we want to risk undermining the Act’s credibility, 1974 must be the year in which our efforts are concentrated on the question of French as a language of work”. This exhortation rested on a number of hypotheses based mainly on Parliament’s resolution of June 1973 and on the few statistics that were then available. Alarmed by the Government’s endemic inaction in shaping a policy of language of work, last year’s report outlined for linguocrats in the federal bureaucracy a modest five-point administrative “strategy” designed to promote the use of French in internal communications and announced that this Office, in the special studies it was or would be conducting, planned to devote more attention to this fundamental aspect of the Act.

Thanks to the statistics we now have on the identification of language requirements for federal positions, we can now examine the hypotheses formulated in the *Third Annual Report*. Also, in light of these figures and of the statements—or silences—of the government, and with data obtained during the past year by our Office while conducting special studies and settling complaints, we can make an initial, though necessarily partial, assessment of the situation in terms of the “mini-strategy”. Finally, this section will conclude with some laconic, but one hopes useful, remarks on the recruitment of Francophones.

1. The Treasury Board as Yogi: It Knows All the Positions

The identification of language requirements for positions—an exercise initiated by the Treasury Board President’s statement of December 14, 1972, and confirmed by Parliament’s resolution of June 6, 1973—corrected a deficiency pointed out many times by this Office, particularly in its special studies. It was discouraging, to say the least, in these

studies, to see federal departments—though often having the best of intentions—remain paralyzed because they simply did not know either the language requirements of positions or the linguistic profile of their own staff. The identification process was a healthy move on the part of the government, and those who managed to draw up this gigantic inventory deserve some sort of bureaucratic Victoria Cross. Without mocking such shiny medals, however, we must view this activity in as clear a light as possible. In addition to some of the hidden dangers warned of last year, we should point out, first, that a considerable number of federal institutions, some of them—like Air Canada and Canadian National—extremely important ones, have not been touched by this linguistic inventory, and second, that these statistical acrobatics are not an end in themselves, but rather a planning tool—there to be used—with which full equality of the two official languages can be achieved.

In our *Third Annual Report*, without laying any claim to infallibility, we pointed out certain “deviations” likely to result from establishing the language requirements of positions.

Specifically, there was the question of whether the somewhat too restrictive criteria in the Treasury Board guidelines for identifying unilingual French positions were not going to limit seriously the number of these positions and thereby inhibit an increase of the use of French at all levels of the federal public service.

The figures provided by the Treasury Board Secretariat do little to dispel this fear. In Tables I and II (see appendix for tables for this section), which give the overall results of the identification of language requirements, we can see how unilingual French positions stack up in relation to unilingual English positions and then in relation to bilingual and “hermaphrodite” positions (those for which the incumbent can be either Francophone or Anglophone).

Of the 210,124 unilingual positions (72.8% of all the positions in the public service), 173,554 (82.6%) require only the knowledge of English and 36,570 (17.4%) require only French, which means that there are nearly 4.8 times as many unilingual English positions as there are unilingual French. This discrepancy is even more pronounced in the National Capital Region, where of the 26,431 unilingual positions (31.8% of all the positions in the Region) 22,233 (84.1%) require English and 4,198 (15.9%) require French. The ratio is therefore more than 5 to 1 in favour of unilingual English positions. Table II also shows that three quarters of the “French essential” positions are in the Administrative Support and Operational categories, whereas only two thirds of the “English essential” positions are in these categories.

In the province of Quebec, where 67.8% of the positions require only a knowledge of French, the statistics show a glimmer of hope. We

must not, however, lose sight of the fact that nearly 80% of these positions are, again, in the Administrative Support and Operational categories.

Looking at the whole of the public service, moreover, we see that the figure of 36,570 unilingual French positions appears rather modest when compared with the 54,915 bilingual and 23,632 “hermaphrodite” or “optional” positions. It rather looks as though there has been an “identification overkill” in these last two groups. Some departments have gone to the strange extreme of establishing more “hermaphrodite” positions than positions requiring only a knowledge of French. Is this an elegant disguise designed to swell the number of positions theoretically open to Francophones? We are not inclined to question departments’ motives here, but the data available will no doubt prompt us to check this hypothesis more carefully in our special studies. Table III shows, among other things, that Anglophones form an overwhelming majority of the unilingual incumbents of these “hermaphrodite” positions, especially in the categories containing the most senior levels. Other data indicate that even in the Montreal region there are more unilingual Anglophones than there are unilingual Francophones holding “hermaphrodite” positions.

If the “hermaphrodite” positions seem, at least in the higher categories of the public service, to be monopolized by Anglophones, then what about the bilingual positions that French-speaking Canadians were able to land without too much competition from their Anglophone countrymen before the appearance of the new Treasury Board guidelines? Our *Third Annual Report* warned of the possibility that bilingual positions might become less and less the preserve of Francophones, which would make a greater number of unilingual French positions more necessary than ever. On the whole, statistics produced by the Treasury Board Secretariat in January 1975 show that of the 40,874 incumbents of positions requiring a knowledge of both languages, 18,425 (45.1%)—4,454 of whom were unilingual—had French as their first official language, and 22,449 (54.9%)—16,768 of whom were unilingual—had English as their first language. Perhaps even more significant are the statistics on appointments (see Table IV) provided by the Public Service Commission. The overall proportion of incumbents whose preferred language of work was English and who were appointed to bilingual positions rose from 18.3 per cent in 1971 to 44.9 per cent in 1974.

Were this trend to continue, it is likely that in future there will be more Anglophones appointed to bilingual positions, which would be only fair—as long as Francophones, for their part, have means of access to the public service comparable to those offered to their English-speaking countrymen.

2. *A Question of Method—We Got Rhythm, but Maybe There's a Pill for Bilingualism*

Last year, when we outlined a comprehensive plan of action that would firmly entrench French as a language of work in the federal public service, we optimistically wrote: "the government has been talking about announcing such a plan for a few months now; the Commissioner, writing in mid-February 1974, would not be wounded in the least if the government were to make the following remarks superfluous by disclosing its plan before this report is tabled". Since the suggestions that followed that remark last year have not yet been made superfluous (unless, of course, the Commissioner, writing in mid-February 1975 . . .), we propose, at the risk of being accused of warming up leftovers, to repeat the essence of the five objectives we submitted then for the government's attention:

- (1) Make French the normal working language of the federal administration in its Quebec regional operations (a kind of single large French-language unit) while still respecting the requirements of the Act in the matter of language of service and creating some English-language units to allow members of the linguistic minority to work in English.
- (2) Make French the usual language for communications between regional offices located in Quebec and their respective head offices.
- (3) Strengthen the French language in the National Capital Region, particularly by increasing the proportion of unilingual French positions markedly and by regrouping them into French-language units.
- (4) Prepare administrative directives designed to settle not only questions arising from the static aspects of the language of work (manuals, instruction books, general internal communications, libraries, personnel services and so on), but also those connected with its more active aspects (language used at meetings, creative work, individual internal communications and so on).
- (5) Lastly, provide federal employees with professional training and development that is equal in quality and accessibility for both language groups.

There is plainly nothing revolutionary or even original about these measures. One senses, nevertheless, that in view of the new rules of the game laid down by Parliament's June 1973 resolution and the Treasury

Board guidelines, they constitute a likely prerequisite for establishing the equal status of the two official languages within the federal public service.

At the time of this writing, only the *Report on the Implementation of the Official Languages Resolution Adopted by Parliament in June 1973*, tabled in the House of Commons by the President of the Treasury Board on November 21, 1974, throws light—albeit a cautiously filtered light—on the government’s intentions in the matter of language of work.

First of all, this report confirms the positive judgment made last year on the French-language units (FLUs) that were set up on an experimental basis in 1971. (Other Treasury Board data show that in general the use of French in the FLUs enjoyed an increase between 1971 and 1974.) The report went on to say that the government was preparing “a program to increase, particularly within the National Capital Region and in parts of Canada where French is commonly used, the number of units working in French at all organizational levels of departments, and especially at the senior levels”.

We will have to wait until we see the actual content of this programme before we know how far the government intends to go in this direction. Of course, a wilfully naïve mind might wonder how the government can expect, without the gift of multiplying bread and fishes, to increase the number of such units in the National Capital Region when there are only some 4,000 unilingual French positions, nearly 3,000 of which are already in FLUs. Of course there is always the ingenious solution that has been adopted by certain federal institutions, such as the Justice Department, National Revenue (Customs and Excise) and even the Secretary of State Department, which consists of generously interlarding these units with bilingual positions. It is even possible, it seems, to find FLUs that are made up solely of bilingual positions. What could be more delightful than the prospect of FLUs made up entirely of Anglophones, all certified bilingual, who would be required to communicate among themselves in French!

Moreover, although the report by the President of the Treasury Board testifies to the government’s good intentions concerning work instruments, the “full participation of both communities” and the language of internal communications, it leaves the practical terms of application shrouded in rather woolly circumspection: “the government is setting deadlines for each department within which all work instruments must be available in French as well as English”; “the government remains (sic) committed to achieving, within the merit principle, full participation in the Public Service by members of both the Anglophone and Francophone communities”; “an announcement will be made

shortly to define clearly the circumstances in which an employee can communicate with other public servants in the official language of his or her choice . . .”

Though still incomplete, our findings during special studies and investigations of complaints between April 1973 and December 1974 underscore the need for quick and decisive action.

From these studies and complaints—the persevering and masochistic reader will find summaries of them in Chapter II—a few patterns begin to emerge. It would be perhaps too hasty to base generalizations on them at the moment, but they do point up some of the difficulties departments and agencies are coming up against in establishing linguistic equality within the public service.

These off-the-cuff observations show that the situation, in terms of the first objective—to make French the normal working language of the federal administration in its Quebec regional operations—although not perfect, is satisfactory in most of the cases studied. There is still room for improvement, of course (it is strange, for example, that some institutions—the Department of Public Works, to give one weighty illustration—have not yet set up any French-language units in Quebec or anywhere else), but there appears to be no heart-stopping obstacle that can prevent most institutions from achieving this first objective.

On the other hand, these same observations reveal a situation that is far from satisfactory in the matter of communications between offices located in Quebec and the head offices of the different departments and agencies. In nearly every case these communications must be made in English because the head offices simply do not have enough employees who can even grasp the gist of messages, reports and so forth written in French. In some instances, even the FLUs in Quebec find it is impossible to communicate with their central offices in French. If these partial findings should prove to apply generally to the federal administration, the government should make plans to revise the language requirements for those positions in head offices whose incumbents have dealings, written or otherwise, with those of their colleagues who hold “French essential” positions.

The status of French as a language of work in the National Capital Region—the third objective in the “mini-strategy” proposed last year—is, to varying degrees in the different departments, inferior to that of English. For many people, this truism will be no revelation: it merely confirms, if need be, that French has not yet been fully accepted at the very seat of the government. The Treasury Board data show just how underdeveloped the use of the French language is in that region: English is the normal language of work for 77% of the public servants (slightly

more than 6% normally use French and slightly less than 17% use both). The difficulty of working in French on the shores of the Ottawa River seems to be particularly acute in technical and scientific fields. Whether in the Canadian Transport Commission, the Department of Public Works, the Canadian Air Transportation Administration (Ministry of Transport) or the National Energy Board, English is by far the dominant language. The question we raised last year is as valid now as it was then: how to create sectors in the National Capital Region that will be substantial enough to enable Francophones to pursue a rewarding career without necessarily having to leave their language in the office cloakroom when they come to Ottawa, or even to Hull? This may very well be the government's shibboleth in the area of language reform.

Neither our studies nor complaints received revealed a definite pattern with regard to the fourth and fifth objectives. Although some institutions have shown themselves—if not enthusiastic—at least willing to provide their employees with work instruments and professional training in both languages, others are still languishing at the rear. In many cases it is the enormous volume of texts to be translated that finally dissolves intentions that were never more than half-hearted to begin with. Occasionally, too, a commonplace but nevertheless deplorable administrative inability is at the root of some inexcusable delays. The government's action—energetic, we hope—announced by the President of the Treasury Board should prod the laggards who should be producing, in the departments, bilingual manuals, directives or instruction books. Similarly, some internal services, essential if employees are to carry out their duties successfully, if not zealously, are far from being provided in both languages. This is especially true of the libraries in the institutions studied: the discrepancy between the number of works in English and those in French usually reaches truly indecent proportions, and this difference cannot be explained away solely by the “relative anemia” of French-language publishers.

In discussing professional training or development courses, we must distinguish between those given by the Public Service Commission and those provided, directly or indirectly, by the departments themselves. Although for those given by the PSC, which, it must be pointed out, represent only about 10% of all such courses given in the public service, it seems that the government is on the point of providing a reasonable solution, the same cannot always be said for the courses given by departments. In fact, efforts in this area are being dissipated. Here again the government, through the Treasury Board, which is given particular responsibility in this area by the Financial Administration Act, could play a decisive role.

3. *The Recruitment of Francophones, or the Art of Crawling at Break-neck Speed*

Without necessarily trying to be evil-minded, we amused ourselves last year by picturing a public service devoid of Francophones. That was not the product of an overly fertile imagination—those conclusions could have been drawn from the available statistics by anyone with even a slight gift for mathematics. If twenty months ago the recruitment of Francophones gave the impression of progressing at the rate of one step forward, two steps backward, the statistics provided this year by the Public Service Commission evoke rather the image of bike racers who, although appearing to be taking part in a test of speed, are actually performing, with consummate acrobatic skill, a breath-taking feat of cycling on the spot, as though they were trying in their own way to prove that the two extremes—in this case speed and slowness—do in fact meet.

In any case, the Public Service Commission's statistics on appointments give this impression of movement in slow motion. A glance at the appointments of new employees shows that the percentage of these whose preferred language of work is French has evolved over the past few years in a zigzag pattern, and at a level that leaves little room to hope that it will ever catch up—19.7 % in 1971, 22.0 % in 1972, 20.2% in 1973, and 23.9% in 1974.

Of course, one way to attract French-speaking candidates is to encourage an increase in the supply through carefully orchestrated information campaigns and by improving the "home ground" structures for Francophones in the public service. But there is the snag, the vicious circle: without a certain critical mass of Francophones, it is difficult to create these "home grounds"; but without these, it is every bit as difficult to achieve the needed critical mass.

The results of studies made by our Office are hardly the stuff euphoric dreams are made of. Given these circumstances, then, how can we achieve the "full participation of the Anglophone and Francophone communities in the public service"? All things being equal, it seems that a substantial increase — spread over several years if need be — in the number of unilingual French positions, grouped if possible into French-language units that would be more than just backwater enclaves, is one of the conditions necessary for achieving this "full participation".

But fie on these philippics. In the face of words which might have provoked in some people a sense of exasperation verging on despair, it is still possible to show no more than scepticism tinged with distress. The citizen who relishes these questions may yet find a little peace of mind if the government takes truly concrete action, soon, to follow up the hints of progress an attentive observer can detect here and there.

However, if to govern is to look ahead, there are times when a government, like an exhausted Hamlet, must stop looking ahead and get down to the business of governing. This means, perhaps, moving from rhetoric to reform.

D. Information: Between Goebbels and Gobbledegook, There Must Be a Few Friendly Facts

Since 1969, the federal government's information efforts on bilingualism have been almost enough, or little enough, to give truth a bad name. Five and a half years ago, Parliament passed a fair and flexible Official Languages Act, a law which deserved to be widely understood. Notoriety, not knowledge, turned out to be its fate as, year after year, the Government let the Act stew in the misconceptions of many and the colportages of a few.

No one could reasonably urge an intoxicating propaganda campaign. But a simple try at regularly reminding people that the Act broadens, not limits, civil rights might give lots more Canadians the giddy feeling that Parliament has, after all, done something rather useful.

This year, in spite of new promises and isolated triumphs, the Government still lacks a clear and co-ordinated policy on official languages information. Even after indulging classic and cathartic rages against interdepartmental overlapping, one has to conclude that the real problem is the lack of accomplishments to overlap. Feeble budgets are not to blame: Lord Acton might have said of government P.R. sharpies that money corrupts imagination, and so on, absolutely. When ideas do emerge, inertia, indeed sometimes distrust, between presumably allied departments too often kills good initiatives in the egg before the egg (even without the help of a marketing agency) has time to turn rotten.

1. How the Blind Lead, or Mislead, the Blind

Enough of bad eggs and sour grapes. Before this report's ritual Greek chorus of comment on the Commissioner's own follies and illusions, it is fair to note several useful, if usually unrelated, initiatives by the Government to help demystify the bogey of "bilingualism".

To recall that the information group now resident in the Treasury Board has physically moved thirteen times in two years may tell something of its startling aura of perpetual motion. In spite of these housekeeping upheavals, the Board's information team has in the past year

been producing metric tons of materials, and holding briefing sessions, to assist the far-flung management staff throughout departments and agencies who act, willy-nilly, as bilingualism buffs, and sometimes buffers. Indeed, and mirroring logically the Board's own role as central manager for the public service, the group has taken on the added role of training language administration officers throughout more than 60 departments and agencies in the delicious intricacies of matters linguistic.

Over the next year or so, this small but hard-working Training and Information Development Division could do much to relax the public service climate on language questions by clueing in employees quickly and clearly on new policies, and even on its ways and means of implementing them. Much, that is, if the Board's chief policy-makers let it pay a little more heed to Danton's prescription of boldness in political strategy and less to Mackenzie King's of blandness. Crystal balls are not enough.

For the moment, one can report the following initiatives which, if not always pregnant with joy, look like promising buns in the oven: an updated "Who's Who" in bilingualism for the still-befuddled information-seeker around Ottawa; a pamphlet telling the average public servant where and when he can choose his language of work—assuming the Government finally works out such a policy: a speaker's kit, mainly for tongue-tied public servants wishing to carry the Word orally; a usefully eclectic information kit for masochistic researchers; one for the general public, and two others for fearful, or merely fascinated, federal employees: on the language requirements of positions, and on French-language units; a kit dissecting the dreary march of bilingualism policy of the past decade; finally, the above-cited concise, if not exactly toe-curlingly racy, question-and-answer booklet called *Official Languages and You*. Only the last six items existed by February 1975, but no doubt the other promises will come true in their time, as will hopes for an audio-visual archive on just about every kind or unkind word ever said about our two official languages.

The Board's partner in creating a world safe for bilingualism, the Public Service Commission, has also begun putting its mouth where its money was. By deciding to explain more, and this more rapidly, to language trainees and other perplexed public servants, the PSC has also refused to run its information program by handing over blank cheques to blank minds. While last year, public servants could be heard weeping to grasp a straw of information on PSC language policies, now some wail about having haystacks of minute-by-minute and preciously bilingual bulletins crammed down their craws. But this healthy trend to telling a graspable version of the truth should not be knocked. The PSC Chairman and Commissioners, in matters of information, have now

assumed what might be termed the missionary position, and with not a taint of shabby evangelism. While awaiting a more concise linguistic Kama Sutra, public servants can study the facts of language life with existing PSC papers, perseverance, and just a little Pepto-Bismol.

Three PSC initiatives deserve honourable mention: its many detailed information sessions for Official Languages Officers and other linguocrats, in concert with the Treasury Board; an interesting, if ironically somewhat inaudible, film on learning second languages; and a clear, cheery, indeed entertaining, kit for language trainees. With its straight-from-the-shoulder question-and-answer sheet, its thoughtful brochure called *Perspectives on Language Learning* and its nuts-and-bolts pamphlet on the student's own language school, this kit leaves little to the imagination and much to the curiosity. Such good ground-work merits imitation by other departments, and continuity by the PSC itself: for language trainees and graduates, a bright, frank and factual monthly newspaper, run and written co-operatively by teachers, students and PSC managers, could do much to allay the postpartum blues suffered by many who are making a loyal effort to give birth in their own mind to a new language.

Efforts by the Department of the Secretary of State to carry the torch of bilingual civilization continue to prove helpful. The minister himself has kept up his travels around the country to chat up both the general public and the educators on whose co-operation most of his pump-priming successes, mentioned later, ultimately depend. His officials too remain active on the rubber chicken circuit, attending meetings, seminars and conferences with strong stomachs and angelic patience. New booklets on the Department's many-sided grant program for the general public and provinces could fill a wheelbarrow; at very least, reference to them will fill a page or two later in this chapter.

Among information-related Crown corporations, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation holds high its reputation for vicarious courage in hard-hitting reruns of Archie Bunker laying bare the scandals of American ethnic and religious prejudice. On Canadian prejudices, the Canadian State networks pursue, with a few local exceptions, their policy of eloquent silence. Whether we like it or not, Canada does exist; and like all human societies, particularly one's own, it stays worthy of interest, satire and, if not always of admiration, then of criticism with some wit. Such a comment is not an ideological call-to-arms: just a hope that, in terms of informative and entertaining national self-analysis, the CBC will not always fill vacuums with vacuities.

A small footnote might congratulate the privately-owned Canadian Television Network (CTV) for showing guts, if not always genius, in its series "Excuse My French". True, Fellini and Hitchcock might contrive more sophistication, as could some Canadian writers now in

Hollywood feeding rib-ticklers to U.S. comics. But in timid Canadian terms, this sweet little parody can prove purgative and, remembering its CTV listeners' rating was topped only by the Canada-Russia hockey series, it could even turn out to be profitable for flattering imitators.

The only other State agency with some gumption and imagination seems to be the National Film Board. Starting late but well in the language game, the NFB has produced four splendid short films in its Language Drama Series, cited here last year. These shorts, with many more to follow with accompanying kits for workshops, are being launched in early 1975 as a valuable teaching aid for second-language teachers across Canada who, for years, have been looking for a good Canadian reason to answer that blunt and desirable question from thousands of students: why?

Naturally, since the funds for this report come out of the Commissioner's budget, he will attempt now to beat shamelessly his own drum.

The first and oldest-running circus in his office is the one playing to the general public. Through foolhardy grapplings with shapeless, if not always nameless, phantoms of unilingualism, and through ingeniously ill-timed outbreaks of foot-in-mouth disease, the Commissioner has pursued his often unwelcome travels across the nation. Radio and television producers have continued their morbid willingness to offer the hospitality of their airwaves for these vices, whether in the form of hot-line shows, interviews, lofty colloquia or much more satisfying gutter-fight squabbles. Academic and professional groups, as well as social clubs, egg-head round tables, and even more lucid bodies such as Rotary Clubs have also significantly helped the Commissioner's personal fight against inflation by offering free meals, or at least another free ride on the public purse. The Office's pamphlets, posters and counter-cards continue to pollute the visual environment with their earnest messages. The Office's press clipping service, which really is not bad, has helped a number of Ottawa journalists, as well as low-budget weeklies, meet a tight deadline with loose statistics or other quickly assembled Press Gallery slices of Canada's linguistic life. Finally, the Office's three-year-old 12-minute colour movie on the Official Languages Act, "Bons Amis", without yet titillating the gargantuan audiences of "The Godfather", has by early 1975 given close to a million people better reasons to be angry or apathetic about bilingualism. New distribution arrangements with the NFB and the Canadian Film Institute promise to flog extant copies of this epic to many more unsuspecting citizens.

The Office's second information program, designed for the half million Canadians who work for the Federal Government, goes on quietly throughout the country in near-Quaker-like sessions of civilized consensus. Using the Office movie to jolly up local audiences of man-

agers or union members, the Commissioner and two or three colleagues go to meet the open-minded and the bloody-minded, trying to answer questions frankly, or at least disguise the truth constructively. The Safari Kit the Office produced last year has by early 1975 crossed the desks (if only, sometimes, on the way to the garbage cans) of some 110,000 people, nearly all federal employees.

But this year's newest and, one hopes, most useful initiative in the long run is an elementary school kit called "Oh! Canada". Conceived and developed with generous co-operation from the interprovincial Council of Ministers of Education and four Ottawa-area school boards, this kit aims to underpin the motivation of children to learn second languages, and to strengthen their interest in Canadian studies. Its theme comes from a 32-page bilingual comic book showing four children of different language and culture travelling across Canada in a magic car. From this story flows a 32-page activity book, a vocabulary-testing travel game on a large cardboard map of Canada, a sew-on badge of the comic book's caustic bilingual parrot, and a record of four songs composed specifically for children. In April 1975, the Council of Ministers is distributing nearly fifty thousand copies of this kit to all ten provinces, and the Office will send others to the two Territories. If the kit does not bomb, work will go ahead on a second kit for high school students, as well as on another movie aimed at presenting Canadian studies and languages in a frank and happy manner. We hope these projects will help not only teachers and students who seem eager for materials on Canada but parents interested in seeing their children develop healthy, positive attitudes to their country, in particular to its language challenges and opportunities.

2. *Some Final, No Doubt Futile, Grumblings*

Four short comments might be in order on the general state of misinformation on bilingualism, two unkind ones and two of encouragement. The first persisting sin of federal failure in information remains the inability of departments to co-operate on new programs, a weakness denounced in last year's report as the Crown Jewels syndrome—each department guarding, if not hiding, its deeds of informational derring-do with the jealousy of a paranoid lover. Although entrusted with apparently lots of money from the same taxpayers, information directors of many departments do not really seem able to share ideas and pool resources of language information. In the past year, the Public Service Commission, the Treasury Board, the Department of the Secretary of State and the Commissioner's office have, it is true, begun to concert and consult with each other in a pragmatic, if not very orderly, way. For

three years, the Office argued unsuccessfully for a non-partisan, union-management co-operative information centre both to save money and avoid grossly contradictory interpretations of the Act. Not wishing to wallow further in his diplomatic failure, the Commissioner now thinks that, apart from the present informal exchanges of ideas between the above four agencies, the Treasury Board, as manager of the Government's bilingualism programs, should formally associate information divisions of all executive-branch departments with its own efforts. Without gutsy leadership by the Treasury Board to help develop general-use materials and to tailor other programs to each department's specific needs, rumour-mongering and fantasy can be expected to plague tillers in the linguistic Garden of Eden until the cows come home and trample all over their delicately cultivated dreams.

The second continuing sin of omission is the indifference of those ever-popular scapegoats, top mandarins. A deputy minister of a scientific, economic or social ministry of course has one or two other things beside language to stimulate his mind. Should one bug these busy people too much, they might be right to paraphrase in reply the Irish farmer who, when asked by a judge whether the people in his county had ever pondered the doctrine or *res ipsa loquitur*, answered, "In County Cork, Your Lordship, we talk of little else." Still, between obsession and attention, there may be some room for caring. Fairly or unfairly, many public servants sense that their bosses really don't care about "bilingualism" until the tapioca hits the air conditioner. The result is contagious ennui, a sense of simmering despair a medievalist might term administrative accidie. If deputy ministers want peace in the linguistic Sinai, they may find it best by playing, more often, the role of Henry Kissinger : innovative and mobile reformers who will ride a mile to gain an inch. That really means just treating language equality as a normal, integral part of all their operations, and saying so every time their departments initiate any new policy whatever.

In a more positive vein, one might urge the Treasury Board and PSC to work up an information program addressed to high school students roughly five to eight years from the labour market. Even with all the short-term accommodations to unilinguals in Parliament's generous resolution of June 1973, these two agencies could help Canada's taxpayers get more bilingualism for a buck by motivating young people to prepare themselves well in advance for a satisfying career in an institutionally bilingual public service. Air Canada, not usually praised in these pages for its bilingual zeal, has recognized the realism of such a policy by going into high schools to explain the advantages of personal bilingualism for airline careers. So, in the name of common sense, foresight and economy, should the two key management agencies of the public service.

A final suggestion might go to union leaders. Already many of these, notably those of the Public Service Alliance of Canada, have cooperated with the Commissioner in joint programs to inform their members of their duties and opportunities under the Official Languages Act. Many other union leaders, even though understandably engrossed in the traumas of inflation, could do their country and members a service by making members aware that new contracts should, as a matter of simple fair play (the *raison d'être*, it is said, of unions), include arrangements by which seniority and "bumping" rights would not invariably override the public's right to be served in the official language of its choice.

Such exhortations may well, in some cases, prove as pointless as preaching prohibition at a brewers' convention. But management should recognize that not all union leaders are "I'm all right, Jack" shop stewards: most, if given encouragement and some decent informational materials, prefer to demonstrate that on language, as on other matters of equity, they normally choose to lead constructively. Perhaps, in spite of management's own negligence in explaining the Act, more union leaders will understand that job security for their members depends on the best possible service by their employer-agencies, including the best bilingual service. Sanely conceived bilingualism, experience has shown, is usually very good for business, and therefore for jobs. Peter Sellers, eat your heart out!

E. Scolding the Schools: on Passing the Bucks to the Next Generation

Probably the only point on which lovers and lambasters of bilingualism agree, though for quite opposite reasons, is that the "long-term cure" (to this vile disease?) rests with the kids now in school. This seductive and theoretically unassailable thesis seems undermined only by trifling suspicions that quite a few Canadians would like to put off any real linguistic reform in the federal government until the Greek Calends.

But setting such unworthy thoughts aside, buying this idea at face value as yet brings scant cause for glee. Glancing at Canada's still modest accomplishments in preparing the generation of 1984 for something better than a hybrid Orwellian Newspeak, one realizes that our country, in teaching second official languages, continues to offer its children bilingual band-aids instead of the required massive doses of linguistic vitamins. This sombre assessment rests on Tables 1 and 2 below showing the balance sheet of second-language instruction in the elementary and secondary schools of Canada over the past five years. After a short comment on these tables, it is worth recalling some promising, if not yet stunning, improvements in such teaching since

1970, then sketching out a few ideas for giving our children (and parents) a fairer chance of believing that, for once, their hopes for bilingual fluency just might make sense.

TABLE 1. Minority Language* Enrolment as Second Language, Elementary Level, 1970-71, 1974-75

	School Enrolment	Minority Language as Second Language		% of Instruction Time Devoted to Second Language
		Enrolment	%**	
Newfoundland				
1974-75	96,000	32,676	34.1	5.8
1970-71	102,319	21,835	21.4	4.9
Prince Edward Island				
1974-75	14,530	6,148	43.3	5.9
1970-71	17,317	3,561	21.2	7.9
Nova Scotia				
1974-75	110,650	24,424	22.7	6.1
1970-71	126,718	12,642	10.4	7.2
New Brunswick				
1974-75	83,350	36,329	67.2	5.6
1970-71	95,178	37,305	61.5	7.5
Ontario				
1974-75	1,405,093	609,709	46.0	6.7
1970-71	1,465,488	526,538	38.2	6.7
Manitoba				
1974-75	122,400	47,224	40.5	5.5
1970-71	136,918	42,655	32.7	4.8
Saskatchewan				
1974-75	112,800	6,208	5.6	7.6
1970-71	134,238	6,950	5.2	8.3
Alberta				
1974-75	233,711	61,921	26.9	6.0
1970-71	226,323	58,235	26.1	5.7
British Columbia				
1974-75	336,000	48,418	14.4	6.2
1970-71	327,794	18,558	5.7	5.0
Total (9 Provinces)				
1974-75	2,514,534	873,057	36.5	6.5
1970-71	2,632,293	728,279	29.2	6.3
Quebec				
1974-75	776,745	234,564	35.4	10.0
1970-71	1,004,782	302,700	35.8	8.9

SOURCE : Statistics Canada. Figures for 1974-75 are preliminary estimates drawn from information provided by provincial departments of Education.

* Minority language is English in Quebec and French in all other provinces.

** Percentages shown in the table indicate for each of the years 1970-71 and 1974-75 the degree of participation in learning of the second language and do not measure changes in participation over the five years. This explains why the five-year rise in enrolment in French as a second language is actually nearly 20% rather than the 7.4% column 3 seems to indicate.

TABLE 2. Minority Language* Enrolment as Second Language, Secondary Level, 1970-71, 1974-75

	School Enrolment	Minority Language as Second Language		% of Instruction Time Devoted to Second Language
		Enrolment	%**	
Newfoundland				
1974-75	63,000	32,902	52.2	10.2
1970-71	59,318	37,895	63.9	9.8
Prince Edward Island				
1974-75	14,160	8,958	64.7	10.8
1970-71	13,305	10,794	83.0	10.4
Nova Scotia				
1974-75	91,960	57,764	64.2	11.9
1970-71	88,179	59,955	70.0	13.4
New Brunswick				
1974-75	83,280	39,318	69.9	12.9
1970-71	80,734	42,708	78.2	11.7
Ontario				
1974-75	609,667	189,426	32.7	13.1
1970-71	556,913	252,496	47.5	13.1
Manitoba				
1974-75	110,130	43,843	41.2	11.3
1970-71	110,028	58,389	55.3	10.4
Saskatchewan				
1974-75	103,933	57,546	55.5	11.2
1970-71	113,094	77,928	69.0	10.0
Alberta				
1974-75	206,852	63,291	31.5	10.2
1970-71	197,599	80,607	42.0	10.5
British Columbia				
1974-75	217,000	96,532	44.5	11.6
1970-71	190,249	127,293	66.9	11.5
Total (9 Provinces)				
1974-75	1,499,982	589,958	41.3	11.9
1970-71	1,409,419	748,065	55.7	11.7
Quebec				
1974-75	611,095	520,225	100.0	16.2
1970-71	642,301	543,966	99.9	14.2

SOURCE : Statistics Canada Figures for 1974-75 are preliminary estimates drawn from information provided by provincial departments of Education.

* Minority language is English in Quebec and French in all other provinces.

** Percentages shown in the table indicate for each of the years 1970-71 and 1974-75 the degree of participation in learning of the second language and do not measure changes in participation over the five years. This explains why the five-year drop in enrolment in French as a second language is actually nearly 21% rather than the 14.4% column 3 seems to indicate.

1. The "National Disaster" Area Revisited:

All the depressing comments of some following paragraphs must take account of one increasingly solid fact: parents of school-age children in all parts of Canada seem more and more to want their offspring

to learn a useful version of our country's other official language. This impression emerges from visits to, and correspondence from, all parts of Canada, and is firm enough, assuming much greater and more imaginative government efforts, to underpin hopes for a Canadian population whose younger adults at least, could enjoy a far richer bilingual fluency within a decade.

This brief attack of optimism assuaged, let us now return to the classic posture of hand-wringing despair about what previous reports to Parliament termed a "national disaster" and a "countrywide catastrophe."

It is clear, no doubt, from Table 1 that Canada's elementary schools have begun to recognize in curriculum and pedagogical terms the discoveries of Dr. Wilder Penfield, the Montreal neurosurgeon who long ago confirmed scientifically that small children have a readier aptitude for learning second languages than have adults or even teenagers. In many parts of Canada, particularly in Montreal and, as we shall see in a moment, in Ottawa, serious large-scale experiments have supported Dr. Penfield.¹ Yet the increase in elementary-school enrolment in second-language study remains well below what a deep nationwide reform would demand: a 20 per cent increase over the past five years is hardly a revolution, even if the trend is encouraging. In terms of percentage of total instruction time, indeed, the number of minutes per week for second-language training remains dismally stable.

Much worse, the trend in Canada's secondary schools (Table 2) goes directly against the gradual progress of the elementary schools. Within the same five years since 1970, the high schools of Canada (not to mention most departments of education) have allowed enrolment in French as a second language to drop nearly 21 per cent—a staggering loss if one considers the greatly rising demand by both government and business for bilingual staff during the same period. The minutes-per-week scene here, moreover, matches closely the stagnation at the elementary level. The reasons for this fall-off are not hard to find: rampant option-ism on the part of departments of education which, nearly everywhere, have allowed 13-year-olds to choke on a smorgasbord of academic choices, leaving many, at age 18, illiterate not only in Canada's history and other official language but even in their mother tongue. If that sounds reactionary, maybe a little counter-revolution is in order. A second cause of the drop in enrolment in second languages in high schools is the chicken-hearted and anti-humanist attitude of most Canadian univer-

1. As we go to press, we are shattered to learn that serious study undertaken by the National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales seems to destroy entirely the above argument. According to the report's authors, the main factor of success in learning a second language is the amount of time spent learning it, not the age at which one starts to learn it. We shall try to resolve this embarrassing contradiction in our next *Annual Report*.

sities. Far too many of these institutions of higher learning, in the dash for per capita student grants, have dropped any knowledge of a second official language as a prerequisite for admittance. Basic Income Units (BIU's), as university students are now poetically known, are presumed by taxpaying parents to be getting both more broadly cultivated minds and a realistic training for today's, if not tomorrow's, world. With academic bureaucrats fretting more over budgets than burgeoning minds, students are being ripped off on both counts. At the very least, and it is embarrassing even to have to note this, some passing acquaintance with both our official languages should be a requirement for passing out of high school into any Canadian university.

A final factor in worsening the impact of both the high schools' optionalism and the universities' opting out is the persisting tragedy of woodenly taught second languages in secondary schools. Some palliatives cited in the next few paragraphs will repeat the heresy that English and French can be taught as living languages instead of dead subjects. But palliatives these reforms will remain until federal and provincial governments join, without sterile quarrels of jurisdiction and funding philosophy, to make some proven experiments in enlivening language learning a routine reality for all students in Canada.

2. Ottawa and the Provinces: Consenting Adults Can Do Satisfying Things Even in Public

That rather long-running off-Broadway show called the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism made one of its most perceptive contributions in 1968 in its Volume II on education. Beginning in 1970, and under the aegis of the Department of the Secretary of State, Ottawa has been priming the provincial pump for better bilingualism both through money and ideas.

The financial core of the federal government's response to the B. and B. Commission's twelve "federal" recommendations was a \$300-million program of contributions to the provinces. This program, for the four years 1970-74, was renewed (for \$80-million a year over five years) after an interprovincial report in May 1973 showed that Ottawa's "seed money" could nurture very interesting plants indeed. Dispensed to the provinces through a formula agreed to by the provincial governments, these funds led to three types of worthwhile reform, including a remarkable intensive program for certain school boards around Ottawa.

The best-known federal assistance is through scholarships. Teachers (nearly 2,800 in 1974) of second official languages may, for example, apply for \$300 scholarships, plus up to \$300 for travel expenses, to

upgrade their skills. And students or recent graduates of universities may apply for one of three specialized scholarships: a \$2,000 post-secondary scholarship for studying in a second official language (some 600 participants in 1974); a roughly \$600 summer scholarship for specifically studying a second official language (some 4,200 participants in 1974-75); or a \$3,000 teaching assistantship for "second-language monitors" (up to 400 participants in 1975-76 in the third year of an experimental program designed to parachute native-speakers into elementary, secondary or sometimes university classrooms to add realism and fluency under the supervision of a "qualified", but not always fluent teacher). This monitors program, which earlier reports to Parliament have been pushing as a near-panacea for some years, has now been sufficiently debugged both politically and pedagogically, one must argue, for Ottawa to consider raising the number of spaces to a level (say, to 2,000 a year) likely to open and excite young minds on a scale which really might do the country some good. Distance, when it comes to studying second languages with "native speakers", tends to lend ennui, not enchantment.

A second field of federal linguistic largesse helps civil servants. In addition to its own somewhat ritzy schools for federal employees, Ottawa each year lets some 200 provincial, municipal or school board employees attend its language schools (almost exclusively, need one say, to learn French). The federal treasury can also be raided for up to \$100,000 a year per province to pay half the costs of second-language programs operated by a province for such staff.

A third, and badly-known, field for getting goodies from Ottawa on the pretext of language reform concerns a delightful concept called "special projects." Meant at bottom as an anti-bureaucratic gap-filler, the Secretary of State's special projects rest realistically on local needs, locally expressed. The formula is uncharacteristically supple for a government scheme: any group of citizens living in an area lacking suitable second-language courses through "continuing education" public institutions, and wishing to improve their knowledge of the other official language, need only gain the backing of their provincial authorities and get, if their proposal is reasonable, 50 per cent financial support from Ottawa. Their project has to meet three standards: it must be innovative, enjoy shared financial aid from the province, and reflect the extra costs needed to launch the scheme. A good deal, all round, which more Canadians should try, because past experience has shown that almost any sensible project can conjure up dollars from the federal capital.

Speaking of federal capitals, one of the most striking of all special projects, linking the federal and Ontario governments, has been breaking precedent, prejudice and records of enthusiasm in the past three years among the four Ottawa-area school boards. With federal con-

tributions amounting to some \$4-million over two years, provincial acceptance and myth-destroying cooperation among the four public and separate school boards, this program is giving some 25,000 children in 1975 a serious chance to become bilingual. Though now only in its third year of total or partial immersion, or of amplified "core" learning (the bare and often futile minimum of 20 minutes a day for all kids), this splendidly constructive subversion of Canada's constitution shines as one of the few beacons of serenity in the bilingualism-bedeveloped, company-town atmosphere of Ottawa. Heavily supported, indeed oversubscribed, by civil-servant and other parents believing in readin', 'rithmetic and the handwritin' on the wall, this pilot program should produce within two or three years at most a workable, sensible model of individual bilingualism for all Canada. If only for the delightful doses of common sense which seem to overshadow all of its predictable setbacks, this experiment should attract school boards from around the country like a lab-full of Henry Higgins' at a phoneticians' convention.

3. Some Unfanatical Hints for Budget-Wise Bilingualism

At a time when we are all deflated by inflation, one should be looking for more bilingualism, as for more hamburger, for a buck. This is true for both schoolchildren and their money-hassled parents.

For the fortunate future taxpayers still in full-time school, two fairly obvious suggestions might be worth study—in addition, of course, to multiplying by five or ten times existing and well-proven programs of student and teacher exchanges, especially the second-language monitor program. School boards, backed by teachers' unions and provincial departments of education, should be allowed to draw generously on Canada's inherited reservoir of native speakers as temporarily "uncertified" teachers. Fluent and culturally wise in their subject, which is simply their own life, such teachers (as some provinces have already discovered) can bring a credibility and vitality to their "subject" that extremely few non-native speakers ever can. If allowed temporary teaching certificates after a summer course in teacher training and with the promise to attain full pedagogical "qualification" within two or three years by summer or night courses, these native-speaking university graduates could probably, within a year or two, overcome much of Canada's current shortage of competent (as opposed to pedagogically "qualified") second-language teachers.

A second suggestion would aim more systematically to let Canadian kids in on the well-kept secret that their compatriots of the other language group not only exist, but are interesting and worth knowing,

particularly in the other language. This proposal would develop present very modest weekend and short-holiday exchanges between children of the two groups into full-scale twinning of classrooms of English- and French-speaking children for a whole school term. With a little common sense, and not an unreasonable amount of imagination, school boards in most provinces (especially in Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Manitoba) could cut through the religious, linguistic, jurisdictional and other venerable pretexts for keeping our kids apart and organize exchanges of whole classes, for whole terms, between schools within the same province. With no interprovincial legal hangups about equivalent courses or teaching competence, school boards could work together to admit children for three or four months from neighbouring or not-too-distant schools into classes in the other language. The kids would not sink or swim in the other language, but possibly learn to float a little closer to the exotic "maudits Anglais" or "Frenchies" who often live just a few miles away, if not in the same town. Money should not prove a problem: lodging could be offered by parents for the "other" group, teachers would continue to get paid by their home boards, and travel costs could be foisted, one trusts, upon the Secretary of State and provincial capitals as very low-budget "special projects." No doubt much care would need to be invested in heading off, or meeting, unavoidable psychological and pedagogical problems. But caring for kids linguistically, as in other ways, is not the same as spoiling them rotten. Here the major gain and risk, with culture shock and future shock, is simply to help the kids become more lucid Canadians.

For the less fortunate taxpayers of today who, in spite of advanced ages of 30, 40, 50, 60 and more, still wish to savour some of the joy of the great bilingual boondoggle they are paying for, Ottawa might in fairness and realism offer two or three incentives. Naturally, the existing special projects program, whose catholic flexibility seems almost as limitless as that of other meritorious freeloading social programs, should be publicized strikingly out of its present, virtually clandestine, status: the program is unknown even to practised siphoners of federal funds around Ottawa. Second, for mature adults who don't fit into any existing federal program, being neither young enough nor old enough to evoke pity, much less official largesse, the federal government could offer perhaps 1,000 full scholarships a year for accredited study of a second official language during a breakthrough period of two to six months. This is not a frivolous or contrived need: the Commissioner, impotent enough when it comes to impregnating the Government with certain ideas, receives some of his most distressing mail from middle-aged (25 to 75 years) Canadians who want to give bilingualism the old college try but can't afford to get to college. For both the general climate and impetus of its programs for civil servants and children, the federal

government ought to give a thought to helping more than a few ordinary taxpaying citizens a chance to do their best for Queen, country and the B. and B. boys.

A final suggestion to assist even busier taxpayers might bring the Secretary of State into still closer solidarity, if possible, with the Minister of Finance. This would urge large-scale, detailed publicity by the Secretary of State (charged with informing Canadians that bilingualism is a Good Idea) about a very worthwhile tax deduction: any Canadian learning a second official language part-time or full-time can claim deduction of all tuition fees over \$25 paid to any educational institution certified by the Department of Manpower and Immigration. Many average Canadians envy, and should be encouraged to at least partly share, the generous linguistic fringe benefits of federal employees who get their subjunctives and audio-visual idioms on company time and at company expense. True, all taxpayers pay a little more when some get a fiscal concession. But a sane and constructive public atmosphere toward languages is, if one dares to guess the meaning of Parliament, a major national priority. And national priorities, particularly when they respect each citizen's personal priorities, need to be known not just to a coterie of tax experts but by the public asked to accept them.

Perhaps though we can take heart that even our taxmen have understood that Keynesian linguistics, like Keynesian economics, must allow for short-term deficits to attain long-term surpluses. We shall all, of course, as the Westminster Lord warned, be dead in the long run. But it must be soul-warming to be able to meet one's Maker in the official language of one's choice.

Chapter II

THE GORY DETAILS : OR MEASURING THE GLACIER'S ADVANCE

Descending now not from Olympus but, perhaps from the grotesque to the sublime, we turn in the following pages to the ungrateful task of reviewing who (how, when and where) has done the best, worst or simply most mediocre job of implementing the Official Languages Act. In this second year of risking sanity and science to try to give a fair assessment of the linguistic performance of some 34 departments and agencies, and details on about 35 others, this “technical” chapter tries to offer handy references which each reader can tailor to his or her degree of curiosity.

After a fairly short section recalling how this office manages to mismanage chaos in hope of helping its own and the Act's credibility, we present a brief “Bilingual Baedeker” guide for the hurried, and possibly worried, gourmet of linguistic reform. Therein are praised or damned in easy-to-swallow categories the efforts of most of the institutions prominent in language-related change. Then follow, as a musical *digestif*, plausibly detailed stories on each of these key institutions—with evidence more concise than last year's preceded by a quaintly distilled assessment, for the still casual reader, in italics. Finally come the facts on some 35 other institutions for which evidence available this year, in complaints, contacts or special studies, is too fragmentary to warrant a reasonable evaluation.

First, then, a word from those who work for our parliamentary sponsors.

A. *Madness in Our Method*

As usual, the office's two operational services, Special Studies and Complaints, marshal memories of labour pains they hope gave birth to

results of interest. Then they scare off the browsing linguophile by printing enough tables to regale a common-room full of Ph.D. candidates.

1. More Than Your Average Faith Healers: the Special Studies Gang

The Special Studies Service—the Commissioner’s constructively inquisitive band of linguistic auditors and purveyors of “preventive medicine”—combined initial scrutiny of many federal institutions with tireless, if occasionally tiresome, follow-up and evaluation during the 21-month period under review.

The 14 institutions studied ranged from that omnipotent enemy of patronage, the Public Service Commission, through the far-flung and mighty Ministry of Transport, that bastion of grey-eyed sheiks called the National Energy Board, the controlling and cost-curbing Canadian Transport Commission, Canada’s horsemen of the linguistic Apocalypse, the RCMP, to the “space makers” of the redoubtable Public Works Department.

a) On the Move

This choice of agencies was not the result, as some might innocently suppose, of random selection. The Commissioner’s decision to examine measures taken by MOT, CTC, the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority (and to a certain extent the Unemployment Insurance Commission) to implement the Official Languages Act reflects a continued concern with organizations dealing primarily with the travelling public. The sustained interest in services offered to the itinerant Canadian and kindred mobile users of federal institutions across the country and around the world is, as noted in the three previous reports, stimulated by Section 10 of the Act which accords that public a high priority.

b) Mens sana in corpore sano

But the legal primacy and geographical sweep of this important segment of the public did not deny the need to consider other types of service as well. The great human significance of both the Welfare (studied in the previous reporting period) and Health Components of the vast Department of National Health and Welfare asks no elaboration. Nor, in an age of nascent consumerism, need one stress the wide potential reach of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Commissioner and his colleagues judged that these institutions warranted priority treatment because they offer service, succour or satisfying rationales to legions of grateful Canadians.

c) *Quis custodes custodiet?*

Brooding over the work of others is often a thankless yet necessary task. The regulatory roles of the Canadian Transport Commission and the National Energy Board are of central importance in our continent-spanning country where transportation and resource policies determine much in the conduct of national affairs. The Commissioner and his colleagues therefore chose these agencies for review because of their pervasive influence (another of the five criteria listed in previous reports). Examining them broadened our range of experience in the niceties of departmental attempts to implement, or ingeniously circumvent, the Official Languages Act.

d) *Everything Else Is Housekeeping*

For many, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is one of the major "nation-building" forces in Canada. When not tuned in to the seductive offerings of American or rival private Canadian stations, Canadians see and hear CBC services during many of their waking hours. But of special interest to our Office is the CBC's "parallel" bilingualism—the existence of two separate yet subtly interwoven networks. Our newly-launched study should help us learn how well the Corporation succeeds in implementing the Official Languages Act throughout its novel structure, particularly in the light of greatly increasing demand for its French-language services.

e) *Ryan's Other Daughter*

Like the study of the Treasury Board Secretariat, summarized and cruelly dissected in the *Third Annual Report*, the Public Service Commission study was launched partly because of the complaint the editor of *Le Devoir* sent the Commissioner on 18 October 1972. Consequently, our focus was on the PSC's role as a decisive agent of central initiatives aimed at bringing the letter, spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act to bear on staffing, career development, language training and allied activities in which it is engaged singly or in collaboration with the Treasury Board and client departments.

f) *Not by Bread Alone*

The Department of Agriculture, and Industry, Trade and Commerce deal with so much that is vital to Canadians that the Commissioner and his colleagues thought it appropriate to see how well geared they are to provide services in both languages and to allow their large, highly-

trained staffs to use them as means of internal communication. This study of ITC, to be completed during 1975, is in a sense complementary to the previous review, undertaken in 1971-72, of the department's attempts to implement the Act in its activities abroad.

g) *Our Brother's Keepers*

But the Service's interests were not entirely parochial. It also launched a study of the Canadian International Development Agency — the main channel of Canada's efforts to help the Third World. This agency's work in fostering the use of our two official languages in serving a world-wide public and in its internal operations at home and abroad will be chronicled, for still unjaded readers, in our next *Annual Report*.

h) *Language of Work: Can Johnny Really Read French?*

Readers might have detected a recurring reference, in this brief catalogue of new studies, to the languages of internal communication. This matter is for the Special Studies Service a relatively recent pre-occupation. More precisely this twin of the "language of service" aspect, known to the growing group of official languages cognoscenti as the language of work question, is an important new dimension added to all but one of the studies launched during the 21-month period covered by this report.

For many participants in, and observers of, the official languages programme here is the rub. How can the equality of status which the law gives both languages be translated into actual practice within the 180-odd federal institutions? Some of the fruits of the Service's initial, modest experience in wrestling with this complex problem are displayed below. Suffice it to say here that the Service has learnt much in this short period to make it realize what a challenge to the ingenuity, imagination and goodwill of federal public servants the functional dialogue in two demanding languages constitutes.

i) *Can Your Boss Swear in English?*

Apart from the close look the Service has been having at language of work matters while conducting studies of departments and agencies, the Commissioner has also asked it to conduct in 1975 a survey of "graduates" of the government's Language School to determine what use they are actually making of their newly-acquired second-language skills. The results could be of practical interest to Parliament, the executive and the public; he will therefore publish our findings in the next *Annual Report*. Preliminary work on this fascinating question is well underway.

j) *Bringing in the Sheaves: Follow-up*

To report on a "harvest" is probably the ultimate self-indulgence. It is particularly delicate to engage in that pastime when one is taking stock of what has been cultivated—even if not planted—mainly by others. Yet much of the Service's energies in recent months has, for both logic and credibility, been invested in the nagging, sometimes niggling, and always painstaking, process of checking what precise action has been taken on some 650 recommendations made by the Commissioner to 24 federal institutions as a result of 42 studies. This follow-up work, which included exchanges of correspondence, field trips, and meetings at various levels, enabled the Service to keep abreast of new developments and thereby help the Commissioner weigh the results of his labour in the most recent-vintage vineyards of bilingualism.

Essential follow-up transactions, like the previous ones, are reflected in the updated assessments in later pages. Below, for those impressed by fancy if slightly tedious tables, one can peruse a cumulative list of studies launched between 1 April 1970 and 31 December 1974.

TABLE I. Special Studies by the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages

Study	Launched	Completion Date
Minister's Offices (Telephone Answering)	21/ 9/70	1970-71
Air Canada—Ottawa	9/10/70	1970-71
Ministry of Transport—Ottawa	13/10/70	1970-71
Ministry of Transport—Toronto	18/12/70	1970-71
National Museums of Canada	4/ 2/71	1970-71
National Capital Commission	5/ 2/71	1970-71
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	9/ 2/71	1971-72
Dominion Bureau of Statistics	17/ 2/71	1971-72
Department of National Defence— Canadian Forces Base—Uplands	18/ 2/71	1971-72
Department of Public Works—Ottawa	8/ 3/71	1971-72
Department of Manpower and Immigration—Montreal	15/ 3/71	1971-72
Department of Public Works—Winnipeg	22/ 4/71	1971-72
Department of Manpower and Immigration—Winnipeg	22/ 4/71	1971-72
Eldorado Nuclear Limited	27/ 4/71	1971-72
Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation	27/ 4/71	1971-72
Atomic Energy of Canada Limited	27/ 4/71	Signs in National Capital Region
Department of Communications	27/ 4/71	
National Research Council of Canada	27/ 4/71	
Department of Agriculture	27/ 4/71	
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	27/ 4/71	
Department of Energy, Mines and Resources	27/ 4/71	1971-72
Department of Manpower and Immigration—Ottawa—Hull	2/ 5/71	1971-72

TABLE I. Special Studies by the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages

Study	Launched	Completion Date
Department of External Affairs	12/ 5/71	Canadian Representation Abroad 1971-72
Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce	12/ 5/71	
Department of Manpower and Immigration	12/ 5/71	
Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (National and Historic Parks)	21/ 5/71	1971-72
Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation	26/ 6/71	1971-72
Air Canada—London and Paris	9/ 8/71	1971-72
Farm Credit Corporation	21/ 9/71	1971-72
Air Canada	19/12/71	1971-72
Department of the Environment (Atmospheric Environment Service)	12/ 1/71	1971-72
Department of National Revenue (Custom & Excise)	17/12/71	1972-73
Statistics Canada—1976 Census	27/ 3/72	1972-73
Canadian National Railways	30/ 3/72	1972-73
Office of the Chief Electoral Officer	21/ 4/72	1972-73
Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Canals)	15/ 5/72	1972-73
Department of National Revenue	12/ 6/72	1972-73
Post Office Department	12/ 6/72	1972-73
Unemployment Insurance Commission	12/ 6/72	1972-73
Department of Agriculture	12/ 6/72	1972-73
Department of the Environment	12/ 6/72	1972-73
Department of National Health and Welfare	12/ 6/72	1972-73
Department of Manpower and Immigration	13/ 6/72	1972-73
Air Canada	13/ 6/72	1972-73
Canadian National Railways	14/ 6/72	1972-73
Department of the Secretary of State—Translation Bureau	19/ 6/72	1972-73
Department of National Revenue (Taxation)	28/ 6/72	1972-73
Department of National Health and Welfare (Welfare Component)	25/10/72	1972-73
Post Office Department	27/10/72	1972-73
National Library	23/11/72	1972-73
National Arts Centre	6/12/72	1972-73
Treasury Board Secretariat	26/ 1/73	1972-73
Unemployment Insurance Commission	11/12/72	1973
Public Service Commission	7/ 3/73	1974
Department of Public Works	24/ 8/73	1974
Ministry of Transport	27/ 9/73	1974
Canadian Transport Commission	2/11/72	1974
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	26/11/73	1974
Department of National Health and Welfare (Health Component)	7/ 2/74	1974
National Energy Board	21/ 2/74	1974
St. Lawrence Seaway Authority	2/ 5/74	
Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs	13/ 6/74	
Language Use Survey (preparatory phase)	11/ 7/74	
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	12/ 7/74	
Department of Agriculture	14/ 8/74	
Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce	14/ 8/74	
Canadian International Development Agency	1/11/74	

2. *The Ombudsman: a "Public Protector", But Hardly a Cop*

The primary role of the Complaints Service is to investigate complaints the Commissioner receives from the public. The first three annual reports contained details on the procedures followed during investigations. The following information is provided as guidance for those who wish to join the merry band of complainants.

a) Is Something Bothering You?

A complaint may be made by "any person or group of persons, whether or not they speak or represent a group speaking the official language the status or use of which is at issue" (Section 26(2) of the Act). Thus it is not necessary to be a Canadian citizen or even a resident of Canada in order to file a complaint.

Moreover, an English-speaker may complain to the Commissioner that the French language is not being respected in a federal agency, and vice versa.

To date, group complaints have been submitted mainly by French-language associations in the provinces, seeking to promote French, or by federal employees in a given sector of the Public Service who are dissatisfied with the linguistic aspects of the working conditions imposed upon them.

The complainant is not obliged to reveal his identity; he may anonymously ask the Commissioner to investigate a complaint concerning what in his opinion is an infringement of the Act. In this event, the Complaints Officer will be unable to ask him for additional information which would be useful during the investigation, and the Commissioner will not be able to inform him of the result.

Even if the complainant reveals his identity, it is the policy of the Complaints Service to preserve his anonymity, unless it has beforehand obtained his authorization to act otherwise. Every precaution is taken to prevent the complainant from being subjected to any possible harm; this is particularly the case with federal employees who fear reprisals on the part of their employers.

b) Various Categories of Pettifoggery

In principle, any complaint that concerns the status of English or French in the administration of a federal institution is admissible. Within certain limits, the Act imposes obligations upon federal institutions with respect to three types of publics: (a) the general public—that referred to, for example, in Section 9; (b) the travelling public,

mentioned in Section 10; and (c) federal employees, who as federal employees may invoke Sections 2 and 39(4). In practice, however, the Commissioner accepts all complaints submitted to him; those which are not directly related to his mandate are investigated unofficially or referred to the appropriate authorities. Acting in this manner, he hopes to contribute to the promotion of bilingualism in the various spheres of public life.

c) If Necessary, Send Us a Carrier Pigeon

How can the complainant make himself heard? By letter, telephone, telegram, a visit to the Commissioner's office, or any other means he considers suitable. He should, however, provide the Complaints Service with sufficient information to enable the institution concerned to investigate and report on the matter as thoroughly as possible.

d) And for Those Who Like Statistics. . .

Breakdown of Complaints

TABLE 1. Number of Files by Period.

	1970-73* (36 months)	1973-74** (21 months)
Opened	1,869	1,655***
Closed	1,753	1,284 (78%)
Still active at the end of the period	116	371 (22%)

*Includes the 1970-71, 1971-72 and 1972-73 fiscal years. The figures are broken down by fiscal year in the *Third Annual Report*.

**From April 1, 1973 to December 31, 1974.

***One of the 1,655 files that were opened contained complaints made by 91 different persons on the same subject, which concerned the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

During its first three years of operations, the Complaints Service received an average of 52 complaints per month, while during the 21 months covered by the present report, this average increased to 78. The length of time devoted to an investigation depends on the nature of the complaint. A number of files—particularly those dealing with the language of work—required considerable effort. This is one reason why the percentage of files that were still active was greater on January 1, 1975 (22) than on April 1, 1973 (12). A file is closed when the Commissioner is satisfied that the requirements of the Act have been respected.

In addition to the 1,655 complaints files that it opened during the 21 months, the Complaints Service opened about 80 files containing requests for information.¹ Without wishing to submit complaints, the correspondents wanted to obtain information on a variety of subjects. Most requests concerned the federal administration: language tests and training, the priority given to the official languages, the bilingualism premium, the status of other languages (section 38 of the Act), interpretations of the Official Languages Act, the relationship between the later and the directives of Treasury Board, translation problems, discrimination, federal employees' working conditions, and questions relating to the language of service or the language of work. The other requests, few in number, concerned the provinces, municipalities or private enterprise; for example, information was requested about Quebec's Official Language Act, labelling problems, elections, advertising and working tools.

TABLE 2. Cumulative Total of Files

Opened	3,524
Closed	3,151*
Still active on January 1, 1975	373

*This number includes 114 of the 116 files that were still open on April 1, 1973.

TABLE 3. Files Opened in 1973-74 (21 months)

Complaints concerning specific federal institutions	1,441 (87%)
Complaints not concerning specific federal institutions	214 (13%)
	1,655 (100%)

TABLE 4. Language of Complainants

	1970-73 (36 months)	1973-74 (21 months)
French	1,394 (75%)	1,376 (83%)
English	475 (25%)	279 (17%)
	1,869 (100%)	1,655 (100%)

¹ These requests concerned questions about which the Complaints Service, because of the competence acquired by its officers while investigating complaints, was qualified to provide adequate answers. In addition to dealing with these rather complex matters, the Service, like the Office Secretariat, gave replies by telephone to a number of requests for information.

Comparison of the two periods shows that the percentage of French-speakers submitting complaints has increased considerably in relation to the percentage of English-speakers. This situation can no doubt be explained by the fact that the Official Languages Act was adopted for the purpose of elevating the status of French in an administration where English predominated. Although more than five years have passed since the Act came into force, the equality of status of the two official languages is still not a reality, a fact which causes French-speakers to remain somewhat pessimistic. Some of the complaints of French-speaking persons have been transmitted by l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario or submitted by inhabitants of the West or the Maritime provinces, who because of their minority situation are more vigilant than other Canadians in drawing attention to infringements of the Act.

TABLE 5. Methods of Submitting Complaints

	1970-73 (36 months)	1973-74 (21 months)
By letter	1,413 (75.6%)	1,201 (72.6%)
By telephone	258 (13.8%)	387 (23.4%)
In person	66 (3.6%)	25 (1.5%)
By referral	76 (4.0%)	22 (1.3%)
Other means (telegram, newspaper, note and so forth)	56 (3.0%)	20 (1.2%)
	1,869 (100.0%)	1,655 (100.0%)

Table 5 indicates that during the second period the number of complaints received by telephone increased markedly in relation to the number received by other methods—from 13 to 23%. This increase is indicative of the Commissioner's desire to facilitate the process of submitting complaints: the complainant need not take the trouble to write, but may submit his grievance by telephoning collect during working hours in the country's seven time zones. In some cases, however, the complainant may fail to provide all relevant information, thus making it necessary for the officer receiving the complaint to communicate with him again in order to obtain additional details or supporting documents.

Complaints submitted by referral are those which are first received by another federal authority (or even a provincial authority) and subsequently brought to the Commissioner's attention. It should be

added that the Commissioner occasionally agrees to investigate complaints concerning federal institutions voiced in letters appearing in newspapers.

TABLE 6. Origin of Complaints—1973-74 (21 months)

Newfoundland	6	0.3%
Prince Edward Island	2	0.2%
Nova Scotia	31	1.9%
New Brunswick	72	4.4%
Quebec	450	27.2%
Ontario	898	54.2%
Manitoba	31	1.9%
Saskatchewan	28*	1.7%
Alberta	82	5.0%
British Columbia	44	2.2%
Yukon and Northwest Territories	1	0.1%
Other countries (Belgium, France, South Africa, United States)	10	0.9%
	1,655	100.0%

*One of the 28 files contained 91 complaints of the same type, submitted by different persons.

TABLE 7. Origin of Complaints (cumulative)

	1970-73 (36 months)		1973-74 (21 months)		Total	
		%		%		%
Newfoundland	3	0.2	6	0.3	9	0.3
Prince Edward Island	18	1.0	2	0.2	20	0.6
Nova Scotia	33	1.8	31	1.9	64	1.8
New Brunswick	94	5.0	72	4.4	166	4.7
Quebec	463	24.7	450	27.2	913	25.9
Ontario	713	38.0	898	54.2	1,611	45.7
Manitoba	227	12.1	31*	1.9	258	7.3
Saskatchewan	96	5.1	28*	1.7	124	3.5
Alberta	164	8.7	82*	5.0	246	7.0
British Columbia	41	2.2	44	2.2	85	2.4
Yukon and Northwest Territories	3	0.2	1	0.1	4	0.1
Other countries (Austria, Belgium, Britain, Chile, France, Pakistan, Senegal, South Africa, United States)	14	0.1	10	0.9	24	0.7
	1,869	100.0	1,655	100.0	3,524	100.0

*During the second period, the number of complaints from the Prairie provinces decreased appreciably: a number of complaints concerning the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation had been submitted during the first period.

The fact that a considerable number of complaints originated in Ontario is largely due to the fact that this province includes a significant part of the National Capital Region (to date only "bilingual district"), where most of the federal departments and agencies have their headquarters. The inhabitants of this region, whether they are federal employees or not, are more aware of the problems inherent in bilingualism and are consequently more strongly motivated to invoke the Official Languages Act.

TABLE 8. Receipt of Complaints—Distribution by Month (1973-74)

	Number of Complaints Received during Month	Cumulative Total
1973 April	88	88
May	113	201
June	86	287
July	78	365
August	76	441
September	83	524
October	83	607
November	64	671
December	44	715
1974 January	80	795
February	71	866
March	108	974
April	98	1,072
May	87	1,159
June	66	1,225
July	70	1,295
August	45	1,340
September	79	1,419
October	92	1,511
November	63	1,575
December	80	1,655

*Complaints Concerning Specific Federal Institutions—1973-74
(21 Months)*

TABLE 9. Language of Complainants

French	1,216 (84%)
English	225 (16%)
	1,441 (100%)

During the 1972-73 fiscal year, of 834 complaints concerning specific federal institutions, 607 had been submitted by French-speakers and 227 by English-speakers. The percentage of French-speakers thus rose from 73 to 84, while the percentage of English-speakers dropped from 27 to 16. It should be mentioned that during 1972-73 more than a hundred files were opened relating to complaints received from English-speaking public servants concerning the designation of bilingual positions in Winnipeg and Edmonton by the Department of Manpower and Immigration. On the other hand, during 1973-74, only a single file was opened for 91 complaints concerning the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation submitted by some Saskatchewan French-speakers.

TABLE 10. Nature of Complaints Investigated

Language of Service	1,169	(88%)
Language of Work	161	(12%)
	<u>1,330*</u>	<u>(100%)</u>

*In most cases, the institution concerned was notified of the impending investigation, in compliance with Section 27 of the Act. A number of these files were still active on January 1, 1975.

TABLE 11. Federal Institutions Cited in Complaints

	1970-73 (36 months)	1973-74 (21 months)	Total
Agriculture	15	14	29
Air Canada	109	117	226
Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.	2	2	4
Auditor General	1	2	3
Bank of Canada	3	2	5
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	177	75	252
Canadian Consumer Council	0	1	1
Canadian Film Development Corporation	0	1	1
Canadian International Development Agency	5	7	12
Canadian Livestock Feed Board	0	1	1
Canadian National Railways	87	90	177
Canadian Overseas Telecommunications Corporation	0	1	1
Canadian Pension Commission	1	2	3
Canadian Radio-Television Commission	4	5	9
Canadian Transport Commission	3	2	5
Canadian Wheat Board	2	1	3
Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation	7	7	14
Chief Electoral Officer	17	18	35
Commissioner of Official Languages	4	2	6
Communications	17	16	33
Company of Young Canadians	1	0	1
Consumer and Corporate Affairs	10	13	23
Crown Assets Disposal Corporation	0	2	2
Defence Construction (1951) Ltd.	0	3	3

Federal Institutions Cited in Complaints (Continued)

	1970-73 (36 months)	1973-74 (21 months)	Total
Economic Council of Canada	1	1	2
Energy, Mines and Resources	10	15	25
Environment	25	40	65
External Affairs	22	19	41
Farm Credit Corporation	2	0	2
Federal Court	2	1	3
Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario	1	0	1
Finance	2	2	4
Food Prices Review Board	0	1	1
Governor General	0	2	2
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	26	23	49
Industry, Trade and Commerce	11	16	27
Information Canada	14	21	35
Insurance (Department of)	3	0	3
Joint Parliamentary Committee on the Constitution	2	0	2
Justice	3	5	8
Labour	3	6	9
Manpower and Immigration	160	93	253
Medical Research Council	0	1	1
Metric Commission	0	2	2
Ministers' Offices	1	0	1
National Arts Centre	4	11	15
National Capital Commission	12	30	42
National Defence	68	75	143
National Film Board	3	5	8
National Harbours Board	1	2	3
National Health and Welfare	31	32	63
National Library	4	4	8
National Museums	17	13	30
National Research Council of Canada	11	14	25
National Revenue—Customs and Excise	40	34	74
National Revenue—Taxation	44	43	87
Northern Canada Power Commission	2	0	2
Northern Transportation Co. Ltd.	1	1	2
Olympic Coins 1976	0	1	1
Parliament	24	19	43
Polymer (Polysar)	2	0	2
Post Office	106	156	262
Privy Council Office	1	1	2
Public Archives	3	5	8
Public Service Commission	66	79	145
Public Works	23	29	52
Regional Economic Expansion	10	8	18
Royal Canadian Mint	5	0	5
St. Lawrence Seaway Authority	0	3	3
Science Council of Canada	4	1	5
Science and Technology	1	1	2
Secretary of State	41	30	71
Solicitor General	0	1	1
(1) Royal Canadian Mounted Police	29	34	63
(2) Canadian Penitentiary Service	16	8	24
(3) National Parole Board	6	5	11

Federal Institutions Cited in Complaints (Continued)

	1970-73 (36 months)	1973-74 (21 months)	Total
Statistics Canada	85	13	98
Supply and Services	20	31	51
Supreme Court of Canada	0	1	1
Tax Review Board	1	0	1
Transport	68	55	123
Treasury Board	9	14	23
Unemployment Insurance Commission	29	37	66
Urban Affairs	1	2	3
Veterans Affairs	8	10	18
Yukon Territorial Government	1	1	2
	1,550	1,441	2,991

The nine institutions that "earned" the greatest number of complaints form the following honour roll:

	Since April 1, 1970 (57 months)		1973-74 (21 months)	
	Number	Rank	Number	Rank
Post Office	262	1	156	1
Air Canada	226	4	117	2
Manpower and Immigration	253	2	93	3
Canadian National Railways	177	5	90	4
Public Service Commission	145	6	79	5
National Defence	143	7	75	6
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	252	3	75	6
Transport	123	8	55	8
National Revenue (Taxation)	87	9	43	9

It should be noted that the federal institutions that were the subject of the greatest number of complaints during the 1973-74 period are those which generally have frequent contact with the public:

- (a) The Post Office Department operates about 10,000 offices throughout the country;
- (b) Air Canada, Canadian National Railways and the Department of Transport serve hundreds of thousands of travellers;
- (c) The Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Department of National Defence serve a large clientele and have a sizeable staff; there were therefore a number of complaints concerning the language of service and the language of work;
- (d) The Public Service Commission deals with federal employees and candidates for employment in the Public Service;
- (e) The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has not yet met the needs of French-speaking minorities; and

(f) The Department of National Revenue (Taxation) sometimes aggravates taxpayers' pain by not always communicating with them in the official language of their choice.

The quality of the co-operation received from these departments and agencies by the Office of the Commissioner during the investigation of complaints varies from ratings of excellence to mediocre, as can be seen in the evaluations that appear later in this report. A comparison of the two periods reveals a certain continuity in the position occupied on the honour roll, with three exceptions: Air Canada moved from fourth place to second, because its directives regarding bilingualism were not followed sufficiently; the Department of Manpower and Immigration dropped one place lower, since in 1972-73 more than a hundred complaints had been submitted concerning the designation of bilingual positions in Winnipeg and Edmonton; the CBC markedly improved its position, owing to the fact that before April 1, 1973 the Complaints Service had opened about 200 files on complaints made by French-speaking minority groups in Saskatchewan and Alberta, while in 1973-74 a single file was opened containing 91 complaints originating in Zenon Park, Saskatchewan.

TABLE 12. Complaints Concerning Specific Federal Institutions from Federal Employees (as Federal Employees), Including Employees of Crown Corporations and Members of the Armed Forces—1973-74 (21 months)

French-speakers	73 (54%)
English-speakers	61 (46%)
	134 (100%)

Most complaints submitted by federal employees (as federal employees) concerned the language of work. Table 13 indicates the nature of the complaints that may be included under this heading. Some of the complaints, however, related to discrimination problems: in such cases the complainant was advised to address his grievance to the Anti-discrimination Branch of the Public Service Commission.

TABLE 13. Nature of Complaints Concerning Specific Federal Institutions from Federal Employees (as Federal Employees)—1973-74 (21 months)

	French-speakers	English-speakers
Language tests	3	8
Language courses	3	30
Competitions, appointments, duties, designation of language requirements	29	19
Working conditions	51	6
	86	63

The number of French-speakers and English-speakers in tables 12 and 13 is not the same, because some complaints on behalf of federal employees (as federal employees) were submitted by persons other than federal employees. Subsequent to directives issued by Treasury Board during the 21 months covered by the present report, it is understandable that a greater number of English-speakers than French-speakers complained of not being able to enrol in language courses—for example, those who were participating in cyclical French courses had to yield priority to those occupying positions that had been designated bilingual. On the other hand, a number of French-speakers complained that the Public Service Commission did not respect their language preferences during interviews on the occasions of competitions. Several English-speakers protested the fact that their positions had been identified as bilingual by their department and Treasury Board. With regard to working conditions, the majority of French-speaking complainants did not like, for example, to have memoranda sent to them in English. A number were employed in French-language units but were unable to communicate in French with the head office or with other regional offices in their department.

*Complaints Not Concerning Specific Federal Institutions—
1973-74 (21 months)*

TABLE 14. Breakdown by Categories

Bilingualism policy	2*
Education	23*
Foreign government	1
Members of Parliament	8
Municipal governments	8
Private enterprise	89
Provinces	52
Public service unions and associations	9
Telephone companies	22
	214

* The Office's Secretariat also answered many requests for information on these topics.

Most of the complaints listed in Table 14 were referred to the appropriate authorities. In a number of cases, the latter informed the Commissioner of the nature of the replies which they had sent directly to the correspondents, or which they wished the Commissioner to transmit to them.

e) How We Are Saving Paper This Year

The reader of the Third Annual Report will have noticed the variety of subjects involved in the complaints investigated during the 1972-73

fiscal year; although 109 summaries had been omitted from the list of complaints concerning specific federal institutions, the reading matter was nevertheless abundant.

In the present report—even though it covers 21 months of activities—certain specific criteria were applied to limit the choice of summaries.¹ First, there are summaries of complaints which resulted in the formulation of recommendations. During the 21 months, the Complaints Service, in the course of investigating 149 complaints, made 184 recommendations relative to 38 federal institutions. These complaints may be classified in the following manner: 123 concerned the language of service and 26 concerned the language of work. Six complaints involving four institutions resulted in recommendations which were still under study on January 1, 1975. The Commissioner's recommendations were brought to the attention of the Clerk of the Privy Council, who in turn referred them to the Treasury Board.

In the next category are summaries of complaints which did not result in recommendations but are likely to interest the reader for a variety of reasons:

- (a) admissible complaints in response to which the Commissioner or his officers gave effective personal assistance to a specific individual, either to improve his working conditions or to obtain a service;
- (b) inadmissible complaints where a referral or intervention on the part of the Commissioner had results which contributed to the advancement of institutional bilingualism in the provinces or in private enterprise;
- (c) complaints where the interpretation of a section of the Act is clarified, the scope of a section is broadened, or a new dimension is considered. Such cases are rather uncommon, since most complaints of this nature resulted in recommendations;
- (d) noteworthy complaints about the language of work, particularly those which concern oral and written communications between federal employees; and
- (e) complaints that have given rise to significant reforms indicative of initiative on the part of certain departments and agencies.

Complaints of which summaries do not appear are mentioned briefly in small type under the heading of each department or agency; the entry gives the file number, a concise description of the nature of the complaint, the place where the complaint originated and the result of the Commissioner's intervention. The terminology used in describing this result requires further explanation.

- (a) *corrective measures*: in a great number of cases, the federal institution concerned made the decision to correct the situation as soon as the complaint was brought to its attention;

¹ A summary is prepared when a file is closed.

(b) *withdrawal*: in a few rather rare cases, the complainant withdrew his complaint or did not respond to a request for information essential to the investigation;

(c) *unfounded*: the Commissioner, after examining the versions of the complainant and the institution concerned, came to the conclusion that there had been no infringement of the Act;

(d) *explanations*: here, the institution concerned attempted to explain why it had not respected what the complainant or the Commissioner considered to be requirements of the Act. In some cases, these explanations were valid. In others, they amounted to excuses based on oversight, omissions or errors; this was too often the case with Air Canada, which, although it had a bilingual capacity, had failed to make use of it on numerous flights;

(e) *special study*: in some cases, when the complaint dealt with a situation already being examined by the Special Studies Service, the investigation was conducted jointly by the two services;

(f) *referral*: when the complaint was clearly beyond the Commissioner's terms of reference, it was referred to the appropriate provincial, municipal or other authorities; and

(g) *service rendered*: even though the complaint was inadmissible, the Commissioner sought to help the correspondent find a solution to his problem; it might, for example, be a matter of "helping out" a federal employee who had a grievance against the implementation of the bilingualism programme.

B. *A Bilingual Beadeker for the Hurried, and Possibly Worried, Gourmet*

The following gastronomic guide seeks to help the hungry lover of languages to digest quickly the tasty or foul dishes of this year's most prominent establishments on the B. and B. menu.



Superb cuisine for the most discriminating of bilingual palates.

(Unfortunately, none of the restaurants visited this year deserved three stars, our symbol for excellence in bilingual gastronomy. The recipes that certain master chefs are concocting, however, allow us to hope that next year some of Ottawa's more elegant watering holes may well merit this dubious and arbitrary distinction.)



Good all-round fare, with several outstanding French and English dishes. If time permits, worth a furtive little side-trip.

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation

Farm Credit Corporation

National Arts Centre

National Capital Commission

National Defence

National Library

Public Service Commission

Secretary of State



Unpretentious, solid linguistic nourishment, but don't ask for anything fancy.

Chief Electoral Officer

Indian Affairs and Northern Development

Information Canada

Manpower and Immigration

National Museums of Canada

National Revenue (Taxation)



Generally bland meals for the diet-conscious: possibly helpful for the ulcer-afflicted, but hardly for the connoisseur.

Agriculture

Communications

External Affairs
Environment
National Research Council
Parliament
Supply and Services
Treasury Board
Unemployment Insurance Commission



Bilingual service à la Cafeteria—an erratic level of culinary performance, depending on the chef's whims.

Air Canada
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
Canadian National
Industry, Trade and Commerce
National Health and Welfare
National Revenue (Customs and Excise)
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Statistics Canada



Greasy spoons with a bitter aftertaste of bilingual sour grapes. Avoid at all costs, unless you're heavily equipped with Tums and/or Bromo Seltzer.

Post Office
Public Works
Transport

C. *The Top Thirty on the B. and B. Hit Parade (from Rocketman to Rock Bottom)*

The following pages offer frank, but one hopes friendly, assessments of 34 departments and agencies whose dealings with us in complaints, special studies and other contacts gave us enough information to hazard a rough judgement on their linguistic zeal. The part on each institution begins with a capsule "evaluation" in italics, and continues with more supporting evidence than the average reader may care to peruse but which may prove useful to specialists in Parliament and in the institutions themselves.

AGRICULTURE—"Green, Green, the Grass is Green"

EVALUATION

The Department has avoided many complaints by its sustained toil in tilling the fields of bilingualism. It quickly weeded out the 14 complaints made against it, and has partly implemented the only remaining recommendation (about forms) resulting from our special study (Third Annual Report 1972-73) of the Moncton district office. Nevertheless, certain complaints against the Institute of Veterinary Research in Hull suggest that the Department might try artificial insemination in preparing a more fertile womb to implant French as a language of work. A systematic study, recently launched, of the Department's whole national operations should allow a much more interesting assessment next year than the above somewhat random harvest.

Forms designed for external use at the Moncton district office were now bilingual and those used internally would be bilingual by March 1976. Meanwhile, our Office has launched a new special study of the Department of Agriculture. This study will examine the whole department on a national basis and will seek to determine the extent to which it meets the requirements of the Official Languages Act with respect to both language of service to the public and language of internal communication.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1706—"The Diseases and Plagues"

A correspondent drew the Commissioner's attention to Regulation 38 of the Pest Control Products Regulations which came into

force on 25 November 1972: it called for the information on every label of such products to be in either the English or the French language or both. The writer was of the opinion that, to protect Canadian consumers and to comply with the provisions, spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act, the regulations should require either the labels to be bilingual or else one to be affixed in English and one in French.

The Department of Agriculture stated that the present Regulation 38 was carried over from the old regulation governing language of labelling requirements and would be superseded when new regulations under Section 18 of the Consumer Packaging and Labelling Act, administered by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, were promulgated. It added that such regulations were apparently in a draft stage and that it was not expected that bilingual labelling would be a requirement of the Consumer Packaging and Labelling Act until 1975.

The Commissioner asked the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs about the status of the proposed Consumer Packaging and Labelling Regulations and learned that the draft regulations were being discussed with consumer and trade associations. He also learned that the effective date for bringing labels into full compliance with the new regulations, including the proposed bilingual labelling requirements, would be some two years after the promulgation of the regulations. However, since the Governor in Council had already made bilingual labelling a mandatory requirement under the Hazardous Products (Hazardous Substances) Regulations, the Commissioner recommended to the Department of Agriculture that Regulation 38 of the Pest Control Products Regulations be amended to provide for mandatory bilingual labelling.

The Department of Agriculture maintained its original position on the matter. Since Regulation 38 of the Pest Control Products Regulations concerned the private sector rather than federal institutions, the Commissioner concluded that its provisions did not contravene the Official Languages Act, and he informed the correspondent accordingly.

File No. 2055—English Folder

A parent complained that the Department had included in a "Student Mailbag", which was sent to thousands of students in English-language schools, a unilingual English folder entitled "We have to get pests before they get us".

The Department informed the Commissioner that the French version entitled "C'est eux ou nous" was to be distributed to CEGEPS and universities in Quebec in September 1973. The Department had delayed distribution because it was unable to obtain mailing lists from these

institutions and had to negotiate with the Quebec departments of Agriculture and Education. In the fall of 1973, the Quebec Department of Education undertook to distribute the folders.

The Commissioner recommended that the Department of Agriculture carefully check its mailing lists to make sure that French-speaking students attending English-language schools (and vice versa) always receive government publications in the official language of their choice.

File No. 2634—Sixteen Memoranda in English

A French-speaking government employee working at the Animal Diseases Research Institute sent the Commissioner copies of 18 memoranda, of which 16 were in English only and two were bilingual. He expressed his concern at such disregard for French-speaking civil servants.

The Department first acknowledged the right of French-speakers to be served in their own language. It then added that it was not always convenient to wait for the official translation when urgent notices had to be sent to employees, but that normally notices were sent in both official languages.

Meanwhile, the Commissioner had received further copies of memoranda in English only and pointed out to the Department that these did not seem to deal with urgent matters.

He therefore recommended that the Department take the necessary steps to ensure that messages addressed to all personnel be distributed at the same time in both official languages.

The Department reported that it had taken such steps, in accordance with its policy on bilingualism. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture had issued directives on the subject to all Department heads.

File No. 3103—Brochures Not Available in French

A French-speaking person informed the Commissioner that a number of works published in 1973 by the Department's Economics Branch were not available in French. Among others, he cited the brochures entitled *Selected Agricultural Statistics for Canada* and *The Tender Fruit Industry in Canada*.

The Department first indicated to the Commissioner that after the brochure entitled *Selected Agricultural Statistics for Canada* had been sent to the translation service, a part of the text had been lost, a breakdown in communications had occurred and in the end the French version had never been completed. By the time this situation became evident, the statistics were already out of date; it was then decided that there was little point in publishing the French version of a brochure which had long been in print in English.

Since a summary of the brochure entitled *The Tender Fruit Industry in Canada* had appeared in both official languages in *Canadian Farm Economics*, the Department had considered it unnecessary to publish a translation of the full text.

The Economics Branch had the same year published a series of studies in English only, entitled *Prairie Regional Studies*. The Department, believing that demand for the publications would come exclusively from the English-speaking public, had concluded that it was unnecessary to have them translated. In support of this position, it pointed out that the officer in charge of answering requests from the public had received no requests from the French-speaking public in this regard.

In spite of the circumstances which had led the Department to decide not to publish the French version of *Selected Agricultural Statistics for Canada*, and considering that the publication in English only of a brochure for public use constituted an infringement of the Official Languages Act, the Commissioner recommended that the Department take all steps necessary to ensure that all documents intended for the public appear simultaneously in English and French. With regard to the public distribution of a summary of the brochure *The Tender Fruit Industry in Canada*, the Commissioner reminded the Department that if it provided French-speakers with an abridgement in French rather than a text equivalent to the English-language publication, it would not be meeting the statutory requirement of equal rights and privileges for the two official languages.

The Commissioner told the Department it had taken the easy way out by maintaining that there was no public demand for the *Prairie Regional Studies* series in French. To comply with the spirit of the Official Languages Act, the Department, like other federal institutions, had to create bilingual services, publicize them and offer them to the public. In this context, the supply in effect creates the demand.

Wishing to conform to the spirit and the letter of the Official Languages Act, the Department informed the Commissioner that:

- 1) The brochure *Selected Agricultural Statistics for Canada* had been revised and published in English and French. The 1975 edition would also be bilingual.
- 2) The third printing of *The Tender Fruit Industry in Canada* was available in English and French.

With regard to the *Prairie Regional Studies* series, the Department stressed that the publications dated back to 1966 and were designed to serve as references for work involving specific regions. They were now out of date.

The Department added that in future, it intended to proceed on the principle that unless there were indications to the contrary, it should be presumed that a demand existed.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1582	Ottawa	Language requirements for position of veterinarian at managerial level	Not justified
2099	Ottawa	Street signs are in English only at the Experimental Farm.	Rectified
2120	Montreal	Unilingual English document used to identify inspected merchandise in CN railway cars.	Rectified
2122	Montreal	English reply to a French-speaking correspondent.	Rectified
2153	Ottawa	Lack of representation of French-speaking element among the Veterinary Services.	Explanation offered
2849	Ottawa	The wife of a civil servant claims that her husband's chances for promotion are curtailed because he cannot learn French.	Withdrawn
2859	Ottawa	Language requirements for a position altered after competition announced without corresponding change of closing date.	Rectified
2917	Ottawa	Unilingual English poster displayed in federal building.	Rectified
2927	Ottawa	A bilingual employee claims he is not being promoted because he is the only one in his section that can offer services in French.	Not justified

AIR CANADA—"Come Fly With Me, Come Fly, Come Fly"

EVALUATION

Air Canada has at last taken off for the fun-filled land of official languages, while keeping its corporate safety belt, of course, prudently buckled. Although "getting there is half the fun", members of the public are still flown there, contrary to their linguistic preference, far too often in English, and not nearly enough in French.

In general, Air Canada does not yet offer, except in a hit-and-miss way, its services in both official languages; travellers continue to complain about the absence of person-to-person service in their preferred official language, on the ground and in the air. A large majority of the 101 complaints received during the period under review touch upon unilingual announcements at airports and on flights, and on the absence of service in French at Air Canada ticket counters in different cities. Air Canada tried to explain these complaints by invoking budgetary limits, operational and other constraints posed by collective agreements, staff forgetting to offer service in the second official language, and so on.

In spite of these sombre realities, Air Canada has begun to gear up for reform. Some changes affect bilingual signs, notice boards, printed materials, a variety of language training courses and a few retention programmes, recruiting of bilingual as well as unilingual staff, and in-flight manuals with instructions on bilingualism. A mixed approach of man and machine (tape recordings) for ground announcements was introduced in late February 1975 at a number of airports.

In its efforts toward acquiring suitable staff for providing service to the public, Air Canada has also made progress: out of a thousand flight attendants hired between the fall of 1973 and the spring of 1974, 530 are bilingual; the airline expects that of new recruits hired between the fall of 1974 and the spring of 1975, 80 per cent will be bilingual. Last, but not least, Air Canada states that it expects to have at least one bilingual attendant on all flights by the summer of 1975. This long-overdue assurance, while welcome, still falls unacceptably short of guaranteeing French-speaking passengers (especially in the multi-cabin aircraft making up most of the company's fleet) the same automatic service in their language that English-speaking passengers expect, and get, on virtually all flights.

As further evidence of its commitment to bilingualism, Air Canada (as recently as February 19, 1975) advanced the following: even though "airlines around the world are being buffeted by soaring costs—particularly for fuel," and in spite of the airline's loss in 1974 "of something in the order of \$9 million," the airline "budgeted approximately \$950,500 for the direct cause of developing institutional bilingualism. Efforts were accelerated during the course of the year and expenditures actually came in at about \$1,108,000. Excluded in these amounts are the 'hidden costs' of doing business in the two languages. For 1975, expenditures are budgeted at about the same level, or well over \$1,000,000." One trusts that such an impressive investment will lead to results less hidden than certain costs.

The company cites employees' lack of co-operation and motivation, and resistance (notwithstanding its efforts to inform employees—see evidence below) as the primary factors responsible for slow progress in implementing several of our special studies and complaints recommendations, particularly those concerning system-wide provision of services automatically in both official languages. As for such allegations that employees could be thwarting Air Canada's efforts to fly faster bilingually, one suspects that if this were indeed true (and nothing proves it is), the fault might lie rather with timid and unimaginative leadership by management. The latter's more open and regular consultations with unions in recent months leave hope that a happier mood for linguistic reform may be developing, with long-term results that should make such discouraging assessments as this one unnecessary.

Air Canada claims that its corporate policy and guidelines recognize that "demand for bilingual service exists at all stations served" by the airline, but the nature of the large majority of the complaints shows that this corporate promise is far from finding full expression—at ticket office and airport counters, and on flights. Somewhere between the corporate policy and the front lines of operations, there seems to be a stumbling block. Even if that is due to the decentralized nature of management, ultimately the headquarters alone is accountable to Parliament.

Ottawa Study

The Commissioner made four recommendations to Air Canada as a result of this study in 1970. These recommendations covered the bilingual appearance of premises and publicity, bilingual flight announcements, and the provision of service in both official languages at Air Canada airport counters and ticket offices in the Ottawa region. Air Canada reported in June 1973 that it considered all four recommendations implemented. A follow-up tour of Canadian airports in October 1973 confirmed that signs at Ottawa International Airport were bilingual, but announcements were not always made in both official languages. As a result of the staff collective agreement made in December 1973, Air Canada now has personnel available to make flight announcements in both official languages.

Despite Air Canada's belief that all four recommendations were implemented, complaints were received relating to lack of service automatically in both official languages at both the Ottawa ticket office and the Ottawa International Airport, and the display of a unilingual notice at the latter.

London and Paris Airports Study

Few recommendations were made as a result of a 1972 study of Air Canada's compliance with the Official Languages Act at airports in London and Paris and, by November 1974, few were fully implemented. With regard to the two recommendations concerning visual aspects of bilingualism, the corporation reported that Air Canada signs and inscriptions at both airports were bilingual and that directives from headquarters regulated their approach to the implementation of the second recommendation that, by June 1972, printed matter emanating from Air Canada or other Canadian federal institutions be displayed in both official languages.

Air Canada stated that service to the public in both official languages at all public contact stations at Heathrow airport was available on request. Unless service is provided automatically in both official languages, equality of status of both languages cannot be respected. Although an additional ten Air Canada employees at Heathrow received language training in 1974, the linguistic competence of agents remained undetermined.

Telephone identification and listings in both official languages still poses problems for Air Canada. The corporation instructed employees to greet callers in both official languages, but as local clients complained, this practice was discontinued. Air Canada requested telephone listings in both French and English in Paris and London directories; such listings will appear in the next edition of the Paris telephone directory, but the corporation stated that it had been unable, so far, to obtain approval for bilingual listings in London.

Headquarters Study

This Office made 34 recommendations to Air Canada in May 1972 resulting from a study of the corporation's systemwide implementation of its bilingual programme. Air Canada cited employees' lack of cooperation and motivation as the primary factors responsible for slow progress in implementing several of the Commissioner's recommendations, particularly those involving systemwide provision of services automatically in both official languages. The corporation made attempts to comply with the recommendation that every effort be made to develop attitudes and create an environment conducive to Air Canada's full compliance with the Official Languages Act. To this end, meetings with airline unions were held, language courses were provided, basic training courses and special courses for "incharge" flight personnel stressed employees' obligations under the Act. In addition, the internal newsletter *Horizon*

published a synopsis of the corporation's bilingual policy, guidelines for its implementation, and other related articles and information to stimulate employee cooperation. Air Canada stated that, a great deal of resistance seemed to thwart corporation plans and procedures for implementing our recommendations. Full implementation of all recommendations will depend, to a large extent, on Air Canada management's ability to instill a more positive attitude in its employees.

Though Air Canada reported that it had large numbers of bilingual staff, deployment of personnel did not result in systemwide availability and provision of service to the public in both official languages, nor did bilingual employees offer service to the public automatically in English and French. Air Canada identified bilingual positions at each base and office for almost all staff categories, although the language competence of some categories remained unknown. No specific inducements were offered to bilingual employees to transfer to locations where a capacity in both official languages was required, nor has Air Canada arrived at a system for ensuring that flights have the necessary bilingual capacity to serve the public in both languages. Air Canada obtained union agreement to have 100% bilingual coverage on internal Quebec flights, and at least one bilingual attendant on all domestic flights and on several international services originating, transiting or terminating in Montreal and Ottawa; a bilingual capacity on all such flights was not, however, always provided. Air Canada stated that it expected to have at least one bilingual attendant on all its flights by summer 1975. This "at-least-one" standard does not seem to be the solution; complaints show that, in spite of all efforts, in-flight complements frequently turn out to be totally unilingual, invariably English. Also, one bilingual flight attendant can face delightful difficulties trying to be in two or three sections of the aircraft at the same time.

Air Canada has made progress in its recruitment of bilingual staff and maintained that it had experienced no difficulties. Between Fall 1973 and Spring 1974, 530 out of a thousand flight attendants hired were bilingual and Air Canada expected 80% of the new recruits hired between Fall 1974 and Spring 1975 to be bilingual. The corporation made efforts to recruit bilingual staff in English-speaking Canada, and showed foresight in introducing a pilot project in British Columbia to encourage students to learn French prior to seeking employment with Air Canada. The corporation did not intend to intensify recruitment of bilinguals from Quebec which has the largest supply "without sacrificing its obligation to provide employment opportunities for Canadians from all regions of the country".

Air Canada was slow in responding to recommendations concerning language training but has now introduced a variety of courses for different categories of personnel. The corporation has not yet tested all

self-assessed bilingual employees but plans to do so over the next three years. By 1976, information on language competence will be placed in its Personnel Information System. The corporation also established language retention programmes in a few locations and intends to have them in other locations throughout Canada during 1975.

With regard to the more visual aspects of bilingualism, this Office recommended that, by November 1972, all public use forms be rendered bilingual; Air Canada reported that this would be completed in 1975. At all locations in Canada the target date for rendering signs bilingual was March 1973; as of November 1974, a few signs remained unilingual as did a few rubber stamps and calling cards. Air Canada reported that "published invitations to tender are now bilingual and all subsequent documentation is processed bilingually", and that all public relations material is published in both official languages. The corporation stated that advertising and promotional material is produced in the language of the market to which it is addressed.

Air Canada reported progress in the field of translation, with permanent translators based in various Canadian locations; it is not certain, however, whether staff members who are not trained translators continue to undertake translation over and above their normal duties.

Recommendations covering public-contact aspects of bilingualism needed much more attention. Air Canada's monitoring system revealed that airport announcements were made in both languages when airports were adequately staffed with bilinguals, and that in-flight announcements were consistently made in both languages. Follow-up visits by my colleagues in November/December 1974 and evidence in the form of complaints, pointed to the contrary. Indeed, owing to the large volume of complaints in this area, in June 1974 we recommended the use of recorded bilingual announcements. Air Canada accepted this practice for Western region where a shortage of bilinguals existed, and on certain types of aircraft. (For more details on this recommendation see summary below.)

Air Canada experienced difficulty in implementing the recommendation relating to telephone identification and information; although the company instructed employees to answer the telephone in both languages, it could not guarantee that they would do so. Rather than teach unilingual employees phrases in a second language enabling them to transfer calls to agents with the second language capability, Air Canada preferred to send the maximum number of employees on language training; the corporation believed this method would also develop a more positive and co-operative attitude towards bilingualism. Although Air Canada finds this alternative method more satisfactory, the fact

remains that members of the public are still experiencing difficulties in obtaining telephone services in both official languages in a number of locations.

Moncton Study

Our *Third Annual Report* indicated that by September 1973 Air Canada had implemented eleven of the seventeen recommendations made as a result of the 1972 Moncton study. By November 1974, the corporation had implemented two more recommendations relating to the provision of signs, notices, badges, etc., in both official languages, and the encouragement of public-contact staff to take second-language training.

Two recommendations dealing with service to the public require further attention. Air Canada considered implemented the recommendation that staff at Moncton District Office initiate contact spontaneously with clients in both official languages. Where a client's name is known, it is used as a basis for language of service; this has not, in the past, proved a fool-proof method for determining a client's preferred official language. Service to the public in both official languages in Air Freight was recommended, but Air Freight had only one bilingual clerk out of four clerks. Air Canada expected to implement this recommendation during 1975.

The two remaining recommendations relate to telephone contact with the public; progress towards implementation reflected the stand taken by Air Canada Headquarters vis-à-vis this subject (as described previously in this section).

COMPLAINTS

File Nos. 1607, 2023—Albert Street Office in Ottawa

A French-speaking person informed the Commissioner that an employee at Air Canada's Albert Street office in Ottawa had called out only in English the numbers which determined the order in which clients were served. Some time later, another French-speaker made an identical complaint.

Concerning the first complaint (File No. 1607), Air Canada told the Commissioner that eight of the eighteen employees in the Albert Street office who had contacts with the public were bilingual and called out the numbers in English and French; the corporation asked the unilingual employees to do the same, and supplied cards indicating the

correct phonetic pronunciation of French numbers. Unfortunately, the results were disappointing because the unilingual English employees were afraid passengers would think that they were bilingual. The corporation had therefore given a bilingual hostess the job of repeating the numbers in French during rush hours. The corporation added that a recent union agreement had established that 15 bilingual employees were required at this office, and said that this objective would be reached in two or three years.

The Commissioner replied that giving the bilingual hostess the job of repeating the numbers in French during rush hours only was not sufficient since another complaint (File No. 2023) had been registered concerning this matter. He therefore recommended that the necessary steps be taken to ensure that, at all times, at least one employee was available to repeat the numbers in acceptable French. In addition, the Commissioner urged Air Canada to try to attain its goal of having 15 bilingual employees at this office within a shorter period of time than anticipated.

Air Canada replied that an additional bilingual employee had been added to the Albert Street office since 18 April 1973 and that it intended to increase the number of bilingual employees regularly through recruitment, transfers and language training. With respect to the Commissioner's recommendation, the corporation stated that, as of 1 October 1973, a bilingual hostess would be stationed near the entrance in the Albert Street office during business hours. Her job would be to guide customers to counter employees able to serve them in the official language of their choice. The corporation added that a similar arrangement had already been put into effect at its Montreal office and that the results had been excellent.

The Commissioner was satisfied with the action taken by Air Canada and closed the files.

File Nos. 1622¹, 2070, 2182, 2199, 2366, 2383, 2409, 2462—Sudbury

The Commissioner received numerous complaints about lack of bilingual services on flights between Toronto and Sudbury, about the availability of newspapers and magazines in the French language on such flights and about reservation and counter service at Sudbury.

With regard to in-flight services, Air Canada recognized that these should be available in both official languages whenever possible. The corporation maintained, however, that it could not deploy personnel as it wished due to union seniority and priority rights. However, it had negotiated the right to assign at least one bilingual person to each flight crew.

1. The Commissioner made recommendations in relation to File No. 1622.

Company policy was that flight announcements be made in both official languages when bilingual staff was available. It was also experimenting with the use of taped announcements on its 747 flights and hoped eventually to introduce pre-recorded announcements on other types of aircraft. (In June 1974, the Commissioner made several recommendations in this regard [see page 80].)

With respect to the availability of reading material in French, the company replied that flights were provided with newspapers from the point of origin of the flight. Since no French daily newspaper was published in Toronto or Sudbury there were only English-language newspapers on board. Concerning magazines, both French- and English-language ones were placed on all flights, but in varying quantities according to the estimated readership. However, it sometimes happened that passengers inadvertently took magazines with them when they left the plane; according to the company, this might account on occasion for a lack of reading material in French.

With regard to bilingual reservation and counter service, Air Canada replied that although no permanent personnel at the city ticket office was bilingual, several employees at the reservation office were, and two others were taking language training. It stated that normally one of the bilingual reservation agents relieved one of the ticket office staff when necessary.

The Commissioner expressed considerable dissatisfaction with Air Canada's reply. He pointed out that although the corporation claimed to have bilingual personnel at its reservation office in Sudbury, none had been on hand when the complainant telephoned, according to the corporation's own admission. He stated that in a city whose French-speaking population numbered 63,800—more than a third of the grand total, according to the 1971 Census—it was really inexcusable that French-language service was not automatically available. Consequently, he recommended that:

- 1) at Air Canada's city ticket office in Sudbury service be offered in both official languages at all times; and
- 2) at Air Canada's telephone reservation office in Sudbury service be offered in both official languages at all times.

The Chairman of the Board of Air Canada replied to the Commissioner's recommendations. He explained that personnel at the city ticket office were members of the union (CALEA¹) and, in accordance with binding union agreements, could not be transferred solely for language reasons. Since Air Canada believed that the volume of business did not warrant hiring additional personnel, the only immediate

1. Canadian Air Line Employees' Association.

solution appeared to be to provide adequate language training. However experience had shown that it required approximately five hundred hours of courses to provide persons having only a very elementary knowledge of French with a sufficient knowledge of the language to be of use to them in their work. The corporation stated that it intended to insist, in future negotiations, that it should be allowed to meet the requirements of the Official Languages Act whenever personnel were in public-contact positions.

In the meantime, the solution put into effect by the director at Sudbury—that of offering the services of bilingual employees at the reservation office or at the airport as required—seemed the most logical. Moreover, as a result of internal committee recommendations, the deployment of personnel at the reservations office had been changed with a view to ensuring the presence of one bilingual employee on every shift, both day and night. In conclusion, the Commissioner's first recommendation was subject to the success of negotiations with the union and the second had already been put into effect.

The Commissioner, in turn, advised the Board Chairman he was pleased to learn that his second recommendation had already been implemented, and that he hoped the negotiations with the union would result in Air Canada's being able to provide service to the public in both official languages at all times.

The Commissioner informed the complainants that he deplored the fact that occurrences of the type they described were still common. He told them that over the past four years he had made well over fifty recommendations to Air Canada concerning the provision of bilingual services. He did not doubt that the situation was slowly improving, though, in his view, far too slowly. He assured them that he would continue to press hard until bilingual services were available throughout Air Canada's network.

File No. 1930—Regrets, Apologies and Deep Sorrow

A French-speaking person from Ottawa wrote to the Commissioner concerning a series of complaints against Air Canada and sent a copy of the letter to the president of the corporation. He alleged that:

- 1) On a trip he made to Haiti the information clerk at Miami International Airport where he had to change planes could speak no French, nor could any of the other ground personnel.
- 2) On a second trip, this time to Cuba, the information clerk at Toronto International Airport could not speak French nor could any of the flight crew. All communications and announcements were in English only. This was all the more irritating as the crew on the return trip from Cuba were properly bilingual.

3) The Ottawa office of Air Canada had only some bilingual personnel, with the result that a French-speaking client must wait an unduly long time to be served or consent to be served in English.

4) All the direction and information signs at Toronto International Airport were in English only.

Air Canada sent the Commissioner a copy of the letter it had addressed direct to the complainant. The letter contained the corporation's "regrets" five times, its "apologies" three times and its deep "sorrow" once.

At Miami Airport there had been three bilingual passenger agents on day-shift and one on night-shift, and the two supervisors also spoke French.

At Toronto International Airport approximately 15% of the passenger agents were bilingual and the complainant should have received assistance in French.

It was true that the charter flight to Havana had only English-speaking crew on board.

At the Ottawa office there was bilingual staff available at all times and a bilingual hostess-receptionist at peak hours, but it was true that more bilingual personnel was required. However, union contracts concerning recruiting and hiring were binding and negotiations were taking place at that time with the union to improve bilingual capacity.

With regard to the signs at Toronto International Airport, the corporation was awaiting delivery of bilingual ones.

The Commissioner advised the complainant that he had exerted, and would continue to exert, pressure on Air Canada to improve its service in both official languages, and had already made formal recommendation to the corporation concerning the signs at Toronto International Airport, the service at the Ottawa office, the in-flight personnel, and even the service at Miami International Airport. He added that he had met with senior management personnel on several occasions with a view to finding more efficient ways of implementing the requirements of the Official Languages Act in the corporation's operations.

File No. 2052—Unilingual Advertisement

A parent from Ottawa sent the Commissioner a unilingual advertisement prepared by Air Canada and Canadian National, which was included in material sent to secondary school students in an envelope marked "Mailbag".

Air Canada informed the Commissioner that the advertisement had been published by the Youth Travel Club of Canada whose head office was located in Toronto. This agency's only connection with Air

Canada was the permission given it by the company to sell its Youth Plan card. Air Canada further stated that all revenue from the sale of these cards went to the Club. The Air Canada and CN advertising consisted of a promotional folder and a blank application for membership in the plan. These two items, available at sales counters, were printed in English on one side and French on the other.

The Commissioner recommended that steps be taken to ensure that all printed material sponsored by Air Canada and distributed by it or by any other organization was made available to the public in the official language of its choice.

The Marketing Branch agreed to produce in both official languages all informational material distributed direct to the public by Air Canada or by third parties.

File No. 2265—Jamaica

A French-speaking person stated that he was unable to receive service in French at the Air Canada kiosk and counter at the airport in Kingston, Jamaica. Furthermore, the flight schedule at the counter was in English only.

Air Canada replied that it was true that it had no bilingual passenger agents at the Kingston airport, although two employees knew some French and seemed to be able to manage when the need arose. Furthermore, the Jamaican Government required the hiring of nationals, who were mostly English-speaking, and opposed the transfer of Canadian employees to Jamaica. The Corporation could therefore not assure the Commissioner that there would be noticeable improvement in this regard. However, it would try to make the flight schedule bilingual in the near future.

While recognizing that Air Canada was obliged to recruit its employees mostly from among the Jamaican population, the Commissioner believed that this was not an insurmountable obstacle to institutional bilingualism, even if this meant providing these employees with the language training necessary to perform their duties. The Commissioner also expressed the wish that signs be bilingual as soon as possible.

He therefore recommended that:

- 1) Air Canada signs and notices in Kingston, Jamaica, be completely bilingual by 31 March 1974;
- 2) all printed matter (folders, tags, schedules and so on) be available in both official languages in Kingston, Jamaica, and that they be bilingual by 31 March 1974;

3) Air Canada take immediate steps to provide the travelling public with service in both official languages at all times and at all service outlets in Kingston, Jamaica.

In March 1974, Air Canada replied that:

- 1) all notices and signs belonging to Air Canada in airports and sales offices in the Southern Region, including Kingston airport, were now bilingual;
- 2) all information material was available in both official languages in the Southern Region;
- 3) from September until the end of November 1974, each district would send a number of employees, chosen from among volunteers, to intensive French courses it was giving in Quebec.

The Corporation believed that by the end of 1974 it would be able to serve its customers in the Southern Region in both official languages.

File No. 2275—Security Guards at Dorval

A French-speaker complained that at Montreal International Airport two security guards checking for weapons could not understand French, although the flight in question was for Quebec City. She found such a situation unacceptable.

Air Canada informed the Commissioner that it hired security guards through the Securex agency to examine passengers at various checkpoints in the terminal. The contract between Air Canada and the agency stipulated that at least 80 per cent of the guards hired must be bilingual and that this proportion must always be maintained in forming teams of four to six guards at each checkpoint. Air Canada apologized to the complainant for her unfortunate experience and explained that this had been an exceptional case.

After noting the high percentage of bilingual guards that had to be hired by the Securex agency under the terms of its agreement with Air Canada, the Commissioner recommended that the Crown corporation ensure that the requirement regarding the percentage of bilingual employees be complied with and that unilingual guards learn key phrases such as: "One moment, please" or "Un instant, s'il vous plaît", as the case might be, and ask for assistance from a fellow worker able to speak the customer's language. The complainant, not satisfied with the reply she received, considered the hiring of unilingual English-speaking guards at Montreal International Airport objectionable. In her opinion such a policy did not do justice to the population of Montreal and of Quebec as a whole, most of which is French-speaking. The com-

plainant asked what criterion established the proportion of bilingual guards used in Montreal at 80 per cent, and the proportion of bilingual and unilingual guards employed by security agencies at the Montreal, Toronto, Quebec City and Ottawa airports.

Air Canada sent the Commissioner the following table:

SECURITY GUARDS

	Total number	Bilingual	Unilingual English-speaking	Unilingual French-speaking
Montreal.....	45	100%	0%	0%
Toronto.....	90	30%	70%	0%
Quebec City.....	5	60%	0%	40%
Ottawa.....	38	50%	50%	0%

It also pointed out that a number of English-speaking guards at Toronto spoke other languages, such as Polish and Italian.

The corporation replied that it had not relied on any particular criterion in determining that only 80% of the security guards seemed equitable. In fact, the table showed that this percentage has seemed equitable. In fact, the table submitted showed that this percentage has now reached 100%.

Air Canada added that it would see that the Securex agency implemented the Commissioner's recommendation.

File No. 2310—Terminal 2 in Toronto

The complainant was unable to obtain service in French at one of the Air Canada counters in Terminal 2 in Toronto.

Air Canada apologized for the mistake. It explained that it was facing serious difficulties in deploying its bilingual personnel but expected to be able to improve its service.

The Commissioner recommended that the corporation deploy its staff so as to ensure immediate round-the-clock service in the two official languages at Terminal 2 in Toronto.

Air Canada replied that 45 out of 221 agents working at Terminal 2 in Toronto were bilingual (six more than the minimum set out in the union agreement), and that it still had to test the language abilities of about thirty newly assigned employees. In addition, six unilingual passenger agents were to take an intensive French course in Jonquière, Quebec, from 12 May to 7 June 1974; and from September to

December 1974 about thirty of their colleagues would also have the opportunity of taking the course. Moreover, beginning in the autumn (1974), French courses were to be given at the Terminal itself to all employees at the starting or intermediate level. The corporation was also attempting to work out a retention programme for those who already met the language requirements of their position but who wished to perfect their fluency.

The Commissioner hoped that this language training would make it possible to provide service in both official languages in all positions.

File No. 2467—"I don't speak French"

A French-speaker passing through Terminal 2 at Toronto International Airport asked the person at the information kiosk a question in French. She received the reply "I don't speak French" and the employee turned his back on her.

Air Canada told the Commissioner that it had approximately fifty bilingual employees in Terminal 2. However, because of shift work, holidays and sickness, there were in practice only about nine on duty at any given moment and they were dispersed over a wide area. The airline also said it was trying to negotiate a change in its collective agreement so that it could increase the number of bilingual personnel.

Air Canada had its managers at Toronto remind employees of their obligations under the Official Languages Act and offered its apologies to the complainant for the lack of courtesy shown her.

The Commissioner pointed out that a person wanting information would naturally go to the information kiosk and expect to be answered in the official language of his or her choice. The failure to provide bilingual service at this information kiosk was a breach of the Official Languages Act. The Commissioner recommended, therefore, that the regional customer relations manager should be given clear instructions about providing bilingual service at the information kiosk. He asked to be sent a copy of these instructions.

The Commissioner eventually received a copy of the instructions, which he felt were rather vague. On making further enquiries, he was told that early in 1975 Air Canada would have an interpretation service capable of handling French and foreign languages commonly spoken by passengers using its Toronto facilities.

File No. 2469—Toronto Airport

A French-speaking person complained to the Commissioner that she had been obliged to act as interpreter at Toronto International Airport to help a young couple from France communicate with Air Canada

staff. She alleged that the Air Canada employees had refused to send for a bilingual colleague. She also asked why it was that flights to Montreal were announced in English only, while flights to Frankfurt were announced in German and flights to Rome in Italian.

Air Canada told the Commissioner that the incident had occurred too long ago for it to trace the individuals concerned. (The complainant did not in fact report the incident to the Commissioner until a month after it happened.) The airline said it had reminded its staff at Toronto of their obligations under the Official Languages Act and it offered its apologies to the complainant.

As for the announcements in German and Italian, it explained that these were intended to help passengers who did not understand either French or English. They were made by crew members.

Finally, Air Canada told the Commissioner that it was preparing recorded announcements which it hoped would help to solve the language problem. They would first be used for flights to Toronto and Ottawa. The corporation intended to make extensive use of the system, but this was a long-term project. However, it could not give a date for the implementation of the first phase because of technical problems that had arisen.

The Commissioner told Air Canada that he thought it strange, to say the least, that an organization which depended for its existence on advanced technology should be unable to set a timetable for introducing recorded announcements. He therefore made a formal recommendation that Air Canada should solve once and for all the problem of announcements in French at Toronto International Airport. He set 1 March 1974 as the date by which this should be done.

Air Canada replied early in March that all its flight announcements at Toronto International Airport were being made in both official languages.

File No. 2509—NorOntair

The complainant reported to the Air Canada ticket counter in Sudbury to catch a flight to Sault Ste. Marie. None of the agents at the counter spoke French, and public announcements at the airport were made only in English. On another occasion, when he took the Sudbury-Toronto flight, he again found that service in French was not available at the ticket counter. In addition, there were no French magazines or newspapers on board the aircraft.

Air Canada informed the Commissioner that NorOntair handled the flight from Sudbury to Sault Ste. Marie. Air Canada personnel, however, looked after NorOntair passengers on the ground. At departure

time for the Sault Ste. Marie flight there were two bilingual boarding officers on duty. However, NorOntair had not requested that its flight departure announcements be made in French.

None of the cabin crew on the particular Toronto flight was bilingual. Air Canada obtained a supply of newspapers at stops along the way and since no French daily was published in Sudbury, no French newspapers were put on board aircraft taking off from that airport. Nevertheless, there should have been some French magazines. Air Canada forwarded this complaint to the service concerned.

Having previously made recommendations concerning the availability of bilingual service at ticket counters and of magazines in both languages in sufficient number during flights, the Commissioner reminded the Corporation of its obligations and recommended that it take the necessary steps to ensure service in the two official languages to the NorOntair passengers whom it served on the ground.

Air Canada replied that the necessary steps had been taken, by means of recordings, to have NorOntair announcements at the Sudbury airport made in both official languages. Should additional announcements be necessary, the passenger agents had been instructed to make them in both English and French.

File No. 2514—With Very Few Exceptions

During a trip across Canada a French-speaking person found that he was unable to obtain service in French from Air Canada personnel at the Ottawa airport, the Toronto airport, on the plane between Toronto and Vancouver, at the Calgary airport, at the Vancouver airport (from the baggage clerk and at the ticket and information counters), at the Regina airport, at the Winnipeg airport, on a Toronto-London-Toronto flight, at the London airport, at the Halifax airport and on a flight from Quebec City to Ottawa.

Air Canada replied that service in French was available on request with very few exceptions. It added that it was organizing French courses for its present employees and making an effort to recruit bilingual personnel as far as possible. It had already exceeded its objectives in several cities.

The Commissioner replied that Air Canada's explanations were not acceptable. He told the complainant that he had on numerous occasions emphasized to Air Canada the need to *provide* service in both official languages rather than merely ensuring that it was available "on request". He reminded the corporation that if a client addressed one of its employees in French, this constituted a "request" for service in French. If he could not himself answer that client in French, the employee should then call upon a bilingual colleague. It was essential that the corporation

plan to make systematic checks on the linguistic quality of its services so that it could take any corrective action necessary. The Commissioner told Air Canada that he had trouble understanding, for example, why the complainant had been unable to obtain service in French at the Ottawa airport when there were eight bilingual employees on duty. The Commissioner also pointed out that there was no mention in Section 10 of the Official Languages Act of "local demand" and that the requirements of the Act with respect to passenger service went far beyond the concept of bilingual districts.

The Commissioner sent the complainant a copy of the reply he had received from the corporation and said that he regretted that incidents of this nature continued to occur despite the numerous recommendations he had made to the corporation.

File No. 2870—Dial Another Number

One evening, a French-speaking person dialled the number for Air Canada reservations in Sudbury. A recording in English invited him to dial another number where recorded information was communicated in English only.

The company explained that after office hours, the number for reservations in Sudbury was connected with an automatic bilingual recording. However, since the telephone message was given in English first, it was possible for a person to hang up too quickly and miss the French version.

According to Air Canada, recordings were usually made in both languages. However, it sometimes happened that the company was unable to record the message in French because no bilingual employee was available for this purpose; it apologized to the complainant. The company indicated, in passing, that the number of bilingual agents employed in Sudbury had increased markedly since the end of 1973.

The Commissioner recommended that Air Canada indicate at the beginning of its recorded messages that the recording was bilingual, by using a sentence such as "This is a bilingual announcement (or recording). Ceci est un enregistrement bilingue".

The company replied that it would not adopt the recommendation for the following reasons:

- (1) recorded messages were not necessarily heard by the client from the beginning of the recording;
- (2) the length of the messages was limited, and their content had to be continually monitored. To preface them by the suggested comment would aggravate this problem.

Air Canada pointed out that it always endeavoured to address the public in both official languages and that it saw no need to specify its intention at the beginning of the recording.

The Commissioner did not accept this explanation and informed the complainant that he would mention the company's unfavourable response in his report.

File No. 3156—Unilingual Inscription

A French-speaking resident of Aylmer, Quebec, sent the Commissioner a reply envelope which had come from Air Canada's Winnipeg office. The envelope bore the unilingual inscription: *Credit Card Bureau*.

As the Commissioner had brought similar complaints to the attention of Air Canada in April 1973 and June 1974, he recommended that the company make an exhaustive survey of all printed material intended for public view (letterheads, envelopes carrying a return address, reply envelopes, reply cards, bills, circulars, advertising folders and so forth), weed out all items which did not conform to the provisions of the Official Languages Act and ensure that they were produced in a bilingual format at the earliest date possible.

Air Canada informed the Commissioner that some time ago it had developed a method of systematically inspecting all its forms for the purpose of ensuring that they were available in both official languages or arranging to have them translated; priority would be given to documents seen or used by the public. It added that the majority of its forms, envelopes, bills and so forth were already bilingual and that it expected to complete by June 1975 the translation of those which were still unilingual.

With regard to the envelope which was the subject of the complaint, Air Canada assured the Commissioner that action would be taken to make the necessary corrections.

File Nos. 162-52/A5—"People who need people. . ."

Since 1970, the beginning of the Commissioner's office, numerous complaints against Air Canada have been received and dealt with. Two types of complaint keep recurring. These complaints concern, firstly, the absence of announcements in French on many flights and at airports, and secondly, service in French on flights. In the latter case, it was clear from complaints, that service, instead of being actively offered in French, was often provided only on request, if indeed it was available at all.

Having reviewed this situation on 7 February 1974 with company officials, and with their agreement, but not directly as a reaction to any particular complaint, the Commissioner made the following recommen-

dations in a spirit of "preventive medicine" to help Air Canada meet some of the longstanding requirements of the Official Languages Act. He recommended that:

1) At all airports in Canada and abroad, where it is not already the case, Air Canada use cassette recordings for departure, arrival and other announcements of public interest; precedence should be given to French in Quebec and in areas where the first language is French, and to English elsewhere, except for Ottawa where some reasonable variation might be devised to reflect the special symbolic character of the National Capital Region;

2) Air Canada extend the use of cassette announcements to all flights. This would cover the situation when at the last moment it is found that flight attendants are all unilinguals. Cassette announcements, in English and French, available to all flights, may be a relatively fool-proof way to help Air Canada meet its system-wide obligations in Canada and abroad;

3) As a complement to Recommendation 2, Air Canada

a) prepare cassette announcements to cover as many as possible situations which can arise during a flight;

b) initiate and bring about, on all aircraft, by October 31, 1974, technical changes, if necessary, to facilitate the installation of cassette equipment or to find ways of hooking up cassettes with in-flight public address systems;

c) have these cassettes in a place readily accessible to flight attendants;

d) train flight attendants how to use the cassettes, under normal conditions, and as far as safety permits, under emergency conditions; and

e) have necessary operating instructions clearly spelled out in the in-flight manual under the heading of in-flight duties;

4) Air Canada use a decal explanation under chair tables inviting passengers to indicate their preferred language of service by adjusting a pin-card on the back of their seats. These cards would indicate to flight attendants the preferred official language in which passengers wish to be served;

5) Air Canada should also make flight attendants more systematically aware, through training, directives and supervision, of their duty to offer service actively in both official languages at all times on all flights;

6) Air Canada try out the fourth recommendation above as an experiment on one or two aircraft for at least two or three months and keep the Commissioner advised of the benefits and/or difficulties in using such a device.

On 13 November 1974, Air Canada sent its reply to the above recommendations; and on 29 November 1974, two of the company representatives discussed them with the Commissioner. The following is the essence of the airline's action concerning these recommendations.

Recommendation 1 (Ground Announcements)

Air Canada's Western Region accepted the use of cassette recordings in all airports, while giving equal priority to increasing its bilingual public-contact staff. Accordingly, recorders had been ordered and tapes were being prepared for all airports in that region. On 13 November 1974, the company reported that Vancouver was "on-line" for the "majority of its airport announcements;" and it added, Winnipeg, Calgary and Edmonton would be ready at the beginning of December (1974); Victoria, Saskatoon, Regina and Thunder Bay by year end (1974).

On 26 February 1975 the company added that Winnipeg was in full operation, Vancouver and Calgary were nearly fully operative, and Edmonton was in full operation as of that day. But Thunder Bay has recently switched its location (in Air Canada's System map) from the Western region to Central region. This change has affected the schedule of implementing this recommendation there. The company stated, as soon as the necessary equipment was received, this station would also be "on-line".

A similar mix of the man and machine approach was being taken, as reported by the company on 13 November 1974, by the Central Region. Air Canada informed the Commissioner that Toronto's Terminal 2 would make use of a centrally located public address unit staffed with bilingual and multilingual personnel. The plans were that bilingual announcements would be requested by the counter or gate passenger agent either through a modified "ready-to-board" communication system or through the Reserve II CRT System. Later, this central unit will be combined with a bilingual courtesy-phone paging service. "Barring unforeseen problems", stated Air Canada, "the unit should be on-line by January 1975."

The company informed the Office of the Commissioner on 26 February 1975 that "the machineries will be installed and in operation within the next six weeks." It also added that Toronto Reservations will have, by 1 April 1975, a separate telephone number for departure and arrival announcements in Toronto.

Air Canada chose "man and machine" because of its "only-when-necessary" approach to recorded announcements: passenger agents who are qualified to make bilingual announcements themselves need not use

the recordings. Air Canada believes this preserves and encourages human, rather than mechanical contact with the customer in the official language of his or her choice. Further, "as bilingual staff level increases through intensified recruitment and language training, the system can be abandoned without loss of a large capital investment."

Air Canada assured the Commissioner further that an approach (mix of man and machine) similar to the above would be attempted at other major airports in the Central and Southern regions. Discussions and meetings for this purpose were to have had taken place between mid-November and end of December 1974. The company reported in mid-November that emphasis had been placed on recruitment and training.

Air Canada indicated in late February, that such discussions were held; and London, Windsor, North Bay, Sudbury, Timmins and Sault Ste Marie, received the green light to go ahead with the mix of man and machine approach; decisions concerning the Southern region will be made "within the next few months."

Recommendation 2 (Use of cassette announcements on all flights)

The company informed the Commissioner that automated taped announcements had been installed in all B-747 aircrafts and in the new B-727-200 aircrafts then being delivered to the airline (November 1974). The airline was not ready to implement this Recommendation on L-1011, DC-8 and DC-9 fleets, because "installation would cost just under \$½ million" and "as the B-747 and B-727 fleets involve a relatively small number of aircraft, and installation was done on the production line, cost is less of a factor . . ."

On 26 February 1975, the company informed us that despite the installation of machineries on B-747 and B-727 fleets, the system was not being used because the company preferred the human touch to machines, and had flight attendants make announcements on flights. Air Canada added that despite difficulties in recruiting, leaves of absence, it was able to provide at least one bilingual flight attendant on almost all flights except the one originating in Winnipeg flying westward.

Essentially, Air Canada believed that the use of any recorded system had one drawback, that is, "inflexibility". It claimed that not all announcements could be handled through taped recordings, they had to be handled by bilingual flight attendants. The airline added, "and if you must have bilingual flight attendants for non-routine announcements, it is to the passenger's advantage, as well as to the airline's, to have them also for routine announcements, as well as for other

elements of the in-flight service—offering meals in both languages, for example.”

Recommendation 3 (Use of cassette announcements to cover all possible situations)

Air Canada rejected this recommendation because of inflexibility of recorded systems and “non-routine or irregular announcements are of such variety of content that they are not manageable by . . . tape or cassette.”

Recommendation 4 (Use of decal to determine passengers' official language preference)

The airline did not accept this recommendation for reasons of safety, cabin appearance and “the segregational aspect of labelling passengers by official language group.”

Recommendation 5 (Flight Attendant's duty to offer bilingual service actively)

On this, the company replied that it had begun a major programme to provide “specialized leadership and functional training to approximately 750 “in-charge” flight attendants” “On these courses, the need to offer services in both official languages is stressed.”

Air Canada stated also that its ratio of bilingual to unilingual recruitment had been stepped up from “approximately 55/45 to 80/20 at least until the spring of 1975.” The company claimed that this action would ensure meeting its own goal of providing at least one bilingual flight attendant on all Air Canada flights throughout the world by the summer 1975 schedule,” and that “with the exception of a few overseas flights from Western Canada and Toronto, this goal has already been met.”

Recommendation 6 (Try out Recommendation 4, at least as an experiment)

This recommendation became inoperative since Air Canada decided not to carry out Recommendation 4.

The Commissioner was pleased to learn that Air Canada undertook to carry out his recommendation about ground announcements in all airports in the Western, Central and Southern regions. He appreciated

the airline's concern for developing an approach of a mix of man and machine by giving preference to "human touch" rather than mechanical contact. While the Commissioner is fully in favour of the airline's desire to "project a warm, friendly and human image, and to provide these qualities in its services", he was not totally convinced that the "only-when-necessary" feature of this man and machine alternative would be fool-proof. He could make allowances for mechanical failures but he found it difficult to accept that often Air Canada's bilingual personnel, forgot or neglected, for whatever reasons, to make announcements in the second official language—Toronto's Terminal 2 is a prime example of that.

As for his recommendation about in-flight announcements, although the Commissioner was satisfied about the action taken by Air Canada concerning B-747, B-727-200, he was far from convinced by the argument the company advanced to explain its refusal to install taped recordings on L-1011, DC-8 and DC-9 fleets, i.e. that such "installation would cost just under \$3 million". He found it extremely difficult to accept that installing ordinary cassette machines for such purpose could cost that much. In his opinion, the use of cassettes on all flights might prevent complaints arising from situations where, in spite of all efforts, in-flight complements turned out to be totally unilingual, invariably English. Air Canada's goal of "providing at least one bilingual flight attendant on all Air Canada flights throughout the world by summer 1975 schedule", was a step in the right direction; however, he found it difficult to visualize a single bilingual flight attendant trying to be in two or three parts of the aircraft at the same time to serve passengers requiring assistance in the second official language. He believed that the company's reluctance to even try out moderately-priced tape recorders, was short-sighted.

The Commissioner was equally skeptical about "inflexibility" as the main reason for the company's reluctance to accept tape recorders for non-routine and irregular announcements and reliance on bilingual staff (at last!) on board, "for routine announcements, as well as for other elements of the in-flight service—offering meals in both languages, for example",—the Commissioner hoped that this dream would one day come true!

Although less than convinced, the Commissioner accepted the company's reasons of safety for not using decals; but he suggested that the company give some thought to flip-over cards.

This Office found some reasons to nourish hope in learning that Air Canada had begun a constructive and positive training programme for some 750 in-charge flight attendants, that it had stepped up its recruitments of bilingual staff and that, with the exception of a few overseas flights from western Canada and Toronto, the goal of having

“at least one bilingual flight attendant” on all flights had already been met.

This Office was impressed with Air Canada’s foresight in starting a project to seek out and recruit more bilinguals from English-speaking Canada. To that end, it launched a programme in British Columbia to “encourage students in high schools and universities throughout the province to learn French as a second language. This is being done mainly by informing them first-hand of the excellent job opportunities awaiting them if they can meet Air Canada’s language and other qualifications. Career day visits are carried out by selected teams of flight attendants and other employees who not only describe their jobs to students but also stress how important and ultimately valuable a second language education can be. In addition, the company supplied French-language newspapers, magazines and other material to the schools and universities in the program. If successful, it will be extended to other parts of the country.”

“Of course, In-Flight Service also makes extensive use of the Company’s language training programs. So far this year some 100 flight attendants have been through the four-week immersion course at Jonquière, and another 160 are enrolled for the current 1974/75 academic period,” added Air Canada.

The Commissioner was also impressed by Air Canada’s statement that “flight attendants are heavily involved in our self-teaching/Tutorial program, ‘Dialogue Canada Programme’. Students work at home a certain minimum of hours and every two weeks meet with a teacher in a mini-class situation organized by a local co-ordinator, whom students call when they are ready for additional lessons. This program is active at all bases at both airport and downtown offices. The same program is used as a retention course for flight attendants who have reached level 3 competence either at Jonquière [language school] or through some other course.”

The company believed that the programmes it had described were only some of the measures, “both preventive and curative, being undertaken by Air Canada in the attainment of a goal . . . development of an institutional bilingual capability enabling the Corporation to conduct its affairs in the spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act.”

It stated further that, “until that goal is reached, there is merit in making temporary use of ‘bilingual band-aids’ such as recorded announcements;” and it welcomed whatever suggestions and recommendations the Commissioner might have in this regard. “But, if the goal of institutional bilingualism is to withstand the vagaries of time and circumstance, it must be built on a sound foundation. Mechanical facsimiles may satisfy a short-term objective of reducing the number of com-

plaints . . ." recognized Air Canada, "but for the long-term the emphasis must be on people."

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1691	Toronto Ottawa	Announcements in English only.	Rectified
1773	Winnipeg- Edmonton, Calgary- Winnipeg	Announcements made in English only.	Explanation offered
1815	Ottawa	Objection raised to a directive requiring passengers to be paged in both official languages and request for an inquiry into the corporation's promotion policy.	Explanation offered
1828	Ottawa	Capital budget tabled in the House of Commons in English only.	Rectified
1834	Montreal- Toronto- Montreal	Reception and passenger services provided in English only. Announcements made in English only.	Explanation offered
1850	Ottawa- Toronto	Announcements made in English only.	Explanation offered
1867	Winnipeg- Ottawa	No service in French.	Explanation offered
1868	Winnipeg	Letterhead in English only in the accounts office.	Explanation offered
1869	Brussels- Montreal	Announcements made in English only except on take-off and landing.	Explanation offered
1876	Freeport (Bahamas)	Announcements made in English only at the Freeport Airport and unilingual English services at the Air Canada office in the International Bazaar.	Explanation offered
1887	Regina- Vancouver	No services in French.	Explanation offered
1904	Earlton (Ontario)	Lack of services in French at the Air Canada counter.	Withdrawn
1918	Winnipeg	Remarks by a corporation official on bilingualism in Air Canada.	Explanation offered
1937	Winnipeg- Regina- Winnipeg	Lack of services in French and arrivals and departures board posted in English only.	Explanation offered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1941	Ottawa	Advertisement in French only in a bilingual programme at the National Arts Centre.	Rectified
1948	Ottawa-Toronto	No services in French. Announcements made in English only.	Explanation offered
1963	Regina-Winnipeg	Announcements made in English by a French-speaker were unintelligible.	Explanation offered
1977	Winnipeg and New York	A French-speaker received a letter in English from the Credit Card Bureau in Winnipeg. Unilingual English-speaking clerk at Kennedy International Airport.	Explanation offered
1980	Toronto-Havana (Cuba) Ottawa	No service in French on the Toronto-Cuba flight. Clerk at the Air Canada counter in Toronto expressed herself in unintelligible French. No bilingual signs in Terminal 2 in Toronto. Delay in obtaining services in French at Albert Street office in Ottawa.	Explanation offered
2006	Ottawa	Unilingual English stamp on a baggage tracer.	Rectified
2046	Regina	Arrival and departure announcements only in English.	Explanation offered
2121	Sudbury-Toronto	Unilingual English services. No French-language newspapers or magazines.	Explanation offered
2130	Ottawa	Assistance requested in the settlement of a strike.	Explanation offered
2144	Victoria-Winnipeg and Toronto-Winnipeg	Explanations concerning the use of the oxygen mask were provided in English only.	Explanation offered
2175	Ottawa	Caption in English only in a bilingual magazine.	Rectified
2205	Ottawa	In Air Canada's monthly magazine <i>En-Route</i> , most of the advertisements were unilingual English.	Rectified
2299, 2490	Edmonton-Winnipeg	All announcements made in English only. No services in French.	Explanation offered
2317	Paris (France)	Poor quality of French in some advertisements.	Explanation offered
2388	Ottawa	Unilingual English inscriptions on maps inside a folder.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2395	Toronto- St. John's (Newfound- land)	Announcements made in English only.	Explanation offered
2402	Toronto	Folder available only in English at the information counter in the Toronto airport.	Rectified
2405	Fredericton	Announcements made in English only.	Explanation offered
2443	Ottawa	Lack of service in French at the Ottawa office.	Explanation offered
2447	Kennedy Airport, New York	A sign failed to comply with the Official Languages Act.	Rectified
2475	Ottawa- Rouyn- Noranda	Unilingual English brochure.	Rectified
2477	Saskatoon (Saskat- chewan)	Pre-recorded message in English only.	Explanation offered
2510	Toronto- Montreal	Deplorable translation service. Lack of French dailies.	Explanation offered
2535	Sudbury	Unilingual English telephone service from the office.	Explanation offered
2543, 2555	Timmins- Toronto- Timmins	Lack of service in French on board a Timmins-Toronto flight and in Ter- minal 2 in Toronto.	Explanation offered
2557	Regina (Saskat- chewan)	No service in French at the Regina office.	Explanation offered
2585	St. John's (Newfound- land)- Montreal	Unilingual stewardess did not offer the services of a bilingual colleague.	Explanation offered
2612	Winnipeg- Montreal- Winnipeg	All the announcements were left un- translated and the unilingual steward- ess did not offer any service in French.	Explanation offered
2620	Montreal	Folder not available in French at the airport. The security guards spoke in English first.	Explanation offered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2636	Toronto	Unilingual English publication at the airport.	Explanation offered
2642	Toronto-- Ottawa	No service in French on board a Toronto-Ottawa flight.	Explanation offered
2660	Ottawa-- Quebec City	No service was provided in French by the ticket clerk in Ottawa, and during the flight the French version of an announcement by the pilot was omitted.	Explanation offered
2662	Toronto	Lack of service in French at the boarding counter at the Toronto airport.	Rectified
2667	Paris-- Montreal	Recorded musical selections presented only in English and partly bilingual programme.	Rectified
2674	Ottawa-- Toronto and Toronto-- Winnipeg	No service in French.	Explanation offered
2697	Saint John (NB)- Halifax	Announcements made in English only during the flight.	Explanation offered
2715	Winnipeg-- Edmonton-- Winnipeg	No service in French.	Explanation offered
2735	Timmins and Toronto	No service in French at the airport.	Explanation offered
2737, 2783, 2787	Ottawa-- Montreal	Announcements made only in English during the flight.	Explanation offered
2777	Montreal-- Quebec City	No French-language magazines or newspapers.	Explanation offered
2796	--	During a program on the final series of the world curling championships televised by the CBC and sponsored by Air Canada, commentaries were made only in English and German.	Explanation offered
2809, 2857	Ottawa-- Toronto	Unintelligibility of the English spoken by French-speaking stewardesses on Ottawa-Toronto flights.	Explanation offered
2882	Winnipeg-- Saskatoon	No service in French.	Explanation offered
2893	Moncton	Delay in obtaining services in French.	Explanation offered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2894	Calgary	A young English-speaker claimed to be experiencing difficulty in obtaining a job because she was not bilingual.	Explanation offered
2913	Montreal	English-language stamps imprinted on envelopes.	Rectified
2923	Ottawa	No service in French at the Ottawa office.	Explanation offered
2944	Montreal-Toronto	Lack of service in French at the counter in Dorval airport, at the boarding gate and during the flight. No French-language newspapers.	Explanation offered
2969	Quebec City-Ottawa	Unilingual English-speaking crew. Greeting incomprehensible French. No service in French.	Explanation offered
2972	Edmonton-Montreal	No service in French.	Explanation offered
2983	Regina-Ottawa and Toronto-Quebec City	No service in French.	Explanation offered
3020	Montreal	Lack of French-language newspapers and magazines on flights to the West.	Withdrawn
3037	Winnipeg	Return address in English only on letters.	Rectified
3051	Montreal	Lack of services in French.	Withdrawn
3064	Montreal-Miami	No service in French. Unilingual tag.	Explanation offered
3070	Montreal	An employee lodged grievances about the calculation of seniority.	Referral
3077	Ottawa	Services in English only at the airport baggage counter.	Explanation offered
3108	Toronto	Difficulties experienced by unilingual English stewardesses in the performance of their duties.	Explanation offered
3165	Quebec City-Montreal	Service provided in English during the flight.	Explanation offered
3194, 3334	Montreal	Sign in English only. Unilingual English telephone reception.	Rectified

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—"I Heard You Talking in Your Sleep"

EVALUATION

The CBC may well be ahead of its time in inventing a bilingual, and triflingly expensive, logo, restfully obscure to both English-and French-speaking viewers. However, judging from the CBC's performance till now, the "accelerated coverage plan", which promises to provide service in the official language of the minority in isolated communities, remains pie in the sky in many instances. The Corporation's and indeed the Government's credibility is seriously at stake if it does not convince its would-be public that Anik (our very own satellite) is truly another word for "progress".

A third of the 75 complaints dealt with (including five petitions containing from 92 to 1,500 signatures) concerned this accelerated coverage expansion programme. Members of the public made representations not only about the lack of French-language broadcasts in parts of Nova Scotia, Ontario and Saskatchewan, but also about the absence of English-language television in the Saguenay region of Quebec. However, the CBC endeavoured to settle complaints concerning unilingual signs, services available in only one or the other official language and the quality of transmissions with reasonable dispatch.

This Office has launched a special study, of national scope, of the CBC to determine the extent to which it meets the requirements of the Official Languages Act with respect to language of service to the public and of internal communications.

COMPLAINTS

File Nos. 2763, 2921—Zenon Park

Ninety-two persons from Zenon Park, Saskatchewan, wrote the Commissioner asking him to help them acquire French television in their province.

The Corporation explained that in February 1974 it had been guaranteed the necessary funds for implementing a five-year accelerated coverage plan.

This plan included more than six hundred construction projects and constituted a vast and costly programme, drawn up by the Corporation and approved by the government, which would enable radio and television broadcasts in French or in English to reach all Canadian com-

munities with populations of at least 500 which did not receive national programmes or had only poor reception.

In order to distribute its services fairly, the CBC had devised a priority-rating formula for its projects. This formula, which took into account six factors (population, equipment costs, operating costs, provincial parity, and geographical and cultural isolation, the respective relative weights of which were 40, 15, 15, 10, 80 and 40), was devised in order to provide service to the largest possible number of inhabitants in areas where the need was most pressing—above all, in isolated regions. This priority-rating formula, as well as other aspects of the programme, was studied in depth in conjunction with the CRTC, the Department of Communications, the Department of Secretary of State and other departments.

At present, the Corporation's stations and affiliated stations provided coverage for the national service in the following proportions: 96 per cent for English television, 95 per cent for French television, 98 per cent for English radio broadcasts and 97 per cent for French radio broadcasts. The implementation of the accelerated coverage plan would enable the four networks to reach approximately 99 per cent of the population. The Corporation would also continue to follow demographic developments which might affect this plan.

The CBC intended to install a rebroadcasting station in Carrot River which would enable Zenon Park residents to receive broadcasts by the French television network. An application was to be submitted to the CRTC in this connection during the fourth year of the plan referred to.

The Commissioner asked the Corporation for the exact date by which it expected to offer French-language broadcasts to the people of Zenon Park.

The Corporation replied that it was difficult for it to keep to a timetable since it did not have complete control over the projects; for this reason, it was reluctant to set exact dates. When it had assembled the necessary documentation, the Corporation was required by law to submit a formal proposal to the Canadian Radio-Television Commission, which would then fit the project into its schedule of public hearings. This procedure could take as long as one year. The Corporation would then have to wait patiently for the CRTC to issue the licence, without which it was impossible to begin work on the project. Construction usually lasted approximately one year but varied depending on delivery dates for equipment, and adverse weather conditions in some regions. The Corporation always did everything within its power to complete its projects as quickly as possible but delays were not always foreseeable or avoidable.

While sympathizing with the nature of the difficulties facing the Corporation, the Commissioner nevertheless asked the latter to make every possible effort to enable the people of Zenon Park to receive French-language programmes within a reasonable length of time.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1443	Toronto	Unilingual English letterheads on writing paper and envelopes.	Rectified
1490, 1600, 2561	Toronto	Unilingual English comments appearing on the screen during hockey matches.	Explanation offered
1796	Ottawa	Some English network programs contained passages in French.	Explanation offered
1803	Toronto	Memoranda and documents in English distributed to French-speaking employees.	Rectified
1865	Mattawa (Ontario)	Eight hundred petitioners requested improved reception of French-language television programs.	Rectified
1891	Ottawa	Unilingual English technicians were allegedly working with the French-speaking public.	Explanation offered
1919	Ottawa	Unilingual English "CBC" stickers on the windshield of a car.	Withdrawn
1922, 1951	Ottawa	Unilingual English signs in the cafeteria on Lanark Street.	Rectified
1942	Ottawa	Advertisement published in French only in the magazine <i>Placedart</i> .	Rectified
1960	Penetanguishene (Ontario)	French-speakers in this region requested television programs in French.	Explanation offered
1988	Hamilton	Unilingual switchboard operators at CJBC.	Rectified
2004	Ottawa	More foreign-language films subtitled or dubbed in English or French should be shown.	Explanation offered
2014	Wawa (Ontario)	Petition for a French-language television network in the region.	Explanation offered
2092, 2257	Toronto	Switchboard operators answering only in English.	Rectified
2114	Moose Jaw (Saskatchewan)	National anthem broadcast in French only.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2243	Ottawa	Directions for use in English only on fire extinguishers in the CBC Building.	Rectified
2336	Windsor- Essex-Kent (Ontario)	No French-language radio or television service in this region.	Rectified
2349	. . .	No French-language television in Saskatchewan or British Columbia.	Explanation offered
2365	North Bay (Ontario)	No French-language radio station in North Bay.	Explanation offered
2372	Bagotville (Quebec)	No English-language radio or television programs in the Saguenay region.	Explanation offered
2381	Peterborough (Ontario)	1,550 petitioners requested programs in French for the Peterborough region.	Explanation offered
2387	Sault Ste. Marie (Ontario)	No French-language radio or television programs in Sault Ste. Marie.	Explanation offered
2400	(Ontario)	No French-language television in Chapeau, Dubreuilville and Wawa.	Explanation offered
2415, 2569	Earlton (Ontario)	Inadequate French-language television and radio programming in the Temiscaming area.	Explanation offered
2436	Edmonton	Unilingual English-speaking receptionist at the French-language television station in Edmonton.	Rectified
2437	Toronto	Unilingual English inscription on an envelope.	Rectified
2471	Ottawa	Inadequate evening coverage of the Quebec election on the CBOT network.	Not justified
2489	Church Point (Nova Scotia)	Poor reception of radio and television programs in French.	Rectified
2496	Montreal	Inadequate evening coverage of the provincial election on the English-language network in Montreal.	Not justified
2520	Truro (Nova Scotia)	No television programs in French in the Truro area.	Explanation offered
2521	Windsor (Ontario)	Unilingual English map on an advertising leaflet.	Rectified
2567	Sudbury (Ontario)	Poor television programming available to French-speakers in Northern Ontario.	Explanation offered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2603	Edmonton	Unilingual English-speaking receptionist at station CBXFT-11.	Rectified
2616	Vancouver	On Saturday mornings only French-language programs are shown on the English television network.	Explanation offered
2670	Elliot Lake (Ontario)	Poor reception of French-language television programs.	Rectified
2676	Iroquois Falls (Ontario)	No local productions on the French-language television network serving Northern Ontario.	Explanation offered
2695	Staples (Ontario)	Simultaneous interpretation of televised speeches and statements.	Explanation offered
2746	Kingston (Ontario)	No French-language radio or television in Kingston.	Rectified
2802	Toronto	Unilingual English particulars on an envelope addressed to a French-speaker.	Rectified
2817	(Ontario)	Petition from French-speakers in Geraldton, Thunder Bay, Dryden and Kenora for French-language radio and television.	Explanation offered
2845	Penticton-Kelowna (BC)	Shortening or cancellation of French-language programs on station CHBC-TV.	Explanation offered
2872, 3177	Sherbrooke, Ottawa	Messages in English superimposed on the screen during a football match.	Explanation offered
2919	Windsor-Essex-Kent (Ontario)	The CBC does not offer comparable service to the French-speaking population.	Explanation offered
3034	Sarnia	No French-language radio or television in Sarnia.	Explanation offered
3101	Brantford (Ontario)	Confidential study which did not urge CBC officials to accelerate the extension of French-language television programming in Southwestern Ontario.	Explanation offered
3213	Kingston	No French-language radio or television in Kingston.	Explanation offered
3253, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288	Saint-Paul/Bonnyville (Alberta)	Delay in the construction of a television rebroadcasting station.	Explanation offered

EVALUATION

The full story of the CN's agonies and ecstasies in reaching the Official Languages Act's goals must await, it seems, at least "until the end of 1978" and be told only "wherever it is practical to do so". This time-schedule and service-philosophy reflect a motion slower, one surmises, and an approach narrower, than that wished by Parliament. But some of the preparatory work the CN has been engaged in since our last annual report shows that the CN has begun to move with a serious plan for progress.

Senior management and some regional vice-presidents (e.g. Edmonton) have taken an active interest in the Act's implementation in the CN, and have reviewed our last year's evaluation with a view to bringing about concrete reform in the company.

In general, the CN gave immediate attention to the 90 complaints we received during the period under review, and in most cases corrected them within a reasonable time.

Following up on our 33 recommendations resulting from two special studies, we have found that the CN has developed a plan of action outlining major objectives, areas needing special attention, the need for setting standards, a timetable of action to achieve certain goals, and a requirement "to allocate funds and to monitor performance on an organized basis." To carry out this plan, the CN has appointed an Assistant Vice-President charged with implementing the whole programme, engaging regional co-ordinators, incorporating a bilingual-service clause in new contracts with concessionnaires, concluding an agreement with unions and determining the jobs requiring knowledge of both official languages on trains (such as the Rapido and the Vancouver-Montreal runs and trains linking Quebec with other provinces).

The CN has also set up a variety of second-language courses for employees at elementary as well as advanced levels; signs and announcements at stations, on ferries and at ferry terminals are becoming increasingly bilingual; as of April 22, 1974, the CN adopted the INWATS Telecommunications system to help serve its clients directly in French; and the corporation's cooperation with this Office in the information field has been quite useful in helping employees to understand their rights and obligations under the Official Languages Act.

For the second year in a row, this Office must point out that the CN does not yet seem to have fully assumed the scope of reform Parlia-

ment wished through the Act's Section 10—that is, to make Canadians feel at home anywhere, anytime, across the CN's system. By using the words "significant demand" and "wherever it is practical to do so" as crutches, the CN is not getting on the right track for serving the travelling public. It still seems to accept "the absence of service in both official languages as a permanent condition at some points in its system" (our Third Annual Report).

The CN could show corporate leadership inspiring many other federal agencies by accepting fully this fundamental principle laid down in the Act. It is a pity the CN's earnest efforts and many concrete achievements are being weakened by the company's taking a restrictive view of its statutory obligations. Having received the personal assurance of the Chairman of the Board about full cooperation and action, we are confident that the CN will re-examine its approach to the travelling public carefully, so that this restrictive view is broadened to meet the clear presumption of system-wide demand (with reasonable and proven exceptions) specified by the Act's Section 10.

Following the recent (January 15, 1975) speech of the CN's President and Chief Executive Officer in Toronto, in which he said: "the achievement of an acceptable level of bilingualism in Canadian National is a challenge to our skills as managers," we look forward optimistically to more acceptable results next year.

This Office is now in a better position to evaluate the various efforts the CN has made to implement the 22 recommendations formulated in January 1973 following the special study carried out on CN's national network and the 11 recommendations resulting from the study of the Atlantic regional office, located in Moncton. The purpose of these studies was to determine to what extent the service provided to the public in the railway, hotel and, in the case of Moncton, express sectors was bilingual.

Toward the end of 1974, the CN informed this Office of the steps that had been taken to implement the 12 recommendations to which it had not given any answers the previous year. This Office's representatives also interviewed senior management members at the Montreal office and in a few regional offices.

The CN implemented most of the recommendations it had accepted in whole or in part at least in principle, as was the case with certain of them. It implemented those concerning the employee information programme, the preparation of an action plan outlining the objectives of the bilingualism programme and assigning the various responsibilities for it (responsibility for this program was given to an assistant Vice-

President and to regional co-ordinators), the availability of bilingual forms intended for the public and written communication with the public in both languages. In this Office's view, this action plan constitutes another appreciable step toward realization of the objectives the CN has set for itself. Although certain aspects of it are still purely theoretical, the plan nevertheless specifies what sectors require special attention, proposes a schedule, allocates the necessary financial resources and suggests means of control.

The CN said that it was giving special attention to the recruitment of bilingual personnel in all parts of the country, but that it was experiencing a number of problems outside Quebec. In Ontario only 72 bilingual employees out of a total of 2,073 were recruited in 1974. The CN therefore had to resort to language courses and it had set up language schools in Moncton, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver.

Employees who agree to take language training first take an introductory course lasting 18 days and then a 40-day course at a more advanced level at the regional school or at the Jonquière language centre which has the advantage of immersing the student in a French-speaking environment. From 1969 to 1973, 1,496 employees registered for French courses and 546 for English courses. No figures were available for the success rate achieved. The corporation also said that in some cases it was recruiting new employees so that its regular staff could take language training and intended to put the finishing touches on a language retention programme that year. The CN accepted in full the recommendations dealing with job security and with co-operation with the unions to implement the programme.

However, the CN will have to make an all-out effort if it wishes to have "bilingual capability of a permanent nature . . . by the end of 1978, wherever it is practical to do so"—an objective it has set for itself. This objective, although highly commendable, contains the same reservations expressed by the CN in our *Third Annual Report*. By invoking these reservations, the CN greatly minimizes the scope of recommendation 3 which requires that the company "accept the existence of overall regular demand for bilingual . . . service to the travelling public across the System." The company only recognizes regular demand on the main line trains and at important stations and hotels. The above recommendation also requires that the CN "accept the existence of regular demand for its bilingual service to the local public wherever that public is made up of the two official language groups." The company concurs only in cases where there is a heavy concentration of the minority language

group. It does not define what it means by heavy concentration: is it a minimum percentage or an absolute number? The onus is on the CN to prove that demand for services is so irregular as not to warrant offering them. Bilingual telephone service and referrals of calls to employees able to speak the language of the client, are offered only where there is a need, in the company's view, and where the company is able to do so. The CN does not indicate the areas where such services must be offered.

The CN refuses to advertise existing bilingual capacities claiming that it does not want to engage in this publicly before being certain of the success of its programme. The CN, it seems, has misunderstood the scope of recommendation 4, which requires the CN "to communicate to the public . . . (the availability of bilingual services) where such capability already exists or is in future developed . . .".

The bilingualization of signs outside Quebec is progressing and a manual for regional administrators is to be published in order to speed up the programme. CN's advertising is not yet completely bilingual: the campaigns aimed at a specific language group are in one language only. The number of bilingual notices in stations and ferry terminals is increasing, according to the corporation.

The new contract between the CN and its concessionaires now contains two clauses regarding the services that are to be provided in both official languages. However, the corporation has not said anything about the interim measures which were to be adopted by the concessionaires governed by the old contract.

We received 90 complaints concerning this Crown corporation between April 1, 1973 and January 1, 1975. Of these, 66 dealt with language of service, including 48 concerning the implementation of recommendations that had already been formulated; five complaints dealt with language of work.

In order to deal with complaints concerning the lack of service in French on the Rapido and the Vancouver-Montreal train and at Montreal terminal, the CN concluded agreements with its employees' unions and decided what positions on trains connecting Quebec with the other provinces required a knowledge of both official languages.

The other complaints dealing with language of service concerned the following specific areas: lack of service in French in various CN offices, hotels and stations and use of unilingual English stamps, posters and advertising brochures. These complaints generally received immediate attention from the CN and the situation was rectified in most cases. Often this meant that the CN had to remind its employees of directives that had already been issued. Choice of French as the language of work

was the subject of five investigations by this Office. Two of the complaints were subsequently withdrawn and another, which dealt with safety standards, was brought to the attention of the appropriate authorities. In the other two cases, the CN informed the Office of the measures it intended to adopt and said it was trying to anticipate language problems that might arise and making an effort to meet the requirements of the Official Languages Act regarding use of both languages in the services concerned.

There were 21 complaints regarding lack of service in French in the CN-CP Telecommunications offices from Sydney, in Nova Scotia, to Vancouver, in British Columbia. In order to provide better service in the Maritimes, Ontario and the West, the CN adopted, on April 22, 1974, the INWATS 1-800-463-3350 telephone system, which makes it possible for customers to be served directly in French. This Office asked the CN to organize a publicity campaign so that people would know what number to dial to obtain this service. The CN informed the Commissioner that 90 per cent of telegrams in French were processed through this system and said it would advertise the service in all telephone directories. However, this system is not used in the province of Quebec or in the National Capital Region, where CN-CP Telecommunications employees must provide bilingual service.

At the end of February 1975, the CN informed us of a number of measures it intended to take to meet the demand for bilingual services on main-lines and at major stations. For example, starting on April 20, 1975 the CN will put at least one passenger service assistant on such runs as the Transcontinental, Halifax-Montreal, Montreal-Ottawa-Winnipeg-Vancouver, Toronto-Capreol-Winnipeg-Vancouver to ensure service in the customers' preferred official language. The CN also stated that as of April 1, 1975, Halifax will have a conference ("hot-line") telephone number to ensure bilingual service to the outlying towns. The CN hopes to extend a similar service to Moncton, Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Edmonton and Vancouver during 1975. In December 1974, the CN introduced a similar service at Toronto Station to serve the province of Ontario. Customers at stations such as Hamilton, St. Catharines, London, Kitchener, North Bay, Niagara Falls, Belleville and Chatham can receive bilingual service by calling a central telephone number at Toronto Station. We hope that the CN keeps the public adequately informed about these services.

As for bilingual services to its hotels guests, the CN seems not to experience too many difficulties. Recently, the CN had come up with a suitable arrangement in order to offer morning newspapers to the guests, at the Queen Elizabeth Hotel in Montreal, in their preferred official language.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1598—Railway Crossings

A French-speaking person from New Brunswick complained that signs indicating railway crossings in Moncton were for the most part in English. He mentioned among others the sign by the CN tracks on the outskirts of Moncton, going towards Dieppe.

The CN replied that it had set up a programme for the Atlantic Region in order to ensure that signs viewed by the general or travelling public are bilingual. Regional representatives estimated that 75% of the programme had been implemented. Railway crossing signs were part of this programme. The CN had taken steps to render bilingual the sign on the road towards Dieppe. The CN was studying, along with other railway companies, the possibility of adopting pictographs for all signs in public view.

The Commissioner recommended that, in the event that the CN decided to continue to use words, it make all railway crossing signs bilingual.

The CN answered that the railway industry in Canada was studying the question with the Canadian Transport Commission. As soon as the Canadian railway industry and the CTC agree upon an appropriate pictograph, they will submit it to the proper provincial authorities and proceed to amend the law and regulations to permit changes in the design of existing signs. After having discussed the matter further with the CTC, the Commissioner recommended that:

in accordance with Section 31(1) and 31(2) of the Official Languages Act, measures be taken to amend section 207 of the Railway Act in order to permit the erection of bilingual signs or pictographs at all railway crossings in Canada and that, subsequent to such an amendment, the CTC establish a programme to erect such signs.

The CTC answered that the question would be examined by the Railway Transport Committee in the light of the Commissioner's recommendation. Existing signs would be replaced with pictographs as soon as section 207 of the Railway Act had been amended.

The CN would then comply as required with the amendment.

File No. 1954—The Sleeping-car Porter

A complainant pointed out that the sleeping-car porter on a train between Gaspé and Montreal was unilingual English. He addressed the porter twice in French, and on neither occasion did the porter offer to call upon one of the French-speaking personnel.

The CN informed the Commissioner that the employee in question had a working knowledge of French and had been working that par-

ticular run for several years without once receiving a complaint. It went on to say that its employee did not recall the incident.

The CN added that there were several bilingual employees on the train. It said that the sleeping-car porter, fully aware of the obligation to provide service to passengers in the official language of their choice, had given assurances that he would ask a bilingual employee for assistance if he felt he could not answer in the second official language.

The CN expressed regret that the passenger had had occasion to complain about its services, but added that it considered the train adequately staffed with bilingual personnel.

The Commissioner recommended that CN periodically remind its employees of the company's obligation to serve its passengers in both official languages and of the need to call upon bilingual employees promptly for assistance if they are unable to answer in the official language in which they are addressed.

The CN accepted the Commissioner's recommendations.

File No. 2892—"INWATS"

The complaint stated that it was not always possible to send a telegram in French by telephone in Moncton. Sometimes a unilingual clerk offered—in English—to connect the customer to CN's office in Quebec City, which then provided service in French.

The Commissioner informed the complainant that in reply to similar complaints from other cities, the CN had just informed him of what it had done to comply with his request to correct such situations. In order to provide better service to French-speakers living outside the province of Quebec and the National Capital, the CN had adopted, on 22 April 1974, a telephone system known as "INWATS". This system makes it possible for users to be connected directly to the Quebec City telecommunications office without going through the local operator, who might not know French. The service is also available at the counter in telecommunications offices and is being used on a temporary basis in places where CN does not have the bilingual staff needed to offer service in both official languages at all times. The employees concerned were to be taught key phrases in French so that they could serve French-speaking customers who came to the office. Moreover, CN planned to advertise this new system in newspapers and to have the "INWATS" number listed, in French and in English, in the directories of the regions in which the service was being offered. It was emphasized, however, that the introduction of this system did not mean that CN would discontinue its efforts to increase its bilingual staff through recruitment and language training.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1211, 1808 2168, 2363 2382, 2440 2574, 2657 2710, 2788		Lack of services in French at the CN/CP Telecommunications Offices in Sydney (Nova Scotia), Ottawa, Sudbury, Windsor, North Bay, Niagara Falls (Ontario), Edmonton and Vancouver. Unilingual English signs in the Sudbury office.	Rectified
1703	Ottawa	Capital budget in English only tabled in the House of Commons.	Rectified
1759, 1802, 2113	Montreal-Toronto	Service in English only on the <i>Rapido</i> , on the platform in Montreal, at the ticket counter in Toronto.	Explanation offered
1890	Cornwall	Some of the signs in the parking lot of the Cornwall station were unilingual English.	Rectified
1895	Montreal	In the employees' cafeteria at the corner of La Gauchetière and De la Cathédrale Streets, unilingual English receipts were issued to customers.	Rectified
1900, 2705, 2948, 2961	Regina, (Saskatchewan)	Telegram received in French and spelt out by an English-speaking employee to the recipient at the Telecommunications Offices in Charlottetown, Sudbury (Ontario), Regina (Saskatchewan) and Dawson Creek (BC).	Rectified
1921	Hearst and Fauquier (Ontario)	Unilingual English signs between Hearst and Fauquier at railway crossings.	Rectified
2003	Ottawa	Unilingual telephone reception at the Ottawa Station and at the public relations office on Sparks Street.	Explanation offered
2044	Saskatoon (Saskatchewan)	No service in French at the Hotel Bessborough in Saskatoon.	Explanation offered
2053	Toronto	Advertising leaflet printed in English distributed to French-speaking students.	Rectified
2061	Vancouver	Unilingual English publication at the Hotel Vancouver.	Explanation offered
2062	Montreal	An employee in the Merchandise Claims Service states that he cannot work in French.	Explanation offered
2081	Ottawa	The inscription "Canadian National Hotels Limited" on the tablecloths used in the Chateau Laurier was not accompanied by its French equivalent.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2119	Montreal	Unilingual English sign in a freight car.	Rectified
2132	Montreal	Inaccurate translation of a caption on a postcard: Altitude 727.	Not justified
2136	Ottawa	Account bearing a unilingual slogan and imprinted with two unilingual English stamps.	Rectified
2157 2553	Ottawa	Unilingual English stamp imprinted on telegrams.	Rectified
2172	Moncton (NB)	French-speaking employees in Moncton were required to operate a machine in violation of safety standards.	Assistance rendered
2180	Vancouver-Montreal	Lack of service in French outside Quebec on the Vancouver-Montreal run.	Withdrawn
2196, 2463, 2470	Ottawa Halifax	No service in French at the news-stands of the Chateau Laurier or the Hotel Nova Scotian.	Rectified
2197	Ottawa	A French-speaking candidate failed to obtain a job because he had no knowledge of English.	Withdrawn
2203	Ottawa and Belleville	Name of a French-language association translated into English on two contracts of carriage drafted in French. Statement of account drawn up under this English name.	Rectified
2220, 2298, 2397	Ottawa	Lack of service in French in the evening during the summer at the Ottawa Telecommunications Office.	Rectified
2227	Ottawa	Unilingual English signs in a parking lot.	Rectified
2228	Gimli (Manitoba)	French-speakers not treated equally during a course offered in Gimli.	Withdrawn
2245	Ottawa	Unilingual English signs in the dispatch office.	Rectified
2249	Toronto	No telephone reception in French at the information office in Union Station.	Rectified
2281, 2289, 2302	Ottawa and Belleville	Unilingual English stamps used to endorse cheques deposited.	Rectified
2332	Ottawa	Date and amount inscribed in English only on CN cheques.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2337	Montreal	Unilingual English-speaking supervisor for a group of employees of whom 90% were French-speakers.	Explanation offered
2385	Montreal	The tour service was unable to provide students with the services of a French-speaking guide.	Not justified
2426	Ottawa	The majority of federal departments were listed in English only in the TELEX directory.	Rectified
2442	Montreal	Error in French in a telegram.	Explanation offered
2526	Toronto	Letter in English sent to a French-speaking person.	Explanation offered
2528	Toronto	A French-speaker was unable to make herself understood by the three employees on duty to whom she gave in French the number of the car she was to board for a trip to Quebec City.	Explanation offered
2565	Montreal	Schedules and instructions are available to employees, only in English.	Rectified
2663	Ottawa	Ticket forms completed in English only.	Rectified
2664	Ottawa	No service in French at the main desk of the Chateau Laurier.	Explanation offered
2734	Vancouver	A clerk was unable to transmit a telegram written in French.	Explanation offered
2818	Ottawa	About one hundred signs in the parking lot of the Chateau Laurier bore the unilingual English inscription "EXIT".	Rectified
2835	Montreal	Unilingual English form sent to a French-language association.	Explanation offered
2858	Ottawa	Menus written in French in the Chateau Laurier's Canadian Grill.	Explanation offered
2862	Ottawa	Public announcement made in English only at the station.	Explanation offered
2896	Moncton (NB)	Unilingual English signs.	Rectified
2912	Toronto	In a notice of competition published in a Toronto French-language weekly, CN's address was given in English only.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2964	Montreal	Memorandum to the division chiefs written in English only.	Rectified
2973	Jasper	Mediocrity of the French version of a menu: Jasper Park Lodge.	Rectified
2988	Ottawa	Prolonged delay before a French-speaker could transmit a telegram.	Rectified
3015	Cheticamp (NB)	Zenith service not available in Cheticamp.	Explanation offered
3050	Jasper	Service in English only at the station.	Rectified
3083	Montreal	An English-speaker objected to signs bearing unobtrusive accents in English.	Explanation offered
3102	Montreal	Unilingual English advertisement published in the bilingual magazine <i>Au courant</i> .	Rectified
3113	Gravelbourg (Saskatchewan)	Unilingual English form sent to a French-speaking person.	Rectified
3190	Montreal	Announcements made in English only on the station platform.	Rectified

CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION— “Gimme Shelter”

EVALUATION

Putting its pride aside, perhaps the CMHC could effectively use a few surplus OPEC dinars to provide Canadians with guaranteed minimum shelters, but when it comes to linguistic installations, despite seven minor faults, it continues to be a master builder.

As stated in the *Third Annual Report*, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation had, by October 1973, implemented all the recommendations flowing from the special study completed in April of that year. In response to a request for updated information, the Corporation provided the Commissioner, in December 1974, with a well-documented review of the status of bilingualism within its walls. The Commissioner is pleased to note that his recommendations continue to be followed.

In its review, the Corporation reports that it is continuing to run its own language-training programme with a high success rate and operates a language-retention programme, which provides specialized courses in such fields as administration and secretarial work. Furthermore, it has announced an official-language policy which encompasses language of service, language of work, the language requirements of positions and French-language units. Finally, the Corporation reported that it is engaged in a programme to test its employees' knowledge of their second official language.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 2186—A Supervisor in Montreal

In an anonymous letter, a group of the Corporation's employees complained of the appointment of an English-speaking person, whom they described as unilingual, to the position of supervisor at the Montreal branch of the CMHC.

The Corporation replied that the appointment had been based on merit and the employee's professional qualifications. Although not fluently bilingual, he had nevertheless passed the third level of the Public Service Commission's language courses and had a sufficient command of French to perform his job satisfactorily. The Corporation also gave the assurance that the public would be served in both official languages and that the branch's employees could use French as their language of work. In his reply, the Commissioner stated that he had taken note of the assurances given by CMHC officials with regard to the language rights of its employees and the public.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1310	Ottawa	Unilingual markings on construction materials.	Rectified
2284	Ottawa	Information service gave answers in English to a French-speaker.	Rectified
2353	Ottawa	Two publications were available only in English.	Rectified
2429	Ottawa	Unilingual English letter.	Explanation offered
2492	Chibougamau (Quebec)	Unilingual English advertisement in <i>La Sentinelle</i> .	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2977	Ottawa	In the magazine <i>Habitat</i> , the book reviews were not translated into French.	Rectified
3246	Ottawa	CHMC's name was engraved in English only on a pen.	Rectified

CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER—"There's Gotta Be Something Better Than This"

EVALUATION

Election promises are now shrivelling on the vine or yielding their harvest in due season; soothsayers and diviners, more often pretentious than prescient, are on the dole; and defeated candidates are sifting through memories of the magnificent structures that would have been built on the consent of the majority. But one lamp is still burning: the Office of the Chief Electoral Officer is patiently at work, preparing for the next interregnum. While it has acted speedily upon the 18 complaints received, it has fully implemented only half of the recommendations formulated as a result of our special study completed in July 1972. However, the Chief Electoral Officer plans to suggest that various amendments be made to the Canada Elections Act to ensure the equal status of both official languages, and he will seek to implement the other recommendations, with his customary impartial zeal, in order to ensure that his services are provided in both official languages.

The latest information obtained from the Chief Electoral Officer indicates that of the 16 recommendations made in July 1972 following a special study, seven have now been acted upon. In particular, these recommendations concerned ballots, forms circulated during elections, special deputy returning officers, and telephone service and correspondence in the offices of returning officers in so-called bilingual electoral districts (those in which one of the two official languages is the mother tongue of at least 5% of the enumerated population). With regard to the two recommendations concerning notices and posters, returning officers throughout the country will be provided with the general contents of these documents in both official languages, in order to prevent errors in printing; as for the entries to be added locally on such notices and posters, the Chief Electoral Officer informed this Office that only bilingual electoral districts have staff capable of carrying out this work correctly in both official languages. As a consequence, these

two recommendations will be only partly implemented in unilingual electoral districts. We hope that the Chief Electoral Officer will be able to find a formula enabling him to conform entirely to these recommendations in the next by-elections or general elections.

In order to improve the quality of printing during election periods, the Chief Electoral Officer will issue directives to printers, reminding them of the importance of producing error-free texts in both official languages. We recommended that persons wishing to communicate orally or in writing with election officials in the official language other than the one used in their electoral district be enabled to obtain service directly from the Office of the Chief Electoral Officer; according to the latter, implementation of this recommendation presents considerable difficulties. It is our opinion that the persons to whom this recommendation refers should be informed by the appropriate media that they can communicate with Ottawa at no expense. The announcements could also indicate the telephone number of the Office of the Chief Electoral Officer in Ottawa.

Two other recommendations concerned the services in both languages that electors in an electoral bilingual district are entitled to expect from electoral personnel—enumerators, revising officers and deputy returning officers. According to the explanations provided by the Chief Electoral Officer, bilingual services will be available only in voting districts containing a linguistic minority group “of a certain size”. (We would like to study in greater detail the implications of this arrangement before commenting upon it.) However, our Office stresses the urgency of setting up control mechanisms—as, moreover, the Chief Electoral Officer proposes to do—ensuring that throughout each bilingual electoral district the minority group receives the services to which it is entitled under the Official Languages Act.

As it is the responsibility of the political parties to appoint the returning officers for each electoral district, it is also important to draw the attention of these parties to the requirements of the Official Languages Act. They should ensure that the returning officer thus appointed recruits enumerators, revising officers and deputy returning officers capable of providing required services in both languages where this proves to be necessary, particularly in the electoral bilingual districts.

Finally, with regard to amendments to be made to the Canada Elections Act, the Chief Electoral Officer agreed to enter them on the agenda of the next meeting of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Most of the eighteen complaints involving the Office of the Chief Electoral Officer were submitted by French-speaking Ontarians.

After communicating with the returning officers concerned, the Chief Electoral Officer provided us with explanations concerning each of these complaints. To prevent the recurrence of such incidents, we reminded him in most cases of the recommendations formulated as a result of the special study.

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1983	Windsor	Poor quality of the French in public announcements.	Explanation offered
2996, 2998, 3003	Sudbury	French-speakers were visited by unilingual English enumerators.	Explanation offered
3011	Richibouctou (NB)	Lists of electors and polling divisions prepared in English only.	Explanation offered
3023, 3028	Ottawa, Timmins	Notice of enumeration completed in English although the information had been furnished in French.	Explanation offered
3045	Earlton (Ontario)	Telephone reception in English only: Returning Officer.	Withdrawn
3054	Mattawa (Ontario)	Unilingual English posters in the post office.	Explanation offered
3060	Ottawa-Centre	Services provided in English at the office for this electoral district.	Rectified
3092	Ottawa	Enumerators should be able to record the occupations of French-speaking voters in French.	Explanation offered
3098	Rogersville (NB)	Notice of enumeration posted in English only and electors' occupations recorded in English only on the list of electors.	Explanation offered
3109	Mattawa (Ontario)	Notice posted in English only.	Explanation offered
3110	Ottawa	A unilingual English enumerator called on a French-speaking person.	Explanation offered
3116	Ottawa	Services provided in English only at the polling station.	Explanation offered
3119	Vancouver	Electoral list printed in English only.	Explanation offered
3139	Ottawa	A French-speaker was visited by unilingual English enumerators.	Explanation offered
3146	Sudbury	The majority of the lists of electors were compiled in English only.	Explanation offered

COMMUNICATIONS—"Call Me"

EVALUATION

In these days of sophisticated communications systems, from electronic eavesdropping to telex to telepathy, the only thing worse than dialling the wrong number is not being able to find it in the directory. Many of the 16 complaints received against this Department concerned telephone service, more particularly absence of bilingual listings or operators. Our Office made recommendations with respect to two complaints. There were, however, no jammed circuits, busy signals or receivers left off the hook between the two offices. Although federal government telephone listings remain unilingual in many centres across the country, the Department has acted swiftly to settle complaints and carry out preventive measures. An Ottawa legend has it also that the Department's mynah birds are learning to chirp back in the language of the caller.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1579—Telephone Directory

A French-speaker noticed that the listings of federal institutions were in English only in the Goose Bay telephone directory.

The Department informed the Commissioner that it had already taken steps to ensure that the listings of federal institutions be made in both official languages in the telephone directories of places located in bilingual areas. This programme was to be completed in December 1974 and to include all the main cities of Canada. Since the town of Goose Bay was located in an area where there was a rather small French-speaking population, it was not covered in the programme.

The Commissioner recommended that the Department extend its programme to include other Canadian and foreign cities where there are federal offices.

The Department replied in September 1974 that the implementation of the Commissioner's recommendation required supplementary funds as well as the necessary change in policy. It had written to the Treasury Board accordingly.

Treasury Board later recommended that a study be conducted to examine the situation in foreign countries. The study would be carried

out by a Government Telecommunications Agency-Information Canada committee in consultation with the Department of External Affairs and the Treasury Board Secretariat and it would recommend the action planned along with the resources required. The committee would probably complete the study by February 1975.

Listings in Canada could be made bilingual as soon as the Federal Identity Program Manual was published (publication was planned for November 1974). As there are 200 directories (including Telex), the Department would require three years to achieve its objective. This time estimate reflected the annual production cycle of directories and the anticipated time required for distribution. The Department was preparing a submission to Treasury Board to obtain the resources required.

In the meantime, action had been taken in all departments and agencies to ensure Federal Government listings would be published in both official languages in designated bilingual areas on a continuing basis. With regard to listings not bilingual as of December 1974, the situation in Canada was as follows:

- a) designated bilingual areas: of a total of 39 directories, 29 would have 100% bilingual listings; three would have 90%; one at 85%; five at 75% and the Vancouver directory at 35%; by mid-1975, 100% would be bilingual at all locations;
- b) other domestic directories: approximately 200 directories including Telex will require attention and they would be bilingual by December 1977.

The Commissioner informed the Department that he was satisfied with the measures taken.

File No. 3170 — Manuals in English

A French-speaker drew the Commissioner's attention to the fact that the departmental publication *Monitoring Service Manual: MS-1 Operations* (2nd edition) was not available in French.

The Department told the Commissioner that the publication was one of twenty manuals intended for its radio inspectors and other technical staff. Fifteen of them had already been translated, printed and distributed. The translation of the manual in question had been completed and was now being revised, and the French edition was expected to be ready shortly.

Noting that although the French version of the publication was expected to be available shortly five manuals in the series had yet to be

published in French, the Commissioner was of the opinion that this constituted a violation of the Official Languages Act. He therefore decided to recommend that:

- 1) the five manuals which were not yet available in French be published in that language by 31 March 1975, and
- 2) in future, all of the Department's publications, including those intended for the use of its technical staff, be made available simultaneously in English and French, preferably in a bilingual edition.

The Department replied as follows to the Commissioner's recommendations:

- 1) The French version of the manual MS-1 would go to press on 15 October. Translation of the four other manuals was completed. All that remained to be done was final revision and preparation of fair copy for the printers. Everything should be finished by 31 December 1974.
- 2) For some time the Department had been applying a policy of putting out simultaneous English and French versions of its new publications. The present manuals had been published in English more than 10 years ago by the Department of Transport, and the sudden demand for a translation of these publications (more than 500,000 words) had imposed a heavy burden on its own Translation Services, which had had to spread the work over a rather long period of time. This explained the delay in publishing the manuals in French.

The Department added that it had made a new request for additional translators to the Department of the Secretary of State and hoped for a favourable response.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1852	Ottawa	One of the receptionists at the government's main number replied in French only.	Rectified
2034	Ottawa	The Governor General's residence, Rideau Hall, was listed in English only in the government directory.	Rectified
2085	Moncton Halifax	Government telephone directories in small towns were printed in English only.	Rectified
2131	Edmonton	Lack of service in French at the federal government's information office in Edmonton.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2164	St. John's (Newfoundland)	A public servant wished to take French courses.	Explanation offered
2329	Ottawa	No telephone services in French at the switchboard of the Communications Research Centre, Shirley Bay.	Rectified
2412	Ottawa	Unilingual English-speaking switchboard operator in the government telephone repair service.	Rectified
2658	Kirkland Lake (Ontario)	Government agencies were listed in English only in the telephone directory for the Kirkland Lake region.	Rectified
2926	Ottawa	An English-speaker was refused the services of a French monitor.	Explanation offered
2975	Ottawa	A switchboard operator replied in English to a French-speaking person.	Explanation offered
3123	Vancouver	Not all the listings in the government directory were bilingual.	Rectified
3236	Windsor	The government directory was not bilingual.	Rectified
3272	Ottawa	Cards identifying items on loan to the Central Canada Exhibition were allegedly unilingual English.	Not justified

ENVIRONMENT—"On a Clear Day"

EVALUATION

The Department considers that it has fully carried out 36 of the 45 recommendations this Office made as a result of its 1972 study of the Atmospheric Environment Service (AES). Recommendations concerning recruitment, language training and retention, translation, the automatic provision of bilingual service to the public, the appointment of a bilingual co-ordinator, signs, ways of increasing use of French in internal communications, have received the Department's ecological attention. However, the Department has failed to provide enough details on the actual measures taken, and is not capable of forecasting when the nine outstanding recommendations will be put into effect.

On the other hand, the Department seems to have fully implemented seven of the nine minor recommendations we made after study-

ing the Fisheries Service, Moncton, in 1972; it has made serious progress in fully carrying out the remaining two.

Members of the public transmitted 40 complaints against Environment Canada, five of which led to recommendations. These were acted on within a reasonable time. To the other 35 complaints, the Department usually reacted promptly and settled them effectively.

Environment Canada has successfully changed its headquarters' (in Hull) bilingual appearance by giving priority to French on all visual aspects. Nevertheless, it has a major fog-lifting task ahead before the two official languages are equally free of haze.

With respect to Special Studies (AES) recommendations, in several instances, information provided by the Department implied that implementation was either partly achieved or it was less than adequate. For example, in the case of our recommendation that publications be produced automatically in both official languages, the Department has made an exception where original scientific research material is concerned. However, its decision is being re-appraised by this Office in the light of recent complaints.

Of the nine recommendations yet to be acted on, Environment Canada imposed limitations on the one concerning publication of the internal newsletter *Zephyr* completely in both languages. Departmental policy is to print the lead article in English and French, and other articles and information in the official language of the author. The Department believes that such a practice aids the development of "bilingual conscience and competence" and it encourages French-speakers to write articles in their own language. The Department has improved the bilingual appearance of *Zephyr* since receiving this Office's recommendations but, in some respects, the equality of status of both languages is still not being respected. The solution might be to encourage the preparation of texts in either language and to translate a few more articles into French.

Environment Canada has moved on the remaining recommendations which, with the exception of the one concerning language training for support staff, relate mainly to the Department's contacts with the public. These contacts involved the AES exhibit at the Ontario Science Centre as well as the provision of various types of weather information. As of January 1975, weather services are available in both official languages east of Thunder Bay only. However, plans are in the offing to introduce a computerized forecast translation system for eastern and western Canada by June 1975. If this date proves untenable, a manned unit will be established in order to meet the Department's own December 1975 deadline.

As ways of increasing the use of French in internal communications, the Department's ideas included recruiting French-speakers and encouraging the preparation of scientific research texts in French.

The 1972 study of the Fisheries Service, Moncton, led to only nine minor recommendations, thanks to the efforts already made there by the Department. By November 1974, the Department considered as fully implemented seven recommendations covering signage, telephone service in both languages, bilingual service in the Albert branch office, bilingual forms, rubber stamps and form letters intended for public use. The Department has taken steps to put fully into effect two partly implemented recommendations; measures were underway to introduce bilingual flashes on uniforms and, in the case of telephone identification, the Department instructed employees to identify the office in both languages.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1667—Language of Work in Hull

An alderman for the city of Hull sent the Commissioner a copy of a letter that he had addressed to the Minister of the Environment with reference to a complaint that he had received concerning the language of work in the Fontaine Building in Hull.

A woman had come to work in the Department in what she expected to be a bilingual setting. She was extremely disappointed to find that she was required to do little work requiring a knowledge of French. She realized that her supervisor and all the personnel in her section were unilingual English-speakers, which accounted for the fact that not only was 95% of her work in English, but she was obliged to communicate throughout the day with other staff members in English only. For these reasons, she quit her job.

The alderman wrote that this situation was intolerable, and that management personnel assigned to federal buildings in Hull should be bilingual.

The Department sent the Commissioner a copy of a letter that the Minister had addressed to the complainant, explaining the reasons for the departure of the employee in question.

The Commissioner nevertheless insisted on carrying out a more thorough investigation of the status of the French language in the Department's head office. This investigation touched on the following points:

(1) Bilingualism directives

The Commissioner asked the Department whether it had ever issued any directives concerning bilingualism. The Department replied in May 1973 that its first directives dated from May and July 1970, when it was called the Department of Fisheries and Forestry. The creation of the Department of the Environment from elements of seven existing departments, following an Order in Council in November 1970 and an Act of Parliament approved in June 1971, did not take place without a certain amount of confusion. It was for this reason that during its long gestation period, the Department of the Environment had not given the matter of bilingualism, then under study, the attention that it would otherwise have had. It pointed out, however, that it had already issued two directives relating to the language of work in French-language units, as well as memoranda concerning bilingual signs.

In June 1973, the Deputy Minister of the Environment published a brochure for the information of all employees, entitled "Policy on Bilingualism in the Department".

The Commissioner nevertheless pointed out to the Department that its policy, while commendable, was not specific enough with regard to the language of work. He would have liked to see the Department draw up a detailed plan for the establishment of French as one of the two working languages in a number of its branches, particularly in the Fontaine Building. He therefore recommended that the Department prepare such a plan and send him a copy of it for discussion purposes.

In response to this recommendation, the Department indicated that the government had not yet adopted any concrete measures or proposed any program for implementing the second part of the June 1973 resolution of Parliament on the official languages. The Department was, moreover, eagerly awaiting government directives in this regard. On the other hand, it believed that the identification and designation of bilingual positions could only serve to promote the use of French as a working language.

(2) Services to personnel

The Commissioner asked the Department if all services provided to personnel by the Personnel Directorate, the Library, Legal Services and so forth were made available in both official languages.

The Department replied that one of the clauses of its bilingualism policy stipulated that "effective immediately, in all matters of personnel services, employees of both language groups will be served either in the

written or oral form in their preferred official language". It added that this was in fact the practice.

(3) *Francophone representation*

In May 1973, Francophone representation in the senior administration of the Department was limited to two persons: the Senior Assistant Deputy Minister and the Director-General of Personnel. It has since doubled with the appointment of a Director-General of Finance and Facilities and a Director of Federal-Provincial Programs.

The Commissioner reminded the Department that the parliamentary secretary to the President of the Privy Council had informed the House of Commons on 16 May 1973 that 88.9% of the employees of the Department were unilingual English-speakers. He made it clear that he was troubled by the low proportion of French-speakers. He consequently invited the Department to take all measures necessary to increase the number of French-speaking employees during the next few years, in order to achieve a better numerical balance between English-speakers and French-speakers at all levels.

The Department replied that any appointment in the Public Service was subject to the merit principle and that to date, the expression of willingness to learn a second language and the knowledge of it were considered equivalent in this respect. The Department added that if the resolution of Parliament of June 1973 had been followed by a government program promoting the recruitment of French-speakers, its bilingualism policy would have reflected this. It was prepared to change its policy should the government adopt a plan in this regard. It stated that in any case, it was very conscious of the imbalance in the proportion of English-speakers and French-speakers, and that it was now making every effort to rectify this situation on the basis of current government policy and the Public Service Employment Act.

(4) *Language requirements of positions*

Since the Department was proceeding with the identification of bilingual and unilingual positions during the course of this investigation, the Commissioner expressed the hope that the proportion of unilingual French and bilingual positions would reflect more accurately than in the past the linguistic balance in the general population.

According to the Department's census, the breakdown of positions to be progressively designated between now and December 1978 is as follows: 72% of the positions require English only, 3% require French

only, 16% require knowledge of both languages and 9% require knowledge of either language; in principle, this would open a total of 12% of the positions to unilingual French-speakers.

The Commissioner was of the opinion that the figures cited above were only preliminary data subject to amendment by Treasury Board and did not necessarily reflect the situation in the Public Service as a whole. Treasury Board had assured him that it was at present actively engaged in developing a program which would give French greater prominence in the federal Public Service, especially in its regional operations in Quebec, in accordance with the second part of the resolution adopted by Parliament in June 1973.

(5) *Integration into the community*

The Commissioner asked the Department whether it had taken special measures since moving to Hull to integrate itself as harmoniously as possible into the surrounding language community.

The Department replied that before and since its arrival in Hull, it had taken measures which, though mainly of a socio-economic nature, had nevertheless had an effect in the cultural and linguistic sphere. These measures had begun with the Department's own initiative to change the name of the building from "Brontor" to "Fontaine" and had touched upon other aspects, such as urban transportation, taxi service, the purchase of equipment, warehouse facilities, personnel recruitment agencies and the transfer of its social activities; the Department had also asked its Co-ordinator of Bilingualism Development to examine the possibility of implementing through his services the most recent decision of the Hull city council regarding the priority to be given to French in the posting of notices.

The Commissioner strongly encouraged the Department to continue its efforts in this direction, so that its linguistic image might become more satisfactory to the people of Hull.

(6) *French-language units*

The Commissioner pointed out to the Department that it was somewhat surprising that there were no French-language units in the headquarters of a department as large as Environment Canada. Firmly convinced that every federal institution should have such units at its head office, the Commissioner recommended that this question be closely re-examined once the identification of bilingual and unilingual positions was completed, and that at least some of the main divisions of

the Department be transformed into French-language units. He made it clear that this measure should have no bearing on the recommendation made in point No. 1, since in his opinion French should enjoy the status of a working language outside the French-language units.

The Department replied that the establishment of French-language units in the National Capital Region was a difficult matter. In the first place, Hull had to be considered a part of the region, just as Ottawa was. It followed that Hull was subject to government policy applicable to the region as a whole. The Department added that even though it was always advisable to take the sociological climate into consideration, the mere fact of being located in Hull rather than Ottawa made it no easier to set up French-language units.

At the end of an in-depth analysis of the possibility of creating French-language units in the National Capital Region, the Department concluded that this would not be feasible at the present time. It considered, in fact, that it had first to ensure that services were provided in French to the 17 French-language units already in existence and that all communications with these units were carried out in French. To this end, the Department had designated as bilingual more than one-third of the positions in divisions in the National Capital Region and the Atmospheric Environment Service in Toronto which in the course of their work had contact with the French-language units. The Department was eagerly awaiting the government program concerning French-language units, and it assured the Commissioner that it would enthusiastically implement any practical plan that might be proposed.

In addition, the Department indicated that it was examining the possibility of setting up French-language work groups. These would differ from French-language units in that the employees assigned to them would continue to serve other staff members in both languages, at the same time encouraging French-speakers and bilingual English-speakers to address them and obtain services in French.

(7) *Percentage of work in French*

The Commissioner asked the Department approximately what percentage of work, by job category, was carried out in French in the Fontaine Building. The Department replied that this percentage varied greatly according to the type of service provided and to the job category involved. It was also necessary to distinguish between oral work and written work. Even within the written work category, according to the Department, it was difficult to arrive at an exact figure. The Department sent the Commissioner various statistics, mainly concerning divisions providing services to departmental personnel. It said it was hoping

for an improved percentage in several of these divisions as well as in other branches of the Department.

The Department recently informed the Commissioner that the use of French had increased in branches other than the Personnel Directorate. As an example it mentioned the Quebec Regional Board, one of five regional boards located throughout the country, which worked exclusively in French; the minutes of its meetings were distributed to the entire Department in French only.

Moreover, in its budget estimates for 1974-75, the Department asked Treasury Board to grant it a total of eighty-four man-years for the creation of unilingual French positions in the divisions responsible for staffing, administrative trainees, services to the French-language units, training and development and working instruments.

(8) *Documents for general use*

The question asked of the Department on this subject was whether all documents for general use by employees in carrying out their duties, such as notices, directives, reports, manuals and so forth, were provided in both official languages.

The Department replied that some of the documents for general use were already available in both official languages. Moreover, as part of its new bilingualism policy, all new documents of this type would be distributed in English and French. With regard to other documents which were available in only one language, they would be translated no later than 31 December 1978. The Commissioner asked the Department to expedite the translation of these documents.

The Department recently indicated that its plan for translating all unilingual documents by the end of 1978 would be subject to two external factors. It mentioned the Alie Report, named after the person who evaluated the Department's translation needs last summer: this study and the recommendations which resulted from it were presented to the Translation Bureau of the Department of the Secretary of State. It added that the Translation Bureau had agreed to assign an additional translation module to the Department of the Environment immediately and to provide it with one or two others during the 1974-75 fiscal year. The Department pointed out that the systematic distribution of documents in both languages throughout its organization by December 1978 would depend on the effectiveness of these new resources.

The Commissioner assured the alderman that he would continue to follow closely the promises made by the Department, and that he would keep him informed of any significant developments.

File No. 2056—"Environmentally Yours"

A father in Ottawa sent the Commissioner a copy of a pamphlet entitled "Environmentally Yours" which was included in the material addressed to thousands of students in the "Student Mailbag".

The Department informed the Commissioner that the document "Environmentally Yours" was made up of articles which originally appeared in two departmental publications, "Pollution Primer" and "Environment Needs You".

"Environmentally Yours" was first published as a supplement to a recent issue of the magazine "Today's Generation", which is sent to some 125,000 secondary school students across Canada. The "Student Mailbag" is a mailing system made available by the publishers of the magazine and their circulation list belongs to the agency, Canadian High News Limited.

Unfortunately, this magazine was published only in English. There were no comparable magazines or distribution services available in French. However, with the assistance of the Information Services Branch of Environment Canada, the publisher arranged with the publishers of the magazine "Le naturaliste" to produce a French version of "Environmentally Yours". Again with the co-operation of the Information Services Branch, the publisher endeavoured to draw up mailing lists for the French-speaking public in order to enlarge his own readership.

The Commissioner recommended to the Department that mailing lists be carefully checked to ensure that French-speaking students attending English-language schools (and vice versa) always receive government publications in the official language of their choice.

File No. 2183—Creeping Errors

The complainant noted that several signs at the Department of the Environment in Hull contained errors: for example, "Gestion de l'Environnement," "Relevés Hydrologique—" "Chef de la Services du Personnel."

The Department acknowledged that a great many errors had crept into the signs, which had been hastily prepared when its offices were moved to Hull. It invited representatives of the Commissioner to visit the premises and submit to the Commissioner a list of the corrective measures to be taken.

The Commissioner recommended:

- 1) that all notices and signs for informing the public or the staff as a whole at Place Vincent Massey be bilingual;

2) that one or two persons competent in French and English be designated by the Department to be responsible for all notices and signs;

3) that no employee be authorized to make changes in notices or signs or to put up new signs unless the French and English texts have been approved by the person(s) designated by the Department.

The Department welcomed these recommendations and took the necessary steps to carry them out. It also sent the Commissioner a copy of the directives it had issued in this regard.

File No. 2268—Regional Managers

The complainant noticed that a competition poster advertising positions of Regional Managers stated that a knowledge of English only was required. Since the duties of these positions included dealing with the general public and departmental personnel, the complainant was of the opinion that two positions, those of Regional Managers for Quebec and the Maritimes, should require a knowledge of both English and French.

The Department replied that the two positions of District Managers in the Maritimes and in Quebec had been declared bilingual. The incumbents of these positions report to the Regional Managers and should be able to satisfy the need for service to the public in both official languages.

Considering that the positions of Regional Managers included supervisory duties in regions where French should be (Quebec) or could be (Maritimes) the normal language of work, in addition to the responsibility of dealing with the public, the Commissioner recommended that these positions be declared bilingual.

The Department replied that the position of Regional Manager (Quebec) would require the knowledge of both English and French. It added, however, that the language requirements for the position of Regional Manager (Maritimes) would not be changed since they had been established in conformity with Treasury Board guidelines. The Treasury Board concurred in the Department's decision. The Commissioner indicated that he maintained his position on his recommendation and that he would in due course report on its implementation to the Clerk of the Privy Council and Parliament.

After further discussions, the Commissioner asked for an organizational chart of positions in the Maritime Region (Fisheries and Marine Service) from the level of Chief to that of Director, along with an indication of language requirements and designation dates, as well as a description of duties for each of these positions. This would

allow the Commissioner to assess more fully the nature of services offered to the general public and departmental employees. Shortly after, the Department announced that the position of "Regional Manager, Small Craft Harbours—Maritime Region" had been identified as bilingual in conformity with the Commissioner's recommendation. The Department also promised to send the required organizational chart as soon as its current reorganization has been completed.

File No. 2416—Fisheries Service

A French-speaker from Shediac, New Brunswick, where 85% of the population is French-speaking, stated that the Fisheries Service office in Shediac answers its telephone in English only.

After a first check, the Department told the Commissioner that the receptionist had indeed answered: "Fisheries Service/Service des Pêches" to the caller. Then the latter apparently began a short conversation which was carried on in very acceptable French.

After receiving the Department's reply, a check made by a representative of the Commissioner's office revealed that although the telephone receptionist was in fact bilingual she failed to identify the Service in French.

The Commissioner recommended that the telephone be answered in the two official languages at the Fisheries Service office in Shediac.

The Senior Assistant Deputy Minister for Fisheries and Marine Sciences issued a directive ordering telephone receptionists always to identify the Fisheries Service in French and English.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1705	Ottawa	Ottawa Weather Office identified in English only on the telephone.	Rectified
1763	Wye Marsh (Ontario)	Unilingual English documents sent to a French-language organization by the Wye Marsh Wildlife Centre operated by the Canadian Wildlife Service.	Rectified
1820	Ottawa	A competition poster announcing an opening for a director stated that only a knowledge of English was essential.	Rectified
1892	Ottawa	Unilingual English signs in the parking lot of the Canadian Wildlife Service's Eastern Region office.	Rectified
1925	Ottawa	Transfer to Toronto of a unilingual English employee: Weather Office.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1978	Montreal	Garbage bag labelled in English only.	Withdrawn
2093, 2344	Halifax and Fredericton	Press releases in English only sent to a French daily.	Rectified
2116, 2342	Winnipeg (Manitoba)	Services rarely available in French at the Winnipeg Weather Office.	Rectified
2125	North Bay (Ontario)	Calls for tenders posted in English only in the post office.	Rectified
2304	Ottawa	Unilingual English stamp.	Rectified
2439	Burlington (Ontario)	Provisions were allegedly made to use English as the only working language at the International Symposium on the Geochemistry of Natural Waters.	Rectified
2456	Hamilton	Unilingual English brochure.	Explanation offered
2588	Ottawa	Unilingual English emblem on a French-language publication released by the Canadian Hydrographic Service.	Rectified
2641, 2650, 2684	Ottawa	Mediocrity of the French in the December 1973 edition of the magazine <i>Pêches</i> .	Rectified
2680	Ottawa	Unsatisfactory results of a French Language Knowledge Examination due to noisy conditions.	Rectified
2981	Ottawa	No French version of the <i>Weather Ways</i> manual (1974).	Explanation offered
3022	Ottawa	Poor quality of the French in a publication.	Rectified
3089	Ottawa	Application for a position rejected.	Explanation offered
3104	Ottawa	Publication available in English only.	Rectified
3209	Hull (Quebec)	Menu and service in English only at the restaurant in the Fontaine Building.	Explanation offered

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—"I Left My Heart in San Francisco"

EVALUATION

In diplomatic circles, where euphemism is traded for understatement, any crude criticism would suggest that the spokesman was but

a mere third vice-consul unable to distinguish démarche from diktat. And yet, one cannot help but wonder at this Department's "surprisingly" slow progress. According to usually reliable sources, it is true, several of our recommendations have been or will soon be included in the Department's Manual of Procedures. On the other hand, to state that the Department has been a little lackadaisical in dealing with the 19 complaints filed since last year would not be so unfair as to justify an aide-mémoire of protest.

The missions that the Department of External Affairs maintains in Western Europe and the Americas were the subject of a special study in 1972, and of a report containing 51 recommendations concerning such aspects of the application of the Official Languages Act as representation, human resources, departmental directives, manuals, printed matter and forms, reception of telephone calls, and internal communication.

The most recent information obtained indicates that of a total of 51 recommendations, 10 may be considered fully implemented, 18 partly implemented, and 19 not implemented. The Department has given no indication of the fate of the other four recommendations. In other words, while some progress has been made, much remains to be done.

The situation may be summarized as follows: in terms of accomplishments, it is clear that the Department has fully or partly implemented a number of recommendations concerning services offered to the public and internal communication at its missions.

The Department has reminded senior officials at its missions to respect the equal status of the two official languages in contacts with the public; it has also made efforts to respect this status in the exhibitions for which it is responsible. Moreover, it has adopted many, if not all, of the measures recommended to improve telephone service at the missions. As the missions distribute official statements and make films available to the public, the Department has tried to ensure that all statements appear in both official languages and that a suitable proportion of films are available in each of the two languages at all locations. Finally, the Department is making sure that printed matter distributed to the public by the missions is available in both official languages, preferably in a single document; where this type of presentation is not possible, each version identifies the Department in both languages, and the reader is informed that an equivalent document exists in the other official language. The recommendation that all forms for use outside the Department be bilingual has been carried out, but the one requiring that rubber stamps for external use be made bilingual has been only partly implemented.

In terms of accomplishments relating to internal communication, a number of recommendations have been wholly or partly implemented. In the area of departmental directives, the missions have assembled documentation on bilingualism, and the Department has partly implemented recommendations that bilingual administration manuals, reference works and dictionaries be made available to employees at the missions. In addition, although to only a limited degree, documents for general use within the missions are issued simultaneously in both languages.

Along with these fairly substantial accomplishments, the Office of the Commissioner noted a number of weaknesses. Certain recommendations relating to contact with the public and internal communication have not yet been carried out. This is the case with two recommendations that works contained in mission libraries be made available in both languages in a suitable ratio.

It is also the case with two recommendations concerning identification of the Department in both official languages in press releases and classified advertisements. Finally, the recommendations concerning visual aspects, forms, stationery, cards and typewriters have not all been carried out.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1935 — Cars of the future

A French-speaker complained that documents distributed to the public at an exhibition of cars of the future were for the most part printed in English only. Certain captions describing the exhibits were also in English as were the films shown on closed-circuit television.

The exhibition had been prepared by the Department with the help of the National Museum of Science and Technology and the Department of the Environment, on the occasion of the meeting in Ottawa of the NATO Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society.

The Department informed the Commissioner that it had sought to ensure that documentation and captions supplied by NATO were bilingual. This had indeed been the case.

In regard to other participants, the Department explained that they represented automobile manufacturers or the Government of the United States and that it found it difficult to press unduly the matter of bilingualism. Given the nature of the exhibition, the short space of time allowed for its preparation and the large number of bilingual documents which had nevertheless been made available to the public, the Department believed that it had done all it could to fulfil its role. The number

of visitors on 14 and 15 April had greatly exceeded predictions and it was quite possible that documents in a given language had not been available at one time or another.

In reply, the Commissioner stated that he believed it was important, for events of this type, to provide the documentation offered to the public in French as well as in English. He therefore recommended that participants in such exhibitions be invited in future to comply in this respect with the provisions of the Official Languages Act.

The Department assured the Commissioner that it always sought to reflect the bilingual character of Canada in public events of a similar nature. When the bilingualism adviser learned that the Department would be responsible for or would take part in an exhibition, he made certain that both official languages were given their proper place by sending a memorandum on the matter to those responsible. The Department indicated to the Commissioner that, for example, it had ensured the bilingual character of the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers held in the summer of 1973, as well as that of the Conference of Commonwealth Ministers of Finance (September 1974) and of the visit of the Prime Minister of Japan during the same month. Some time ago, the bilingualism adviser had established close contacts with the various branches of the Department and was preparing for the conference and exhibition to be held in Vancouver in 1976. The Department explained that it obviously could not be responsible for the acts or omissions of other departments and agencies. With regard to events in which it took part, it sought to keep a close watch in order to comply with the recommendations made by the Commissioner of Official Languages.

The Commissioner informed the Department that he found its reply satisfactory.

File No. 2264

The complainant discovered that a large map of Canada in the entrance hall of the Canadian Embassy in Haiti is labelled in English only.

The Department replied that such maps had been distributed to several missions a few years ago but that they were becoming increasingly difficult to obtain.

The Commissioner recommended that, starting with Port-au-Prince, all unilingual maps in public view in Canadian missions be replaced with bilingual maps.

The Department finally provided the Commissioner with a copy of its directive ordering that maps labelled in English only be removed.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1536	Ottawa	A French-speaker received the English version of the magazine <i>International Perspectives</i> . The envelope also bore an inscription in English only.	Explanation offered
1955	Ottawa	Plaques identifying the buildings or offices occupied by the representatives of foreign governments were often unilingual English.	Explanation offered
2147	Cape Town, Pretoria (South Africa)	Difficulty experienced in obtaining service in French at the Canadian Embassies in Cape Town and Pretoria.	Explanation offered
2358	Ottawa	Letter in English sent to a French-speaking person.	Explanation offered
2392	French West Indies	An objection was raised to the fact that there were no Canadian consulates in Martinique, Guadeloupe or French Guiana.	Explanation offered
2430	Ottawa	Only the words "External Affairs" appeared on a truck.	Rectified
2519	New Delhi (Coimbo)	Lack of service in French at the High Commissions in these two cities. In addition, in New Delhi the magazine <i>Canada</i> was published in English only.	Explanation offered
2621	Rome	Difficulty in obtaining service in French at the Canadian Embassy. In addition, the documents available were in English only.	Explanation offered
2767	Ottawa	Telegram written in English only sent to the employees of several missions abroad.	Explanation offered
2833	Ottawa	Grammatical error on a signboard in the parking lot of the Lester B. Pearson Building.	Explanation offered
2856	Ottawa	A French-speaker disputed the use of the title "Affaires Extérieures" instead of "Affaires Etrangères".	Explanation offered
2937	Ottawa	Unilingual receptionists at the Lester B. Pearson Building.	Not justified
2962	Ottawa	A French-speaking public servant asked the Commissioner for help in obtaining the necessary authorization to take a French course.	Referral
3048	Ottawa	Telephone service in English only at the Information Division, Europe.	Explanation offered
3222	Ottawa	Unilingual English stamp.	Rectified

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION—"Brother, Can You Spare a Dime?"

EVALUATION

The Farm Credit Corporation seems to have come across some kind of linguistic liability insurance service since it has prevented complaints and has succeeded, by July 1974, in applying six out of eight recommendations this Office made following a special study in 1971. Its credit, therefore, in matters of language, is still better than last year.

The Farm Credit Corporation has taken an active interest in language training and retention programmes and has ensured that signs, calling cards, telephone listings and publicity are in both official languages. Its guidelines on bilingualism, published in 1973, also make mention of these subjects.

The one remaining problem again this year is the difficulty of recruiting bilingual graduates in agriculture in order to offer service in both official language in the 26 offices mentioned in the 1971 special study. Seven such localities (Peace River, Athabasca, North Battleford, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Portage la Prairie, Brandon) are still a source of concern; however, in each case, either employees are taking language training or bilingual service is being assured by neighbouring offices, an acceptable temporary solution until such time as the problem is definitely resolved.

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—"Indian Love Song"

EVALUATION

The Department, through early recognition of its responsibility under the Official Languages Act's Section 10 to provide bilingual services to the public from coast to coast, traced a trail which departments and Crown corporations such as the Ministry of Transport and CN might profitably follow. The Department has shown foresight in developing a job-oriented language retention programme for employees located in Ottawa which, if successful, will be introduced in the parks. The Department has also wisely prolonged the services of the regional bilingual coordinators whose continued presence seems necessary to maintaining and extending the excellent results of the last three years. Nevertheless, it is somewhat disappointing to note that, while the De-

partment has made progress at several points of the bilingualism compass, it has postponed still further its target dates for giving effect to a number of recommendations made as a result of complaints and two special studies.

Citizens lodged 23 complaints against the Department, most of which concerned signs and services, mainly in the national parks. Four of these required recommendations. The Department, as in the past, was commendably prompt in finding satisfactory solutions to complaints in nearly all cases.

Even though the Department has been among the leaders in accepting and implementing the Official Languages Act, it is a pity that the Tussaud Wax Museum in Banff continues successfully to frustrate the objectives of this Office and the IAND and to create a violation of the Act. This museum remains an uncharacteristic yet regrettable example of the Department's legal quibbling and administrative pussyfooting with its concessionaires.

As stated in the *Third Annual Report*, the National Parks and Historic Sites Branch was the subject of two special studies done by this Office.

In a report to us in November 1974, the Department indicated that during that year it had made progress in rendering national parks signs bilingual, had distributed a bilingual manual of directional and information signs, made a greater number of interpretive programmes available in both languages and recruited additional bilingual naturalists in the Maritime Provinces. In addition, the Department had identified its manpower needs with a view to recruiting appropriate staff for parks in Western Canada.

However, despite these measures, some 40 recommendations have not yet been fully implemented. The Department is unwilling to move forward its 1977 completion date for making all historic markers bilingual. In 1972, we recommended a target date of June 1975 and still consider a further delay, without clearly explained valid reasons, of two and a half years as unacceptable.

The Department indicated that, while it expected all signs in national parks to be bilingual by June 1975, it had extended the target date for the signs programme in the canal systems to May 1976. This Office had already taken issue with the Department for changing the original date for signs in the canal systems from December 1974 to June 1975. This further delay, for which no explanation has been provided, seems totally unreasonable, especially since relatively few signs are involved. Moreover, the Department has still not fully met recommendations concerning bilingual labels, descriptive texts and the greater use of symbol signs, the meaning of which would be explained

in a bilingual brochure. The Department has also been slow to open negotiations with provincial governments with a view to replacing unilingual park approach signs.

This Office had recommended that all public information material be provided in both official languages by June 1972. Although the Department had previously reported that it had met this recommendation, its most recent reply revealed that approximately seventy brochures distributed in western parks were still unilingual and that the target date for making them available in both official languages had been changed to June 1976. Once again, little information was provided to explain the Department's derogation from the target date recommended.

The Department has made little progress in providing bilingual telephone listings for parks and canals offices or in ensuring that weather and road reports are in both languages. Bilingual service was still not available at information booths at all times, although the Department has assured this Office that it is provided during the "normal visitor season."

The Department had not met its target of December 1973 for having recordings used in interpretive programmes available in both languages, nor is it clear when recordings, slides and films will be available at all locations in French and English. It is essential that the Department recognize the importance of this information service to the travelling public.

The Department had begun to develop a language training programme within the parks, and was still studying the possibility of establishing a naturalist school in the east to provide specialized language training. Although a job oriented language retention programme has been developed for employees located in Ottawa, nothing, however, has been done to develop language training and retention programmes for employees of the Canals Division.

The Department stated that it had taken steps to ensure that concessionaire services are provided in both official languages. However, it still needs to exert a greater influence to achieve the desired result, since certain of these services, such as the provision of bilingual safety signs, were far from satisfactory.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1933—An Amendment

A French-speaker complained that a competition for Land Title Officers in the Indian and Eskimo Affairs Program had been amended

to admit both unilingual and bilingual candidates but the amendment had been circulated in English only.

The Department explained that the positions advertised called for people who would do research and interpret documents that had been prepared in English. The competition poster required competence in English only; the positions were not identified as bilingual.

The Department told the Commissioner that it had wanted to make these positions accessible to French-speakers as well as to English-speakers. An amendment had therefore been published to open the competition to candidates who did not have the language qualification but were willing to take language training. Due to an oversight, the amendment had been circulated in English only.

The Commissioner recommended that a revised competition notice be issued in both official languages.

The Department replied that it now realized that the amendment did not conform to the provisions of the Government's bilingualism policy and that it could not offer to provide language training to meet the language requirements of positions where only a knowledge of English was required. The Commissioner accordingly agreed to withdraw his recommendation.

File Nos. 2076, 2191—Cruise Boats

Two French-speaking persons complained of a lack of services in French on the cruise boats operated by Paul's Boat Lines on the Rideau Canal and the Ottawa River. The Commissioner thought that this complaint had been disposed of in his Annual Report for 1971-1972 (page 261).

The Department of Indian and Northern Affairs—to which this complaint applies, as a result of a transfer of departmental responsibility—and the Commissioner each sent a representative to make an one-the-spot investigation. They observed that a tape-recorded commentary was provided in French and English during the cruise. The quality of the language spoken appeared to be satisfactory. It appeared, however, that there was no provision for assistance in French in the event of accident or emergency, as the personnel operating the boats were unilingual English. The representatives found that the notices and tickets were in English only, and that barely one-sixteenth of the space in the folders was allotted to French. The ticket sellers were serving English-speaking customers in their language, but were not doing the same for French-speaking customers.

After referring to the correspondence he had had in 1970 with the Department of Transport and the National Capital Commission, the Commissioner recommended to the Department of Indian and Northern

Affairs that the concessionaire be required immediately, in accordance with the terms of the lease which sets conditions for tourist services, to post bilingual notices, provide bilingual folders and tickets, and hire bilingual ticket sellers and commentators for the tourist cruises, so as to reflect the equal status of both official languages. He also recommended that the Department in future ensure, under the terms of any lease it may negotiate, that the concessionaire provide such bilingual services; this recommendation was particularly urgent as the Department would be dealing with the renewal of Paul's Boat Lines' lease on 1 January 1974.

The Department agreed to amend any future lease so as to require that the concessionaire respect the equality of both official languages in printing his notices, tickets, and so on, and in offering services. It reminded the Commissioner that it had no jurisdiction over Confederation Square or the Rideau Bridge, but indicated that it would endeavour to include a stipulation in the lease with regard to posters displayed by the operators in these locations.

Seven months later, the Commissioner had to point out to the Department that the concessionaire was still advertising in English only, and he asked to be informed of the steps taken by the Department to correct the situation before the opening of the 1974 tourist season. The Department replied that it would have the unilingual posters corrected immediately. There was also the matter of ensuring that service personnel are bilingual. However, as the current concession was about to expire, the concessionaire could not be expected to go to the expense of correcting his folders. In any event, the Department was to call for tenders for long-term operation of tourist cruises, and the successful bidder would be required to advertise and to provide services in both official languages, in some instances subject to prior approval by the Department.

File No. 2217—Concessionaires

A French-speaking tourist from St. Boniface, Manitoba, noticed to his regret that signs, publications and guide commentaries were in English only at the Tussaud Wax Museum in Banff National Park.

The Department informed the Commissioner that its bilingualism policy with regard to concessionaires was to ensure that a clause requiring that service to the public be provided in both official languages was inserted when leases were renewed or contracts signed.

In this case, it was discovered upon examination that such a clause had not been added to the contract. The Department therefore agreed to discuss the matter with museum representatives.

In spite of the national park superintendent's efforts at persuasion, the manager of the Museum was not prepared to take upon himself the additional costs that the provision of service in French would entail, since he believed that there was no significant demand and since the Museum was visited by many tourists speaking German, Ukrainian, Spanish and Japanese. The Department then offered to contribute to the preparation of a bilingual brochure and a bilingual sound track. The manager, while refusing the department's offer, said that he would keep its suggestion in mind.

The Commissioner, being of the opinion that this lack of service in French contravened Section 10(1) of the Official Languages Act, recommended, as a temporary measure, that the bilingual documents in question be prepared and that upon renewal of the contract, a clause respecting the provisions of the Act be inserted.

Representatives from the Office of the Commissioner and the Department met to examine the means best suited to ensure that concessionaires comply with the Official Languages Act. A departmental representative indicated that he made a distinction between concessionaires and leasees. The first were persons or organisations providing such service to the public as the Department might otherwise provide itself in the absence of a contract; the second were persons or organisations providing services that the department would not provide in the absence of a contract. The Tussaud Wax Museum would fall in the second category. Leases usually contained an automatic renewal clause.

The Commissioner's *Second Annual Report* makes mention of a special study conducted at the request of the Department and concerning its National Parks and Historic Sites Branch. With regard to concessionaires, the Commissioner recommended that: "the Branch review all existing contracts with concessionaires to determine what can be done to require concessionaires to comply with the Official Languages Act; the results of this review be made available to the Commissioner by 29 February 1972 . . ."

The Office of the Commissioner is continuing its efforts to ensure the implementation of this recommendation. Following this recommendation, a review of the contract held by the concessionaire revealed that article 5 stipulated that the contract and its renewal were subject to all regulations then in effect or to be decreed later by the Governor in Council concerning managing and supervising national parks.

Accordingly, the Commissioner invited the Department to maintain its diplomatic relations with the Tussaud Wax Museum management in order to persuade them to accept the offer made to help them comply with the provisions of the Act.

The Department argued that Section 10 of the Official Languages Act required only that services be provided in French and English by departments and agencies of the Government of Canada, by crown corporations and “by any other person pursuant to a contract for the provision of such services entered into by it or on its behalf on and after the 7th day of September 1969 . . .”

The Department added that, aside from the fact that the lease with the Museum had been signed in 1933, it did not oblige the lessee to provide services. According to the Department, it seemed clear that the Museum would not be bound by regulations decreed to ensure the respect of Section 10 of the Official Languages Act. The Department stated that it would nevertheless continue its efforts to convince the Museum management to provide bilingual service and would be pleased to assist it if need be.

The Commissioner replied that he did not agree with the Department's interpretation of Section 10 of the Act and believed that it did not represent the legislator's intention. Furthermore, he did not think that Parliament intended to exclude leases from the larger category of contracts for the provision of services. The Commissioner informed the Department that he would forward its reply to the Clerk of the Privy Council and publish an account of it in his annual report.

File No. 2589—On a Canoe Trip

A group of French-speaking youths on a canoe trip from Ottawa to Quebec City were given documents in English only at the Carillon locks at Hawkesbury.

By way of explanation, the Department pointed out that since the canoe was not registered in accordance with the Small Craft Regulations, it was not authorized to pass through the locks. However, this in no way justified the error that was committed.

The Department added that instead of providing the group with the bilingual publication, “Navigation Canals/Canaux de navigation”, a copy of which it forwarded to the Commissioner, the lockmaster or some other employee had unfortunately given them outdated documents.

The Department asked the Commissioner to convey its apologies to the complainant for this incident which it deeply regretted.

The Commissioner recommended that the Department remind all its lock employees of their obligation under the Official Languages Act to provide small craft pilots with material which is bilingual or in the official language of their choice.

The Department issued directives to regional park directors, who are responsible for the administration of navigation canals, reminding them always to serve the public in the official language of its choice.

File No. 3086—Departmental Golf Tournament

The complainant took exception to the posting on each floor of the headquarters building of two copies of a memorandum written in English only regarding a departmental golf tournament.

The Department informed the Commissioner that the memorandum was addressed specifically to Program Personnel Advisers and Division Chiefs. It added that the memorandum had not been intended as a notice but someone had unfortunately taken the liberty of photocopying it and posting copies in the building. Finally, the Department said that if the memorandum had been intended as an official notice to all staff, it would have been issued in both official languages.

The Commissioner was of the opinion that the memorandum should have been issued in both official languages. Accordingly, he recommended to the Department that memoranda announcing administrative decisions of wide interest to the headquarters staff be henceforth issued in both official languages.

The Department agreed with the Commissioner's recommendation and assured him that it would be followed in future.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2011	Ottawa	Publication in French only in <i>Intercom</i> .	Rectified
2030	Fort Beauséjour (NB)	No French-speaking guides on Sunday.	Not justified
2301	Ottawa	A competition notice indicated that a knowledge of English only was essential for a bilingual position.	Rectified
2399	Jasper	Unilingual English signboards at the entrance to the park.	Rectified
2410	Winnipeg	The ceremony for the unveiling of a plaque to commemorate La Vérendrye was conducted almost exclusively in English.	Explanation offered
2531	Lower Fort Garry (Manitoba)	Lack of bilingual guide services in October, 1973.	Explanation offered
2742	Ottawa	A competition notice announcing an opening for an exhibition planner in Cornwall stated that a knowledge of English only was required.	Explanation offered
2895	Hopewell Cape (NB)	A commemorative plaque on the monument erected in memory of the Right Honourable R. B. Bennett bore an inscription in English only.	Explanation offered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
3042	Ottawa	Unilingual English receptionist in a division.	Explanation offered
3155	Ucluelet (BC)	Poor quality of French used on posters.	Rectified

INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE—"I'm in the Money"

EVALUATION

After a rather long rumination about profit and loss in the bilingualism business, some stirrings of concern with the Official Languages Act are now noticeable in this Department. To be sure, its industry in this area does not yet justify any public celebrations; while the Department's accomplishments with regard to the recommendations resulting from a special study allow a still very faint glimmer of hope to penetrate the darkness, the same cannot be said about the manner in which the Department has dealt with the 16 complaints received concerning the bilingual aspect of services provided to the public, particularly in Canada.

However, if the Department were, in the near future, to follow up its announced policy with concrete action, write off as losses some of its rather dubious options (especially its interpretation of the concept of "significant demand") and capitalize its interest by studying and implementing our recommendations, it might then be able to turn a profit for itself, and Canadians, in respecting the equality of status of the official languages.

It was in March 1972 that this Office, following a special study of the Department's offices abroad, formulated 38 recommendations. Of this number, it would appear that 24 are now in effect and four others, concerning the deployment of bilingual staff and the language knowledge examination, are in the process of being implemented; this progress is due more to the efforts of Treasury Board and the Public Service Commission than to those of the Department. In the case of eight other recommendations, namely those concerning telephone reception, publications, printed matter, rubber stamps and signs, the Department has only partially met the requirements. Finally, with regard to one recommendation concerning press releases and another concerning the advertising posters of the Office of Tourism, the Department's arguments seemed convincing and its preferences acceptable.

The foregoing record is somewhat encouraging. However, an attentive examination of the Department's policy, stated in a brochure distributed in September 1974, prompts two reservations. In the first place, the general principles set forth in the Department's policy should be followed by more specific directives, to ensure that in day-to-day administrative practice, the personnel of the Department respect the requirements of the Act. In the second place, with regard to the eight recommendations mentioned above, it would seem that the Department, in introducing the concept of "significant demand" with respect to Section 10(2) of the Act, is interpreting it too restrictively and thus running the risk of receiving complaints from the public. This is particularly true since the task of evaluating "sufficient demand" appears to be left to individual employees, who may have varying opinions on the matter.

The Department has shown less than wild enthusiasm in settling the 16 complaints lodged against it. Even though it readily accepted in principle the suggestions and recommendations made after investigations, in practice it has made very few efforts to improve the situation. As an example, the French edition of the January 1974 issue of *Canada Commerce* was not published until March 1974; the French edition of the September 1974 issue appeared five months after the English edition.

As there is still many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip, the Commissioner intends to follow the progress of the Department's policy and the implementation of his own recommendations, and to require a report on the reforms actually carried out. Without the latter, the Department's general policy will amount to little more than good intentions, with which, it is said, the road to hell is paved. This Office, moreover, has begun a second special study, this time concerning the Department's activities as a whole, from the standpoint of the language of internal communication as well as that of the language of service.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 2042—Furniture and Allied Industries Division

A French-speaking woman from Quebec complained that, on 24 May 1973, she was unable to communicate in French over the telephone with the Furniture and Allied Industries Division of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in Ottawa. She pointed out that the receptionist had replied in English that her position was not bilingual and that she was therefore not required to speak French. The complainant added that the telephone conversation had ended abruptly without the receptionist even being able to take down her name and phone number so that someone who did speak French could contact her later.

The Department informed the Commissioner that an English-speaking secretary recalled the incident. Since the person to whom the call should have been referred was absent at the time, the secretary inquired in English if the caller wished to leave a message. Then, according to the Department, the person at the other end asked in English why she was not being answered in French. The Department pointed out that the secretary had tried to explain that, although she sometimes answered the telephone, her position was nevertheless unilingual English; it also pointed out that she had tried in vain to obtain the caller's name and phone number.

The Department stated that the Division in question was normally able to answer questions from the public in either official language. It assured the Commissioner that it always endeavoured to serve members of the public in the official language of their choice.

After further inquiry, the Commissioner made the following recommendations to the Department:

- 1) that employees of the Furniture and Allied Industries Division identify the division in both official languages when answering telephone calls so that service is provided in French and in English;
- 2) that unilingual English employees automatically transfer calls in French to fellow employees with a good knowledge of that language, saying to the caller "Un instant, s'il vous plaît";
- 3) that employees of the Division refrain from speaking English to French-speaking persons since service must be automatically provided in the official language of the person seeking such service;
- 4) that callers not be kept waiting too long; and finally
- 5) that the composition and distribution of Division staff be such that service can be provided in both official languages at all times.

The Department assured the Commissioner that in future the Furniture and Allied Industries Division would make every effort to ensure service in both official languages at all times.

File No. 2084—Linguistic requirements

An English-speaking complainant drew the Commissioner's attention to the linguistic requirements in two competitions, one for four positions in the Resource Industries and Construction Branch and the other for seven positions in the Office of the Industrial Policy Adviser. In the complainant's view, a knowledge of both English and French was necessary to fulfil the duties of these positions properly, but in each case the competition required only a knowledge of English.

The Commissioner pointed out to the Department that, from the job descriptions, it was apparent that most, if not all, of the positions

involved contact with the public, particularly with the management, marketing and engineering staff of industrial enterprises. Some of the positions also involved liaison with provincial governments and the chairing of conferences.

The Department replied that the determination of language requirements was the prerogative of the Department and the Treasury Board and maintained that it had sufficient bilingual capability to provide services to the public in accordance with the Official Languages Act.

The Commissioner then asked the Department to provide him with details of the linguistic composition of the branches concerned. He also made a formal recommendation that a knowledge of both English and French be required for those positions whose duties include being chairman *ex officio* of conferences which, by their nature, are likely to involve both English-speaking and French-speaking members of the public.

The Department provided the Commissioner with details of the linguistic composition of the two branches and informed him that all the positions of division chief and a number of other positions in the two branches had been identified as bilingual. The Commissioner was of the opinion that, provided that bilingual staff was suitably deployed, the branches were capable of serving the public in both official languages.

He also noted that the Department concurred with his recommendation and would provide simultaneous translation or take other administrative steps to ensure there was always bilingual service at conferences involving both English-speaking and French-speaking members of the public, if the current incumbent of the chairman's position was not bilingual.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1929	Ottawa	Map of Canada in English only.	Not justified
2260	Ottawa	Reprint from British magazine published in English only.	Rectified
2291	Ottawa	Unilingual English rubber stamp.	Rectified
2379	Ottawa	Letter written in French translated into English and back into French.	Explanation offered
2493	Ottawa	Discrepancies between English and French versions of <i>Canada Events</i> .	Explanation offered
2771	Ottawa	Inadequate services in French from departmental library.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
3192	Ottawa	Error in entry in French in a telephone directory.	Rectified
2502	Ottawa	Telephone answered initially by employee who couldn't speak French.	Not justified
2573	Ottawa	French version of <i>Commerce Canada</i> up to three months late.	Explanation offered
2649	Ottawa	Letter in English sent to French-speaking person.	Rectified
3078	Cleveland (U.S.A.)	Identification in English only on envelopes.	Rectified

INFORMATION CANADA—"Baby, Hang up the Phone"

EVALUATION

This Office, aware of Information Canada's burdensome role of keeping the Canadian public alert to the latest government folklore, doesn't really mind disseminating information on subjects (such as grants, summer camps and citizenship) other than the Official Languages Act. For the agency, as far as the Act is concerned, continues to display its wares more or less within the law.

Information Canada reacted quickly to the 22 complaints received in 1973-74 and implemented recommendations made in four cases. In particular, it has recognized the need for advertising that most of the publications it sells are available in French as well as English and can be bought in its bookstores or ordered and delivered within three to five days. Miracles may take a day or two longer.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 2117—Bookstore in Winnipeg

A French-speaking person complained that people of her language group are not being catered to at the Information Canada bookstore in Winnipeg. According to her, French-speaking people can never obtain service in French. She also stated that, as a general rule, only English books are displayed. If, by chance, the book is bilingual (as an example, she mentioned the *Second Annual Report* of the Commissioner of Official Languages), only the English side is shown.

Information Canada informed the Commissioner that each of its bookstores possessed a sign indicating the availability of books in the French language. It also emphasized that each of its centres had a staff that was able to offer service in both official languages. As examples, it pointed out that its Information Centre in Winnipeg had two French-speaking employees, that one member of its mobile team of information officers in Manitoba was French-speaking, and that the officer in charge of Information Canada operations in the Prairie region was French-speaking. He also added that all these people were bilingual.

Information Canada also supplied the Commissioner with a list of 150 publications being sold at that time in its Winnipeg bookstore. This list did not include the publications distributed free of charge by Information Canada on behalf of departments and agencies. However, it did state that its Winnipeg bookstore sold an average of only two French books per week.

On the occasion of another similar complaint, the Commissioner had already asked Information Canada to encourage, through appropriate advertising, the French-speaking people of the area to make better use of the publications available to them. The agency replied that it was taking measures to encourage the French-speaking people of the area to take advantage of its services in Winnipeg. The Commissioner then requested that Information Canada provide him with details of these promised measures. In addition, since the bookstore and the Information Centre constituted two distinct services, he asked the agency to provide him with information on the language ratio of the bookstore staff as well as on its distribution.

Information Canada informed the Commissioner that its Winnipeg bookstore was dealing more and more with the Collège de St. Boniface and with Landry's bookstore, also in St. Boniface, both offering publications in the French language. It added that it intended in the near future to use the French radio station CKSB to invite the French-speaking people of the area to take advantage of the services offered to them by Information Canada.

With regard to the staff at the Winnipeg bookstore, Information Canada pointed out that there had been a French-speaking clerk at this bookstore since 20 August 1973. The agency's management stated that prior to this date, the bookstore's staff consisted of five employees, one of whom was an English-speaker able to express himself in French and who was registered for further second language training.

Given these facts, the Commissioner emphasized that this bookstore should, in accordance with the Official Languages Act, be able to ensure service in both official languages at all times. In view of the nature of the complaint, he recommended that definite directives be

issued to ensure that courteous service is offered at all times to the bookstore customers in the official language of their choice.

A representative from the Commissioner's office noted that, during the week of 10 August 1973, only a few bilingual publications, and none in French alone, were on display near the window of this bookstore. The Commissioner therefore recommended that Information Canada make an effort to display a number of French publications in its Winnipeg bookstore as well as the French side of some bilingual publications.

Information Canada replied to the Commissioner that it accepted the above-mentioned recommendations and would see to it that the French-speaking population of the Winnipeg area received maximum service in the French language.

File No. 2247—Bookstore in Toronto

A French-speaking person from the Toronto region complained of the fact that there was only a limited selection of French publications at the Information Canada bookstore in Toronto.

Information Canada advised the Commissioner that its bookstore in Toronto did offer certain publications in French. It went on to say, however, that since the population of Toronto was almost entirely English-speaking and the demand for publications in French was very limited, it would be too costly to keep thousands of additional publications on hand to satisfy the three or four requests received by this bookstore each month.

Information Canada noted that this policy also applied to its other regional centres. In Montreal, for example, the reverse was true. Information Canada kept on hand a number of texts in English proportional to the English-speaking population.

Further, Information Canada pointed out that all its regional centres offered bilingual services, and, if a publication was not available in one or other of the two official languages, an order could be sent to Ottawa immediately. Delivery took three to five days.

In view of the fact that in the 1971 census there were 45,570 French-speakers in the Toronto area, the Commissioner advised Information Canada he found it hard to understand why its Toronto bookstore had received only three or four requests a month for publications in French. Further, he wondered whether Toronto residents knew that, if a publication was not available in French or in English at the Information Canada bookstore in Toronto, it could be obtained within three to five days.

Accordingly, having regard to the nature of the complaint and the explanations offered by the agency, the Commissioner recommended

that Information Canada advertise to the public the fact that all publications in French or English sold by Information Canada could be obtained from its Toronto bookstore either immediately or after a relatively short delay (of three to five days) if they were not in stock at the bookstore.

After consulting with its Toronto staff, Information Canada agreed to improve promotion of French publications. It also decided to post, in its Toronto bookstore, a notice explaining that French publications which were not on its display stands could be obtained from Ottawa. Information Canada further noted that such a notice was in use at its Winnipeg store and it would be distributing copies to its Vancouver and Halifax stores.

File No. 2928—A Questionnaire in English

A French-speaking person responsible for an information centre in New Brunswick received a questionnaire in English from Information Canada.

His organization found it regrettable that a unilingual English questionnaire should be sent to a centre with an obviously French-sounding name. The questionnaire had been sent to more than 300 libraries and community centres throughout the country. As information intended for these organizations was usually bilingual, it was by oversight that an Information Canada employee had sent an English copy of the questionnaire to the complainant.

The Commissioner recommended that Information Canada take all steps necessary to ensure that in future, each citizen, or institution received services in the official language of its choice.

File No. 3178—A Letter in English

The secretary-general of a French-language association sent the Commissioner a copy of a letter, written in English only, which Information Canada had addressed to his association.

The Director of this agency informed the Commissioner that the letter, which had been sent to the association by the Financial Services Division, had been prepared in both official languages, French and English. It had originally been planned to present the two versions on either side of the same sheet, but various administrative problems and the necessity of mailing the monthly statements of account at the earliest date possible had made such an undertaking impossible. The French and English versions had accordingly been printed on two separate sheets.

He explained that members of the Ottawa and District Association for the Mentally Retarded had been given the task of inserting the

letters in the appropriate envelopes, and that very specific instructions as to which clients were to receive both versions of the letter had been given to them; these instructions also applied to all clients in the province of Quebec.

As the anonymity of the complainant was respected during the investigation of this matter, Information Canada could only assume that the error was committed either by the Association, which, had neglected to include a copy of the French version of the letter in the envelope, or by the Financial Services Division, which at the time it gave its instructions, was unaware that the complainant wished to receive his correspondence in French.

Information Canada nevertheless accepted responsibility for the error and apologized for any inconvenience that might have resulted from it. The agency assured the Commissioner that the occurrence was exceptional and that it endeavoured at all times to observe the requirements of the Official Languages Act.

To avoid further errors in distribution, the Commissioner recommended that:

- (a) all form letters intended for clients of Information Canada be issued in both official languages in a single document;
- (b) at the time of mailing these documents, the clerks have at their disposal the means to verify in which official language the client wished to receive communications, so that addresses would be suitably worded.

In response to these recommendations, the Director of the agency took the following steps : he advised the Financial Services Division that in future, they should prepare all form letters in both official languages in a single document. With reference to the second recommendation, clients would be given the opportunity to indicate, if necessary, the language in which they wished to receive the information to be sent to them.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2001	Winnipeg	Availability of publications in French at the bookstore.	Explanation offered
2314	Ottawa	Two French-language publications were unavailable at the bookstore.	Recommendation
2333	Ottawa	Unilingual English postcards.	Explanation offered
2394	Ottawa	Few publications available in French at the bookstore.	Explanation offered
2431	Ottawa	Form printed almost entirely in English sent to a French-speaker.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2727	Montreal	Telephone operator's greeting not wholly bilingual.	Rectified
2825	Ottawa	Unilingual English advertising leaflets.	Rectified
2939	Ottawa	Service provided in English only at the entrance of the Vanguard Building.	Rectified
3019	Ottawa	The equal status of French was not respected in the publication of a bulletin.	Rectified
3174	Ottawa	Only two of the forty publications on a display stand were in French.	Rectified
3180	Ottawa	Error in a publication.	Rectified
3218	Ottawa	Unilingual stamp.	Rectified
3355	Ottawa	The English edition of a map was not available.	Explanation offered
3340	Halifax	Unilingual English sign.	Rectified

MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION—"I Hear You Knocking"

EVALUATION

In regard to the Official Languages Act, the Department, compared with many other institutions, shows an encouraging spirit of cooperation. For instance, it has a deputy-minister who takes a personal interest in bringing about innovative solutions (a few complainants even like him); it has a well-documented manual on the official languages which leaves no room for "discretion" on its officers' part; it has established a monitoring mechanism (no magic or Mata Hari's) to ensure that its administrative guidelines are respected; it has 132 French-language units and sub-units in Canada and Europe—these are a few of our favourite things.

The Department has been quick to pin-point the causes of, and to apply remedies to, the 93 complaints lodged against it. Most of these were attributable to easily avoidable mistakes or misunderstandings. The demands by official-language minorities for face-to-face service in French at Canada Manpower Centres in parts of Northern Ontario, in British Columbia and elsewhere, indicate that the Department should extend its usual ingenuity to provide these offices with a bilingual capability. The Department has fully implemented the 48 recommenda-

tions this Office made as a result of special studies conducted in Montreal, Moncton, Ottawa and in various immigration offices abroad; but its handling of the recommendations we made after studying the services in Greater Winnipeg, gives rise to some concern.

In December 1974, the Department informed us about the implementation of recommendations ensuing from two studies, one of the Department's operations in various immigration offices abroad, and the other, of its services in the Winnipeg area.

The special study of immigration offices abroad contained thirty-two recommendations, all but three of which had been carried out by October 1973. These recommendations (numbers 27, 29 and 31) were concerned with the preparation of statistics on the linguistic composition of the Department's foreign service officer staff, the availability of management courses for these officers in either official language and the determination of the number of bilingual officers to be recruited. The Department reported in December 1974 that it had completely met these three recommendations.

With regard to the recommendations made pursuant to the study of services in Greater Winnipeg, the Department's reply and a follow-up visit by members of the Commissioner's staff at the end of 1974 revealed that twelve of the 17 recommendations had been fully met and the remaining five were partly implemented.

At the end of 1973, telephone services in both official languages were not available in all centres; since then, however, the Department has made some progress and now answers telephones in both languages at the Regional Office and at Canada Manpower Centres in St. Boniface, Winnipeg, Winnipeg West and Winnipeg North. There is still no French-speaking capability at offices located at post-secondary institutions and none of the positions in these offices has been identified as bilingual. The Department has taken no further action to implement more than partly the recommendation regarding reception services and initial contacts with clients. It once again reported that the Winnipeg and St. Boniface Canada Manpower Centres are the only offices with bilingual receptionists, despite the fact that centres in Winnipeg North and Winnipeg West have some bilingual personnel.

Three matters, namely job vacancy descriptions on Canada Manpower Centre notice boards, job advertisements in newspapers and news releases cause some concern. We had received assurances, in the past, that these documents were always in both English and French. However, in its latest report to us, the Department stated that although all forms were bilingual, standardized translations of job vacancy descriptions were only in the process of being prepared, while job advertisements and news releases were not always available in both

the English and French media. The Commissioner trusts that the Department will, in future, ensure that these documents are always prepared, displayed and made available in both official languages.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 935—“Esprit Côte-des-Neiges”

In an open letter captioned “Arrogance ou inconscience des anglophones” (Arrogance or thoughtlessness of English-speakers) addressed to the Secretary of State, Mr. Gérard Pelletier, and published in *La Presse* on 26 July 1972, a French-speaking Montreal resident complained of the “peculiar bilingualism” of the “Esprit Côte-des-Neiges” project funded by the federal government. He stated that the program was administered mainly by unilingual English-speakers and that, as a result, French-speaking clients could not obtain service in their own language.

Since the letter published in *La Presse* mentioned the Opportunities for Youth program, the Commissioner first communicated with the department concerned, the Secretary of State Department, which stated that the project in question had not been funded by Opportunities for Youth 1972. The Commissioner then got in touch with the Department of Manpower and Immigration, which administers the Local Initiatives Program. This Department experienced difficulty in identifying the project because of lack of specific information on its official status (for example, its number, its entry in the departmental files and so forth). Upon locating the file, the Department expressed a desire to discuss the matter with the Commissioner.

The Commissioner studied the various documents submitted by the Department of Manpower and Immigration and pointed out to the latter that, under the agreement, the Federation of Catholic Community Services Inc. (new name of the Federation of Catholic Charities) served both French-speaking and English-speaking residents in the Côte-des-Neiges district. By virtue of this fact, and because the agency had received a grant from the Canadian government, the Commissioner felt that it should offer its services in both official languages at all times.

Consequently, he recommended that the Department examine the possibility of including in any new agreement with the Federation of Catholic Community Services Inc. aimed at extending this program, a clause requiring it to provide service in both official languages at all times.

In addition, the Commissioner recommended that the Department study the possibility of including similar clauses in all contracts concluded between the Canadian government and project sponsors within the context of the Local Initiatives Program whenever services were required to be provided in both official languages.

The Department replied that, in keeping with the basic philosophy of the Local Initiatives Program the proposed aims could be achieved without inserting such a clause in the contracts. Since Local Initiatives projects did not constitute government services, the Department could not intervene in their administration. However, it agreed to bear the official languages factor in mind when studying submissions under the Local Initiatives Program in order to ensure that future projects offered bilingual services if the population to be served consisted of both French-speakers and English-speakers.

The Commissioner admitted that this would represent an improvement. However, he pointed out two weaknesses inherent in this new procedure—first, once an application had been approved, the Department could no longer exercise control over what was or was not done to satisfy the language requirements, and, secondly, there was no official invitation to applicants to offer services to the public in the language of its choice. The Commissioner therefore informed the Department that he would stand by his two recommendations.

The Department then replied that, in most federal ridings, applications to the Local Initiatives Program would henceforth be examined by an advisory committee composed of local representatives. The Department felt that, since the latter would have a good knowledge of local needs, they would recommend projects that met the language requirements of the community involved.

The Commissioner replied that he would make the Department's stand known in his annual report.

File Nos. 1626, 1627—Welland and Port Colborne

Two Ontario residents, one from Welland and the other from Port Colborne, complained that the Department had not offered them training courses in French, and said that they had found it difficult to follow courses in English. They also said that the Manpower Centres in both cities did not always provide bilingual service.

The Department replied that it believed it had a sufficiently bilingual staff in Welland to offer service in both languages, but admitted that there were no bilingual counsellors in the Port Colborne Manpower Centre. The Department added that it would remind its employees of its policy regarding the language of instruction for courses in bilingual areas.

The Commissioner recommended that :

- 1) the staff at the Welland Manpower Centre be distributed in such a way as to ensure service in both official languages at all times, and that the Department reminded its employees that, if they are addressed by a client in French, this in itself constitutes a request to be served in that language ;
- 2) the Port Colborne Manpower take steps as soon as possible to provide service in both official languages at all times ;
- 3) the Department send periodic reminders to the managers of manpower centres in bilingual areas that they are to ask members of the minority-language group which language of instruction they prefer and to offer them training in the official language of their choice whenever possible ;
- 4) the Department set up an effective system of referral or automatic transfer to centres where the courses are offered in the desired language.

The Department replied that its staff in Welland was distributed in such a way as to ensure service to the public in both official languages and that its employees were aware of the necessity of serving clients in the language of their choice. The Department planned to assign a bilingual officer to the Port Colborne Manpower Centre in order to ensure the availability of service in French. A directive was issued urging the regional directors to set up an effective system of referral or automatic transfer to centres where clients could take the courses they wished in the language of their choice.

During a visit to the regional office in Toronto, the Commissioner's representatives had occasion to discuss this matter again with Manpower representatives so that they might avoid a repetition of similar complaints.

File No. 1692—Toronto Regional Office

An officer of a French-language co-operative submitted an application in French for the Training-on-the-Job Program and received service in French from the Canada Manpower Centre in his area. The application was then sent to the Department's Toronto office. An employee in this office, who wished to obtain further information telephoned the co-operative and spoke in English. Since he had also received other complaints concerning the Toronto regional office, the Commissioner decided to send two of his officers accompanied by a representative of the Department, to study the organization of this office in relation to the requirements of the Official Languages Act.

In order to help the Commissioner with his investigation, the Department sent him a list of the bilingual employees in the Toronto regional office as well as explanations regarding the processing of

applications for the Training-on-the-Job and Local Initiatives Programs. The investigation by the Commissioner's representatives revealed that some of the problems involving services provided to the public were attributable to the lack of bilingual personnel at the regional office and too frequent use of translation.

The Commissioner recommended that when it identified and designated bilingual positions, the Department take into account the need to increase the bilingual capacity of the unit responsible for the Training-on-the-Job Program and auxiliary services in order to provide service of equal quality to the French- and English-speaking public and enable employees to work in the official language of their choice. The Commissioner also recommended that the translation services observe the priorities established in section 4 of the Translation Bureau Regulations.

The Department replied that during the 1973-74 fiscal year, twelve per cent of the members of the Local Initiatives Program unit were able to communicate in French and that this number was sufficient to meet the demand for service in French. In addition, the unit responsible for the Training-on-the-Job Program had been decentralized, the forms and other documents had been standardized, and relations with the public had been made the responsibility of counsellors in the Manpower Centres. The Department hoped that these measures would obviate the problems that had been raised. It intended to identify and designate a sufficient number of bilingual positions during the fiscal year to meet the requirements for auxiliary services and supervision. The Department also undertook to respect the priorities established for translation.

File No. 1749—Welland and St. Catharines

A French-speaker reported that he had gone to the Canada Manpower Centres in Welland and St. Catharines (Ontario) and found that the receptionists at both these offices could speak only English. He was apparently made to wait until someone was found who could speak with him in French. He added that while he was waiting in the Welland office a young woman who spoke only French was unable to make herself understood by the receptionist. In Welland as in St. Catharines, the employees did not understand French and were able to answer his questions only in English. However, the complainant added that he had no criticism to make regarding the attitude of the staff.

The Department pointed out to the Commissioner that the number of employees able to provide service in French in the St. Catharines and Welland offices was as follows : in St. Catharines, one counsellor, one supervisor and one typist were perfectly bilingual; in Welland, two counsellors, one switchboard operator and one receptionist were bi-

lingual. The bilingual receptionist occupied the main position at the information counter. The Department said that the staff of these two offices was sufficiently balanced linguistically to provide adequate service to both the English- and French-speaking public.

The Commissioner pointed out to the Department that the complaints he had brought to its attention concerning these two offices contradicted its assertion. He therefore recommended that the Department assign a bilingual receptionist to the St. Catharines office, that it ask receptionists in both offices to inform the French-speaking public that service could be obtained from French-speaking counsellors, and that it take appropriate measures to avoid making French-speakers wait longer for service than English-speakers.

The Department took the necessary steps to appoint a bilingual receptionist to the St. Catharines Manpower Centre and to provide adequate service to the French-speaking public.

File No. 1971—Sudbury

A complainant from Sudbury stated that the new immigration policy was advertised in English only in his area ; he mentioned in particular the advertisements appearing on buses. He also claimed that the announcement of the official opening of the Canada Manpower Centre for Students was in English only and that he believed the ceremony was conducted solely in that language,

The Department acknowledged that a very limited amount of publicity in English for the new immigration policy was done in the Sudbury area, including the use of 34 bus cards ; but it denied, with supporting details, that the opening ceremony of the Canada Manpower Centre for Students was conducted solely in English.

The Commissioner reminded the Department of its obligation to provide its services in the Sudbury area in both official languages and, after quoting the results of the 1971 Census, recommended that all departmental advertising and promotional activities in the area, including all news releases, be always made simultaneously in both official languages.

The Department agreed to implement the Commissioner's recommendation.

File No. 1986—Hamilton

A French-speaker telephoned the Canada Manpower Centre in Hamilton and asked the operator in English whether there was anyone at the Centre capable of interviewing French-speaking students seeking employment. The operator replied that no one spoke French in the

office but that, if the students would come down, they would try to arrange something.

The Department of Manpower and Immigration informed the Commissioner that the operator at the Hamilton Manpower Centre was not bilingual but that she had considerable experience. Whenever callers asked for someone who spoke French, she would immediately refer the call to a bilingual manpower counsellor capable of providing the information requested. An inexperienced employee may have relieved the switchboard operator during her lunch break. In any case, the Manpower supervisor was preparing a list of names and telephone numbers of all bilingual counsellors for the use of telephone switchboard operators, receptionists, and information clerks. This list was to enable staff to locate French-speaking employees in the office when necessary.

The Department added that there were enough bilingual employees to meet the demand and to avoid the repetition of incidents such as the one that had given rise to the complaint. In addition, it assured the Commissioner that every possible effort was being made at the Manpower Centre in Hamilton to ensure that the public was served in the official language of its choice.

The Commissioner recommended that the Department ensure that :

- 1) telephone operators identify the Manpower Centre in both official languages ;
- 2) unilingual switchboard operators reply merely "Un instant, s'il vous plaît" and transfer all calls in French to a bilingual colleague, without the caller having to insist that his call be transferred ;
- 3) unilingual English-speaking telephone operators refrain from speaking English to French-speaking persons since service is to be provided automatically in the official language of the customer ;
- 4) the waiting time be always as short as possible.

A system was set up to enable switchboard operators to automatically transfer all calls from French-speaking persons to a bilingual employee. On 13 September 1973, the Office of the Assistant Deputy Minister sent a memorandum to all regional directors requesting that they provide their switchboard operators with a list of all employees capable of providing the public with bilingual service. In addition, telephone operators were taught the appropriate French phrases for the implementation of the Commissioner's recommendations.

As for the fourth recommendation, the Department was of the opinion that waiting time would never be a problem since the demand for service in French was small and Hamilton Manpower Centre had nine bilingual employees capable of providing adequate service in both official languages.

File No. 2047—Accounting

A French-speaking person from New Brunswick stated that he was sometimes unable to obtain certain informational material in French from the Manpower Centre to assist officers in charge of Local Initiatives programs with their accounting system and documentation on the Local Employment Assistance Program.

The Audit Services Bureau of the Department of Supply and Services, in co-operation with senior departmental officials, produced a pamphlet in English entitled *Accounting System for Local Initiatives Program Projects*.

The purpose of this brochure is to help promoters carry out their projects under the Program in disadvantaged areas where the services of a full-time accountant cannot be justified. It serves as a guide for them in keeping their books and in drawing up balance sheets. Where necessary, the Audit Services Bureau handles the setting up of the accounting system itself. For a variety of reasons, the Department was unable to prepare an acceptable French version of the English text, and the former was not distributed until about two months later.

The second part of the complaint had to do with internal administrative documents given out at a conference on the Department's special programs in Ottawa in March 1973, to enable participants to study the implementation of these programs. As the relevant information was required as soon as possible by the various Manpower Centres throughout Canada, and since translation of these documents had not been completed, departmental employees were encouraged to begin their programs anyway, following the instructions contained in this initial documentation.

The Department pointed out that it had been trying to obtain a translation of the English text since February 1973. However, revisions in the text had made it impossible for the final version to be completed before the end of the conference. Nevertheless, a bilingual pamphlet entitled *Fact Sheets* and *Actualité* was now available at all Canada Manpower Centres.

The Commissioner recommended that the Department do its utmost to reduce to a minimum delays in the publication of French texts. The Department agreed to follow this recommendation.

File Nos. 2231, 2251—Training Courses

Two French-speakers objected to the lack of Canada Manpower Training Program courses in the French language in Timmins, Sudbury, and Hearst, Ontario.

The Department explained that several important factors are considered when deciding to offer courses in French in Ontario, such as

the availability of clients to fill French-language training seats, the capability of the Province to develop French training courses, and the needs of local employers. Only one of these criteria could easily be met in Sudbury, Hearst and Timmins: the vigorous undertaking of a strong initiative on the Department's part to encourage the Province to develop skill programmes in French. However, the difficulty was in attracting enough clients to fill the classroom. Furthermore, there was a heavy demand for unilingual English or bilingual clients from employers in all three Canada Manpower Centre areas, but very little demand for unilingual French clients. In any event, the Department decided to send a team to conduct an on-the-spot study of the situation.

Two visits were made by the team to north-eastern Ontario and a thorough analysis was made of Canada Manpower Training Program course purchases for that area. As a result, the following French-language courses were planned for 1974-75: academic upgrading courses (Sudbury); a skill course for cutters and skidders (forestry)—(Hearst); a business and commerce course (Sudbury); a course for forestry filers (instruction available in French and English)—(Timmins). In addition, the Department intended to hold further discussions with provincial officials responsible for the operation of all Canada Manpower Training Program institutional training courses, and pilot projects would be developed to test new approaches for the provision of job-oriented training. The Department believed that this kind of action would enable it to find more effective ways of providing services to its clients in both official languages.

File No. 2312—French Courses

A French-speaker from Ottawa stated that the Department of Manpower and Immigration would not let her husband, an immigrant artist, take French courses under the Canada Manpower Training Program.

The Department replied that any immigrants who do not have a sufficient command of French or English to find employment may take language courses given by the Department in either official language. Although the complainant's husband spoke neither French nor English, this had not prevented him from finding employment since he practised his profession as an artist on his own account. He was therefore not eligible for the language training given as part of the Department's program. A number of immigrants who wish to learn one of the official languages, or even both, take the evening courses offered by local school boards and other educational institutions. This possibility was also open to the complainant's husband.

The Commissioner forwarded the Department's reply to the complainant. She was not satisfied and discussed her case with the Commissioner on a radio programme. The Commissioner expressed the opinion at that time that any immigrant who had recently arrived in Canada, whatever his trade or profession, should be entitled to take an introductory course on Canadian society in either French or English, whichever he chose. He later got in touch with the Department in the hope that it would reconsider its decision and allow the complainant's husband to take French courses.

The Department then explained its policy to the Commissioner. Immigrants experiencing difficulty finding a suitable job because of their insufficient knowledge of English or French may be given full-time language training under the Canada Manpower Training Program. However, immigrants who can find work in their own or a related field, even if it is at a lower level than the work they were doing in their native country, are not eligible for such training. Instead, they may enrol in one of the many part-time language courses offered by the educational institutions receiving funds to provide such courses from the Secretary of State Department. The Department repeated that it could not give the complainant's husband language training since he had been practising his profession on a full-time basis for the past year.

The Commissioner again expressed to the Department his views on setting up an introductory course on Canadian society for immigrants. He felt that the Department could help immigrants study the official language of their choice for a certain length of time, and that this would no doubt facilitate their integration into the cultural and linguistic life of the country. Such assistance would not require a major revision of Department policy; it would merely require that a broader interpretation be given to existing regulations concerning language courses. The Commissioner suggested two ways of interpreting the regulations that would allow the Department to grant the request made by the complainant's husband.

In its reply, the Department encouraged the complainant's husband to take a part-time language course given by universities, community colleges and school boards for a modest fee. Although it agreed with the principle put forward by the Commissioner, the Department could not authorize the complainant's husband to take full-time language training.

The Secretary of State Department had the chief responsibility in the area of language training for immigrants, while under the Adult Occupational Training Act the Department of Manpower and Immigration provided language courses only as training for a particular job. Although a broader interpretation of the regulations was desirable, the Department had to balance its budget and therefore could not give

language courses to all immigrants requesting them. The Department planned to spend approximately \$18,000,000 during the 1973-74 fiscal year on language courses given as part of the Manpower Training Program. The Commissioner transmitted the Department's final reply to the complainant and encouraged her husband to take part-time language courses. He even gave the complainant the names of several institutions offering French courses in Ottawa.

File No. 2341—Advertisements in French-language Weeklies

The editor of a French-language weekly newspaper in Western Canada stated that the Department advertised only in the English or the ethnic press. He referred specifically to publicity concerning the Local Initiatives Programme and the Immigration Adjustment of Status Programme.

The Department told the Commissioner that its policy was to select advertising media on the basis of the people it wished to reach. In the case of the Immigration Adjustment of Status Programme, priority had been given to foreign-language media and English and French mass media to reach the audience. The Department had seriously considered using weekly newspapers, but its budget could not be made to cover advertising in the more than 950 English and French weekly papers across Canada. With regard to the Local Initiatives Programme, the Department stated that the weekly paper whose editor had filed the complaint had received advertising for this programme.

Because of the discrepancy between the complainant's and the Department's version of the facts, the Commissioner telephoned the complainant, who said that his newspaper had received the LIP advertising—but only after he had registered his complaint and telephoned Department officials in Ottawa. He added that his newspaper had later received advertising relating to the Immigration Adjustment of Status Programme.

The Commissioner had dealt with a number of complaints concerning advertising in French-language weekly newspapers in Western Canada. He had come to the conclusion that, where there were no French-language daily newspapers, federal departments should use French-language weeklies for publicity purposes. He therefore recommended that the Department adopt a policy of advertising in French-language weeklies where no French-language daily newspapers existed, just as it had already done in the case of the complainant's newspaper.

The Department replied that, following the telephone conversation it had had with the complainant, its advertising agency had been instructed to place LIP advertising in the complainant's and several other French-language weeklies. No advertising had been placed on a

national basis in weeklies with regard to the Immigration Adjustment of Status Programme, but regional offices had been authorized to augment national advertising whenever they believed that people in their areas were not being reached by the national campaign. Consequently, publicity relating to this programme had been placed in the complainant's newspaper by the Regional Office.

The Department expressed its concern that all Canadians be fully informed of government programmes, and asked for guidance from the Commissioner.

The Commissioner suggested that the Department should advertise wherever possible in French-language and English-language weeklies in those areas of Canada where daily newspapers in one or the other official language did not exist.

File No. 2538—Windsor CMC

When the manager's position at the Canada Manpower Centre in Windsor fell vacant in September 1973, the linguistic requirements of the position were changed from "bilingual" to "English essential". The complainant maintained that a knowledge of both official languages was, in fact, necessary for the job.

The Department said in order to provide bilingual service it seemed more practical to have the position of receptionist and some of the manpower counsellors' positions identified as bilingual rather than to have the manager's position bilingual. It added that this view had the support of the Public Service Commission and the Treasury Board. The Commissioner asked the Department for detailed information on the bilingual capability of the Centre in Windsor. The Department replied, but then wrote again with a revised list of bilingual positions as its original list evidently contained several errors. The Commissioner, on reflection, decided to send two complaints officers to Windsor to investigate and report on the situation.

At the time of the visit, the Centre's staff included a receptionist, a supervisor and two counsellors who were fluent in French. Six other employees were scheduled for language training.

The area manager maintained that, despite the sizeable local minority which claimed French as its mother tongue, there was in fact little demand for service in French. However, whenever service was required in French, it was always provided promptly. Correspondence which came in French was answered by the staff in French. The area manager could not recall having received any complaints about the language of service. (The Commissioner had not had any either.)

The Commissioner's representatives reported that it seemed to them that there was probably very little expressed demand for service

in French but that this might be at least partly due to the mainly unilingual English appearance of the office. Unless it was made very plain that the two official languages had equal status within the Centre, French-speaking clients might well be reluctant to exercise their right to use their mother tongue to discuss employment and training possibilities. On entering the Centre, the client was immediately confronted with a very large notice on the wall opposite the door inviting him, in English only, to use the new classified job lists.

These lists were kept in binders at small desks labelled with the names of the various trades (e.g. carpenter, clerk). The names on the desks, the instructions in each binder, and the lists themselves were in English only.

To the right of the entrance, there was a large notice-board on which the latest vacancy notices were pinned. The Department's name and a few descriptive words were in both languages, but the texts of the notices were all in English.

Finally, the pamphlets on careers, although bilingual, were almost all displayed English side up.

These things might well have the cumulative effect, albeit unintentional, of proclaiming that the Centre operated in English and that those who wanted service in French were asking for a favour.

The Commissioner came to the conclusion that, under present circumstances, it was not necessary to identify the manager's position as bilingual. He reached this conclusion not on the basis of the geographical criteria established in Treasury Board guidelines, but because the data gathered on the specific situation in Windsor did not seem to warrant, for the time being, a bilingual manager.

The Commissioner, however, made the following three recommendations which were intended to help the Department correct the linguistically unbalanced visual aspect of the Centre in Windsor and guard against a similar situation developing elsewhere:

- 1) that all new initiatives and programs have the bilingual element built into them right from the planning stage (in the case of the self-service job lists, this would probably include providing from headquarters draft texts and instructions that are needed to set up the system in the various Centres where it is to be used);
- 2) that management structures ensure effective co-operation between departmental staff responsible for bilingualism, those who identify the language requirements of positions and arrange language training, line management and operations planning groups; and
- 3) that Centres be regularly and systematically checked to make sure that adequate bilingual capability is always maintained and properly deployed, and that the visual aspect of the Centres fully reflects the

Department's desire to serve its clients in the official language of their choice.

The Department informed the Commissioner of remedial action that it had taken to improve the visual aspect of the Windsor CMC and to advertise its capability to serve the public in both official languages. It agreed with the Commissioner's first and third recommendations and had issued appropriate directives to its branch directors and regional directors-general. It was studying (in December 1974) the second recommendation as part of the process of organizational change and renewal under way.

File No. 2891—Vancouver

A French-speaker alleged that when he visited the downtown Vancouver Canada Manpower Centre to get information and politely asked to be served in French an employee told him that without an appointment made two weeks in advance he could not enjoy such a "privilege", adding that no one in the office could speak French. He had therefore been unable to get the information he desired.

The Department informed the Commissioner that the manager of the Centre had thoroughly investigated the incident but had been unable to identify the staff member involved. The Centre had staff available to provide service in the French language upon request and employees were well aware that clients who requested service in the French language should be referred to a bilingual staff member. The demand for interviews at this office was sometimes particularly high, creating a backlog in appointments. When this occurred, clients were advised of the length of time they would have to wait, whether they made their request in French or English. The Department regretted that it was unable to throw more light on the incident because of the length of time that had elapsed, the large number of clients the Centre dealt with daily and the fact that the complainant's identity was not known.

The Commissioner noted the Department's explanation but drew its attention to Section 2 of the Official Languages Act which, in his opinion, required that federal institutions offer service in French to French-speakers automatically and not just on demand. To ensure full compliance with the Act, the Commissioner recommended to the Department that unilingual English-speaking employees of the Howe Street Canada Manpower Centre in Vancouver always immediately refer French-speaking clients to a bilingual or French-speaking colleague after asking the client to wait in a simple French phrase such as «Un instant, s'il vous plaît».

The Department told the Commissioner that his concern about its statement that services were provided in French at the Centre "on re-

quest" seemed to be a matter of semantics rather than substance. Its policy had been and was to offer services in French automatically to persons speaking French, rather than to wait for a formal telephone request or demand for this service. Anyone speaking French or English over the phone or in person was deemed to be requesting service in that language and this request would be met by all divisions, branches, programmes and services at national and regional headquarters, and in field offices where there was a significant demand and where it was feasible to do so.

The Department conjectured that perhaps this policy was not always followed, and stated a reminder would be sent to the staff, incorporating the Commissioner's suggestion that staff members who were unable to speak the language being used by the client should use a simple phrase such as "Un instant, s'il vous plaît".

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1637	Elliot Lake	Unilingual-English advertisements placed in the town's only newspaper.	Rectified
1742	Sudbury (Ontario)	A post card in English is sent to a French-speaker.	Rectified
1765	Toronto	Letter in English sent to a French-language association.	Explanation offered
1791	Toronto	A French-speaker receives a reply in English from the Ontario Regional Office.	Explanation offered
1798	Ottawa	Complainant is interviewed in English after having completed forms and spoken in French over the telephone.	Rectified
1827	Toronto	Local initiatives projects and applications for courses presented in French do not receive the same attention as those written in English.	Not justified
2036	Moncton (N.B.)	An English-speaker unable to obtain summer job because he cannot speak French.	Not justified
2138	Montreal	A French-speaker feels obliged to deal in English with departmental employees for the sake of efficiency.	Not justified
2149	Montreal	A Portuguese immigrant wishes to take courses in English as well as French.	Withdrawn
2156	Toronto	A French-speaker suffers alleged discrimination after insisting on being served in French.	Not justified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2237	Sudbury (Ontario)	Certificates in English given to French-speaker by CMC. French-speaker required to wait 5 to 10 minutes for service in French.	Explanation offered
2259	Gander (Newfoundland)	No service in French at Immigration point in Gander Airport.	Not justified
2269	Vancouver	Poor quality service in French offered by Howe Street CMC. French-speaker unable to obtain courses in English.	Rectified
2278	Ottawa	Unilingual-English sign at CMC Office located within "Union du Canada" building.	Rectified
2334	Ottawa	Unilingual-English return address on an envelope sent to a French-language association.	Rectified
2355	Toronto	French-speaker fails to obtain service in French when calling Toronto Regional Office.	Rectified
2362	Midland (Ontario)	No service in French at Midland CMC.	Rectified
2413	Peace River (Ontario)	No service in French at the Peace River CMC.	Rectified
2419	Sudbury (Ontario)	Unsatisfactory French-language services at Sudbury CMC.	Rectified
2424	Ottawa	French text of pamphlet does not accurately reflect the English text.	Explanation offered
2432	Ottawa	List of available jobs sent to manpower counsellors is unilingual-English.	Rectified
2444	Ottawa	Errors in French text of a form.	Rectified
2449	Prince Albert (Saskatchewan)	"BLADE" programme does not exist in French.	Not justified
2457	Ottawa	A publication is available in English only.	Rectified
2464	Sudbury (Ontario)	Francophones receive a unilingual English circular.	Explanation offered
2497	St-Hubert (Quebec)	French-speakers do not have access to language courses.	Not justified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2499	Ottawa	French does not have the status it deserves as language of work in the Department.	Withdrawn
2529	Mississauga (Ontario)	No service in French at local CMC.	Explanation offered
2532	Montreal	Immigrants allegedly being refused English courses at Montreal CMCs.	Explanation offered
2539	Toronto	Lack of service in French at Toronto CMC.	Not justified
2546	New Liskeard (Ontario)	Unilingual English, handwritten notices in CMC.	Rectified
2606	Toronto	French-speaking immigrant denied access to a course in English.	Explanation offered
2622	Vancouver	No service in French at 2 CMCs in Vancouver.	Explanation offered
2625	Ottawa	Envelope bearing a unilingual-English return address.	Explanation offered
2626	Montreal	A group of stenos allegedly suffer discrimination at hands of supervisor.	Referral
2651	Montreal	A telecommunications Supervisor's position is identified as unilingual French.	Withdrawn
2707	Winnipeg	A French-speaking "migrant" wishes to take English-language training.	Assistance Rendered
2732	Ottawa	Complainant wishes to have her position identified as bilingual instead of unilingual French.	Withdrawn
2741	Toronto	Poor quality of French in a letter.	Rectified
2753	Toronto	Error in French text of a sign at Toronto Airport.	Rectified
2766	Halifax	English-language notices sent out to French-speaking public.	Rectified
2793	Montreal	Complainant wins competition but is not appointed immediately to new position.	Assistance rendered
2798	Montreal	An employee cannot occupy a position as acting supervisor because he is not bilingual.	Explanation offered
2846	Penticton, Kelowna (B.C.)	No signs in French at airports.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2673	Toronto	A French-speaker receives a letter written in incomprehensible French.	Explanation offered
2713	Ottawa	French advertisement in English daily.	Explanation offered
2721, 2724	Port Hawkesbury (N.S.)	Poor quality service in French at local CMC.	Explanation offered
2725, 2726	Montreal	A French-speaking stenographer is turned down because she cannot speak English.	Explanation offered
2744	Toronto	A French-speaker receives correspondence in English about his local initiatives project.	Withdrawn
2791	Elliot Lake (Ontario)	French-speaker is not served in his own language at local CMC.	Not justified
3032	Ottawa	Unequal service alleged in supervision of French-language LIP project.	Explanation offered
3081	Ottawa	Telex sent to French-speaker is in English.	Rectified
3056	Summerside (P.E.I.)	A public servant on language training wants to be reimbursed for trips home.	Explanation offered
3090	Vancouver	An employee believes that the wrong employees are chosen for language training.	Explanation offered
3148	Edmonton	Telephone service is available in English only.	Explanation offered
3198	Montreal	Poor quality of French text of a directive.	Rectified
3217	Ottawa	An English-speaking public servant objects to the fact that interfacing units must communicate with French language units in French.	Explanation offered

NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE—"There's No Business like Show Business"

EVALUATION

The National Arts Centre orchestrated complaints made against it in elegant rubato and displayed sprightliness in seeking linguistic solutions that could well be emulated by other agencies whose renditions are less bright.

The *Third Annual Report 1972-73* cited the difficulties experienced by the NAC in implementing the five special study recommendations. The NAC sent this Office a new progress report in December 1974.

Forms and signs, as well as contracts with Canada's Capital Visitors and Convention Bureau, now conform to the recommendations made. This is true to a lesser extent of the recommendations concerning information and personnel. However, a few blemishes remain: these are, first, the availability of information in both official languages about foreign performers and second, difficulty in recruiting staff such as part-time and casual help, nurses, barmen and waiters.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 2145—French Productions Advertised in French

An English-speaker complained that the folder advertising the 1973-74 subscription series of French plays, which included an application form and coupon for a draw for a trip to Paris, was only available in French.

The Centre told the Commissioner that its policy had always been to advertise French-language theatre productions in French and English-language theatre productions in English. This was because each of its theatre series was aimed at the segment of the public which understood the language of the production. To advertise each series in the other language, the Centre maintained, would double publicity costs without producing a comparable increase in the return from ticket sales.

The Commissioner told the Centre that as an agency of the Government of Canada within the National Capital Region it had a duty under Section 9 (1) of the Official Languages Act to ensure that "members of the public can obtain available services from and can communicate with it in both official languages". He pointed out that in both series for the upcoming season there were plays which could be of interest to theatre-goers who had a fair understanding of the second language: the French series included a play by Goldoni, a translation of Shaw's *Misalliance* and an adaption of *Anna Karenina*, while the English series included plays by Brecht, Molière and Sophocles.

The Commissioner therefore recommended that the Centre should make information on its theatre series readily available to the public in both official languages.

A year later, the Commissioner received a complaint that the folders advertising the 1974-75 subscription series for French and for English plays were unilingual. He took the matter up again with the Centre.

The Centre replied that it had given a great deal of thought to the matter and had decided to continue to advertise the subscription series in the language in which the plays were to be performed. The Centre believed that advertising the plays in both official languages would tend to confuse, rather than enlighten, the public. It pointed out that information as to time, date, place and availability of tickets was always presented bilingually. Press releases were also produced in both official languages.

The Commissioner, from his experience of the Centre's co-operation in the past, believed that its concern was genuine and that the spirit of his recommendation was being observed.

He expressed the hope that a more complete solution of the problem would emerge in the course of time. He also asked the Centre to spare no effort to encourage those of both language groups who have some knowledge of the other language to sample the other culture.

File No. 2296—No Sub-titles

A French-speaker complained that French films shown at the National Arts Centre as part of the "Canadian Films—Cannes '73" festival were sub-titled in English whereas English films were left in the original without French sub-titles. A second person made the same complaint, adding that French-speakers were obliged to pay the admission price to see a single film in their language whereas English speakers had the advantage of seeing two films for the same price.

According to the information provided by the Director of the National Arts Centre, very few Canadian films are sub-titled either in French or English since this is an unprofitable proposition—unless the film turns out to be a hit. In the film series in question, two English films were not sub-titled. Unfortunately, the sub-titled version of the film *Wedding in White* was in Europe during the presentation of "Canadian Films—Cannes '73".

The programme's producer had made a genuine effort to put on a bilingual programme with the films available to him. A French and an English film were shown daily and, in addition, both the advertising and the programme leaflets were bilingual. As for the English sub-titles, they should be considered a bonus. In point of fact, the film *La Vie rêvée*, shown on 24 August, did not carry English sub-titles.

The Commissioner recommended that the Director General of the NAC ensure that future film presentations at the Centre respect the equal status of the two official languages.

An English-speaker objected to the fact that a concert given by Roger Whittaker was mostly in French. He believed that the National Arts Centre advertisement of the programme had been misleading in that the content of the concert had not been correctly indicated.

The National Arts Centre stated that Mr. Whittaker was renowned for his rendition of French songs and it expressed surprise that anyone could have a contrary impression. Notwithstanding his Australian birth, Mr. Whittaker made his international reputation as a singer from Paris and only later began to include a few English language songs in his repertoire. He could therefore not be expected to sing an equal number of English and French songs. Furthermore, the Centre believed that the sentence "His mellow bass voice is as comfortable in English as it is in French", which appeared in its publicity material, indicated that French was the artist's first language. In any event, an artist insisted on some freedom to vary his programme according to audience response, and the National Arts Centre would not wish it otherwise.

The Centre added that it did not advertise that Harry Belafonte sings a predominantly English programme since it presumes, perhaps erroneously, a certain knowledge on the audience's part. The Commissioner agreed that it would be silly to advertise that Harry Belafonte gave a predominantly English programme in view of his international renown. However, Roger Whittaker was not really quite so well known and a good many English-speakers thought of him as an English singer, having heard him sing mainly in that language on the English radio networks and on records. Furthermore, the Commissioner believed that a predominantly French programme such as had been offered by the National Arts Centre would not have been performed in Australia or New Zealand, and the artist had a sufficient number of English songs in his repertoire to allow English-speakers to conclude, however erroneously, that he was primarily an English singer.

The Commissioner did not dispute the fact that an artist had every right to choose the songs he wished to perform at a given concert. However, he believed that, taking into account the linguistic reality of the National Capital Region, it would have been wise to mention, in the bulletin of 15 to 18 May, 1974, that most of Roger Whittaker's songs for that particular concert would be sung in French. In this way, those ignorant of this artist's linguistic background would have known in advance what to expect. Had this been done, for example, when Petula Clark performed in Ottawa a number of years ago, a very unpleasant situation could have been avoided. The Commissioner therefore suggested that, in future, a few words about the linguistic content of programmes to be

presented by lesser-known singers be included in all advance publicity.

The National Arts Centre agreed to act upon the Commissioner's suggestion.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2292	Ottawa	Unilingual English-speaking parking attendant.	Rectified
2359	Ottawa	English reply to a request sent in French.	Rectified
2481	Ottawa	Unilingual French programme distributed at a French singer's performance.	Rectified
2572	Ottawa	Although the Centennial Choir's Christmas (1973) programme had been introduced in both languages, individual carols were announced only in English and only one of the eighteen carols was in French.	Assistance rendered
2915	Ottawa	Parking receipt printed in English only.	Rectified
3157	Ottawa	A doorman could not speak French.	Explanation offered

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION—"Bridge Over Troubled Water"

EVALUATION

Jolly joggers, Sunday farmers, penny-farthing riders, mermaids and seadogs in our federal perfumed garden were able to run down some 30 complaints during 1973-74, while they had fished out only 12 in the three preceding years. Despite these few mildly capital sins, the NCC remains an exemplar for just about anybody who wants to take bilingualism seriously.

Complaints cited unilingual English signs and lack of service from concessionaires. The NCC tidied up some complaints sluggishly and others with typical panache. In order to keep its vocation as the guardian genie of the National Region, the NCC would do well to inveigle the caliphs, vizirs, merchants, innkeepers and camel drivers of the private and non-federal government sectors on the Ottawa side into offering bilingual service much more fully in this official Mecca.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1945—Camp Fortune

A French-speaking correspondent alleged that the Ottawa Ski Club at Camp Fortune did not provide adequate services in French. Most, if not all, of the personnel were English-speaking only and signs and literature of the Club were in English only.

The National Capital Commission replied it was aware that many French-speaking people were offended by an alleged lack of respect for the French language at Camp Fortune. The problem was complicated by the fact that the Ottawa Ski Club is a private club and owns "Fortune Valley" where the two main lodges, the Ski Shop and other facilities such as the day-car centre, the information trailer and the first-aid post are located. Moreover, the Club's presence in that part of the Gatineau antedated that of the federal government by several decades.

However, the NCC did have two leases with the Ottawa Ski Club with respect to areas contiguous to Fortune Valley owned by the NCC, the Skyline and the Meach areas. In both leases the NCC had retained powers to assure respect for the Official Languages. One clause provided that the "lessee shall provide bilingual service to his customers and ensure that menus, signs, etc. are printed in both official languages." Another required specifically that signs be approved by the NCC.

Although the NCC did not appear to have formal rights with respect to the Ottawa Ski Club's privately-owned properties it had had amicable discussions with the Club concerning language policy which the NCC considered open to certain improvements. Some publications were bilingual; others were not. Certain services were found to be bilingual; others less. The Ski Club authorities contended that their service was, in fact, generally fully bilingual and that the incident must have related to one particular shift where less than a full bilingual service was available. Officials of the Club had agreed to look into the specific points raised by the NCC and to keep in touch with the Commission.

The Commissioner informed the complainant of the NCC's reply, sending him a copy of the Commission's letter with all the details.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1874, 2021, 2035, 2057, 2080, 2109	Ottawa	Unilingual English signboards on NCC property.	Rectified
1920, 2262, 2306	Ottawa— Hull	Unilingual English signboards and services in English only in Gatineau Park (Quebec).	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2088	Ottawa	Unilingual English services offered on the Picadilly Tours.	Explanation offered
2089, 2171	Ottawa	Unilingual French-speaking security guard employed in Vincent Massey Park, Ottawa.	Rectified
2098, 3057	Ottawa	Unilingual English-speaking attendants at a boat rental agency—an NCC concessionaire.	Explanation
2194, 2348	Ottawa	Unilingual English-speaking employees and unilingual English sign and refreshment menus at stand.	Rectified
2218	Ottawa	Announcements in English only during a musical concert given by the Governor General's Foot Guards at the Astro-labe Theatre.	Rectified
2276	Ottawa--Hull	Services offered in English only at the Moorside Tearoom.	Explanation
2290	Ottawa--Hull	English map in a French folder concerning the Moorside Tearoom.	Rectified
2367	Ottawa	Unilingual English date-stamp.	Rectified
2598	Ottawa	Request by the wife of an ex-employee for help in obtaining explanations concerning his unemployment insurance.	Assistance rendered
2672	Ottawa	Unilingual English documentation given to French-speaking members of the press at the Portage Bridge opening ceremony.	Not justified
2747	Ottawa	Unilingual English menus used at the Champlain Restaurant and The Mill, both concessionaires of the NCC in Ottawa.	Rectified
3179	Ottawa	Service in English only: Financial Services—Payroll.	Explanation offered
3183	Ottawa	Service in English only: Moorside Tearoom.	Rectified

NATIONAL DEFENCE—"You're in the Army Now"

EVALUATION

Although the Department made an error in judgement in ordering caps which didn't quite cover the officers' pates, its 15-year bilingualism

and biculturalism programme appears to measure up to National Defence dimensions. This Office is happy to note that during the period covered by this report the Department has continued to show initiative, innovation and enthusiasm. For example, in the spring of 1973, it sought to explain its bilingualism and biculturalism policy by holding information sessions at all important bases in Canada and Europe. Although no one was obliged to attend, roughly 7,000 people turned out at these meetings. DND also pioneered the use of dual sound tracks for the projection of films in both English and French at the same time; this system could be of use to many private and public institutions. Additionally, in order to promote the use of French as a language of work, DND studied the nature of internal communications at Headquarters and set a definite policy for documents to be distributed in both official languages. Finally, DND volunteered to show this Office a promising progress report on the implementation of its 15-year programme.

We received 75 complaints against DND in 1973-74. Six required recommendations, while 25 other contraventions of the Act were quickly rectified by the Department.

As stated in the *Third Annual Report 1972-73*, National Defence reported in October 1973, that it had fully implemented five of the ten recommendations resulting from the 1971 special study of CBF Uplands conducted by this Office.

In November 1974, the Department informed us that it considered three more recommendations to be fully met, including one relating to bilingual signs which, investigation had shown, contained occasional errors in the French inscriptions.

In the case of the recommendation that a full-time translator be assigned to the Base, DND introduced an alternate solution, namely that the Translation Bureau at DND headquarters continue to provide for all the Base's translation needs. The remaining recommendation dealing with bilingual service at the main entrance to the Base still awaits full implementation; the Canadian Corps of Commissionaires, which is responsible for the service, has been unable to provide the required number of bilingual personnel.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1832—In French in The Gazette

A person from western Quebec complained that an advertisement for recruits for the Canadian Armed Forces appeared in the English-language *Montreal Gazette* in French only.

The Department explained to the Commissioner that, as part of its plan to attain as soon as possible a 28:72 ratio between French- and English-speakers, it wished to recruit equal numbers from each language group for basic trades courses in 1972. By 23 February it had accepted 25 English-speaking candidates for the engineering technicians course starting in May but only 10 French-speaking persons had applied and not all of them were suitable. The Department therefore began a special advertising campaign to attract more French-speaking recruits. The advertisement in French in the *Gazette* was designed to appeal to French-speaking readers of that newspaper.

The Commissioner replied that although he realized that the Department was anxious to get its message across to potential recruits, the English-speaking public was entitled to read communications from federal government institutions in English in newspapers published in that language.

The Commissioner recommended that the Department publish such announcements in a bilingual format or at least in the language of the newspaper in which they appeared.

The Department accepted the Commissioner's recommendation.

File No. 1970--Sudbury

A French-speaking person visited the "Sportsorama" display held in the Sudbury arena during the last weekend of April 1973. He noticed that although an Armed Forces trailer bore signs in both English and French, all announcements inviting people to see the film being shown inside were made in English only, thereby leaving no doubt as to the language of the film.

The Department informed the Commissioner that the complaint probably had to do with a recording inviting people to enter the trailer. Officials at the sports complex in charge of publicity for the "Sportsorama" had used the recording as part of the exhibition's general programme.

The Department admitted it should have requested the officials to provide a recording in French also, even though the film was being shown in English only. Its policy in the past had been to show English films in its exhibition trailers in those regions where most of the people were English-speaking and French films where the majority were French-speaking. In areas where both language groups were relatively large, the Department had tried out a programme with films in both French and English. This practice had been adopted in most regions of New Brunswick. According to the Department, bilingual programmes had met with reasonable success, although a few complaints had been submitted by persons who, after lining up to see a film, suddenly realized

that it was not being shown in the language of their choice. Such situations arose even though the screening times for both English and French films were clearly indicated.

Finally, the Department conceded that the film at the "Sportorama" should have been shown in both languages. It expressed awareness of the need to advertise and show its films in both official languages when the composition of the population justified it.

The Commissioner informed the Department that it found it difficult to understand why those responsible for the Armed Forces' contribution to "Sportsorama" had not taken into consideration the number of French-speakers in Sudbury, which, according to the 1971 Census, totalled 24,445 people, that is, 27% of the city's population. Such a failure on the part of the Department to understand the need—indeed, its obligation—to serve the public in the language of its choice, would appear to indicate that the organizers did not have access to pertinent information regarding the distribution of the Canadian population by language group.

To prevent the recurrence of such errors, the Commissioner recommended that the Department ensure that its representatives referred to the statistics published by Statistics Canada where necessary and that steps be taken to require the Exhibitions and Displays Branch to use both official languages wherever it would be desirable to emphasize the bilingual nature of the Canadian Armed Forces, including those localities likely to be included in a future bilingual district.

The Department informed the Commissioner that the Exhibitions Branch had modified its language policy and its handling of exhibitions so as to resolve the problem. Thus, the figures published by Statistics Canada would be used to determine the breakdown by language group of the various communities. These figures would also be put at the disposal of the other agencies that made up the Department's information services. Moreover, the Department stated, the Exhibitions Branch would obtain films with two sound-tracks and that could be specially projected simultaneously in English and French. This should meet the needs of the Canadian public wherever the exhibitions or displays were being presented.

The Commissioner had the opportunity to see the new system in action in the spring of 1973 and was pleased to note that the Department had found a universally applicable solution to a difficult problem.

He took note of the fact that the use of audio-visual techniques had been extended to a number of other areas. In particular, the system of simultaneous screening of films in both official languages could be put to good use during staff training programmes whenever there was a lack of bilingual instructors or when teaching materials were available in only one of the two official languages.

File No. 2054—No French Version

An Ottawa parent sent the Commissioner a letter and a form both prepared in English by the Department, which were included in material sent to secondary school students in an envelope marked "Mailbag".

The Department informed the Commissioner that the "Mailbag" was sent only to students of English-language schools and that translating the letter and enclosing a self-addressed stamped envelope in French would have meant a great deal of additional and unjustifiable expense. It added that if there were a service in French similar to the one provided by "Mailbag", it would not hesitate to use it. The Department expressed its willingness to send a French version of its material, as well as an explanatory letter from the Director of Recruiting and Selection, to any French-speaking students who might have felt that their rights had been disregarded.

The Commissioner recommended that the Department carefully check its mailing lists to make sure that French-speaking students attending English-language schools (and vice versa) always received government publications in the official language of their choice.

File No. 2075—Sign in English Only

A French-speaking person complained that the sign "ARMY CADET WEEK OCT 21-27" on the Chateau Laurier in Ottawa was displayed in English only.

The Department informed the Commissioner that the annual recruiting campaign announced by the sign was conducted under the auspices of the Army Cadet League, an independent civil organization solely responsible for the unilingual advertising noted by the complainant. However, since the Department supported cadet leagues in several ways, it brought this complaint to the attention of the League's representatives. The latter attributed the unilingual publicity to an error on the part of the person in charge of advertising. The Army Cadet League reaffirmed that its policy was to communicate with the public in the language of the latter's choice.

In order to avoid such contraventions, the Commissioner recommended that the Department ask cadet leagues to make certain that their advertising complied with the provisions of the Official Languages Act.

The Department pointed out to the Commissioner that cadet leagues had the power to make their own decisions and regulations under the terms of the federal charter granted by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and that it could not insist that they act in a given manner. However, in order to carry out the Commission-

er's recommendation, the Department invited the various cadet leagues to comply with the directives issued in an earlier statement from the Department regarding the application of the Official Languages Act.

File No. 2283—The Recognized Working Language

A representative of a French-speaking association complained about a directive addressed in May 1973 to the Base Surgeon by the Base Administrative Office of the Canadian Forces Base Ottawa (South). In the directive, the Base Administrative Officer (who was also Base Bilingualism Adviser) stated that he had been informed that medical reports in French were being sent to unilingual English-speaking supervisors on the Base. He remarked that the Base supported the departmental policy of providing services in both official languages to the public and to servicemen and that certain positions of the Base establishment had been designated as bilingual in order to meet this requirement. Such support, however, was not to be interpreted as permitting the normal language of the Base to be either or both tongues: the recognized working language of CFB Ottawa was English.

Medical reports in French, the directive went on, were of no use to unilingual English-speaking supervisors or to other medical authorities until all such persons were bilingual. A serviceman, if he so desired, could receive treatment or instructions in French from the staff of the Medical Section, but all reports and records were to be written in English.

Before replying to the Commissioner, the Department asked him for an opinion about the rights of members of the Canadian Forces to use the official language of their choice. The Commissioner replied that he recognized that it was not always easy in certain cases to adhere to the important principles contained in Section 2 of the Official Languages Act. The Section did not speak of the rights of individuals but of equal status for the official languages. Individual rights must thus be inferred from Parliament's perhaps intentionally general language.

Legally speaking, therefore, Section 2 was not observed in any particular situation when the equal status conferred on the languages was not being respected. It was intellectually possible to argue that this status was not observed unless every civil servant or member of the Armed Forces in all circumstances had the absolute freedom to use the official language of his choice. But common sense dictated that the practical results of such a theory would be administrative anarchy, and Parliament, in other parts of the Act, had left it to the Commissioner to investigate particular cases, apply his judgment and make recommendations. The Act must deliberately intend to leave the Commissioner scope for judgment and good sense. In that way, his opinion of when there was a failure to respect equal status had a statutory basis.

These limitations of good sense could take various forms—they could be applied to the who, the when, the where and the how, depending on the circumstances.

In trying to understand Parliament's intention, the administrator concerned must himself try to apply the same opinions and judgments as to whether the case involved a failure to respect the status conferred by the Section. The Act made no provision for the Commissioner to issue interpretations for general guidance and thus legislate subsections to Section 2. It required him to form opinions on the basis of investigations of complaints or special studies and to make recommendations accordingly. These recommendations arising out of such individual complaints formed the only "jurisprudence" contemplated by this Section of the Act.

The Commissioner's opinion on the case raised in this complaint would only be by way of example and could not alter his duty to form an independent opinion and make recommendations on the basis of actual complaints about similar situations.

In the case of the doctor referred to in this complaint, the "who, when and where", in the Commissioner's opinion, came out in the doctor's favour. It should be possible for French-speaking doctors serving in units which had English as their primary language of work to be permitted to write their medical reports in the official language of their choice. These reports were not intended for non-professionals but for other medical offices and ultimately, perhaps, medical personnel of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Information required by commanding officers following medical examinations or interviews could satisfactorily be met by a bilingual report especially designed for the purpose.

The Department later informed the Commissioner that the Base Administrative Officer had amended his original directive in July 1973. He had conceded the Base Surgeon's right to work in the official language of his choice, and stated that he would not seek to prevent him from using French.

He said that he had an "institutional responsibility" concerning bilingualism on the Base, and that, as all other personnel were similarly entitled to work and to receive services in the language of their choice, there was a requirement for documents in English whether or not they originated in French. Accordingly, all reports, records, files and the like originally written in French were to be translated, with copies for the files and for the supervisors or other persons concerned.

The Base Administrative Officer agreed that translation of such documents was normally a Base responsibility, but as CFB Ottawa did not have a central translation staff, he considered that the Medical Section had sufficient capability to provide the required translation. He

therefore directed the Base Surgeon to ensure that translation was carried out within his Section.

The Commissioner informed the Department of his belief that this second directive, while recognizing the Base Surgeon's right to work in French, did in fact impose an extra burden of work on the bilingual personnel of the Base Medical Section. In any case, the directive had not taken into account one of the recommendations of a Special Studies report on the Base (see his *Second Annual Report 1971-1972*, pages 70-73), already agreed to by the Department, concerning translation services on the Base.

The Commissioner was of the opinion that certain distinctions had to be made. For instance, certain forms employed on a daily basis, and even annual reports, could be adapted easily to a bilingual format. However, medical opinions and other information of a professional nature, normally written in a person's first language, required translation in order to be understood by unilingual persons of the other official language.

The Commissioner therefore recommended that the right of an employee—in this case a medical officer—to work in the official language of his choice should not be hampered by the need for him, or other members of his group not officially considered and hired as translators, to do the required translation.

The Department told the Commissioner that the directive which led to the complaint was not aimed at the Base Surgeon but at a former incumbent of a bilingual post in the Medical Section. The second directive, requiring that medical reports completed by this doctor be translated by the Medical Section's staff, reflected a decision approved by the Base Surgeon that took into account translation needs and the rights of the individual. Its importance lay in the fact that it recognized the doctor's right to complete his medical reports in French even if it did suggest an administrative solution that would sometimes require that the translation be done within the medical unit itself. In this matter, the Department had followed the principle of the Commissioner's recommendation that an individual should not be required to ensure his own translation, since there had been no question of forcing the doctor to do so.

The Ottawa Base would ordinarily accept the delays involved in the translation services provided by Defence Headquarters but not when patients had to be referred urgently to another doctor or another medical service. The solution outlined in the second directive took into consideration the delays caused by official translations, the frequency and volume of texts to be translated, as well as the nature of the medical care dispensed and the professional character of the reports, the translation of which was perhaps best ensured by a doctor.

Finally, the Department said that a range of special circumstances in the Canadian Forces would always make it necessary for units and sections to do some translating although they were free to turn to the Translation Services for official translations or when more important tasks made this necessary. It was unthinkable that the efficiency of the Canadian Forces should be made subservient to "Translation".

The Commissioner thanked the Department for its clarification regarding the doctor concerned. He pointed out that the second directive did not merely suggest but ordered that the doctor ensure that his reports were translated within his section. He also pointed out that the Department had misinterpreted his recommendation which was that the right of each member of the medical team to write reports in his own language be recognized.

The Commissioner added that he agreed that it was unthinkable that the efficiency of the Canadian Forces should be made subservient to "Translation". Indeed the complaint centered round this very question which was raised again in the following statement in the second directive: "As a result of direct requirements for services in English there is a base or institutional requirement for working documents to be in English whether or not they originate in French." The Commissioner was of the opinion that even if this statement reflected the true situation within the Armed Forces, it was contrary to the spirit and letter of the Official Languages Act, which stipulated the equality of status and the equal rights and privileges of English and French as to their use in all the institutions of the Parliament and Government of Canada. He felt the Department would agree that the linguistic situation in the doctor's military unit required recourse to translation.

The Department subsequently informed the Commissioner that, to avoid further complications, it would ask Air Transport Command to rescind the two directives of the former Base Administrative Officer. It would continue to do its best to see that English and French enjoyed the same rights and privileges in all of its establishments in the National Capital Region.

File No. 3093—Memoranda in English

A French-speaking person called the Commissioner's attention to the fact that memoranda circulated within the Documentation and Drawing Services Branch, where a number of positions had been identified as unilingual French, were prepared in English only. These memoranda, of general or professional interest, originated from both outside and inside the Branch.

The Department replied that at the time these memoranda were issued, its language policy did not deal with this type of document.

In addition, it had noticed that sometimes the term “memorandum” was misused to designate other kinds of documents. The Department accordingly decided to change its language policy. As from 1 September 1974, all notices, orders, instructions, directives, forms and written information, as well as memoranda included in the following categories, were to appear in both official languages:

- 1) documents defining policies, establishing procedures, dealing with general subjects or announcing social events;
- 2) correspondence intended for wide circulation to a standard list of addressees or to all personnel in a group of division; and
- 3) information which would remain valid for a long period.

File No. 3124—Many Are Called . . .

A French-speaker stated that she dialled the number of Personnel Information Systems (992-3525) at about 11.45 a.m. on 10 July 1974 to make inquiries. The person who took the call allegedly replied insolently: “Can’t you speak English?” to her question in French. The complainant when asked if someone who was able to speak French could not be found. The employee apparently answered that there was no one there who spoke French and insisted that the caller speak English. The employee was eventually able to obtain assistance from a French-speaker.

The Department informed the Commissioner that an internal check had failed to corroborate the allegations. The employee who had taken the call had asked a French-speaking fellow-worker to help her as soon as she realized that it was impossible to carry on a conversation. Since the inquiry was about locating a member of the armed Forces, the complainant was asked to contact another section which would probably have the information required.

The Commissioner recommended that the Department periodically remind Headquarters staff that the fact that a person contacting one of its offices used one or the other official language was in itself an implicit request for service in that language. Accordingly, unilingual personnel should learn to use a phrase such as “Un instant, s’il vous plaît”, or “One moment, please”, before transferring a call to a fellow-worker able to speak the language of the caller. The Commissioner also asked the Department to send him its comments on this recommendation and, if necessary, a copy of any directive issued.

The Department agreed to implement the Commissioner’s recommendation and to issue a directive on the subject.

It said it was aware of the presence of unilingual operators at National Defence Headquarters and of the possible consequences. It was seeking to improve the situation in order to offer faultless

services. It related the recruitment problems it had in this respect and the steps it was taking in order to have such employees classified as clerks. In the meantime it was evaluating a course entitled "Communications Canada, Bonjour" which it hoped to offer to unilingual operators and secretaries so that they might acquire the rudiments of the other language and thereby better serve the public and departmental staff.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1790	Ottawa	Request for information on the right of French-speaking parents to provide their children with schooling in French.	Explanation offered
1821	London (Ontario)	Circular in English sent to a French-language association.	Rectified
1844	Ottawa	Unilingual English parking sticker: CFB Rockcliffe.	Rectified
1873	Cornwall	Unilingual English signs in front of the Department's building.	Rectified
1879	Ottawa	Delay in obtaining the results of the Language Knowledge Examination and difficulty in pursuing studies at the Language School.	Assistance rendered
1923	Kingston (Ontario)	Service in English only at federal government switchboard.	Rectified
1924	Ottawa	Request for assistance in obtaining a promotion.	Referral
1949	Ottawa	Manager's refusal to send an employee to the Language School.	Explanation offered
2022	Petawawa (Ontario)	Unilingualism of the newspaper <i>Petawawa Base Post</i> .	Rectified
2050	Montreal	Changes in the language requirements for a position were announced shortly before the day on which interviews were to be held.	Explanation offered
2082 2107 2137	Montreal Ottawa Toronto	Use of the English initials "HMS" on naval establishments in Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto.	Explanation offered
2105	Ottawa	Directive addressed to a receptionist stating that it was not necessary to answer the telephone in French.	Withdrawn
2124	Ottawa	Protest against a certificate of service printed in both languages.	Explanation offered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2148	Ottawa	A supervisor refused to accede to an employee's request to take a language course.	Assistance rendered
2150	Halifax	Serviceman's concern about the probable quality of the French taught in Shannon Park School.	Rectified
2178	Ottawa	Request for information concerning the use of French as a language of work.	Explanation offered.
2189	Kingston (Ontario)	Most captions at the Royal Military College Museum are in English.	Rectified
2192	Bagotville (Quebec)	French as a language of work at BAMEO.	Rectified
2202	Kingston (Ontario)	Folder in English given to visitors to the Royal Military College. Names of streets and avenues and traffic signs in English only.	Rectified
2221	Cowansville (Quebec)	The Department took longer to reply to letters written in French than to those written in English.	Rectified
2230	Shilo (B.C.)	A French-speaker claimed to have abandoned his officer training course for linguistic reasons.	Withdrawn
2239	Saint-Hubert (Quebec)	Disqualification of a unilingual French-speaker from a competition requiring a knowledge of English.	Explanation offered
2271	Mont Apica (Quebec)	Grievance concerning the payment of a 7 per cent bilingualism bonus.	Explanation offered
2272	Oromocto (N.B.)	Promotions were allegedly conferred only on French-speakers.	Not justified
2300	Ottawa	Unilingual English signs in the Ogilvy Building.	Rectified
2352	Petawawa	Canadian Forces Base Petawawa advertised a vacancy for a French teacher in Ottawa's two English-language dailies but not in the French-language one.	Rectified
2404	Ottawa	A public servant wished to take French courses.	Assistance rendered
2450	Ottawa	Unilingual English inscription on a drill hall.	Rectified
2458	Valcartier (Quebec)	A French-speaker who was retiring received a diploma and a letter in English. The speech which was delivered was also in English.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2516	Plantagenet (Ontario)	Unilingual English signs on a truck.	Rectified
2542	Ottawa	A French-speaker was invited to an interview and interviewed in English.	Rectified
2547	Ottawa	Televised advertisements promoting the recruitment of French-speakers were merely translations from the English.	Explanation offered
2587	Petawawa	Survey on French-language teaching at the Petawawa Base conducted in English only.	Explanation offered
2627	Ottawa	Presence of unilingual English-speakers in the only French-language unit at the Department's headquarters.	Explanation offered
2640	Halifax	Entitlement to the 7 per cent bonus for services rendered in French.	Explanation offered
2681	Ottawa	A member of the Armed Forces wishes to take the PSC Language Knowledge Examination.	Explanation offered
2716	Ottawa	A directive intended for general internal circulation was distributed in English only.	Rectified
2759	Montreal	A bilingual French-speaker employed at the 202nd Workshop Depot objected to his position's being identified as unilingual French or English.	Rectified
2779	Ottawa	An English-speaking serviceman criticized the special promotion policy favouring French-speaking members of the Canadian Forces.	Explanation offered
2816	Ottawa	Memoranda distributed in English only.	Rectified
2822	Ottawa	Visitors to the Department's Headquarters were invited to fill out a form printed in English only.	Rectified
2850	Victoria	Request to investigate the methods of teaching French used at Royal Roads Military College.	Explanation offered
2910	Ottawa	A form used by Headquarters was printed in English only.	Rectified
2958	Trenton	Unilingual English signs at the main entrance to the Base.	Rectified
2963	Montreal	Unilingualism of a so-called military plan.	Not justified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
3008	Ottawa	Letter in English sent to a French-speaker.	Rectified
3040	Grande Prairie (Alberta)	French entries in the telephone directory were abbreviated.	Rectified
3100	Ottawa	Job advertisement circulated only in English in French-language secondary schools.	Rectified
3132	Cold Lake (Alberta)	Armed Forces Day programme published in English only.	Explanation offered
3137	Kingston	A young man was allegedly refused admission to the Military College because he was a new Canadian.	Withdrawn
3186	Ottawa	Listing only in English in the telephone directory.	Rectified

NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE—"Smoke Gets in Your Eyes"

EVALUATION

Although the patient, who has just been given his second purge, is looking better now, the 32 complaints that we have received indicate that there is still a possibility of relapse. However, the Department has in most cases been able to treat—and cure—its linguistic infections on its own. It has twice had to undergo preventive treatment we recommended, and it has followed our prescriptions well. Finally, in spite of the improvement noted with regard to several recommendations which did not pose any major problems, the Welfare Component must follow sustained remedial therapy in order to comply with the requirements of the Official Languages Act and prevent any dysfunction of administrative organs essential to bilingualism.

In particular, the Department might undertake to define objectives and establish programs and control mechanisms for implementing its official languages policy, to give special attention to providing oral services in both official languages throughout the country, and to revise its interpretation of "significant demand"—a concept that it appears to diagnose too restrictively in some cases.

In May 1973, following a special study of welfare services, this Office sent twenty-two recommendations to the Department of National Health and Welfare.

As this Office's *Third Annual Report* was published soon after the recommendations were sent to the Department, there was not sufficient time to make a detailed evaluation of the measures taken by the Department in response to the recommendations. However, it is now possible to do so, in light of the Department's report on the steps that it has taken, and data provided during three interviews with regional administrators in the Welfare Component.

According to the information obtained in December 1974, twelve recommendations have apparently been implemented. These recommendations concern signs, publications, forms, rubber stamps, special language courses for telephone receptionists, recruitment, information services and the latter's relations with the English- and French-language press, exhibitions, films and language training.

In spite of the improvements made in the above-mentioned areas, information services in Toronto and Edmonton are still unable to offer their services in both languages; the Vancouver office can lay claim to only limited bilingualism. The Department does not indicate whether it has at least taken concrete temporary measures to enable each of the two language groups to benefit from information services in its own language. On the other hand, it does indicate that it will achieve institutional bilingualism in 1978. The subject of forms, too, calls for comment: while the Department states that all forms are now available in both official languages, investigation of a complaint revealed that such is not the case everywhere in the country, and that the conception that the institution has of "significant demand" on the regional level is, at least in this case, very restrictive.

Because of delays that we find difficult to understand, nine recommendations had not been completely implemented by December 1974. It was only in January 1975 that the Department proceeded to appoint a director for the Official Languages Program; in addition, it has remained silent as to the objectives and the plan of action that it should have formulated in accordance with one of the recommendations. The Department has made laudable efforts to ensure that its personnel is informed of the requirements of the Official Languages Act by giving wide distribution to the material prepared by the Office of the Commissioner and the Treasury Board. However, it has not yet assembled its own information kit. The latter will not be ready before the spring of 1975, according to the Department.

Too many shortcomings remain with regard to the Department's listings in telephone directories, examination of the linguistic composition of the staff, telephone reception, and informational material made available to the public in reception areas—material which the Department says it wishes to improve on the French side by increasing its

subscriptions to French-language periodicals. With regard to the capacity that the Department must have to provide its services in both languages, it should be noted that the recommendations have been only very partially implemented. As an example, the Office learned that in Winnipeg, the telephone is answered in English only, in order not to "offend" the English-speaking public. As another example, it is not certain that services in Toronto are provided automatically and equally in both languages.

In addition, two sub-recommendations—one advocating a staff information program concerning departmental policy on the official languages, and the other requesting a statistical report on the linguistic profile of departmental employees—have not been implemented.

In spite of the progress that has been made, the Department would do well to act with greater vigour in implementing the recommendations, and to be more generous in its conception of "significant demand", which it seems to interpret too narrowly. Considerable effort must be made if the Department wishes to ensure that all its services are provided equally to both language groups.

This Office has also completed a new study concerning the Department's Health Component. A report appears below.

SPECIAL STUDY—NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE (HEALTH COMPONENT)

In 1974, a special study of the Health component of the Department of National Health and Welfare was carried out pursuant to Section 25 of the Official Languages Act. It concentrated upon the broad range of internal and external activities engaged in by the Department in the discharge of its health-related responsibilities. Activities and Services examined included: research, health protection, sport and health education programmes, as well as medical services provided to Indians, public servants, immigrants and pilots.

At the time of the study (March to December 1974), the Health component had made some progress with regard to its implementation of the Official Languages Act. Its 1971 policy document on bilingualism had defined a certain number of measures to be taken towards making its services available to the public in both official languages and providing "every available opportunity" to work in the language of their choice. The study revealed, however, that this policy statement was in some respects outdated and inadequate and, consequently, in need of revision. Some of the people interviewed believed that this document did not provide enough specific guidance and left too much leeway for subjective interpretation. It was also noticed that the Department's decen-

tralized approach to the implementation of the Act did not permit the Bilingualism Adviser or the Language Retention Co-ordinator to function as effectively as possible. At the time of the study, however, the Department was reorganizing its Official Languages Division. Hopefully, this will enable it to coordinate and monitor its efforts to implement the Act.

Information obtained during the study indicated several areas in which the Department's language training programme could be improved. These included a more extensive information programme, second-language retention programmes directed to the acquisition of technical and professional terminology, and opportunities for voluntary transfers to units where the second language is used more frequently.

The quality of translations into French, and the time taken to do them, gave rise to numerous problems. The Department seems to have done little to improve this situation despite a number of memoranda and internal studies, the findings of which were corroborated during this study.

Since 1971, the Health Component has taken a number of steps towards the implementation of those sections of its Official Languages Programme dealing with the provision of service to the public in both official languages. Signs, forms used at headquarters, are for the most part bilingual; certain publications are available in both official languages. Letters are answered in English or French as required in most cases.

There are a number of areas which need improvement, however, before the Department can be said to be providing its services to the public in both official languages as required by the Act. The Health component did not consistently identify its offices in both languages on the telephone or refer calls to employees capable of providing information in the appropriate language. Units which come into direct contact with the public, particularly those concerned with education, field research, or regulatory work, often did not have the requisite degree of institutional bilingualism to ensure that its services were equally available in both languages. With respect to correspondence, the department's policy of answering in the language used by the correspondent is in conformity with the Official Languages Act. Nevertheless, in many directorates, delays in replying to letters received in French sometimes resulted from the necessity of having recourse to translation for reading incoming mail and/or drafting replies. The Department has apparently translated many publications that had been available in English only; however, a few texts were not yet bilingual.

In its use of communications media, the Health component, should take steps to ensure that equal service is provided to both

language groups. The study showed that certain measures are required to ensure that press releases and broadcasting services are addressed to both language groups, particularly where information deemed to be of regional interest is distributed from regional offices. Special attention should also be given to increasing the number of professional or scientific employees capable of giving interviews on radio or television in French.

According to the information gathered, the Health Component has made far less progress with regard to its objective of offering its staff "every available opportunity" to work in the language of their choice. Persons interviewed in the National Capital Region indicated that it was difficult, if not impossible, for French-speakers to work in their own language. While no such difficulty was encountered in the Quebec region, employees there indicated nevertheless that they often felt obliged to communicate in English with headquarters in Ottawa.

There were considerable delays in making manuals, internal documents and other working tools available in both official languages. In this regard no programmes had been initiated and only sporadic efforts had been made to monitor the translation of these working tools. Library services also left much to be desired as far as the use of both official languages was concerned. The fact that there were very few journals and books available in French in the central as well as in branch libraries meant that French-speaking employees were often unable to obtain necessary reference material in their own language, and were thus discouraged, however indirectly, from working in the language of their choice.

Administrative and personnel services could not always be offered in both official languages because of a lack of bilingual personnel. The same was true of training courses which were for the most part not available in French.

The results of an analysis of the linguistic profiles of Health Component personnel did not come as a surprise, given the difficulties experienced by the Department in its attempts to provide a working environment conducive to the use of both official languages. According to the information received, 75% of the bilingual positions in the major branches which were supposed to be occupied by bilingual incumbents by 1974 were actually filled by bilingual personnel. Some of the persons interviewed claimed that this was because it was difficult to recruit French-speaking personnel particularly scientific, professional and technical personnel. Others claimed, on the one hand, that the right "reservoirs" of French-speaking personnel were not being tapped. In view of such contradictory statements, the Department might wish to examine its recruitment and training procedures more closely.

In the light of these findings, the Commissioner recommended that the Department:

GENERAL POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION

- (1) revise its policy statement on the official languages by 30 June 1975, making it more precise, bringing it up to date and ensuring that the requirements of the Official Languages Act are fully taken into account;
- (2) complement this statement with regional directives which reflect local conditions and requirements and which include practical ways and means of complying with the Act;
- (3) reassess and, where necessary, revise its implementation programme indicating target dates and designating the centres of responsibility for each activity;
- (4) use the findings, suggestions and recommendations of this study as a general but not necessarily exclusive guide for revising its policy statement on official languages, and integrate them into the implementation programme whenever appropriate;

STAFF INFORMATION PROGRAMME

- (5) distribute the revised policy statement on official languages in bilingual format to all employees both at headquarters and in the regions prior to 31 December 1975; give copies of the policy statement to all new employees hired after that date and inform them as to what actions are necessary to comply therewith;
- (6) provide a continuing staff information programme; such a programme should include practical ways and means of complying with the Act and be revised from time to time, whenever necessary;

ORGANIZATION, SUPERVISION AND MONITORING

- (7) examine the responsibilities of the various bilingualism advisers and co-ordinators and, where necessary, redefine them so as to provide for the most effective and integrated implementation of the Official Languages Act and official languages programmes possible;
- (8) supervise and monitor closely the implementation of the Act within all its units; compile and keep up to date more accurate linguistic profiles on employees in all positions; ensure the regular appraisal of all actions taken in the bilingualism field, and adopt corrective measures as needed;
- (9) take the necessary interim measures to meet the requirements of the Official Languages Act with respect to those bilingual positions whose incumbents are unilingual or which are vacant, so that services to the public and to the members of the Department can be provided in both official languages;

LANGUAGE TRAINING

- (10) review the implementation of its policy on language training, particularly in the regions, and pay attention to (a) Treasury Board guidelines and

(b) the Public Service Commission recommendation concerning the appointment of language training contact officers in Halifax, Moncton, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Edmonton and Vancouver;

(11) keep these contact agents, and through them all employees in the regions, continuously informed concerning new developments, programmes, approved institutions where language training is available and reimbursement procedures, and in collaboration with these regional offices, make every effort to have staff members enlist in these courses;

(12) expand its second-language retention programmes so as to facilitate the acquisition of specialized terminology whenever this is necessary for the employee to be able to work in his second language;

(13) provide, on a voluntary basis, for temporary appointments to another section or to a regional office where the employee can improve his knowledge of his second language as well as broaden his experience;

(14) provide, on a voluntary basis, remedial language training, such as courses in administrative writing in French, for Francophone employees who, as a result of working and living in an English-speaking environment, are no longer confident of their ability to work in French;

TRANSLATION

(15) take specific measures, such as the appointment of French-language editors to the major branches, to ensure better and more systematic quality control of translations and, in so doing, to relieve the professional staff of this additional burden;

(16) nominate an officer in each of the major branches to be responsible for assuring the establishment of an efficient system of priorities for material to be sent to departmental Translation Services;

(17) approach the Translation Bureau, Secretary of State Department, with a view to increasing the number of specialized translators at headquarters;

LANGUAGE OF SERVICE

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Telephone and Reception Services

(18) (a) implement consistently its policy of providing bilingual telephone answering and reception services in the National Capital Region and in all offices serving both official language groups;

(b) ensure henceforth that unilingual employees answering the telephone can at least identify their units in both official languages and refer the call with a simple courteous phrase in the caller's language to another employee capable of providing service in the appropriate language;

(c) ensure henceforth that all enquiries, whether of a general, professional, technical or scientific nature, receive an equally appropriate response in both official languages in the National Capital Region and in all offices serving both language groups;

(19) ensure henceforth that in offices in the National Capital Region and elsewhere, all those services which bring, or should normally bring, departmental employees into contact and communication with the French- as well as the English-speaking public, whether local, travelling or migrant (at seaports, airports, and ports of entry for example) be provided equally in both official languages, including the provision of educational and informational services (through meetings, lectures, seminars, television, radio and film interviews), the conduct of studies, surveys, regulatory inspections, investigations of occupational health conditions or aircraft accidents, medical examinations, counselling and treatment, consultation services to professional associations and provincial and foreign governments, and quarantine and immigration medical and regulatory activities;

(20) (a) undertake a thorough study before 30 June 1975 of all studies, projects or programmes, in such areas as sports, drug abuse, community health and long range planning, which are undertaken by individuals, groups or organizations with the help of departmental grants or contracts in order to ascertain whether the arrangement(s) enable the Department to meet its obligations under the Official Languages Act with regard to the equal availability of services and communication in both official languages;

(b) ensure, where the requirements of the Official Languages Act are not being met through the above-mentioned arrangements, that all services are provided in both official languages according to the terms of the Act by 30 September 1975;

VISUAL BILINGUALISM

Publications

(21) ensure that all present or future publications including folders, pamphlets, posters, manuals, information sheets and letters, or books, prepared and/or distributed by the Health component are issued simultaneously, preferably under one cover, in both official languages;

Films

(22) take the necessary measures to ensure equal availability of its films in both official languages so that by 31 December 1975, French-language as well as English-language films are available in all subject categories, and that, by 30 September 1976, the respective proportions reflect the equality of status of both official languages;

Calling Cards, Postal Imprints and Rubber Stamps

(23) issue all calling cards with both official languages on the same card and use bilingual rubber stamps and postal imprints throughout the Department by 31 March 1975;

Telephone Listings

(24) (a) ensure, as was already recommended to the Welfare component, that all its offices place bilingual listings in the telephone directories and that it contact the Telecommunications Agency of the Department of Com-

munications to obtain its assistance in negotiating bilingual listings with telephone companies in the various jurisdictions where difficulties have been encountered in the past;

(b) publish the telephone numbers of all programmes and services of the Health component every three months in appropriate French-language dailies or weeklies until recommendation 24 (a) can be put into effect;

Bulletin Boards

(25) ensure that both official languages are represented in material posted on bulletin boards;

Correspondence

(26) (a) ensure that the Department's policy of answering in the language of the correspondent continues to be observed and that all efforts are made to encourage employees who are capable of originating correspondence to do so in the official language used by its various clients, to avoid delays inconsistent with equal efficiency of service, and to ensure equal linguistic quality;

(b) encourage such efforts by ensuring that in all offices and at all levels with a responsibility for monitoring incoming and outgoing correspondence, in the National Capital Region and in all regional offices serving both language groups, there is a sufficient level of capability in both languages for reading correspondence without translation;

Forms

(27) (a) render bilingual all remaining unilingual forms intended for public use, as well as the basic text of all standard agreements and contracts with provincial governments, private firms, or individuals, by 30 June 1975 in the case of documents issued by headquarters, and by 31 December 1975 in the case of documents issued in the regions;

(b) take interim measures to provide service and communication in the appropriate language wherever the documents mentioned in (a) are unilingual;

LANGUAGE OF INTERNAL COMMUNICATION

Working Instruments

(28) undertake an immediate and thorough inventory of administrative and scientific manuals for internal use, as well as of directives and analysis handbooks, so that these instruments will be available in both languages no later than 31 December 1976; render bilingual all printed forms, bulletins, letters of information and guides, so that all those in use in the National Capital and Quebec regions will be available in French and English by 31 December 1975 and in the other regional offices by 31 December 1976;

Auxiliary Services

(29) ensure by means of either temporary or permanent appointments that by 30 September 1975 departmental libraries have a degree of institutional bilingualism enabling them to:

- (a) provide services orally and in writing in both languages;
 - (b) keep abreast of current bibliographical development in both languages and be well acquainted with production in French and English throughout the world, as well as with suppliers and with various libraries capable of co-operating and providing assistance, and
 - (c) make knowledgeable evaluations of works in both official languages in order to identify those which would assist personnel to work in either language and increase considerably the number of publications available in French in order to respect the equality of status of the two official languages;
- (30) review, with Treasury Board, the designation dates for positions with a view to making services equally available in both official languages at the earliest possible date; and
- (31) take advantage of employees' suggestions by encouraging them to recommend titles of works in French;

ADMINISTRATION

Personnel Services

- (32) (a) henceforth ensure, notwithstanding the long-term measures taken to carry out Treasury Board guidelines that personnel services are offered equally in the two official languages;

Administrative Services

- (b) re-examine immediately the language requirements of certain positions in the administrative services (personnel, etc.) attached to the regional offices, in order to ensure that they meet the demand in French and in English;

Training

- (c) begin immediately to provide in both official languages administrative and professional training courses set up by the Department or arranged through it, so that all courses will be available in both official languages by 31 March 1976;

Job Descriptions

- (d) ensure that job descriptions of interest to employees of both language groups are simultaneously available in both official languages;

USE OF THE TWO LANGUAGES

- (33) develop immediately a programme to encourage those employees who wish to do so to use the French language as much as possible in originating documents and carrying out their work and in internal oral and written communication, in order to favour a more equitable use of the two official languages:

- (a) by setting up an increased number of French-language units especially in the National Capital Region and at all organizational levels;
- (b) by grouping French-speaking employees whenever possible into viable units where, because of their numbers, the work and supervision can be carried out in French; by reviewing where necessary the designation dates for supervisory positions in units where there is already a majority of French-speaking employees;
- (c) making it possible for French to be used in meetings and seminars and in communication with the Quebec region;
- (d) by following its own policy statement on bilingualism which states that notices, memoranda and directives should be prepared in both languages when they are intended for employees of the two language groups;

Quebec Region

(34) develop and implement a special programme for the Quebec region, so that French will become the usual language of work for the employees working there, without, however, hindering communication in English by those wishing to use that language; set up points of contact in the auxiliary services in Ottawa capable of ensuring that all services are provided in French and English; and explain to employees working in French-language units the criteria that governed the establishment of the FLUs, in order to clear up any misunderstandings;

(35) make increased efforts (through the Public Service Commission's post-secondary recruitment programme and through activities fostering greater awareness in educational institutions of the Department's work) to attract reasonable and sufficient numbers of candidates from the professional, scientific, technical and other fields, in view of the need to obtain a degree of institutional bilingualism (resulting from the presence of bilingual and unilingual personnel from both language groups), in order to ensure the provision of services in both languages and to ensure that, in its internal use of the two official languages, the Department meets the requirements of the Act;

CONSULTATION

(36) maintain close liaison and consultation with its employees' unions and staff associations in implementing the preceding recommendations;

JOB SECURITY AND PROMOTION

(37) avoid jeopardizing the job security or career opportunities of its personnel in implementing the recommendations listed in this report;

HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS

(38) deal with complaints taken up with the Department by the Commissioner of Official Languages in his role as ombudsman and take corrective action in the shortest possible time, notwithstanding any action taken by the Department with respect to the recommendations contained in this report or for any other purposes, and regardless of any target dates specified in these recommendations.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 2242—It was only a reference number

A French-speaking person complained that the Information Branch used a unilingual English stamp and that the reference coding (at the bottom of envelopes: NHW) was based on the English name of the Department.

The Department issued instructions for the Branch to obtain a bilingual stamp. As to the code used, the Department indicated that it was only a reference number for internal use and did not represent an abbreviation of the Department title.

The Commissioner asked the Department to discontinue using the letters NHW, even if they did not represent an abbreviation of the Department's title. In fact, their close resemblance to the English abbreviation of the Department seemed to annoy the French-speaking public, which regarded them as conflicting with the provisions of the Official Languages Act.

The Department decided to replace this reference system with the NATO numeric code consisting of thirteen numbers. This numbering system will be used in reprinting envelopes. They will be in circulation in the next financial year.

File No. 3036—Midland, Ontario

The complainant noticed that only the English version of a newsletter of the Canada Pension Plan was available at the Department's office in Midland, Ontario.

The Department replied that all publications concerning the Canada Pension Plan were printed in both official languages. However, the newsletter in question had been prepared in the region.

According to the Department, the officer responsible for the Midland region had taken into consideration demand and data from the 1971 Census in deciding to publish the newsletter in English only. The Department added that only 4% of the district of North York was French-speaking. Nevertheless he was studying the possibility of disseminating, in both official languages, information prepared at the regional level.

The Commissioner brought to the Department's attention other census data which demonstrated the importance of the French-speaking population in the region. He recommended that all newsletters, bulletins or notices prepared by the Regional Office be issued in future in both official languages, preferably in a bilingual format.

The Department replied that the newsletters in question would be translated and that in future, written material intended for public use in localities such as Midland, Penatanguishene, Welland and Windsor would be made available in both official languages.

File No. 3328—"Health and Fitness"

A French-speaking person complained that an Information Bulletin (No. 38F dated 4 October 1975) distributed by Information Canada indicated that the Department of National Health and Welfare publication entitled "Health and Fitness—Health and Welfare" was available in English only.

The Department replied that the publication was available in both official languages. Its French title was "La santé et la forme". The Department sent the Commissioner a copy of each version.

Information Canada advised the Commissioner that the information printed in its bulletin was provided by the departments and that it was certain that in this instance it had failed to secure the right data. To correct this anomaly the Commissioner recommended:

- (1) that in future, departmental publications for general distribution be published in both official languages, preferably in a bilingual format, and
- (2) that, should problems related to the preparation of publications in a bilingual format prove insuperable, the French and English versions be made available to the public at the same time.

The Department replied that this was its policy. It published a complete list of its publications once a year and sent a copy to Information Canada. This list indicated whether texts were available separately in French and English versions or were printed in a bilingual format. The Department assured the Commissioner that the French and English versions of publications were made available to the public simultaneously. It believed that the confusion that had arisen was due to Information Canada's oversight.

The Commissioner forwarded this information to the complainant.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1723	Ottawa	French printed in smaller letters on the title-page of the "International Certificates of Vaccination" booklet.	Rectified
1795	Ottawa	English entries on a bilingual form letter addressed to French-speakers.	Withdrawn
1831	Ottawa	Numerous mistakes in a circular letter.	Rectified
1916	Ottawa	Bulletin in French sent to an English-speaker.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2009	Ottawa	Two ostensibly bilingual publications (for internal use) contain relatively little information in French.	Rectified
2101	Bathurst (N.B.)	Reply in English to a request sent in French.	Explanation offered
2235	Ottawa	English form letter sent to a French-speaker.	Withdrawn
2285	Ottawa	The French version of a document published in English is not available.	Rectified
2361	Ottawa	An offprint is available in English only.	Rectified
2364	Ottawa	Difficulty in obtaining information in French over the telephone.	Withdrawn
2401	Ottawa	Unilingual English address printed on departmental post-card.	Not justified
2434	Ottawa	Films and publications on figure skating and learner badges offered in English only.	Withdrawn
2455	Ottawa	Unilingual English Family Allowance form given to a French-speaker by a hospital.	Assistance rendered
2602	Toronto	French-speaking Cornwall-Hawkesbury-Ottawa region pensioners receive services in English only from Regional Office.	Explanation offered
2655	Ottawa	English information bulletin and letter sent to a French-speaker.	Rectified
2708	Ottawa	Poor French translation of a document on the non-medical use of drugs.	Rectified
2723	Ottawa	Service by telephone not available in French: Medical Services Branch.	Rectified
2749	Ottawa	Use of English-only date stamp.	Rectified
2820	Ottawa	Letter sent in English to a number of French-speaking bursars.	Rectified
2844	Quebec City	Poor quality of French of two circular letters sent to French-speaking post-secondary training institutions.	Rectified
2911	Ottawa	There is no French version of the film "It couldn't happen to me", produced with the aid of a Department grant.	Explanation offered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
3025	Ottawa	Unilingual English-speaking appointments officer at the Public Service Medical Centre.	Rectified
3158	Ottawa	The complainant objected to the fact that a public servant was being sent on language training after working only six months.	Referral
3210	Ottawa	Two English-language forms are sent to a French-speaker.	Rectified
3256	Winnipeg	Opening ceremony of Hockey Canada—Russia match broadcast in English only.	Explanation offered

NATIONAL LIBRARY—"Forget All Your Books"

EVALUATION

The National Library's action in implementing special study recommendations has been commendably studious. It had to catalogue only four complaints against its services; these were settled quickly.

As stated in the *Third Annual Report*, the National Library had, prior to the special study completed in April 1973, already taken steps to comply with the spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act. In this same spirit of cooperation, the Library reacted positively to the six recommendations flowing from the study. It reported in October 1973 that it had implemented the one calling for precise directives concerning the Library's obligations under the Act, and had taken action on the remaining five recommendations.

By November 1974, the Library considered four more recommendations implemented. Almost half of the positions identified as bilingual according to Treasury Board guidelines had bilingual incumbents, thus giving the Library some capability of providing service to the public, including telephone contact, in both official languages.

The recommendation aimed at ensuring bilingual services in the Library's cafeteria had not been fully implemented by December 1974 and was the subject of on-going correspondence with the Department of Public Works.

The Library also reported that all items likely to be seen by the public, such as cards, labels and badges, are now issued in both English and French. Directives stated that all publications emanating from the

Library and intended for the public should be simultaneously available in both languages and, where desirable, under one cover. In the case of one document which, for technical reasons, is produced in separate French and English versions, the Library has informed interested parties that both language versions are available.

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2682	Ottawa	Delay in obtaining language test results.	Assistance rendered
2702	Ottawa	Delay in providing language test.	Assistance rendered
2748	Ottawa	Letter in English in reply to telephone order for books given in French.	Explanation offered
2794	Ottawa	Poor service in English alleged.	Withdrawn

NATIONAL MUSEUMS OF CANADA—"How Much Is That Doggy in the Window?"

EVALUATION

The National Museums of Canada, though usually guardians of the past, seem to exhibit a certain skill in looking forward when it comes to respecting the Official Languages Act. During the period under review, we received only 13 complaints. Most of these concerned signs, poor French texts and lack of bilingual service. This Office made three recommendations: two were acted on quickly; the remaining one, concerning lack of reference works in French at the War Museum, has been temporarily defused. Should our optimism about these relatively few complaints be misplaced, only a more systematic special study might, and may tell.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1800—Museumobile

A French-speaking schoolteacher complained that when a travelling exhibition about the Canadian North visited the École Supérieure de Clare in Nova Scotia, "it was all in English".

The National Museums of Canada told the Commissioner that 20 per cent of the guides who staffed the Museumobile "Canada North I" during the tour of Nova Scotia were bilingual. The agency explained that, although every effort was made to have an English-speaker and a French-speaker on duty at any given time, the caravan was open for as much as 14 hours a day. It was possible, therefore, for two anglophones to have been on duty together.

The staff endeavoured to handle all requests for information in French at Meteghan River and did not recall an incident involving language.

The Commissioner emphasized that it was particularly important that the younger generation should be able to learn about their own country from federal agencies in the official language of their choice.

He recommended that Museumobiles should at all times be attended by staff able to provide the public with service in both languages. He also recommended that, when Museumobiles visit schools and teaching institutions, a special effort should be made to provide guides who are completely fluent in the language of instruction.

The Commissioner also suggested that the National Museums of Canada might feel that it would be appropriate to include the Ecole Supérieure de Clare early in the next Museumobile's itinerary in the Maritimes to erase any unfortunate impression which might have been created during the last visit.

The National Museums of Canada replied that it had made a special effort to provide its Museumobile Division with bilingual staff. The tour co-ordinator, tour manager, driver and three instructors were fully bilingual and the fourth and fifth instructors were upgrading their knowledge of their second language.

File No. 2369—What's On in Ottawa

A French-speaking person informed the Commissioner that the National Museum of Science and Technology had printed an advertisement in English only in the September 1973 issue of the monthly publication, *What's On in Ottawa/Voici Ottawa*.

The institution noted that the language used in the publication was English, with the exception of the advertisements that it carried for other federal institutions. The Museum also pointed out that it had made an effort to reach the Francophone community by regularly publishing advertisements in the Saturday edition of the daily newspaper *Le Droit* throughout the entire summer of 1973, though it had not placed equivalent advertisements in the English-language newspapers.

The Commissioner informed the Director of the Museum that the very title of the magazine suggested that the editor wished to receive bilingual advertisements and articles. Given the statutory obligation of

the Museum, under section 9(1) of the Official Languages Act, to serve the public of the National Capital Region in both official languages, the Commissioner recommended that any advertisement that the Museum publishes in this magazine or any other bilingual publication appear in both official languages.

The National Museum of Science and Technology complied with the Commissioner's recommendation, and a bilingual advertisement appeared in the May 1974 issue of *What's On in Ottawa/Voici Ottawa*.

File No. 2762—The Evolution of Guns

A French-speaking student who was doing research on the evolution of guns through the years visited the Canadian War Museum in Ottawa. He was able to find only one book in French on the subject. He complained to the Commissioner that there were not enough books in French at the Museum.

In a first reply, the Secretary-General of the National Museums observed that the libraries of the National Museums existed to serve the needs of the staff. Members of the public should address themselves rather to the National Library to meet their documentation needs.

The Commissioner replied that if he were to confine his remarks to the views expressed in the answer, he had to conclude that French-speaking "technical, curatorial and historical" employees of the museums would not have access to the same research facilities as their English-speaking colleagues. He then quoted paragraph 4 of Treasury Board Circular No. 1971-21 which states that one of the management objectives concerning bilingualism is to "ensure that the French language increasingly takes its place, along with English, as a language of work in the federal Public Service." The Commissioner added that he was not aware of any regulation forbidding members of the public to consult books in the library. He therefore recommended that the National Museums ensure that library material be available, in appropriate proportions, in both of Canada's official languages, and that this be accomplished by 1 July 1975.

The reaction of the Secretary-General of the National Museums was quite sharp. He stated that his administration has always sought manuscripts, translations etc., in French as well as in English, and that it intended to do so in the future, that the Canadian War Museum was interested in Canadian military history and that it was limited accordingly in its acquisition programmes by the fact that the language of publication of material on Canadian military history has been predominantly English. Where required for research or other purposes by museum staff, translation services were made available, particularly in respect of French-speaking employees working in their own language. The National Museums of Canada were therefore complying with

Treasury Board Circular 1971-21. The Secretary-General declared again that the library in question was a reference resource for employees and that it was not open to the public. Under normal circumstances, members of the public were referred to the National Library. The complainant had been given access to the documents he needed as a special courtesy. Since the nomination in January 1974 of a new Chairman and Vice-chairman, the Corporation had made every effort not only to abide by law and regulations, but to ensure that the spirit of the legislation was accorded the full co-operation of the staff.

The Commissioner accepted the view advanced by the National Museums that its libraries served principally the needs of the museums' staff and recognized that the Secretary-General's remarks seemed quite consistent with the recommendation he had made. He acknowledged that perhaps the deadline of 1 July 1975 should be extended. He recognized the Corporation's efforts and progress made in the field of bilingualism but he remarked that it would be some time yet before the Corporation reached its goals.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2159	Ottawa	The French version of a sign at the National Museum of Science and Technology is illegible.	Rectified
2238	Ottawa	English monograph on the James Ensor exhibition offered to French-speaking visitors: National Gallery.	Explanation offered
2254	Ottawa	Poor quality of French terminology used in the texts and legends at the Copernicus Exhibition.	Rectified
2595	Ottawa	A unilingual secretary wants to replace incumbent of a bilingual position and receive acting pay.	Referral
2974	Ottawa	A unilingual English-speaking employee replied to a telephone call placed in French.	Rectified
3205	Ottawa	Letter in poor French sent to French-speaker: National Gallery.	Explanation offered

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL—"Switched-on Bach"

EVALUATION

Science is indeed sometimes stranger than fiction. Even Jules Verne would never have believed that French would some day invade the English universe of alchemy. During the period covered by this report,

members of the public identified 14 elements of service incompatible with the spirit or letter of the Official Languages Act. The Council's Dr. Faustus' quickly discovered the right formulas to neutralize these. Its bibliocrats will also try to share future-shock scientific information in both official languages, be it through learned papers, cryptograms or audio signal.

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1856, 1872, 1990	Ottawa	The English logo took precedence in a French-language daily.	Rectified
1972	Ottawa	No French-speakers among the eighteen associate science directors on the staff of the Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences.	Explanation offered
1996	Ottawa	Unilingual English initials "OHMS" on the windshield of a truck.	Rectified
2016	Ottawa	Form letter in English sent by the library to a Francophone institution.	Rectified
2139	Ottawa	Forms in English sent to a French-speaking person.	Rectified
2280	Ottawa	A French-language cultural organization received a unilingual English report.	Rectified
2427	Ottawa	Departmental libraries and federal agencies were listed in English only in the <i>Union List of Scientific Serials in Canadian Libraries</i> .	Rectified
2549	Ottawa	No service in French from the National Scientific Library's consultation service.	Explanation offered
2720	Ottawa	Unilingual English-speaking director supervises French-speakers	Explanation offered
2918	Ottawa	Unilingual English initials "NRCL" on the cover of the French version of the laboratories' annual report.	Rectified
2950	Ottawa	Unilingual English document transmitted to a French-speaking person.	Rectified
3215	Ottawa	A list of articles on technical subjects offered no choice of language: English only.	Rectified

NATIONAL REVENUE (CUSTOMS AND EXCISE)—“I’ve Grown Accustomed to Your Face”

EVALUATION

The Department has a quick eye and nimble hands when it comes to seizing smuggled goods; too often, alas, in spotting linguistic lapses, its vision tends to blur, allowing far too much contraband unilingualism to slip past Parliament’s stringent guarantees to the travelling public. Still, the Department dealt quickly and effectively with the 34 complaints this Office received during the period covered by this report. In only one case was a formal recommendation required. The public may be reassured to learn that the Department has made not negligible progress toward achieving many of the goals recommended by this Office as a result of the special studies undertaken in 1972 and 1973. Also, in establishing an Official Languages Programme Branch with access to its central management process, Customs and Excise has moved toward creating an administrative structure presumably capable of ensuring that departmental policies, plans and programmes meet the requirements of the Official Languages Act. Nevertheless, the Department, in its effort to meet fully the demands of institutional bilingualism, still has a large outstanding account of unpaid linguistic duty.

As stated in the *Third Annual Report*, the Commissioner made 48 recommendations to the Department following a special study completed in January 1973. In December 1974, the Department reported that 24 of the Commissioner’s recommendations had been put into effect, that 13 had been partially dealt with and that nine had yet to be implemented. Due to the ambiguity of information provided by the Department, this Office could not precisely determine the effective status of 13 of the 24 recommendations which the Department reported implemented. The Department stated that two of the original recommendations had been made inoperative (as Ron Ziegler might have said) by a reorganization of the Excise Branch.

Customs and Excise stated that it had dealt satisfactorily with recommendations relating to departmental translation priorities, the need both to inform members of the public of the availability of bilingual services and to ascertain their linguistic preferences and the conversion of those unilingual Excise Tax Operation signs for which it is responsible. It had partially implemented several other recommendations concerned with signs, telephone listings, calling cards and rubber stamps. A third group of recommendations, concerned mainly with the display of forms, publications and information material, had not been met.

The Department’s record in treating the closely linked problems of staffing and language training has been similarly mixed. Recom-

mendations on the need to advertise competitions in both official languages and to continue hiring bilingual back-up staff have been implemented. It had also taken steps to assess accurately language training needs and priorities and to prepare highly functional second-language courses for its officers. Customs and Excise further reported that it was encouraging its employees to take language training and that it had, to a limited extent, made opportunities available to employees to put their acquired linguistic skills to use on a full-time basis through a programme of exchanges and transfers between offices located in English and French-speaking areas of the country. However, the Department has yet to provide job-oriented language training courses outside the National Capital Area, and has been unable to enlist the aid of the Public Service Commission in preparing specific testing and training programmes recommended by this Office.

At the time of reporting, the Department has achieved only one of the general policy and planning goals set by the Commissioner. Although the official languages branch had successfully developed a bilingualism information programme, directed to both managers and employees, the major task of revising and reissuing the Department's statement of policy on bilingualism had not yet been completed. In addition, Customs and Excise has not yet drawn up a plan for the provision of services to the public in both official languages, taking into account the problems and needs peculiar to Customs and Excise and the Commissioner's findings and recommendations. Instead, it has chosen to confine its official languages planning to the ready expedient of identifying the linguistic requirements of positions and setting designation dates for their occupation by linguistically qualified personnel according to the criteria laid down by the Treasury Board Secretariat.

The Department has also relied on this procedure to implement a number of recommendations relating to the automatic provision of certain public services and to the recruitment of linguistically qualified personnel. While the Commissioner does not deny the possibility that completion of this programme could constitute one element of full compliance with the Official Languages Act, he would like to stress to Customs and Excise that the Act places obligations squarely on each individual department. It requires that the Department, on its own initiative, fulfil these obligations immediately, or as soon as possible.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 2258—Gander International Airport

The Complainant alleged that there was no Customs or Immigration official able to speak French at Gander International Airport. On three occasions in the past two years, he had had to help French-speak-

ing relatives who had been literally pushed to one side until all other arriving passengers had passed through Customs and Immigration, and who were then questioned in English by an official who spoke no French. He noticed moreover that there were no signs in French and that all announcements were made in English within the Customs and Immigration area. He remarked that Customs services were not available in French in St. John's.

The Department of National Revenue (Customs and Excise), whose officers were responsible for primary examinations, recognized the importance of providing services in both official languages at Gander and in St. John's and accordingly had identified two positions to be designated as requiring bilingual incumbents, in accordance with Treasury Board guidelines. The Department indicated, moreover, that additional arrangements were being made with other government departments to increase the bilingual capacity at Gander and in St. John's.

The absence of bilingual signs at the airport was due partly to renovations. The Department assured the Commissioner that all signs in the Customs area were bilingual as were all signs relating to Health and Welfare and Immigration Services. However, in other parts of the terminal many signs were in English only. The Ministry of Transport was in the process of correcting these to conform to the requirements of the Official Languages Act.

Most announcements at Gander International Airport were made over Air Canada's public address system and, whenever possible, were in both official languages. As a result of a special study (made in 1971-72) of services provided members of the public by Air Canada, the Commissioner had recommended, among other things, that such announcements be made in both official languages. The Department had contacted Air Canada in this regard.

Since, in cases where positions have been identified as requiring the knowledge and use of both French and English in order to satisfy the requirements of the Official Languages Act, departments are required to make administrative arrangements to meet the language requirements of the positions, the Commissioner recommended that the Department make such administrative arrangements immediately.

The Department informed the Commissioner that it had set the designation dates of two positions, at Gander and in St. John's respectively, for 31 March 1975 and the incumbents were scheduled to begin language training early in the new fiscal year (1973-1974). In the interim, the Department would solve the problem at Gander and in St. John's by providing an interpretative service for French-speaking travellers, through co-operative administrative arrangements with personnel of Air Canada, as well as with the Department of Public Works at the latter location.

File No. 2311—A \$25.00 Fine

A French-speaking correspondent wrote the Commissioner about certain difficulties he had encountered when going through Customs at the Port of Prescott, Ontario. The correspondent had asked for directions about the shortest route to Ottawa and had been answered in English. Since he did not understand English very well he drove away, believing that he had been told to turn left and drive on to Ottawa. In reality, he had been ordered to stop and have his car searched. A unilingual E-67 form had been placed on the windshield of his car which the complainant took to be a pass routinely given to returning Canadians. The result was that the Ontario Provincial Police stopped him in Kemptville and forced him to return to Prescott where he was interrogated in English, even though he had apparently requested the services of a French-speaking officer. His car was searched and nothing illegal was found. A \$25.00 fine was imposed and the complainant felt that he had been treated as a criminal.

The Prescott office had been the subject of a similar complaint and the Commissioner reminded the Department that he had been informed of plans to increase the bilingual capacity of the office. Furthermore, the Department had accepted the Commissioner's suggestion regarding the use of the phrase "Un instant, s'il vous plaît" by unilingual English-speaking officers before calling on a bilingual colleague. The Commissioner had also been assured that form E-67 had been rendered bilingual. Consequently, he asked the Department to provide him with, in addition to its explanation, copies of all directives which were sent to the Prescott office in regard to the provision of bilingual service to the public following the closure of the earlier complaint.

The Department complied with the Commissioner's request about directives and also provided him with a lengthy explanation. With respect to the bilingual capacity of the Prescott office, one additional bilingual officer had been added in 1972 and additional bilingual staff were to be added in the near future. The use of the phrase "Un instant, s'il vous plaît" had been introduced as recommended on 7 March 1972 and the recommendation was being followed. Form E-67 was not intended to be read by the public. The unilingual version had been withdrawn but was still in use in Prescott due to a misunderstanding of instructions about the disposal of existing stocks.

With regard to the incident itself, the Department explained that the complainant never gave any indication, nor did any of his three passengers, of wishing to be served in French, and the customs officer was left with the impression that they all understood English. Furthermore, when the complainant was returned to Prescott, his explanations to the officer in charge at the Customs office were stated in English. One of the passengers did eventually ask whether any of the officers

spoke French. He was asked if he wished the services of a French-speaking officer and answered in the negative. In any event, on that day there were two officers on duty who could speak French.

The complainant was apparently given every possible opportunity to explain why he had left the post. Unfortunately, he became very excitable and vocal, a fact which his brother, one of the party, acknowledged by apologizing to the officer in charge.

Fines imposed for "Running-the-Post" generally fall between \$50 to \$200. However, nothing illegal was found in the complainant's car. Also the complainant had been given a speeding ticket by the Ontario Provincial Police. The Officer-in-Charge accordingly used proper discretion and reduced the fine to \$25.

The above facts were forwarded to the complainant and he was invited to telephone the Commissioner if he disagreed with the Department's version of the facts. The complainant did call and stated that he did not wish to pursue the matter further, adding that he was pleased to learn that the Department intended to take no further action against him.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1888	Regina	Lack of service in French at Customs in Regina.	Explanation offered
2074	Louisbourg	Unilingual English sign.	Rectified
2154	Winnipeg	Alleged irregularities in a competition.	Withdrawn
2177	Ottawa	Unilingual English stamp used on envelopes.	Rectified
2229	Ottawa	A French-speaker received correspondence in English only.	Rectified
2270	Ottawa	French-speaking public servant prevented from taking a course in English.	Withdrawn
2277	Toronto	Unilingual English stamps used by Toronto customs office.	Rectified
2288	Ottawa	Softball team's sweaters bear the unilingual inscription "Customs and Excise".	Referral
2316	Ottawa	A form contained a French phrase which was not idiomatic.	Rectified
2384	Ottawa	French correspondence is answered in English by Ottawa Customs postal office.	Rectified
2487	Ottawa	"Canada Customs Bonded Carrier" is written only in English on trucks.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2548	Montreal	English-speaker objects to having his position identified bilingual.	Withdrawn
2575	Ottawa	Poor quality of French on two bilingual memoranda.	Rectified
2578	Montreal	Public servant denied the right to take part in an internal competition.	Withdrawn
2580	Ottawa	Poor quality of French on a competition poster.	Rectified
2614	Quebec City	Departmental manual sent out in English only with a bilingual memo explaining that the bilingual version would arrive later.	Explanation offered
2685	Brockville, Cornwall, Kingston, Lansdowne, Prescott, Pembroke, Trenton	An M.P. wished to know whether the Treasury Board had the authority to identify positions as bilingual.	Assistance rendered
2751	Toronto	Lack of service in French at Customs, Toronto International Airport.	Rectified
2782	Ottawa	Letter in English addressed to French-speaker.	Rectified
2869	Vancouver	Service available only in English at Vancouver Airport.	Explanation offered
2879	Winnipeg	Competition poster in English only calling for unilingual English candidate in an area having a significant French-speaking minority.	Explanation offered
2976	Cornwall	A Customs officer was repeatedly refused the right to go on language training.	Withdrawn
3001	Location unknown	Signs at a Canadian customs office are in English only.	Withdrawn
3062	Halifax	Delays in obtaining language training.	Explanation offered

NATIONAL REVENUE (TAXATION)—“Pennies from Heaven for You and Me”

EVALUATION

The Department has acted as speedily in correcting complaints and implementing recommendations as in collecting taxes. Several entries on the credit side of the linguistic balance sheet tend to prove that

the Department's small liabilities are covered by promising assets. Only 3 out of 13 special study recommendations, carried over from last year, were not fully implemented. Only 5 of the 43 complaints this Office received required a formal recommendation.

As summarized in the *Third Annual Report*, the Commissioner made 13 recommendations to the Department of National Revenue (Taxation) concerning with language of service. Of these, five had been put into effect by October 1973 and the remainder were in various stages of implementation.

In December 1974, the Department reported further progress, informing this Office that five more recommendations had been put into effect and that continuing efforts were being made with regard to the remaining three. The Department has agreed to ensure that its telephones are answered in both official languages, to publicize its capability of providing services in the two languages, to display and make available at its district taxation offices, publications in both languages, and to make arrangements with the Post Office Department concerning the display and availability of taxation forms in the two languages. Furthermore, the recommendation dealing with the establishment of a method to allow the taxpayer to indicate, in advance, his linguistic preference in taxation forms had been adopted on an interim basis, the Department having established bilingual forms as an ultimate goal.

Two recommendations were still not fully carried out. The Department had not yet been able to ensure that all its public information facilities were staffed in such a way as to provide services in the two languages. Neither had it been able to obtain sufficient translation capability to permit the elimination of occasional delays in answering correspondence in the language of the correspondent.

COMPLAINTS

File Nos. 2313, 2320—Edmonton

A French-speaker complained that she had not been served in the language of her choice when she wrote to the Department's regional office in Edmonton and that she had not received a French-language form for the 1972-73 year. This incident gave rise to a series of events which she described in detail and which boiled down to the fact that the Department had disregarded her reply, written in French. She then tried to communicate in French by telephone with the Department in question, but without success.

Another French-speaker complained that the same office had been unable to serve him in French during the same week.

According to the Department, the first complainant had completed and submitted her 1971 income tax return in English and that was why she had been sent an English form for 1972. The complainant had subsequently been asked for additional information by means of a bilingual circular, to which she had not replied. The Department added that she could have obtained service in French if she had so requested when submitting her return or by replying to the letter sent to her. The complainant's husband had in fact asked for a French form but the departmental clerk had sent him an English one by mistake.

The Department had hired two bilingual employees for its regional office in Edmonton, but during the week in which the complainant telephoned, one of the two had been on annual leave and the other on sick leave. The same explanation held true for the second complaint.

The Department also informed the Commissioner that its Edmonton representatives had met with the complainant and her husband and had then taken the necessary steps to resolve the question of their submitting returns in the language of their choice. They had also assured the complainant that she would henceforth be served in French.

The Commissioner asked the Department for a breakdown of the staff in the Edmonton regional office. He was informed that as of 30 June 1973, the staff consisted of 390 full-time employees, fifty-three of whom were assigned to the assessing section. The two bilingual employees working in this section therefore represented less than four per cent of the total section staff.

Taking into account the Edmonton office's extremely limited capacity for providing services in French, the proportion of French-speaking residents in the Edmonton, St. Paul/Bonnyville and Peace River districts which were served by this regional office, and the taxpayers' right to be served in the official language of their choice wherever there was a significant demand, the Commissioner recommended that the Department increase the number of bilingual employees in its Edmonton office.

In a letter dated 21 February 1973, the Department informed the Commissioner that it had taken the following measures to rectify the situation in its Edmonton office. Five of the positions in the assessing section had been identified as bilingual. Three of these were already occupied by bilingual incumbents and the employees appointed to the other two would be bilingual as soon as they had completed their language training course.

File No. 2814—Not Deductible

The complainant sent to the Commissioner a copy of a letter he wrote to the Ottawa District Taxation Office concerning a Notice of Re-

assessment disallowing his claim of a deduction for a French instruction course.

The Commissioner informed the complainant that the matter did not constitute a contravention of the Official Languages Act and that he could not intervene in an official capacity to have it rectified. He had however sent the complainant's letter to the Deputy Minister of National Revenue (Taxation) and had inquired about the possibility of having expenses incurred in acquiring knowledge of one of the official languages recognized as tax deductions.

In its reply, the Department stated that, under the requirements of the Income Tax Act, tuition fees may be deducted in computing the income of a taxpayer if he was during the year a student registered at an educational institution in Canada which is certified by the Department of Manpower and Immigration. Since the commercial firm selected by the complainant was not so certified, tuition fees paid to it would not be deductible.

The Commissioner replied that the government made large sums of money available to the province to promote the teaching of both official languages throughout Canada and adopted measures to offer training in the official languages, at public expense in certain educational establishments, to members of the public whose lack of knowledge of one of the official languages made it difficult for them to secure permanent employment. The programme administered by the Department of Manpower and Immigration did not cater to those already gainfully employed and thus it seemed to him that the Department's list of certified educational institutions might not be applicable in the complainant's case. The Commissioner suggested that self-employed taxpayers should be allowed to claim as business expenses certain tuition fees for training in one of the official languages of Canada which they considered essential for the conduct of their business, upon submission of the usual supporting invoices. There were obviously several ways open to individuals to acquire proficiency in one of the official languages and the method chosen by the complainant seemed to best meet his personal requirements and constraints. Unfortunately, taxpayers choosing this method would not ordinarily know that they must first verify whether the institution had been certified by the Department of Manpower and Immigration. The Commissioner added that he believed it in the public interest to encourage Canadians who, on their own initiative, take training in one of the official languages.

As in the case of other taxpayers in the past, the Commissioner's fervent yet logical appeal on behalf of the complainant went unrewarded. The Department said that the question of whether a claim for second-language training should be deductible was one of tax policy which was the responsibility of the Minister of Finance. As things stood,

the Department had no alternative but to disallow claims unless they qualified as tuition fees. Since the complainant did not attend an educational institution eligible under paragraph 60 (f) of the Income Tax Act, his expenses were not allowable.

Nothing ventured, nothing gained. In the light of the Department's position, the Commissioner wrote to the Minister of Finance urging that consideration be given to expanding the scope of paragraph 60 (f) of the Income Tax Act. The Minister agreed to take the Commissioner's suggestion under advisement when considering further amendments to the Income Tax Act.

File No. 2906—Computer Printouts

A French-speaker complained that certain computer printouts giving instructions to district offices in Quebec, where the language of work was French, were in English only. He maintained that these printouts could easily be made bilingual.

The Department replied as follows: "The question of language for internally-used computer-generated documents has been considered on a number of occasions but as yet the problem has not been resolved. It has never been argued that the computer cannot be programmed to provide the information in French; rather the computer cannot know in advance the language of the recipient. The messages in question are generated automatically with no predetermination of their ultimate disposition. Computer messages are often transferred among offices, and a number of offices have both French- and English-speaking employees.

At one point we attempted to translate the message text when we were considering the possibility of a bilingual printout. This gave rise to serious problems for two main reasons: firstly, most of the messages contain abbreviations or terminology which are neither French nor English and do not lend themselves to translation and, secondly, the form size required for a bilingual printout was unmanageable and the format was too complicated.

A number of other approaches have been considered, such as using the language of the taxpayer, using only French for the Quebec district offices, etc., but, for the reasons described above, no wholly satisfactory answer has been found."

Members of the Commissioner's staff visited the Department to see what was involved and to discuss the problem with the Department's systems experts.

They noted that the manuals and instructions associated with the programme were bilingual and that the Department had clearly made an effort to help its French-speaking staff to do their work in French. Nevertheless, they felt that the present system still imposed a heavier

burden on the French-speaking employee than on his English-speaking counterpart, which is against the spirit of the Official Languages Act. The Commissioner therefore recommended that the Department's technical and bilingualism staff continue to study the language-of-work aspect of existing computer programmes and that they take steps to ensure that linguistic equality is built into future systems right from the start.

File No. 2947—Centre for Career Development

A French-speaker complained to the Commissioner about the lack of bilingual telephone identification of the Centre for Career Development. He complained about the promotion of people to acting positions at the Centre to avoid implementing Treasury Board directives which require that unilinguals appointed to bilingual positions attend language courses. He stated that unilingual English documents were addressed to departmental personnel with accompanying notes promising a later French version.

The Department informed the Commissioner that:

- 1) the Centre's receptionist was bilingual but a temporary replacement may not have answered the telephone in both official languages;
- 2) the Centre was a very new venture for the Department. It had moved from concept to reality in less than a year (on 5 June 1974, 250 students had begun their programme of instruction). To meet stringent deadlines, it had been necessary to borrow personnel from a number of other divisions in the Head Office and the District Offices to develop the curriculum, course outlines and lesson plans which were of vital importance to the Centre. At the same time, suitable instructors and administrative staff had to be recruited. A number of these temporary personnel who were on loan to the Centre were thus placed in acting pay status for a short period of time. This procedure has now ceased. All unilingual personnel occupying bilingual positions will be receiving language training in accordance with government and departmental policy,
- 3) only in circumstances where deadlines made it necessary, was correspondence issued to employees in a unilingual format, and whenever this happened the translated version followed with a minimum of delay.

Regarding three unilingual office memoranda which the complainant had later brought to the Commissioner's attention, the Department said that one had not been intended for general circulation but was specifically addressed to a limited number of employees, all of whom professed English as their mother tongue. It was therefore considered quite correct for this memo to be written in English only. The other two should admittedly have been issued in a bilingual format and

steps were being taken to prevent a recurrence of the error. The Department reiterated that its policy was to put out all directives, instructions, memos and other documents which were intended for general distribution to its employees in a bilingual side-by-side format. Unfortunately, on a few occasions the writers neglected one language or the other, but invariably this was because of pressure of deadlines and never with the intention of circumventing the Official Languages Act. The Department asked the Commissioner to convey its apologies to the complainant and assured him that it would continue to be vigilant and do whatever was necessary to ensure that all employees of its Taxation component became and remained fully aware of the linguistic rights of taxpayers and departmental employees.

After studying the matter, the Commissioner concluded that there had been violations of the Official Languages Act. He therefore recommended to the Department that:

- 1) switchboard operators, when answering calls, give the name of the Centre for Career Development in French as well as in English;
- 2) unilingual English-speaking operators automatically transfer calls received in French to colleagues with a good knowledge of that language, after alerting the caller with the very simple phrase: "Un instant, s'il vous plaît";
- 3) operators refrain from speaking English to French-speaking callers, as service should be provided automatically in the language of the caller;
- 4) waiting time be reduced to the minimum in all cases covered by the preceding recommendations;
- 5) the Department take immediate steps to ensure that the Centre for Career Development has an adequate bilingual capability to serve the public in both official languages while unilingual incumbents in positions identified as bilingual are receiving language training; and
- 6) all internal communications of the Centre for Career Development which are of general interest to employees or intended for general circulation be distributed simultaneously in English and French.

The Department informed the Commissioner in October 1974 that the Centre for Career Development had the bilingual capability at the secretarial level to meet his recommendations regarding the answering of telephones. The Centre was also able to serve the public and departmental employees in both official languages while unilingual incumbents in positions identified as bilingual were receiving language training; and all internal communications within the Centre which were of general interest to employees or intended for general circulation would henceforth be distributed simultaneously in English and French.

File No. 2957—The Urgency of Disseminating

A French-speaker alleged that French versions of directives, circular letters and interpretation bulletins were distributed (if at all) many weeks after the English versions in National Revenue (Taxation) offices located in French-speaking districts. These documents emanated from Ottawa.

The Department replied that its official policy was to prepare all circular letters, interpretation bulletins and directives intended for wide distribution in a bilingual side-by-side format and therefore simultaneously. This also normally applied to directives issued for wide distribution which were then placed in the Taxation Operations Manual. The Department added that there were, however, "a very few number of occasions where the urgency of disseminating the information overrides the necessary delay brought about by translation". During the 1973-74 fiscal year, a total of 473 releases for the Taxation Operations Manual were made, of which 143 were "emergency" releases. These had to be made very quickly and, as a result, 31 such releases were first issued, under special authority, in a unilingual English format but were followed up as soon as possible with bilingual replacements.

The Department believed that its actions had reflected a determined effort on its part to have all information published simultaneously in both official languages.

The Commissioner commented that if it was urgent to pass on information to English-speaking employees, surely the same urgency applied to French-speaking ones, regardless of their numbers. He therefore recommended that all circular letters, interpretation bulletins and directives, including Emergency Taxation Operations Manual releases, henceforth be distributed simultaneously in both official languages in order to respect the equality of status of both French and English, in accordance with the Official Languages Act.

The Department sent the Commissioner a directive issued to its senior managers on 24 September 1974, which contained instructions requesting compliance with the Commissioner's recommendation. The Department indicated that it had also requested more translators from the Department of the Secretary of State in order to achieve this objective.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1792	Ottawa	Unilingual English inscription on envelope.	Rectified
1849	Ottawa	Bilingual competition poster containing a serious error in translation.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1897	Ottawa	French speaker receives unilingual English form after having asked for it in French over the telephone.	Explanation offered
1926	Ottawa	French speaker receives personal income tax form in English.	Assistance rendered
1936	Toronto	A French speaker encounters difficulties in completing his income tax form.	Withdrawn
1939	Ottawa	Note in income tax guides explaining availability of forms and correspondence in the other official language should be displayed more prominently.	Explanation offered
1943	Ottawa	A French speaker receives an income tax return form containing a return envelope addressed in English.	Assistance rendered
1946	Ottawa	A bilingual form bears a unilingual English message.	Rectified
1982	Windsor	A French speaker receives a letter written in poor French.	Rectified
1993	London (Ontario)	Delays in receipt of income tax refund. Letter in French replied to in English.	Explanation offered
2037	Ottawa	A French-language income tax form contains an English-language income tax table.	Assistance rendered
2086	Montreal	A French speaker receives income tax forms in English after having specifically requested French-language forms.	Rectified
2095	Ottawa	A French speaker has difficulty obtaining service in French at the Taxpayers Enquiries Service.	Explanation offered
2134	Ottawa	A French-speaking departmental employee is unable to deal in French with the personnel office.	Rectified
2163, 2187	Saint John, Ottawa	A French speaker receives an English language income tax form.	Rectified
2181	Ottawa	Lack of service in French at the Interpretations Branch.	Explanation offered
2184	Ottawa	A French speaker is unable to obtain a copy of the French version of the 1971 income tax form.	Explanation offered
2222	Sherbrooke (Quebec)	A French speaker receives a copy of form T462 which had been completed in English.	Assistance rendered
2255	Ottawa	A French speaker receives a questionnaire in English only.	Assistance rendered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2356	Ottawa	A French-speaker receives a bilingual T462 form completed in English.	Rectified
2435	Ottawa	T400 A forms fail to arrive as ordered.	Explanation offered
2445	Ottawa	French-speaker receives a collection letter in English.	Rectified
2568	Ottawa	No service in French at departmental inquiry desk.	Rectified
2619	Ottawa	An English-speaker, wishing to take a course in French abroad, complains that he would not be able to claim the cost as a tax deduction.	Explanation offered
2692	Sudbury	Lack of income tax forms in French at local post office.	Explanation offered
2704	Ottawa and Falher (Alberta)	English version of the income tax form sent to French-speaker. Another person received a French form containing a bilingual guide. Lack of forms and a guide in French at Falher Post Office.	Rectified
2745	Regina	A French-speaker is spoken to rudely on the telephone.	Explanation offered
2764	Winnipeg	A French-speaker receives correspondence in English.	Rectified
2778	Sudbury	District Office in Sudbury slow to fill an order for 5000 T1 forms in French.	Rectified
2815	Ottawa	Language of work of French-speaking temporary employees is not respected.	Explanation offered
2855	Ottawa	A French-speaker complains that too many bilingual positions are occupied by anglophones.	Withdrawn
2978	Ottawa	A French-speaker objects to the appointment of English-speaking employees and to unilingual-English supervisors filling positions designated as bilingual.	Not justified
3095	Ottawa	Service in English only: Taxpayers' Inquiries Service.	Explanation offered
3118	Ottawa	A French-speaker receives 1973 Notice of Assessment in English.	Rectified
3245	St. Boniface (Manitoba)	Letter in English to French-speaking organization.	Rectified
3299	Ottawa	A letter and pamphlet in French are sent to an English-speaker.	Rectified

EVALUATION

In matters bilingual as in every other matter, one is inclined to look to Parliament for exemplary leadership. Since last year's report, however, the public pointed out 19 infractions of the Official Languages Act under the ægis of the Peace Tower.

These complaints touched on services provided by parliamentary staff. As last year, complainants remarked on lack of service in French from telephone operators and security guards in the Parliament Buildings. French-speaking security guards continued to make representations to the Commissioner about language-related conditions of work, as well as about memoranda sent in English only to French-speaking employees. Four of the above complaints led to recommendations.

The former Speaker of the House of Commons extended close cooperation in settling these complaints and sent the Commissioner a copy of directives he issued to security staff. He also reminded telephone operators of their obligation to provide, automatically, service in both official languages. The Commissioner met with the Speaker to discuss those matters related to conditions of work of French-speaking security guards who came within his authority. The Speaker also took appropriate measures to ensure that memoranda were distributed in both official languages to all his staff. The new Speaker of the House has shown the same open-mindedness and spirit of cooperation as his predecessor in rectifying promptly and fairly problems of a linguistic nature.

Nevertheless even while seeking to understand the causes of the above difficulties, one finds it saddening, but unavoidable, to report on so many complaints against the very institution which passed the Official Languages Act.

COMPLAINTS

File Nos. 1641 and 1667—Constables

A member of Parliament wrote to the Commissioner on behalf of a number of French-speaking constables concerning some aspects of their conditions of work.

1. Even though Parliament, in "sound" constitutional law, includes Crown, Senate and House of Commons, marked differences in the degree of our activities vis-à-vis these three elements of Parliament suggest that it may be more sensible to report evidence on each of the three components separately. Thus, dealings with His Excellency the Governor General will be found below in the appropriate alphabetical order.

The member stated that in view of the absolute necessity for the constables to be bilingual to fulfil their tasks (providing information to the public, conducting tours, etc.), in view of the right of the public to be served in the language of its choice when visiting the Parliament Buildings, and because of the fact that all French-speaking constables were bilingual whereas nearly all English-speaking constables were unilingual, it was inadmissible that: (1) a 7% bonus in pay was not applicable to the said constables; (2) the bilingualism factor was not taken into account in according promotions (of 11 recent promotions, 7 had been given to unilingual English-speakers); and (3) the French-speaking constables were called upon to work longer hours since they were the only ones able to deal with visitors in both English and French.

The Commissioner's legal adviser and a member of the Complaints Service met with the Sergeant-at-Arms. They admitted at the outset that there appeared to be no infraction or contravention of the Official Languages Act in the points raised in the M.P.'s letter, unless it were true that the bilingualism factor was not taken into consideration in determining promotions. The other two points in the complaint—the question of a 7% bonus for bilingualism and the alleged longer hours for French-speakers—were not in themselves contraventions of the Act.

The 7% bonus for being bilingual referred to is given, in the federal Public Service, to the ST group only: that is, to typists, stenographers and secretaries.

The Sergeant-at-Arms produced a document entitled the "Annual Statistical Report—1972—Protective Service" that established that English-speakers worked as long and/or as often as French-speakers, on weekend duty.

With regard to promotions, the Sergeant-at-Arms repeated what had been stated previously (see our *Second Annual Report*, Parliament, File Nos. 449, 453, 466, 470) and insisted there was no racial or linguistic discrimination, adding that all possible candidates for promotion were honestly considered.

The Commissioner later appeared before the standing committee on Procedure and Organization, at its request, to answer questions relating to the previous year's complaint, the administration's answer to which had included the statement that of the last 25 recruits hired for the Security staff, 22 were bilingual. There appeared to be a certain discrepancy in the facts; only 13 of the 25 were bilingual.

Subsequently, the Commissioner met with the Speaker of the House of Commons to discuss all matters relating to the Commissioner's jurisdiction under the Official Languages Act as applied to the personnel of the House of Commons. They also discussed, unofficially, the various administrative questions raised by the member of Parliament.

The Commissioner informed the member of Parliament of the above developments.

File No. 2233—Confederation Building

A French-speaking person from Hull went to the Confederation Building, in Ottawa, to see an MP. He wanted to get some information from an attendant at the reception desk and the latter told him he did not speak French.

The Speaker advised the Commissioner that the attendant in question was in fact a unilingual English-speaker. The security service tried to displace bilingual personnel in the most strategic locations open to the public, but in view of relief requirements and the number of duties to be performed, it was sometimes necessary to use unilingual employees to replace officers at mealtimes or during coffee breaks.

The Commissioner recommended that there should always be a bilingual attendant at the reception desk in the Confederation Building.

In his reply the Speaker indicated that he had taken careful note of the Commissioner's recommendation.

File No. 2523—Parliament Buildings

A French-speaking couple complained of the failure of the security service at the Parliament Buildings to provide service in French.

The complainants went to the main entrance of the Parliament Buildings with some friends and asked the first guard they met whether they could visit Parliament. He arrogantly replied that he did not speak French. The complainants then asked another guard who was a French-speaker. He complained about having to provide service in both official languages and about being unable to obtain a promotion because he was French-Canadian.

The Speaker of the House of Commons, who is responsible for the security service at the Parliament Buildings, informed the Commissioner that there were probably six guards on duty at the time of the incident and that it was difficult to identify those responsible without knowing their numbers or having more details.

The Speaker informed the Commissioner that the security service personnel had received directives urging them to use tact and diplomacy at all times when dealing with visitors. He hoped that the unilingual English-speaking guard in question had not intended to be arrogant but said that he had probably been flustered when the French-speaking visitors had spoken to him in French.

After noting that directives had again been issued to remind the guards that it was their responsibility to provide all visitors with courte-

ous service in the official language of their choice, the Commissioner pointed out to the Speaker that he found the unilingual English-speaking guard's reaction to French-speaking visitors less than satisfactory. Under the circumstances the guard could have used at least some degree of tact to get out of the uncomfortable situation. A visitor is entitled to decide which official language to use, and it is incumbent on all agencies and institutions of the government and of Parliament, and particularly in the case of security guards at the Parliament Buildings, to provide bilingual service.

The Commissioner reminded the Speaker of similar cases (see File Nos. 1219, 1257 and 1585 on page 366 of our *Third Annual Report*) and asked to be sent a copy of all directives issued to the security guards between June and December 1973 concerning bilingual service to the public.

The Sergeant-at-Arms sent the Commissioner a recent directive issued by the chief of the security service after the complaint. He said that strong warnings had been given to remind the entire security service that it must treat the public with the utmost courtesy at all times. He added that these instructions had been frequently repeated. Although he explained that the staff had been deployed in such a way that bilingual guards were always available to the public, the security chief stated that sometimes, especially at mealtimes and during coffee breaks, it happened that only unilingual English-speaking guards were on duty.

This procedure appeared both disconcerting and contradictory to the Commissioner, who recommended that the shifts be changed so that bilingual guards are available to serve visitors in the official language of their choice at all times, even during coffee breaks, mealtimes and so forth.

The Speaker of the House of Commons took note of the Commissioner's recommendation and brought it to the attention of those responsible so that they could take the appropriate action.

The Sergeant-at-Arms informed the Speaker that of the seventeen guards who had been hired in 1973, fourteen were bilingual; the three unilingual English-speaking guards were veterans with many years of active service in the Armed Forces. He assured the Speaker that the present policy of recruiting bilingual guards would continue. This information was forwarded to the Commissioner.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1896	Ottawa	A French-speaker had to persist in order to obtain telephone service in French.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2064	Ottawa	Security officers should draft their reports in English.	Withdrawn
2071	Ottawa	Unilingual service provided by guards at the main entrance.	Explanation offered
2112	Ottawa	Only three of the six guards in the Centre Block understood French.	Withdrawn
2323	Ottawa	No telephone reception in French.	Withdrawn
2454	Ottawa	The institution was identified in English only.	Explanation offered
2633	Ottawa	Lack of French-speaking guides.	Explanation offered
2717	Ottawa	Only four of the thirteen constables in the House of Commons at the service of the public were bilingual.	Explanation offered
2799, 2885	Ottawa	Memoranda written in English only.	Rectified
2823	Ottawa	The French-speakers of Nova Scotia and of Prince Edward Island were not represented in the Senate.	Referral
2938	Ottawa	Unilingual English-speaking supervisor in the Peace Tower and at the entrance to the Senate.	Explanation offered

POST OFFICE—"Please, Mr. Postman"

EVALUATION

While the Canadian public may be thinking of raising bilingual pigeons to ensure efficient and uninterrupted postal service, this Office is groping to find ways of making the Department move on its appointed rounds against snow, sleet, hail, latter-day Luddites and bilingual sluggishness.

Although aware of the endemic labour strife and administrative complexities plaguing this Department, this Office is singularly unimpressed by the Post Office's snail-like and sporadic progress in meeting the requirements of the Official Languages Act.

Since last year's report, the Post Office has taken more steps towards serving the public in both official languages, including a bilingual-service clause in transportation contracts; but these steps are evidently not adequate. During the period under review, we received 156 complaints similar in nature to the 106 received between 1970-73. In set-

ling complaints, the Department's action has often been unduly protracted.

The Department remains unable to offer counter services in both official languages, even in the main post offices of many major cities. Even in the National Capital Region, it is quite often impossible to obtain services in French.

The Post Office's actions in carrying out 28 recommendations made after two special studies seem inadequate and lacking in cogency; rather, it seemed more concerned with indulging an implacable passion for inertia. In sum, the senior management appears to have failed to create a dynamic organization, and to enlist the staff's co-operation and energy, in order to move ahead meaningfully towards developing institutional bilingual ability.

In January 1975, the Department's Official Languages Development structure at Headquarters (Ottawa) went through some change. We hope this change will add the impetus, authority and imagination the Department requires to respect fully Parliament's wishes under the Official Languages Act.

Readers of the *Third Annual Report* may recall that the Post Office has been the subject of two special studies. We made 11 recommendations as a result of the 1972 study of the Moncton Post Office and a further 17 on completion of the 1973 study of the Department's headquarters. In December 1973, the Department provided information on the current implementation status of all 28 recommendations, and this Office gathered additional data during visits to four major centres.

In the case of the Moncton study, the situation remained basically unchanged from that reported by the Department in October 1973. Although the Post Office had implemented 7 of the 11 recommendations, it had still not installed the central switchboard, already planned in September 1972, which would allow the provision of bilingual telephone reception services in Moncton. The Department rejected the recommendation concerning bilingual capability on letter carrier walks on the grounds that "letter carrier contact with the public is not sufficiently extensive to warrant any specific language requirement". This Office is obliged to point out that the onus is on the Department to prove this claim with sound statistical or other evidence. Finally, the Department stated that it was in no position to "dictate the language of service provided" by sub-postmasters and cites as reasons its difficulty in attracting business people to become sub-postmasters and the lack of qualified bilingual people on the labour market. While acknow-

ledging that such difficulties do exist, we must stress that the Post Office must seek out satisfactory solutions and through discussions, negotiations, and extending help, if necessary, thereby meet the Act's requirements as they relate to the provision of services in both languages.

In its response to the second study, which was designed to help the Department meet the requirements of the Official Languages Act all across the country, the Post Office reported that it had taken action on all 17 recommendations. However, the persistence in complaints of a similar nature gives us reason to question the adequacy of the "action". Also, in the case of all but two recommendations (those dealing with job security and close liaison with unions), the extent of implementation and the pace at which it has progressed, make the Department appear remiss.

With respect to recommendations dealing with matters related to informing those responsible for implementation and other employees about the requirements of the Act, planning, carrying out and reviewing an action programme for the appropriate staffing of positions, appointing regional bilingualism co-ordinators, keeping an annual record on employee turnover and, where necessary, relocating staff, the Department cited the Treasury Board's OLAS system of identifying and designating the language requirements of positions as the principal method of implementation. It is, perhaps, a little early to pass judgment on the overall performance of the Department's activity in this complex operation; initial data suggested that, except in some cases, the programme offered some hope for the future, and in others it seemed to perpetuate the inadequacies of the past. The Department might benefit from consulting the appropriate sections of this report in which we have attempted to show the surfacing weaknesses of the OLAS system.

Perhaps because of its feverish participation in the OLAS programme, the Post Office still had far to go before achieving full implementation of six recommendations. The Department stated that bilingualism is included in its corporate goals and objectives, but failed to say what these goals are, or how and when they would be attained. The recommendation that the public be informed of the Department's capability of providing service in both languages "is continually under review" and has not been carried out for fear of creating an "us and them" attitude among both employees and members of the public. As mentioned earlier, bilingual service clauses have been introduced in transportation contracts, but not in those signed with group or sub-post offices for reasons cited above. Finally, the recommendations dealing with translation procedures, correspondence with the public, visual matters such as signs, printed material and telephone identification and service, are all being pursued at a less than precipitous pace.

Many of the complaints received during the period under review pointed to the absence or insufficiency of bilingual capability to serve local official-language minorities across the country. The Department offered few solutions that would ensure comparable quality of counter service to French- and English-speaking customers. The post offices in Sudbury, which over the last four years have been the subject of a number of complaints, have considerably improved their services in French and have earned the thanks of the local French-speaking population.

Of the 156 complaints we received, many touched on such things as signs, unilingual printed material and more easily resolvable problems, such as unilingual rubber stamps. The Department took action to correct them without a great sense of urgency. Twelve of the 156 complaints led to recommendations. The incidence of this kind of complaint seems to be diminishing as the Department's campaign to replace unilingual stamps progresses. Complaints about unilingual exterior signs on post offices, however, are increasing: the Post Office and Public Works both have a responsibility in this area. From the results, neither appears to be moving at the speed of light.

We received a number of complaints alleging that mail had been delayed or misdirected because the address was in French. In an effort to prevent this sort of thing from happening, the Department has provided many of its staff with mini-glossaries of common postal terms in the two official languages. This Office has asked the Department to step up such staff-assistance work, and has also urged that more standardized bilingual messages be supplied to local postmasters so they can readily produce routine notices to the public in bilingual form.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 959—Signs in French only

A French-speaker wrote that the signs identifying offices in four small towns between Quebec City and Rimouski were in French only. He felt that the signs should have been bilingual so as to reflect the dual linguistic nature of Canada.

The Department informed the Commissioner that a copy of his letter had been sent for reply to the Building Administration Branch of the Department of Public Works, which is responsible for policy in this field.

The Department of Public Works explained that it had been working very closely with the Post Office Department on a programme of signs to meet the stipulations of the Official Languages Act and the

Federal Identity Programme. In addition, the Post Office Department was in the process of developing a programme to reflect its new corporate image, and the two programmes had to be co-ordinated in order to minimize the cost of sign conversion.

The Public Works Department had begun its national programme of converting unilingual signs in 1969 and was trying to have the task completed as quickly as its resources would permit, keeping in mind the requirements of the Federal Identity Programme and other requirements such as the Post Office Department's programme. It endorsed the views expressed by the complainant and stated that it would be in a better position to ensure that all federal signs in the country were bilingual once the order of precedence of the two languages had been set by the Cabinet.

The Commissioner stated that he had examined the Department of Public Works' "Policy on Building Plaques and Signs", issued 4 July 1968, which stated that all permanent exterior official recognition signs were to be bilingual and that the order of precedence of the two languages was to be "decided on a majority basis from language use statistics compiled by the District Director of Postal Services for the area where the property is situated: settlement, village, town, municipality, city". The Commissioner was in complete agreement with this flexible policy on precedence and mentioned that he had quoted it as an example in one of his letters to another institution.

The Commissioner agreed that the conversion of all unilingual Post Office signs in Canada was a considerable task. However, taking into account the fact that the work had begun a few years ago, he recommended that all signs which served to identify post offices in Canada be made bilingual by 31 March 1974. A copy of the letter containing his recommendation was sent to the Post Office Department.

The Post Office Department eventually informed the Commissioner that the bilingual signs for the 4,000 Revenue post offices for which it was responsible were being produced by the Canadian Penitentiary Services and would be delivered to individual locations by 1 February 1974 and installed by 30 June 1974.

The Department of Public Works stated that it would not be able to meet the Commissioner's deadline for the conversion of signs of the approximately 6,000 postal facilities under its jurisdiction. However, it offered to keep the Commissioner informed of its progress in developing a detailed plan for the conversion of these signs. At last report, the Department was aiming for a completion date of December 1978.

File No. 1594—Unilingual Markings

A French-speaker complained that a parcel he received bore unilingual stamps: "Received at Toronto in damaged condition" and

"Found in damaged condition at Toronto". He maintained that they should have been bilingual.

The Post Office Department informed the Commissioner that it had begun a programme to make all its stamps bilingual but that it would be some time before the work was completed. It had drawn the attention of its district directors in Ontario to the complaint and asked them to review all their stamps to make sure they were bilingual.

The Commissioner recommended that the Department draw up without delay a programme with definite priorities and a time-limit that would ensure that bilingual stamps were rapidly substituted for unilingual ones. He emphasized that the requirements of the Official Languages Act should be used to determine these priorities, rather than the wearing out or obsolescence of the equipment.

In March 1974, the Department informed the Commissioner that the National Operations Branch had placed a high priority on making mail marking devices bilingual. The areas where changes were required had been identified and a number of alternative procedures had been developed. The Senior Executive Committee had then reviewed the plans and they were being considered by the Minister.

In the meantime, steps were being taken to standardize bilingual descriptions of installations and to extend the use of the 24-hour system of recording time.

File No. 1987—Burlington

A French-speaker from Hamilton remarked that "the post office in Burlington (Brant Street) has a sign that reads 'Stationnement inter Dits' but no one in the office speaks French . . .".

According to the 1971 census, 1.7 per cent of the population of Burlington was French-speaking—1,500 persons out of a total of 87,020. Although the Department would like to be able to serve the public in the official language of its choice, it claimed that there was no indication that bilingual services were required in that region.

However, the Commissioner considered that this complaint and similar complaints proved that there was a certain demand for service in French. He therefore recommended that the Department make all possible efforts to offer bilingual services to the public in Burlington, as well as to the travelling public that visited that region.

The Commissioner also recommended that the Department correct the misspelling "inter Dits".

The Department informed the Commissioner that a study was in progress on the identification of bilingual positions in all post offices throughout the country and that it would forward him the results of this

study as soon as it was in a position to implement them. It added that the sign in question had been corrected.

By 31 March 1974 the Commissioner had sent three reminders to the Department with regard to the first recommendation but had received no reply.

In early April the Department informed the Commissioner that since only a minute percentage of the population of Burlington was French-speaking, the creation of bilingual positions was not justifiable at that time. There were then 158 unilingual English positions and no date had been set for designating bilingual positions. The Department added that French speakers using this office could obtain satisfactory service using administrative forms. If these forms were no longer adequate the Department would consider recruiting a bilingual employee.

In view of the small demand for services in French, the Commissioner agreed that providing a bilingual form to customers could be retained as a stopgap measure. He pointed out to the Department that he would have to investigate any further complaints he might receive regarding the Burlington office and might, if the need were felt, suggest the adoption of other measures to provide adequate service to the French-speaking public.

The Department gave this assurance and sent the Commissioner a copy of its directive on the matter.

File No. 2417—Shediac

A French-speaker deplored the fact that at the post office in Shediac, New Brunswick, the woman answering the telephone identified the office in English only, although she could easily continue the conversation in French.

The Department informed the Commissioner that four employees at the Shediac post office had been recognized as being bilingual under the old system where a candidate's language abilities were assessed during his interview.

As to their manner of identifying the post office over the telephone, the Department stated that employees were following the usual practice of commercial establishments in Shediac and that it was difficult to break themselves of an ingrained habit. It added, nonetheless, that although the employees did know the proper procedure, the matter had been brought to the postmaster's attention.

The Commissioner thought it useful to remind the Department that unlike private businesses, all post offices were subject to the Official Languages Act. He recommended that the Shediac post office be identified on the telephone in both official languages.

After directives were issued, a check revealed that telephone calls in Shediac were answered: "Post Office/Bureau de poste".

File Nos. 2420, 2441, 2465, 2511, 2537—Sudbury

The Commissioner received a number of complaints in October and November 1973 about the lack of service in French at the two post offices in Sudbury. On four occasions, French-speakers said that they had been obliged to transact their business in English as the wicket clerk did not speak French and did not offer to fetch a bilingual colleague.

The Commissioner was puzzled by these complaints as the Department had a few months previously assured him that it had ample bilingual capability at the two Sudbury post offices.

When no explanation was forthcoming, the Commissioner informed the Department that he was sending two of his staff to Sudbury to investigate. The Department was asked to nominate representatives of its headquarters and regional organization to accompany them.

The visit took place on 12 December 1973. The Commissioner's representatives were surprised to learn that the Sudbury area manager had not yet had details of the complaints made in October and November about the two post offices under his charge. Evidently, the information had been delayed somewhere in the administrative pipeline.

The post office at Lasalle Boulevard in North Sudbury handles the sorting of all the city's outgoing mail. It also has a small counter, staffed by three wicket clerks and a supervisor. The supervisor was bilingual. Previously, two of the three wicket clerks had been bilingual, but at the time of the visit all three positions were occupied by unilingual English-speakers. The area manager explained that these positions were available on a seniority basis but, in fact, many of those entitled to "bid" for them preferred for various reasons to work in the "plant" rather than at the counter. When the incumbents changed recently, the question of bilingual capability at the wicket had unfortunately been overlooked.

The post office at Elm Street in the centre of Sudbury had a much larger counter staff. The two supervisors and seven of the twelve wicket clerks were bilingual; the other five wicket clerks were unilingual anglophones.

The Commissioner recommended to the Department that:

- 1) the fourth counter position planned for the Lasalle Boulevard post office in Sudbury should be designated as bilingual. If two of the four positions were staffed by bilingual clerks, this should make sure that service in French and English was available at all times; and

2) customer courtesy courses given by the Post Office anywhere in Canada should invariably include training in the proper way for a unilingual employee to deal with a customer addressing him in the other official language.

The Department, in the meantime, informed the Commissioner that the area manager had told his employees that unilingual English-speaking staff, when addressed in French, should reply courteously: "Un instant s'il vous plaît" and obtain the assistance of a bilingual colleague.

In replying to complainants, the Commissioner asked them to speak to the manager if they were not properly served in French. If he did not provide satisfaction immediately, they should call collect to the Commissioner's Office and lodge a complaint. The Commissioner hoped that this would help to prevent a repetition of the situation where problems were not put right because the man-on-the-spot was not aware that there had been complaints.

File No. 2425—Chelsea, Quebec

A French-speaking person complained of the lack of service in French at the post office in Chelsea, Quebec.

The Department informed the Commissioner that the Chelsea office was a grade 10 revenue post office which meant it had only a single employee, the postmistress. She had been in charge of the Chelsea office since 1955 and this was the first such complaint the Department had received about her. The population served by this post office is approximately ten per cent French-speaking.

When the postmistress was appointed in 1955, the Chelsea office was part of the Ottawa District and the incumbent was hired as a unilingual English-speaker. The Department added, however, that in accordance with the new official languages policy it would give the person in question the opportunity to learn French. It realized that she had some difficulty in expressing herself in French but felt sure that she understood enough of the language to provide the service necessary to the population of Chelsea, which is predominantly English-speaking.

The Commissioner expressed the opinion that the new official languages policy could not be interpreted as allowing government departments and agencies to postpone the obligations incumbent on them under the Official Languages Act. He therefore recommended that the Post Office Department take all the necessary steps, without infringing upon the rights of the present employee, to ensure that the Chelsea office provide service in the two official languages by 31 March 1974 at the very latest.

The Department answered that in order to ensure service in both official languages, it had decided to build a sub-staff post office in Chelsea.

The construction of this office was to have been completed by the beginning of 1975. In addition, the person in charge of the present post office has taken a language test, but the results were not yet known. If she failed, she agreed to attend French courses.

File No. 2488—A More Humane Solution

A correspondent wrote the Commissioner and asked for his help so that she could retain her position in the local Post Office of a small town in Ontario.

The Commissioner replied that he was not empowered under the Official Languages Act to deal with the correspondent's problem. However, he offered to bring the matter unofficially to the attention of the Department provided she gave him permission to reveal her name. The Commissioner also asked the correspondent to clarify some of the points raised in her letter.

The correspondent eventually wrote the Commissioner, stating that she was to be replaced in a week by a bilingual person, regardless of her 23 years of experience. She had failed the language knowledge test and had agreed to go to Ottawa for language training, but no longer wished to go because of her husband's ill health.

The Commissioner, in the course of the investigation of past complaints, had recommended that the post office in question develop a bilingual capability. He was convinced, however, that it was not necessary to cause any employee hardship in order to achieve this. Accordingly, he asked the Department to find a more humane administrative solution to the problem.

The Department announced that it had reached an agreement with the correspondent and that the latter would be taking language training in Ottawa after all.

The Commissioner was pleased to learn of this happier turn of events and closed the file.

File No. 2491—Russell, Ontario

A French-speaking correspondent complained that the post office in Russell, Ontario, did not provide bilingual services. She recalled that in January 1970, when the Department decided to close down the two small post offices in Marionville and St-Onge, a petition was signed asking for a bilingual assistant at Russell. The petitioners were somewhat disappointed with the Department's reply.

In September 1971, a new request was made, this time for a bilingual postmaster to replace the postmistress, whose ill-health, according to the complainant, often prevented her from performing her duties. The Department had answered at the time that the postmistress was due back at her desk shortly and that bilingual telephone service was available. The complainant added, however, that no one was even aware that such a service existed and that in any case such an arrangement was unacceptable to her.

The Department informed the Commissioner that, at the moment, the staff of the Russell post office was not bilingual but that members were able to understand the customers on a limited basis and serve them with such things as stamps. If they were unable to understand the customer's need, they would immediately use the telephone facilities, but this post office had not once used these facilities since they became available.

The Department added that since the post office was located in the National Capital Region the postmistress's position would be designated as a "bilingual position". However, until the actual designation date was reached (31 March 1977), customers requesting service in the French language would be tactfully requested to use the telephone facilities if the present staff could not give them entire satisfaction.

The Commissioner was of the opinion that the telephone line was not a proper solution because equal status also implied equal facilities. The fact that the postmistress's position was to be designated as bilingual at some indeterminate date in the future did not solve the immediate problem of complying with the requirements of the Official Languages Act. The Commissioner therefore recommended that a bilingual capability be established at the Russell post office as soon as possible.

The Department replied that it would continue to rely on order forms and telephone assistance to serve the French-speaking public until such time as the postmistress was nominated for language training.

The Commissioner therefore recommended that the designation date of the postmistress's position be advanced from 31 March 1977 to 31 October 1975.

The Department then pointed out that the incumbent of the position was born in 1912; language training was not a practical solution in her case. The Department said it had no budget to provide "back-up" staff.

The Commissioner took the matter up directly with the Treasury Board. Negotiations are continuing.

File Nos. 2810, 2812, 2827, 2829, 2830, 2831, 2838, 2839, 2840, 2841, 2853, 2865, 2866, 2867, 2877—Sudbury

A number of French-speaking residents of Sudbury telephoned the Commissioner to voice their dissatisfaction with the arrangements made for an "Open House" at the La Salle Boulevard post office in March 1974. They said that the invitations to visit the post office were in English only. Several also complained that the tour of the post office facilities was all in English and they had been unable to understand what was going on.

The Department agreed that invitations had been in English only, owing to an oversight. On the other hand, it maintained that two out of the four hostesses and six out of the ten guides for the "Open House" were bilingual. The literature provided for the public was in English and French, but a film was shown in English only as no French version of it was available.

The Commissioner said he was disappointed that the Post Office had not of its own accord tried to make amends. He therefore recommended that another "Open House" be held in Sudbury as soon as practicable (and in any event before the end of the summer). All publicity and invitations announcing it should be produced and distributed in both official languages. Films and other audio-visual materials should be provided in both English and French, in a manner that reflects the equal status of the two official languages.

The Department decided to arrange a display of modern mail-handling equipment rather than to simply repeat the "Open House". Unfortunately, the arrival of machinery was delayed but it was hoped that the display would take place in March 1975.

File No. 2821—Postal Code Directories

A French-speaker complained that the Department's postal code directories did not use the words "rue" and "promenade" as often as the words "street", "drive" and "crescent".

The Department explained that the street names, types and directions used in the directories were the official ones supplied by the various municipalities; they were printed in the language officially given by the communities. The streets, avenues and crescents, etc., in directories for the province of Quebec were all in French.

The Commissioner told the Department that, although its explanation seemed reasonable and practical, he was afraid it would not be supported by a strict interpretation of the Official Languages Act; the municipalities were not covered by the Act but the Department was, and the client had complained against the Department. Its reply had

raised an important question, namely whether federal institutions could simply pass along a service in the form received from some other agency not covered by the Official Languages Act. The Commissioner was of the opinion that they might not, if by doing so they gave rise to a breach of the Act. He therefore recommended that in reprinting its postal code directories the Department ensure that all information given in these publications was in both English and French.

At the Department's request, two officers of the Complaints Service met with two of its representatives to discuss the question of bilingualism of postal code directories. After studying the report of the meeting, the Commissioner informed the Department that, among the suggested solutions, the best was the one which called for street names to be printed as follows:

In Quebec

ST MICHEL (rue/st)

Elsewhere in Canada

CYRVILLE (rd/ch)

DIEPPE (st/rue) VANIER

At the Department's request, two of its representatives met with members of the Complaints Service and discussed possible problems in adopting this solution. The Department reiterated a view it had earlier expressed that this method would involve considerable time and money. It also felt that certain street names should not be translated but printed as submitted by the municipalities.

The propriety of two-letter French abbreviations in the current Quebec directories was questioned.

It developed that the problem in making the directories bilingual was three-fold, namely, how to meet the requirements of the Official Languages Act; how to prepare bilingual entries in a form the computer could handle; and how to do both in a manner that was aesthetically pleasing.

It was agreed that the Post Office would examine the rationale behind setting up the system in the present way. It would then explore the possibility of having the Translation Bureau form a Terminology Committee to advise it on the best way to go about producing a bilingual directory. The Post Office would also undertake to find out whether and how similar directories were published abroad, say in Belgium and Switzerland.

The Post Office would keep the Commissioner informed of developments.

The Department subsequently informed the Commissioner that it had received and was following in principle a draft copy of the Federal Identity Program Manual, prepared by the Treasury Board Advisory Committee on the Federal Identity Program, three paragraphs of which applied to its postal code directories.

File No. 3007—Toronto

A French-speaker went to the post office at 50 Charles Street, Toronto, and asked for a passport application form in French. He was told that only English forms were available, although apparently at one time the office had received some French forms.

The Department replied that both French and English passport application forms were available at post offices in Toronto. The French forms might not be on display, but they could be obtained on request. The area manager had contacted every postal manager in the Toronto District and instructed them to inform their employees of the incident and explain that the forms should be made readily available.

The Commissioner recommended that both versions of the passport application forms should be given equal exposure whenever the forms were available to the public.

Shortly afterwards, the complainant happened to require another passport application form and went to the post office in Charles Street to obtain one. The clerk who served him said that they didn't have application forms in French at the post office.

The Commissioner therefore took up the matter again with the Department. The Department explained that the manager of the Charles Street post office had repeated his instructions to the staff and trusted that the incident would not be repeated.

The Department also told the Commissioner that it concurred with his recommendation and had issued a circular to Regional General Managers and District Directors across Canada saying that postmasters were to be reminded that they should keep a sufficient stock on hand at all times of both the French and English versions of all forms intended for the public. The circular laid down that where such forms were on display, the French and English versions must receive equal exposure.

The complainant subsequently wrote to the Commissioner to say that he had returned to the Charles Street post office and found both English and French passport application forms on display.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1605	St-Isidore	Post office listed in English only, in local telephone directory.	Special Study
1717	Ottawa	Unable to obtain service in French at sub-office at Billings Bridge.	Rectified
1737	Ottawa	A resident of Black Capes objected to receiving communication addressed to "Caps Noirs".	Rectified
1739	Toronto	Couldn't obtain tax form in French from the post office: Union Station.	Special Study
1777	Winnipeg	French crossed out and English substituted on bilingual form completed in French.	Rectified
1780	Bonnyville, Edmonton (Alberta)	French signs difficult to read.	Explanation offered
1782	North Bay	Letter in English sent to French-speaker.	Explanation offered
1837, 2287	Fredericton, Ottawa	Unilingual English date stamps.	Explanation offered
1863	Pierrefonds, (Quebec)	Services not available in French in a sub-post office; signs in English only.	Rectified
1905	Sudbury	Lack of service in French: Elgin and Lisgar Streets.	Explanation offered
1907	Sudbury (Ontario)	French version of income tax forms not available at local offices.	Rectified
1914	Montreal	Instructions on photocopies at Place d'Armes in English only.	Explanation offered
1950	Verdun (Quebec)	Service not available in French at post office in store.	Special Study
1964	Plamondon (Alberta)	Competition poster for postmaster, states position requires knowledge of English only.	Rectified
1979	Val d'Or (Quebec)	Letter addressed in French to Canadian Forces Station returned.	Explanation offered
2010, 2321	Ottawa	Unable to obtain service in French at post office at Sparks and Elgin Streets.	Rectified
2012	Ottawa	Error in French on a Special Delivery form.	Rectified
2025	Montreal	Employee had not received results of French test taken two years previously.	Assistance rendered
2027	St-Victor (Saskatchewan)	Unsolicited newspaper returned with rude comment.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2040	Bathurst (N.B.)	Invitation to tender for carrying mail appeared in French only in English-language newspaper.	Explanation offered
2072	Moncton	Precedence given to French in bilingual imprint.	Not justified
2073	Tatamagouche, Englishtown, Louisbourg (N.S.)	Signs in French only.	Rectified
2090	Regina	Unilingual French stamp.	Not justified
2100	Toronto	Mail correctly addressed in French was re-addressed.	Rectified
2111	North Bay	Notices in English only.	Rectified
2126	Ottawa	Poor service at philatelic counter, whatever language used.	Referral
2141	Penticton (B.C.)	Card addressed correctly in French returned to sender.	Explanation offered
2176	Cornwall	Unilingual English stamps.	Explanation offered
2211	Ottawa	"Push" and "Pull" signs on doors in English only.	Rectified
2234	Ottawa	J and G in postal codes causes confusion as they are pronounced opposite ways in English and French.	Referral
2246	Ottawa	Unilingual signs "OHMS" on vehicles.	Rectified
2266	St. John's (Newfoundland)	Service not available in French.	Explanation offered
2282	Ottawa	Unilingual English inscription on a building letter chute.	Explanation offered
2294	Moncton	Precedence given to French on mail-box markings.	Not justified
2297	Vancouver	Unable to obtain service in French at main post office.	Explanation offered
2322	Vancouver	Letter in French answered in English.	Explanation offered
2338	Ottawa	French-speaker received refund notice in English.	Withdrawn
2345	Ottawa	Notice of office hours in English at sub-post office.	Rectified
2350	Ottawa	Unilingual English receipt given for registered letter.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2389	Ottawa	Reply envelope sent with bilingual questionnaires was addressed in English.	Withdrawn
2396	Ottawa	Letters dispatched to "Terre Neuve" returned to sender.	Rectified
2428	Ottawa	English version of brochure sent to French-Canadian association.	Explanation offered
2461	Ottawa	Drawing on the French side of a bilingual pamphlet contained a sign in English.	Explanation offered
2480	St-Boniface (Manitoba)	Post Office announcements not placed in local French newspaper.	Explanation offered
2498	Moncton	Questionnaire in English sent to French-language cultural association.	Rectified
2506 2761	Ottawa	Service in French not available in sub-post office in Place Bell Canada.	Rectified
2525	Kazabazua (Quebec)	Mailman left a note in English in a French-speaker's mail box.	Rectified
2536	New Liskeard (Ontario)	Labels for perishable goods only available in English.	Rectified
2540	Ottawa	Service not available in French at Sparks and Elgin Streets post office.	Rectified
2545	Montreal	Circular in English sent to French-speaker.	Explanation offered
2556	Vancouver	Mail addressed in French was not delivered.	Rectified
2562	Ottawa	A member of a selection committee was not able to understand French.	Referral
2610	Montreal	Service in English not available at post offices on St. Hubert and Everett Streets	Explanation offered
2611	Regina	A letter addressed in French was returned	Rectified
2624	Quebec	Stamp machines bear words "STAMPS" and "COIN RETURN" in English only.	Rectified
2647	Sudbury	French-speaker was asked to speak English.	Rectified
2719	Edmonton	Mail addressed in French is either returned or delivered late.	Explanation offered
2738	Moncton	English form letter sent to French-speaker.	Rectified
2739	Kearns, Virginia-town	Signs in English only.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2743	Vancouver	Special delivery letter delayed because it was addressed in French.	Not justified
2775	Ottawa	Unilingual English parking permits.	Rectified
2786	Sudbury	Poor quality of French in a letter.	Rectified
2805	Ottawa	Discourteous reply to English-speaking client at Besserer Street post office.	Referral
2828	Sudbury	Had to wait for service in French at the Elm Street post office.	Withdrawn
2832	Ottawa	Discourteous reply to French-speaking client at Besserer Street post office.	Withdrawn
2847	Summerland (B.C.)	Post office sign in English only.	Rectified
2874	Ottawa	Notice of office hours in English only.	Rectified
2880	Niagara Falls	No service in French at main post office.	Explanation offered
2888	Blind River (Ontario)	No service in French.	Explanation offered
2897	Hopewell Cape (N.B.)	Post office sign in English only.	Explanation offered
2903	Ville St-Laurent (Quebec)	Unilingual English sign in window "Post office".	Rectified
2946	Ottawa	An advertisement appeared in <i>Le Devoir</i> for a position which required only a knowledge of English.	Explanation offered
2984	Ottawa	Letter in French sent in answer to application in English.	Withdrawn
3000	Sudbury	English form sent to French-speaker.	Rectified
3009	Ottawa	Questionnaire in English concerning lost mail sent to French-speaker.	Rectified
3046	Quebec	Faults in design of a bilingual receipt form.	Rectified
3053	Mattawa (Ontario)	Sign in English only.	Rectified
3068	Edmonton	Delay in receiving letters addressed in French.	Rectified
3072	Sudbury	Poor quality of French text of a circular.	Rectified
3088	Ottawa	Passport application forms for adults not available in French at post office at Sparks and Elgin Streets.	Rectified
3131	North Bay	Letter in English to French-speaker.	Rectified
3164	Bonfield (Ontario)	Sign in English only.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
3172	Halifax	A letter addressed in French is returned to sender.	Explanation offered
3258	Ottawa	A call placed by a French-speaker is answered in English only.	Rectified

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION—"A Man and (this year at least) a Woman"

EVALUATION

This Office's relationship with the PSC's Chairman and his colleagues continues to rest on an implicit trust which, thank goodness, does not exclude occasional hair-pulling shouting matches good for the soul of each protagonist and—who knows?—maybe even for the cause of bilingualism. The Commissioner has again benefited greatly from the Chairman's profound, if not contagious, savoir-faire, which helped him more than triflingly to restrain his zeal for results the day before yesterday.

The Commission dealt promptly with 79 complaints touching on language of service and of work, four of which led to recommendations. The PSC implemented these briskly.

In August 1974, we completed a comprehensive study of the Commission (summary below) as a central body able to initiate measures and programmes to promote the implementation of the Official Languages Act within the Public Service. The PSC reacted favourably to the 18 recommendations we made. In a letter of November 1974, the Chairman, while recognizing the constraints imposed by time and limited resources, agreed to do everything possible to carry out these recommendations. Our Office, without vindictiveness or false ambitions, must follow up these recommendations and give fraternally unpretentious assessment of the PSC's rating in the next annual report.

The complaints referred to such matters as documents or letters being sent out in the wrong language, errors of translation in notices and circulars, the inability of certain receptionists to handle incoming calls in French.

Better information on the requirements of the Official Languages Act and on the administrative procedures devised to meet them seemed, as time went on, to be producing a lower incidence of complaints and inquiries. However, the limited access to language training, whether on the grounds that it was unnecessary for an individual's present position

or because he had little aptitude for learning languages, was often very hard to take. In a number of borderline cases, the Commissioner was able to make representations on the individual's behalf that elicited a quick and satisfactory response. Even the PSC can be merciful from time to time and dip into its treasury of merits to grant a few indulgences.

SPECIAL STUDY

This study of the Public Service Commission was in part a response to a complaint lodged on 18 October 1972 by the Editor-in-Chief of *Le Devoir*. The study team conducted information-gathering interviews between November 1973 and February 1974 and concentrated upon the PSC as a central body capable of initiating measures and programmes to foster the implementation of the Act by some 60 federal institutions within its purview.

The team examined the following major areas of activity: staffing, the provision of staff development courses and language training, the determination with departments of the levels of language knowledge required for positions and the development of procedures for assessing the language knowledge of individuals.

The PSC's responsibilities under the Official Languages Act must be viewed, not only in terms of the major requirements of the Act, which are applicable to all federal institutions, but also in terms of its own special role with regard to "the appointment and advancement in employment of personnel" as defined in Section 39(4) of the Act.

Section 20 of the Public Service Employment Act is also of special relevance in that it states:

Employees appointed to serve in any department or other portion of the Public Service, or part thereof, shall be qualified in the knowledge and use of the English or French language or both, to the extent that the Commission deems necessary in order that the functions of such department, portion or part can be performed adequately and effective service can be provided to the public.

Finally, the second part of a Resolution adopted by Parliament in June, 1973 confers a special mandate upon the PSC and Treasury Board to work towards a "full participation in the Public Service by members of the anglophone and the francophone communities" through "further recruitment efforts" and "training programmes offered in the French language".

Since the PSC's main instruments for implementing the Official Languages Act are its staffing and training functions, it is on these activities that the study concentrated.

With regard to its staffing role, the PSC gathers and on occasion publicizes statistics about the recruiting process, advertises positions, and attempts to attract qualified candidates from both language groups. It also chairs interviews of candidates, draws up eligibility lists, and makes offers to successful candidates when these duties have not been delegated to a department. In addition, the PSC assesses the language knowledge of candidates and public servants and, together with departments, determines the level of language proficiency required for bilingual positions. However, it no longer actively participates in the determination of language requirements for positions, this now being carried out by the Treasury Board Secretariat and departments.

An examination of the PSC's staffing activities revealed a need for improving or modifying certain existing procedures to make them conform more closely to the Official Languages Act. It was found that more complete data on the relative positions of the two language groups in the service would enable the PSC to better direct recruitment efforts in respect to one or both of the two official language groups. Furthermore, the Commission should re-examine its means of recruiting in fields where there is a chronic shortage of candidates with appropriate language skills. The Commission should also improve its country-wide candidate inventory system to circulate information about candidates more effectively.

The PSC required that a majority of members of a selection board be able to communicate with candidates in their preferred official language. However, to respect the rights of candidates, all members of a board should be able to communicate fully with each candidate in the official language of his choice.

Another shortcoming in the Commission's recruiting and staffing activities was the lack of information about equality of opportunities for career advancement for both language groups. With minor exceptions, no studies had been carried out and consequently corrective measures could not be taken where required.

The study team also examined the process of "identifying" positions, i.e. determining whether a position requires unilingual or bilingual incumbents. Section 20 of the Public Service Employment Act and Section 39(4) of the Official Languages Act clearly place ultimate responsibility for such activities on the PSC. The team found no evidence that the PSC was engaged in or monitoring this process. To all intents and purposes, it seems to have abdicated its responsibility in this respect.

With regard to its staff development and training function, the PSC publishes a calendar of courses for each fiscal year giving the languages in which the courses are offered as well as times and places.

Although efforts were being made to remedy the situation, a considerable number of these courses were not available in French at the time of the study. Moreover, courses offered in the context of the Career Assignment Programme should be available in French as well as in English, for it is this programme which is likely to determine, at least in part, the make-up of the future executive class in the public service. In addition, the PSC has no means of gearing the frequency and accessibility of courses in either or both official languages to a planned estimate of demand. Hence, it is unlikely that it would be able to ensure that courses are provided on an equal basis to both language groups.

The Commission's responsibility for language training in the public service cannot meaningfully be studied in isolation; rather, it must be viewed as a part of a larger system developed to produce and use bilingual personnel. Although the PSC was engaged, in cooperation with Treasury Board and the departments concerned, in fixing the levels of language proficiency for bilingual positions, no comprehensive studies had been made to ascertain to what extent such requirements reflected the day-to-day demands made upon incumbents, nor for that matter had any standards been set for unilingual positions. Moreover, the PSC did not know whether the linguistic criteria used in the creation of language profiles for bilingual positions were the same as those employed in the creation of the Language Knowledge Examination.

With regard to language training as such, a broad general knowledge of the second language (the most common result of public service language training) is unlikely to enable a public servant to carry out his job effectively in positions requiring specialized vocabulary. Further, it is doubtful whether the passive knowledge of a second language, which seems to be another frequent result of this same training, is sufficient for personnel who come into contact with the public or who have supervisory responsibilities.

Finally, the information gathered indicated that on the whole the PSC had not yet formulated a concrete plan of action for the implementation of the Official Languages Act. In fact, many of the problems encountered might have been avoided if several years ago a group had been established within the PSC to plan, coordinate, and centralize all matters related to language policy. Such a group should have been responsible for: (a) evaluating the PSC's progress in contributing to the language goals of the public service, (b) ensuring that all necessary data were gathered and appropriately analysed, (c) making policy recommendations to the Commission and relevant branches, and (d) rationalizing and integrating the various criteria and assumptions underlying the identification of positions, the determination of levels of language proficiency, language proficiency tests, and learning progress tests.

In the light of these findings, the Commissioner recommended that:

PLANNING

(1) the Public Service Commission establish a plan for the implementation of official languages legislation and policy; such a plan to provide for, *inter alia*, the gathering of information and the effective discharge of its supervisory and monitoring function to enable it to assume fully the responsibilities placed on it by Section 20 of the Public Service Employment Act and Section 39(4) of the Official Languages Act; the PSC incorporate into this plan, whenever appropriate, the findings, suggestions and recommendations of the report, the task of coordinating and monitoring the implementation of such a plan to be given to a single organizational component within the Public Service Commission;

STAFFING

(2) so as to make available to those involved in the staffing of the public service comparative information that will assist in the creation of a public service which can meet the requirements of the Official Languages Act,

(a) the PSC introduce a continuing study of the staffing process by 31 January 1975 to monitor the preferred language of: all applicants, all those rejecting offers, and all those accepting appointments, according to the classification of the position, and the institution to which appointments are made;

(b) the PSC investigate the alleged reluctance of Francophones to move to Ottawa and take all possible means, including the dissemination of information through film and other media, to ameliorate the situation, as necessary;

(c) the PSC inform the Commissioner of Official Languages upon completion of the studies and that the data from such studies be made available to the Commissioner of Official Languages on request;

(3) since the PSC is finding difficulty in recruiting post-secondary graduates with appropriate language skills in fields where demand chronically exceeds supply, the PSC in cooperation with departments, use all appropriate means to maximize its chances of recruitment in these fields and more particularly make offers to graduating students as early as possible in the academic year, and explore the possibility of establishing scholarships and/or bursaries for potential public servants;

(4) to enable regional offices and central staffing programmes to exchange information on potential candidates in cases where local searches have failed to produce a suitable language mix of candidates, a central candidate inventory system be established by 30 April 1975, which will enable a regional office to draw not only on information from headquarters but on information from other regional offices;

(5) so that candidates from both language groups may have an equal opportunity to speak and be heard in their own language during an interview,

(a) all members of an interview board, whether from inside or outside the public service, be able to communicate fully with the candidate in the language of his choice;

(b) in no circumstances a member of an interview board request a candidate to agree to an interview in an official language other than that selected by the candidate prior to the interview. It is further recommended that, to ensure compliance with the above recommendations, a regular audit of this aspect of interview board proceedings be introduced by 30 September 1975;

(c) the appropriate directives be issued by 31 December 1974;

(6) since it would be difficult to reconcile unequal career opportunities within the public service for the two language groups with a respect for the equality of status of the two official languages,

(a) the PSC carry out a study by 31 December 1975, to determine whether equal career opportunities exist for the two language groups in their own language, and the reasons for any inequalities, and that appropriate recommendations be made to the Treasury Board, departments, and agencies;

(b) the PSC inform the Commissioner of Official Languages upon completion of the study and that a copy of the study be sent on request to the Commissioner of Official Languages so that he may assess the relative career opportunities open to English and French speakers within the public service;

STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

(7) to enable the Bureau of Staff Development and Training (BSDT) to obtain a more accurate picture of the language preferences of public servants intending to take BSDT courses in a particular fiscal year and to make use of this information in planning the frequency of its courses, public servants be given a formal opportunity to indicate their language preference for such courses as early as possible in the preceding fiscal year, as of the training year 75/76;

(8) so that both language groups may have an equal opportunity to take BSDT courses in the language of their choice,

(a) all BSDT courses be available in both languages by 30 April 1975;

(b) all BSDT courses be equally accessible (in terms of frequency and place) pro demand, in both languages by 30 April 1976;

(9) so that French-speaking employees may become aware of the increasing number of courses available in French, a special campaign be launched, not later than 31 December 1974, to publicize the existence of such courses;

(10) to guarantee equal accessibility to BSDT courses in French and in English, where a course offered in both of the official languages becomes uneconomical in one because of the BSDT principle of cost recovery, then alternate means be found to provide for such a course, such a policy to be introduced immediately;

(11) so that both language groups may have an equal opportunity to participate in Career Assignment Program (CAP) courses in the language of their choice,

- (a) CAP courses be offered in French as from 1975;
- (b) CAP courses be equally accessible (in terms of frequency and place) pro demand, in English and French as from 1976;
- (12) so that there may be a common understanding throughout the public service of what constitutes a bilingual BSDT course, the BSDT provide guidelines for a practical definition of such a course based on the following criteria: the language requirements for students, the number of seminars and lectures to be given in each language/both languages, the number of participants from each language group, the number of texts, documents and audio-visual materials in each language, and the provision of simultaneous interpretation. Such guidelines should be issued by 28 February 1975;

LANGUAGE LEARNING

- (13) since a general knowledge of the second language is unlikely to enable a public servant to fulfill his tasks in situations requiring job-specific language, specialized language training be introduced for those employees who are seen by the PSC as requiring such training; the requirements for such training to be determined by the PSC by 30 April 1975;
- (14) since the expressed aims of the Language Bureau and the nature of the present test used to determine the language proficiency of an individual strongly suggest that passive rather than active bilingual competence is being emphasized, and since many posts inevitably require active ability, language training and associated tests, and the Language Knowledge Examination place a much greater emphasis on the acquisition of active language skills for posts where these are required;

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS

- (15) so as to ensure that the tests used by the Language Bureau to assess student progress measure the same underlying dimensions of linguistic performance as the tests used by the Coordinator of Official Languages Programme to determine actual proficiency,
 - (a) a study be carried out to determine whether the proficiency tests of the Language Bureau are directly related to the Language Knowledge Examination;
 - (b) if such a study reveals that the tests are not related, the necessary action to make them so be taken by 31 July 1976;
- (16) so that equal consideration may be given to the assessment of the language-learning capacity of candidates from both language groups, the diagnostic tests used for the testing of both language groups be made equivalent;
- (17) so as to provide for the evaluation of the language competence of an applicant for a French-essential or English-essential post, for which the language requirement is not the first language of the applicant;

(a) the PSC establish language requirements, based on the actual demands of the positions, for unilingual positions;

(b) the PSC introduce a process (using uniform criteria, standards and methods) for assessing the language knowledge of applicants where the language required for the post is not the first language of the applicant;

(c) the PSC keep the Commissioner of Official Languages informed of the process being made in the implementation of *a* and *b*;

(18) since little is known about the effectiveness of bilingual positions in meeting the requirements of the Official Languages Act,

(a) a study be made to determine whether the language profiles of bilingual positions accurately reflect the actual language requirements of positions and that appropriate corrective action be taken where necessary by 30 April 1976, for all bilingual positions already identified. Such a process to be continuous;

(b) a study be made to determine whether the linguistic criteria used in the drawing of language profiles are the same as those employed in the creation of the Language Knowledge Examination, and that appropriate corrective action be taken by 30 April 1976, if the criteria differ.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1882—Appeals Branch

A union representing employees in the Public Service complained to the Commissioner that, because decisions of the Public Service Commission's Appeals Branch were in one language only, the union was obliged to translate them itself and, as a result, had difficulty in meeting the time-limit for appeal to the Federal Court. The union also used decisions of the Appeals Branch to guide its officers in handling similar cases.

The Public Service Commission explained that appeals were heard in the language of the appellant's choice and the decision was rendered in the same language.

The matter turned upon the interpretation of Section 5(1) of the Official Languages Act, which reads as follows:

"All final decisions, orders and judgments, including any reasons given therefor, issued by any judicial or quasi-judicial body established by or pursuant to an Act of the Parliament of Canada shall be issued in both official languages where the decision, order or judgment determines a question of law of general public interest or importance or where the proceedings leading to its issue were conducted in whole or in part in both official languages."

The Commissioner obtained a legal opinion on the applicability of this section to decisions of the Appeals Branch. He was advised that, although decided cases established no simple definition of a "quasi-judicial body", the Appeals Branch might be held to be one. How-

ever, the fact that the section specifies “decision, order or judgment (which) determines a question of law of general public interest or importance” cannot reasonably be interpreted to mean that *all* decisions of the Appeals Branch must necessarily be issued in both official languages. He was further advised that although the union can be considered a part of the Appeals Branch’s “public” under Section 9 (1), the existence of Section 5(1) indicated that it was not Parliament’s intention that Section 9(1) should apply to the Appeals Branch’s decision and reasons therefor.

Under Section 31(1) and 2(b), the Commissioner has wide powers of recommendation where there appears to be a violation of the spirit and intent of the Act. He therefore recommended that the Appeals Branch adopt a generous and helpful interpretation of the words “a question of law of general public interest or importance” and accede to all reasonable requests for decisions and reasons in both official languages, whether an appeal to the Federal Court is contemplated or not. He also recommended that the Public Service Commission’s Appeals Branch consent to or support an application for enlargement of the time of the appeal to the Federal Court in the case which had prompted the union to make its complaints.

The Public Service Commission informed the union that it was prepared to accept the Commissioner’s recommendations in principle and would accede to reasonable requests for decisions to be issued in both official languages. It also said it would decide whether or not to oppose an application for enlargement of the time of appeal to the Federal Court on the merits of the case. If such an application was made because of delay in issuing a decision in the second official language, the issue would be decided on the basis of the circumstances that contributed to the delay.

File No. 1940—PLAN

An English-speaking engineer complained that an advertisement for a mechanical engineer which appeared in the Corporation of Engineers of Quebec’s bilingual publication *PLAN* appeared in French only although the position was open to both unilingual and bilingual candidates.

The Public Service Commission told the Commissioner that it had had difficulty in staffing this position. The advertisement was placed in *PLAN* at very short notice and the Commission had not been aware that the publication was bilingual as it had never used it before. The position had previously been advertised in the news media in both official languages.

As the position had not been filled, the Commissioner recommended that a bilingual advertisement should be inserted in the next available issue of *PLAN*.

A bilingual advertisement was inserted in the August 1973 issue of *PLAN*.

File No. 1975—Toronto

Two people who had to deal with the Commission's regional office in Toronto observed that the receptionist, a unilingual English-speaker, was unable to provide service in French.

The Commission replied that at least five of its employees in that office were bilingual and that normally the receptionist could ask one of them for assistance when a client spoke to her in French.

Since the receptionist was called upon to receive visitors and put through all telephone calls, the Commissioner was of the opinion that her position should definitely be classified as bilingual. In making this recommendation, he noted that there are 45,570 French-speakers residing in Toronto.

After some hesitation, the Public Service Commission took the necessary measures to ensure bilingual service at the reception desk in this office.

File No. 2527—Away on Language Training

A group of French teachers employed by the federal government complained about the appointment of a unilingual English-speaker as administrator of their unit.

The Commission replied that the appointment in question had originally been a temporary one and had been made to meet urgent needs resulting from the fact that the unit in question was moving to a new building. The position was now considered permanent and was soon to be identified as bilingual.

As for the administrator, he had already taken French courses and was to receive intensive training in the language in the near future. Moreover, his immediate supervisor was bilingual and perfectly qualified to run the unit in French. A bilingual officer was to administer the unit on a temporary basis while the administrator was away on language training.

File No. 2678—Staff Development Branch

A French-speaker wrote to the Commissioner with a series of complaints concerning the Public Service Commission's Staff Development Branch.

He complained that the Branch's telephone directory contained several translation errors, that the development courses were not all offered in both official languages, that some of the courses were merely translations of courses prepared in English and that certain courses that were to be given in French were cancelled arbitrarily.

The Commission informed the Commissioner that the telephone directory in question was not an official one. It had been put out to meet an immediate need and the errors mentioned by the complainant were administrative errors made by a well-meaning support employee who had prepared the directory on his own initiative. However, the Branch assured the Commissioner that from now on, it would pay particular attention to any documents for use by the staff.

Concerning the offering of courses in French, the Branch said that great progress had been made in this regard. During the 1973-74 fiscal year, thirty-four of the sixty-five courses dealing with staff training and management were offered in French. Twenty-three courses in French were to be added to the list during 1974-75, and it was expected that by the end of 1975-76 all courses would be offered in both official languages.

The Branch said that its policy was to prepare all new courses in both official languages, but admitted that this could not be done with certain courses because of special circumstances.

Regarding the cancellation of courses, the Branch said that a course could be cancelled for various reasons—such as insufficient enrolment. In the past courses in both French and English had been cancelled for such reasons. Before cancelling a course, however, those responsible for the decision carefully studied all the factors involved. These included the relationship between the teaching method and the learning situation (limited participation can reduce the quality of certain courses), the cost/benefit ratio, the taking into account of the time already devoted to planning, development and administration, and the self-financing policy the Branch is required to follow. A minimum of twenty-five participants is generally required to cover the operating costs. The decision to cancel a course is never taken lightly and is never based on only one consideration but on a variety of factors.

The Commissioner made recommendations regarding the offering of courses in both official languages following a special study (see above).

File No. 2929—Job Description in English Only

A French-speaking candidate for Competition No. 74-412-PEN-5137, Regional Librarian, Canadian Penitentiary Service, stated that when he went to Place Canada in Montreal on 13 March 1974 for an

interview, he was given only a few minutes to read a five-page document describing the position in English only. He also stated that a member of the Board told him that the document was prepared solely in English.

The Public Service Commission informed the Commissioner that no poster was issued for this competition. The complainant had been identified by a Data Stream search and been asked whether he would like to be interviewed for the position. A summary description of the job in French had been attached to the Commission's letter to him.

As the complainant arrived a bit early for his interview, he had been given a detailed job description written in English. Candidates were normally provided only with job summaries but since the complainant had indicated on his Data Stream questionnaire that he had an "excellent" facility in reading English, he was given the detailed description in the belief that it might help him while he waited for the interview. This interview was conducted entirely in French.

The Commissioner told the Commission that he was of the opinion that, in this instance, its well-meaning gesture of making the detailed English job description available to the French-speaking candidate resulted in an unintentional contravention of the Official Languages Act. He added that the practice of making available to candidates internal documents written in only one of the official languages discriminated against unilingual French-speaking candidates who were denied access to complementary information that would be useful to them during the interviews. He therefore recommended that the Public Service Commission ensure that, in future, all written complementary information be offered to candidates of the two linguistic groups only when it is available in both English and French.

The Commission agreed with the Commissioner and assured him that its policy was that all information made available to the public was provided in both official languages. The case in question was obviously an oversight and the Commission recognized the importance of ensuring that such incidents were not repeated. To that end, it had instructed its regional offices and the appropriate headquarters personnel to take special precaution to prevent a recurrence of such a situation.

File No. 2991—A Private School

A young English-speaking clerk maintained that he had been unfairly treated by the Language Bureau. He asked the Commissioner to help him.

He explained that he had entered a competition for a bilingual position and had been successful. Having expressed willingness to learn

French, he was sent on language training. In 12 weeks, he was subjected to three different teaching methods and had had between 20 and 25 teachers. The Language Bureau then withdrew him from training. He asked for his case to be examined by the Language Review Committee. The Committee upheld the decision that he should be withdrawn. He believed that he had been "bounced around" and claimed that when the Resolution was adopted by Parliament in June 1973, the intention was that unilingual public servants should be given a fair chance to learn the other official language.

The Commissioner explained that he had no jurisdiction in these matters. However, he agreed to put the complainant's case to the Public Service Commission on an unofficial basis.

The Commission replied that the clerk had little aptitude for learning languages but, as the linguistic requirements for his position were not very high, he was given the opportunity to take language training. Various methods were tried in an attempt to find one which suited his particular needs, but it was finally decided to withdraw him from training.

The Commissioner regretted that there had not been better communication between the Language Bureau and the student. It was a pity that a generous gesture in admitting a borderline student should have led to such a misunderstanding.

The Commissioner later learned that the Treasury Board had given the Department permission to send the complainant to a private school for intensive language training.

File No. 3149—Unilingual Forms

A French-speaking person alleged that the Staff Development Branch of the Public Service Commission showed contempt for the French language and French-speakers. He sent the Commissioner a copy of a form printed in English only.

The Commission replied that the form in question had been used temporarily and only for internal purposes in one section, while a bilingual form was being printed. It added that other sections had used the document inadvertently. A new bilingual version was now available. Accordingly, the unilingual forms had been destroyed.

The Commissioner recommended that the PSC refrain from adopting temporary measures of that nature. He recommended that all such forms be published in a bilingual format from now on.

The Commission accepted the recommendation and assured the Commissioner that the required measures had been taken to give it effect.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1829	Ottawa	Poor quality of French in questionnaire.	Rectified
1843	Ottawa	Courses provided by Berlitz oriented towards France.	Explanation offered
1902	Ottawa	Letter in French answered in English.	Rectified
1910	Ottawa	Public servant's language training is discontinued.	Referral
1931	Ottawa	Candidate unsuccessful in obtaining position as French teacher.	Referral
1938	Ottawa	Poor quality of French in letter.	Rectified
1969	Ottawa	Public servant objected to his native province being called Colombie Canadienne by language monitor.	Referral
2002	Ottawa	Linguistic specialist alleges discrimination because French not her mother tongue.	Referral
2017, 2800	Ottawa	Social Economic Program receptionist unable to speak French.	Rectified
2019	Toronto	No credit given to candidate for knowledge of both official languages.	Withdrawn
2051	Montreal	7% bonus for bilingualism.	Explanation
2067	Edmonton	Information sought on opportunities in Public Service for graduates of bilingual schools.	Assistance rendered
2068	Montreal	Information sought on opportunities for French-speaking statisticians in the Public Service.	Assistance rendered
2078	Winnipeg	Language Bureau school lacks students.	Explanation offered
2091	Ottawa	Candidate for position of language teacher asked to make application in both official languages.	Rectified
2129	Ottawa	Poor quality of French used in presentation to staff of French language Unit.	Assistance rendered
2162	Ottawa	Courses on classification offered only in English.	Explanation offered
2193	Montreal	English-speaking public servant unable to get transfer to join husband in Montreal.	Referral
2216	Ottawa	Public servant withdrawn from language training.	Assistance rendered
2219	Ottawa	Application in French acknowledged in English.	Rectified
2343	Ottawa	Poor quality of English on bilingual form.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2354	Ottawa	Unilingual sign.	Rectified
2398	Ottawa	Public servant required to submit to testing before continuing language training.	Explanation offered
2446	Montreal	French-speaking candidate obliged to use English at interview.	Rectified
2479	Ottawa	Letter in French answered in English.	Rectified
2515	Ottawa	Public servant who volunteered for language training had to forfeit acting pay.	Referral
2518	Ottawa	Few professional development courses available in French.	Explanation offered
2560	Ottawa	A unilingual English-speaking division chief and receptionist in a predominantly French-speaking unit.	Explanation offered
2571	Ottawa	Public servant withdrawn from language training.	Explanation offered
2599	Ottawa	Language test results not received.	Assistance rendered
2665	Ottawa	Receptionist at Bureau of Staff Development and Training unable to answer in French.	Rectified
2677	Ottawa	Candidate experiences difficulty in obtaining position as language teacher.	Referral
2679	Ottawa	Alliance Française courses for parliamentary wives are oriented towards France.	Explanation offered
2693	Ottawa	Poor quality of French in letter and unilingual English stamp.	Explanation offered
2706	Toronto	Successful candidates declined promotions because language training was available only in Ottawa.	Explanation offered
2718	Ottawa	Language Knowledge Examination alleged to be biased in favour of English-speakers.	Explanation offered
2722	Halifax	Letter in French answered in English.	Rectified
2733, 2914	Ottawa	Unilingual stamp.	Rectified
2756	Ottawa	Organization chart provided in English only.	Explanation offered
2861	Ottawa	Memorandum in English sent to French-speaking employee.	Rectified
2871	Ottawa	Poor quality of French in "Selected Decisions of Appeal Board".	Explanation offered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2889	Vancouver	Inability to administer test of English knowledge to French-speaker.	Not justified
2905	Ottawa	Candidate wished to be interviewed in English and French but was interviewed in English only.	Not justified
2930	Ottawa	Language teaching dull and Language Knowledge Examination irrelevant.	Explanation offered
2935, 2954	Ottawa	Administrative documents provided in English only. A bilingual memorandum contained many errors in French.	Rectified
2945	Montreal	A bilingual public servant asked why his language knowledge must be evaluated again.	Explanation offered
2949	Edmonton	Person obliged to begin language course at too high a level.	Withdrawn
2966	Moncton	Start of language training unduly delayed.	Explanation offered
2967	Ottawa	"Effective Secretary" course given in English to French-speakers.	Explanation offered
2971	North Bay (Ontario)	Failure to explain procedures for staffing bilingual positions.	Explanation offered
3031	Ottawa	Candidate for position of language teacher unable to obtain information on possible vacancies.	Assistance rendered
3079	Montreal	A bilingual public servant wonders why he must pass the Language Knowledge Examination again.	Explanation
3080	Ottawa	Public servant wished to attend language school in Ottawa rather than in Hull.	Explanation offered
3140	Montreal	Delays in publication of competition advertisement in French press.	Not justified
3143	Ottawa	Language courses for M.P.'s not available when Parliament was not in session.	Assistance rendered
3241, 3347	Ottawa	Public servants who had worked for years in both official languages objected to being made to retake the Language Knowledge Examination.	Explanation offered

PUBLIC WORKS—"I'll Build a Stairway to Paradise"

EVALUATION

Readers will be interested to know that the "flowers inside the Governor General's greenhouse are managed by the DPW" as befits a vice-regal Garden of Eden; they will also learn with reassurance that

“every spring the National Capital Commission takes formal custody of the greenhouse goldfish when they are shifted to the outside pool, and returns them to the DPW’s custody in the fall.” While the Commissioner recognizes that the Department is an exemplary purveyor of goldfish to greenhouses, he is dismayed by the time the Department has taken to implement some of his recommendations. A recent full-scale study conducted by his Office (summary below) underlines that “three years have passed since the Commissioner conducted two studies of the DPW in the area of signage, one in the National Capital Region and the other in Metropolitan Winnipeg. During this time, the Department should have been able to clarify its responsibilities in this area and, in addition, implement a national signage conversion programme; neither has occurred.”

Examination of 29 complaints, the new special study and follow-up work revealed that while the Department has made some progress with bilingualizing parking lots, its bilingualism policy seems all too comfortably parked. A long road lies ahead before it fully meets the Official Languages Act’s requirements with respect both to internal communications and service to the public. In particular, the Department has demonstrated less than giddy speed in covering its most discernable area of jurisdiction, that of signs and inscriptions. The public, it seems, must wait while the Treasury Board, agencies and departments—Public Works included—play a jurisdictional ping-pong game.

Nearly half of the valid complaints dealt with unilingual or ungrammatical signs and the Department either promptly made corrections or offered satisfactory explanations. A few complaints concerned the language requirements of advertised positions or the language of competition posters; these led to three recommendations with which the Department disagreed. The Department also had difficulty in accepting five recommendations arising from a complaint about telephone service.

In December 1974, the Department provided information on the current implementation of recommendations made as a result of two special studies on signs, both of which have received attention in previous annual reports.

The study on signs in the National Capital Region, completed in September 1971, contained four recommendations, two of which were fully met in 1973. The Department reported that it planned to implement the third, regarding lettering on buildings, “by about 1975 or 1976”; it would comply fully with the fourth, which deals with rendering bilingual all exterior signs and inscriptions on buildings under its jurisdiction, by the end of March 1975.

Of the 13 recommendations resulting from the special study of signs in Greater Winnipeg completed in 1972, the Department had, as of

December 1974, fully implemented nine, partially met two and had taken no visible action on the remaining two. Information provided by the Department, together with data gathered in Winnipeg by this Office, determined that for the seven buildings falling within the Department's jurisdiction, most signs and lettering were bilingual in three, a good proportion were so in two, and all were in English only in the remaining two. Officials stated that the Department had not taken action to change signs in the latter buildings because one was the subject of extensive renovations, while the other was used primarily for storage and contained few signs.

The two outstanding recommendations dealt with the setting up of a programme for the Winnipeg area so that signs and lettering in parking lots, Crown-owned buildings and leased buildings occupied by federal institutions should, by September 1974, be consistent with the spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act. While the Department had been unable to meet the target date, it anticipated that the programme would be completed early in 1975.

As reported later in this section, the Office of the Commissioner completed, in 1974, another special study of the Department of Public Works. This study, the scope of which was national rather than local, examined the various functions of the Department in the light of its policies, procedures, plans and achievements in the areas of both language of service and language of internal communications.

SPECIAL STUDY

This special study was begun in September 1973 for the purpose of examining the Public Works Department's compliance with the Official Languages Act, in terms of both language of service and, to a lesser extent, language of work. The study required 90 interviews with managerial staff at the Department's head office, in the six regions (Atlantic, Quebec, National Capital, Ontario, Western and Pacific), and in three satellite offices: Winnipeg, Saint John and Quebec City.

Examination of four documents issued by the Department concerning its bilingualism policies revealed that two were satisfactory and the other two were incomplete and lacking in clarity and definition. The first document, which appeared in March 1971, is entitled *Development of Bilingualism—Federal Government Policies*; it states general objectives but does not deal with practical means of implementation. The second text, a sort of provisional policy on signs which was issued in August 1973, gave rise to a number of initiatives, but it also caused

confusion, since it was not followed uniformly. The other two directives (October 1972 and September 1973) are more specific: they deal with forms management and executive correspondence.

At the time of the study, the Department stated that it was able to provide services in both official languages where there was significant demand, although it had never attempted to evaluate the demand. In any case, outside Quebec and certain parts of New Brunswick, the Department was not providing services in French, alleging that the demand was non-existent. This assertion is open to question, at least with respect to certain parts of Ontario, Winnipeg and other areas where there is a significant French-speaking minority.

As a general rule, it was rather easy to distinguish the branches of the Department which were able to provide bilingual services from those which were not. Those which dealt with public relations, information services and administration generally respected the requirements of the Act. The same could not be said of the other branches which, mainly because of the technical or specialized nature of their work, seemed less able to provide services in both official languages.

With respect to language of work, it appeared that, with the exception of Quebec, English was the language of internal communication. In the other parts of the country, the number of French-speaking or bilingual employees was so low that oral communication in French was almost non-existent; as for written communication, the Department was able to meet the need thanks to the services of the Translation Bureau or the goodwill of a bilingual employee acting as translator. As a consequence, meetings were always held in English; in Quebec, they were held in French, unless the presence of a head office representative, usually a unilingual English-speaker, obliged all the participants to speak English. To improve the situation, it would be necessary for the Department's head office and the offices in the National Capital and Atlantic regions to acquire qualified personnel at an early date.

It can thus be concluded that as a result of the dearth of bilingual personnel in the regions, English continues to be the only language of work, although the Department has accepted the principle that the choice of the language of internal communications be left to the employee. Moreover, the lack of French glossaries and the tendency of French-speakers to choose to speak English adds to the difficulty.

In addition, the considerable variance between the number of bilingual employees and the number of positions identified as bilingual in August 1974 (620 employees for 1,041 bilingual positions) is indicative of a major problem. In effect, if language training is the only means of ensuring that internal communication is carried on in both languages, it must be considerably accelerated, so that incumbents of bilingual

positions may fulfill their obligations and thereby enable their colleagues to use the language of their choice.

The Department's provisional policy on signs has given rise to misunderstandings between the head office and the regions. Indeed, the regions seemed unaware of the intentions of the head office, which in turn seemed unaware of the effects of its policy in the regions. Moreover, even though at the time of the study the regions asserted that the policy was being carried out, the Department had not drawn up an overall plan, an inventory or an implementation budget. There is also the prickly problem of jurisdiction, which has long delayed reforms in the use of signs. Not only is the Department of Public Works not the only authority in this area, but, in addition, it is often difficult to determine the limits of its jurisdiction. For example, the departments are responsible for signs relating to operations, but they may obtain them from Public Works; on the other hand, some agencies are completely autonomous in this regard. The provisional character of the departmental policy was due in part to the fact that Cabinet had not made a decision concerning the order of precedence to be given the official languages. As Cabinet has since made its decision known, a definitive policy should be forthcoming.

With regard to notices, calls for tenders and contracts, the Department followed no official policy, but had rather adopted a variable line of conduct, based on routine and tradition. Thus, in Quebec, the Department used only French in some parts of the province, while in the Ontario region it used only English, even though the notices, calls for tenders and contracts prepared in the offices of this region were addressed to the entire country. Since the Department had never evaluated the demand for services, it was possible that it was offering them in only one language in the regions, contrary to the wishes of some contractors.

The Department thus had much to do, in terms of policy and planning, as well as implementation. It had to move all branches forward uniformly and adopt measures to ensure respect for the Act not only in the Quebec region, but on a department-wide basis.

To assist the Department in this task, the Commissioner recommended that:

General Policies on Bilingualism, Implementation and Monitoring Structures

(1) in order to ensure full compliance with the Official Languages Act, the Department develop, by 30 April 1975, implementation objectives, plans of action and procedures for its administrative components which take into account its internal communications, as well as all aspects of its service to the public and which are consistent with the ensuing recommendations;

(2) the Department establish, by 30 April 1975, a central body responsible, at a sufficiently high level, for effectively managing, co-ordinating and monitoring all aspects of a programme in order to comply with the Official Languages Act throughout the Department;

(3) this central co-ordinating and monitoring body keep senior management informed, on a regular basis, of the problems encountered, measures taken and progress made by the branches in their efforts to implement the Official Languages Act;

(4) a person responsible in each region be assigned for dealing with matters concerning the official languages, to ensure implementation of the plans and requirements of the central body, and keeping it informed of all progress and problems;

(5) the Program Management Evaluation Directorate henceforth include in its studies, where applicable, an evaluation of the extent to which the Official Languages Act is being implemented;

Information

(6) (a) the Department develop and actively undertake, by June 1975, an extensive staff information programme designed to familiarize the staff as a whole with the purposes and intent of the Official Languages Act and with various measures taken by the Department to achieve compliance with the Act, as well as to elicit individual cooperation;

(b) the Department include among the literature used for staff orientation purposes the material prepared for the information programme mentioned above;

Library

(7) the Department henceforth acquire for its library such additional French-language publications as will permit its personnel to be able to read or conduct research across the same range of subjects in both official languages;

External and Internal Communications

(8) the Department take all necessary steps to ensure that, wherever such is not already being done, communications of general interest or for general circulation in the Department, in other federal government departments and agencies or to the general public are issued simultaneously in both official languages by 31 December 1975, with both official language versions appearing wherever possible in the same document;

(9) the Department take steps to render bilingual, by 31 August 1975, all forms, notices, posters, office stamps and other similar material which are still available in only one of the official languages;

(10) the Dominion Fire Commissioner's Office make sure without undue delay, that films, publications and other similar material are equally available and equally publicized in both official languages;

Services to the Public

(11) the Department approach the Department of Communications so that the latter may, at the earliest opportunity, make the necessary arrangements with the appropriate telephone companies to have all Department of Public Works offices listed in both English and French in telephone directories by 30 September 1975;

(12) the Department ensure, by 30 April 1975, that bilingual receptionists and telephone operators are strategically posted in all offices serving both official language groups or, failing this, that alternate arrangements are made for answering the telephone, referring calls by a simple phrase in the official language of the caller and providing information so as to enable callers at all times to be served automatically in the official language of their choice;

(13) the Department immediately take steps to increase its institutional bilingual capability in order that it may automatically serve its public in both official languages in all functional and geographical areas in which that public is not being served in the language of its choice, and especially in the following areas:

the Program, Planning and Co-ordination Branch, the Property Administration Branch, and the Design and Construction Branch at Headquarters and in the Capital Region, as well as Design and Construction at St. John, New Brunswick;

the Dominion Fire Commissioner's Office at Headquarters and in the Capital Region;

Management Consulting Services at Headquarters:

the Program Management Evaluation Branch and Technological Research and Development Branch at Headquarters;

the Financial Advisor's Branch and the Personnel Administration Branch at St. John, New Brunswick;

in information units across the country.

Use of Media

(14) where the object is to convey information to the public at large, the Department make such use of national or local media in both official languages as to ensure that a Francophone can be as fully informed in his language as his Anglophone counterpart is through the English-language media;

Recruitment

(15) the Department, in co-operation with the Public Service Commission, identify the sources of potential candidates within both language groups and draw on them to the extent necessary so that it can staff with greater ease positions requiring one or both of the official languages;

(16) in view of the very limited number of positions at Headquarters identified as unilingual French, the Department take whatever administrative measures are necessary to increase the number of unilingual French

positions at least at Headquarters as an additional means of achieving equality of status in the use of both official languages in communications within the Department;

(17) so that institutional bilingual capability can be improved in locations where it is lacking, as for instance at Headquarters and in New Brunswick, the Department, in co-operation with the Treasury Board and the Public Service Commission, take the necessary steps to initiate (especially in the Province of Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick, where there are facilities in the French language), a programme to sponsor architectural and engineering students with an accompanying obligation that they work for the Department for a number of years after graduation;

(18) the Department take the necessary steps to ensure that by 30 April 1975, all members of an interview board, whether from inside or outside the Public Service, be able to communicate fully with a candidate in the official language of his or her choice;

Manuals

(19) the Department take all necessary steps to establish priorities and accelerate the adaptation of existing unilingual manuals in the other official language so that they are all adapted by the Department's own target completion date of 31 December 1975;

Translation

(20) the Department approach the Translation Bureau, Secretary of State Department, with a view to increasing the number of specialized translators in its Headquarters unit or to taking whatever other administrative steps are necessary to enable it to relieve departmental employees of all translation duties, to cope with the backlog of material to be translated, and to meet its target date for the translation of manuals;

(21) to reduce as much as possible the volume of translation, the Department take every available means

- (a) to have correspondence originated in the language of the correspondent;
- (b) to have other texts originated simultaneously in both official languages.

Internal Communications

(22) the Department take immediate steps to ensure that in all components, at least at Headquarters, in the Atlantic and Capital Regional Offices and the New Brunswick satellite office at St. John, there is a sufficient number of employees capable of communicating orally and in writing in both official languages within the Department itself and with employees of other departments and agencies;

(23) the Department take the necessary steps to ensure that personnel services are available at all times in both official languages, at least at Headquarters and in the Atlantic, Quebec and Capital Regional Offices by 30 April 1975. In all other offices where there are employees from both official language groups and where the personnel staff is unable to provide services in both languages, the Department institute a system of communicating with Headquarters i.e. telex, "hot lines", etc. or resort to such alter-

nate arrangements as will ensure services in both French and English by 31 October 1975;

(24) the Department ensure that, in areas where the personnel comprises or may comprise employees of both official language groups, the employees of each group be able to function by the end of 1976 in the official language of their choice in internal communications, including meetings and the preparation of documents or reports. This objective may be achieved by simultaneous translation, or by any other means which the Department deems appropriate provided the status of one official language is in no way inferior to that of the other;

Courses

(25) the Department ensure that courses prepared or given by it be henceforth available, where feasible, in both official languages so that the individual employees of both official language groups may have equal access to the same or equivalent courses in the language of their choice; where this is not feasible within the Department, then the latter should ensure such equal access through courses of a similar nature given by other federal government institutions or by outside firms;

(26) the Department develop a technical language training programme, in conjunction with the Public Service Commission or any other appropriate body, by 1 June 1975, so that employees may improve their knowledge of their second official language to the extent necessary to fulfill their responsibilities;

(27) the Department make a language retention programme available to employees who have completed language training; this programme could make use of monitors, films, tapes, inter-regional exchanges or any other method deemed appropriate in order that these employees may retain or even improve their skill in the second language;

(28) the Department provide, on a voluntary basis, remedial language training for French-speaking employees who, as a result of working in an English-speaking milieu, are no longer confident of their ability to speak or write in French in discharging their duties;

Signage

(29) by 30 April 1975, the Department promulgate a definitive signage policy and a phased national signage conversion programme, the latter embracing both permanent and job-site or other temporary signs and including the means of implementation, the procedures to be followed, and a monitoring system so that all signs for which it is responsible are rendered bilingual by 1 September 1976. This includes all signs at and in elevators and instructions on equipment in buildings that it manages or leases to other federal institutions;

(30) in all other buildings in which the federal government occupies space, the Department use its good offices to achieve, with regard to signage, maximum compliance with the letter as well as the spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act;

Tendering

(31) the Department, by 1 August 1975, canvass all actual and potential bidders by directly contacting those firms that have requested plans and specifications during the past two years and by reaching the remaining firms through placing advertisements in newspapers across Canada and requesting them to indicate in which official language they or their employees wish to receive plans and specifications in the future;

(32) the Department canvass all actual and potential bidders, every second year at first and then at such other intervals as will ensure compliance with the Official Languages Act, in order to provide firms with the opportunity of changing, if they so desire, the official language in which they or their employees wish to receive plans and specifications and to include firms that were not previously canvassed;

(33) the Department determine, on the basis of this canvassing of firms, the areas where there is a requirement for service in both official languages and, as a consequence, ensure that such service is available and offered in these areas;

(34) by 30 April 1975, the Department develop and issue a policy statement on advertising, tendering and contracting which comprises at least the following elements:

(a) advertising, in appropriate media, all invitations to tender and notices of occurrences in both official languages whenever these are addressed to a nation-wide public or a region-wide public in the Capital, Atlantic, Quebec and Ontario regions or to a public in those communities where the business and services sectors to which the advertisements are directed include both English- and French-speaking groups;

(b) preparing tendering and contracting documents, as well as plans and specifications, in both official languages whenever the advertisements or notices are in both languages;

(35) the Department phase its implementation of this policy on the publication of advertisements and notices, and on the preparation in both official languages of contract documents including plans and specifications in French and in English by allowing:

(a) three months from the date of the issuance of its policy, for all projects in the Capital Region; but no later than 31 July 1975;

(b) twelve months from the date of the issuance of its policy, for all projects advertised on a national basis, irrespective of the geographic projects in the Capital Region but no later than 31 July 1975;

(c) twenty-one months from the date of the issuance of its policy, for all projects advertised on a region-wide basis in the Atlantic, Quebec, Capital or Ontario regions or in all cases not already covered where the advertisements and notices are directed to a sector of the business and services community which comprises both official language groups, but not later than 31 December 1976.

Unions

(36) the Department, in implementing the preceding recommendations, maintain close liaison and consultation with its employees' unions and staff associations;

Job Security and Career Opportunities

(37) the Department, in implementing the recommendations listed in this report, not jeopardize the job security or career opportunities of its personnel;

Complaints

(38) notwithstanding any action taken by the Department with respect to the recommendations contained in this report or for any other purposes, and regardless of any target dates specified in these recommendations, complaints taken up with the Department by the Commissioner of Official Languages should, because of the latter's ombudsman-like duties under the Official Languages Act, be dealt with on their own merit and corrective action taken in the shortest possible time.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1687—The Search Had Been Unsuccessful . . .

A bilingual woman bearing an English name wrote to object to an advertisement for a position of Assistant Deputy Minister (Realty) in the Department of Public Works. The advertisement stated that a knowledge of the English language was essential, but made no mention of French. She believed this was contrary to the government's language policy and, presumably, the Official Languages Act.

The Department stated that in conjunction with the Public Service Commission it had first searched extensively in the Province of Quebec for a bilingual Assistant Deputy Minister (Realty) from the French-speaking community in order to balance its senior management team. The search had been unsuccessful and consequently the Department had requested the Public Service Commission to undertake an advertising campaign across the country. It advised the PSC that it would be happy to accept candidates from either language group, that bilingualism was desirable, but that the competition should be open to unilingual English-speaking candidates. According to the Department, the stipulation in the advertisement concerning language was at the discretion of the Public Service Commission.

The Commissioner informed the Department that it was his task to make recommendations leading to the establishment of institutional bilingualism to the extent necessary to provide services in both official languages to the public in the National Capital Region, and wherever else this was feasible and sufficient demand existed. Furthermore, Section 2 of the Act dealt with language of work of federal public servants, and the description of both the nature of the position and

of the executive desired implied that the incumbent would have dealings with Quebec regional personnel in a supervisory capacity. He should therefore be able to deal with French-speaking subordinate personnel in their own language. The Commissioner therefore recommended that:

- 1) the Department of Public Works review the question of language requirements for the position of Assistant Deputy Minister (Realty) in order to conform to the letter, spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act; and

- 2) a new competition poster and advertisement making knowledge of both official languages an essential requirement be issued, cancelling and replacing the advertisement that was the object of the complaint.

The Department replied several weeks later to the effect that it would have found the Commissioner's recommendations difficult to accept, but that the question had become academic since a fluently bilingual person had been appointed to the position in the interval. The Commissioner pursued the matter a step further, pointing out that the position as such should be identified bilingual to avoid any equivocation about the language requirements in any future competitions.

In any event, Treasury Board circular No. 1973-88, issued subsequently (June 1973), specified that all positions in the Executive Category be declared bilingual.

File No. 2730—Dominion Fire Commissioner

A French-speaker alleged that he telephoned the office of the Dominion Fire Commissioner at three separate numbers and each time received a reply in English only.

The Department said that the office of the Dominion Fire Commissioner had "personnel who can respond and answer questions in both official languages", adding that "telephone calls are generally answered in English".

The Commissioner pointed out to the Department that its admission was exactly the subject of the complaint: the telephones had been answered in English only and the caller had been *ipso facto* denied service in the official language of his choice. The Commissioner therefore recommended that:

- 1) switchboard operators, when answering calls, give the name of the office of the Dominion Fire Commissioner in French as well as in English;

- 2) unilingual English-speaking operators automatically transfer calls received in French to colleagues with a good knowledge of that lan-

guage, after alerting the caller with the very simple phrase: "Un instant, s'il vous plaît";

3) operators refrain from speaking English to French-speaking callers, as service should be provided automatically in the language of the caller; and

4) waiting time be in all cases kept as short as possible.

The Department replied that the reference to "switchboard operators" was incorrect since the persons concerned were secretaries or clerical staff who answered the telephones as part of their duties. "Switchboard operators, who would by the nature of their duties be dealing with the public continuously, would obviously have to be bilingual." In any case, the Dominion Fire Commissioner's office was not adequately staffed to meet language requirements. An extensive study just completed of the organization and operation of the office had confirmed this. Recommendations for a reorganization were to be reviewed in September or October 1974 and a decision made then. Meanwhile, "the Dominion Fire Commissioner (would) do his best to provide service in both languages but there (would) be a period when he (might) still experience some difficulties."

The Commissioner first drew the Department's attention to an apparent contradiction between its admission that the office was not adequately staffed to meet language requirements and its earlier statements that there was capability within the office to refer any French-language inquiries and that the Dominion Fire Commissioner was said to have at his headquarters personnel who could "respond and answer questions in both official languages". The Commissioner then pointed out that, in any event, the important thing was not who answered the telephones but whether they were answered in both official languages. As the Department had admitted that telephone calls were "generally answered in English", his four previous recommendations stood and he was now adding a fifth, namely that the Department ensure that by 31 December 1974 receptionists and strategically posted telephone operators in the office of the Dominion Fire Commissioner were bilingual, or, failing this, that alternative arrangements for handling calls were made, so that calls might be answered and rerouted and information provided, at all times, in both official languages.

The Department reiterated its statement that it was reviewing the organization, staff and language capability of the Dominion Fire Commissioner's office and said that it should certainly meet the Commissioner's suggested date of 31 December 1974 for ensuring that telephone calls to the office could be handled in either official language.

A French-speaking person from North Bay sent the Commissioner a copy of a unilingual English poster which announced a position requiring the knowledge of both official languages. He wondered why this poster was not available in both official languages.

The Commissioner learned that the poster announcing an open competition was prepared in the Toronto office of Public Works and sent to the Canada Manpower Centre, North Bay, to be used as a guideline for their recruiting process. It was not for public posting and, apparently, it had not been posted. The Department mentioned that the successful candidate was French-speaking.

Since the complaint was anonymous, the Commissioner, to clarify the situation, asked the Department a number of questions concerning the procedure that exists for providing Manpower Centre with the information and job descriptions required by them to select candidates for referral to the Department itself.

Since the position required “knowledge of both official languages” and since “unilingual persons may also apply”, the Commissioner believed that there was a need to provide the information, whether for interested public servants and members of the public seeking employment or for the use of Manpower counsellors, in each person’s official language.

The Commissioner therefore recommended that when, for any reason, a poster or circular was prepared for any position, to provide information concerning the position, the poster or circular be prepared in a bilingual format.

The Department questioned the need for spending so much time on a complaint to which the complainant was not prepared to sign his name.

“With respect to your comment” the Department said, “we will of course comply with instructions received from the Public Service Commission but we do not agree that all competition posters all across Canada need to be produced in both official languages. There is already enough administrative delay in filling positions, and impositions of such a requirement could also have a negative effect on the language programs in certain parts of the country”.

The Commissioner explained that he gave all complaints the same attention and that he had reason to believe that many anonymous complainants were public servants employed in the very departments against which the complaints were lodged. He thought it reasonable that such complainants wished to remain anonymous.

The Commissioner also told the Department that since the complaint had given rise to a recommendation he would, as required by Section 31 of the Official Languages Act, report his opinion and his reasons therefore to the Clerk of the Privy Council.

File No. 3029—Letter in French to English-speaker

An English-speaking person, who had had land expropriated for the construction of the airport at Ste. Scholastique, complained that the Department had sent him a letter and forms in French. He said that some of his English-speaking neighbours had also received their documentation on compensation in French.

The Department told the Commissioner that it regretted the incident and explained that it had had to deal with 3,000 people in a very limited time. The offers and covering correspondence had been printed in French and in English and the Department had sent out the documentation in the language it thought the individual spoke. Because of the inexperience of casual staff hired for the job, some mistakes had been made. However, the information office at the Mirabel site had a supply of offers in both languages, and when a problem came to light, it endeavoured to put matters right. Every effort was made at the Mirabel site to serve the public in the official language of the individual's choice.

The Commissioner said that it was perhaps not surprising in the circumstances that some English-speaking residents had received their documentation in French. He recommended that when the Department initiated communication with a large public and was unable to establish with certainty the official language of the individual's choice, it should produce the text of its message in bilingual format.

The Department accepted this recommendation.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1613, 1823	Ottawa	Unilingual English signs on federal buildings, adjacent parking lots or construction sites.	Rectified
1846	Casselman (Ontario)		
1854	Plantagenet		
1871	Navan (Ontario)		
1875	Cornwall (Ontario)		
2020, 2303	Ottawa		
2423	Edmonton		
2476	Noranda (Quebec)		
2696	Halifax		
2916	Midland (Ontario)		

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1714	Ottawa	Provincial permit for elevator construction in the Parliament building issued under the Department's English name only.	Not justified
1816	Ottawa	Service not available in French at cafeteria: Daly Building.	Explanation offered
1886	Toronto	Two French-speaking employees conversing together are told to speak English.	Rectified
1913	Ottawa	Elevator signs in English only at Place Bell Canada.	Assistance rendered
2058	Ottawa	Poor quality of French used on menus at government canteens and cafeterias.	Rectified
2103	St. Joseph (N.B.)	Unilingual English form supplied to French-speakers for submitting building tenders.	Rectified
2236	Ottawa	Poor quality of French on signs in a federal building.	Withdrawn
2250	Ottawa	English only required in a competition for a supervisory position.	Rectified
2295	Hull	Language requirements for certain positions should be changed.	Rectified
2438	Ottawa	Error in the French text of a sign at a federal building.	Not justified
2500	Ottawa	Faulty entries in Government telephone directory.	Rectified
2570, 2591	Hull	Unilingual English signs at a handicraft exhibition held on the Place du Portage mall.	Explanation offered
2709	Ottawa	Failure to advertise a particular competition in local French press.	Not justified
2951	Hull	A French-language firm receives a memorandum in English.	Explanation offered
3181	Toronto	Error in French text of a sign.	Rectified

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE—"Back In the Saddle Again" (but who's that girl riding Dobbin?)

EVALUATION

The RCMP's fame in enforcing federal laws, its gusto in performing colourful musical rides, in giving spirited band concerts and "getting its man" rest on a resolute determination to be the best. One must,

therefore, express some surprise and disappointment at the Force's piecemeal and slightly wobbly approach to meeting its responsibilities under the Official Languages Act. Instead of coming to grips with most of the core problems of policy, staffing, language training, recruitment, internal communications, and other related elements concerning service to the public, the Force has, over the past four years, done little more than rectify some of the obvious visual and written contraventions of the Act and begun the process of identifying the language requirements of positions, without paying due regard to the requirements of the Act in a number of cases.

During the period under review, citizens lodged 34 complaints against the RCMP, leading to recommendations in 8 cases. As in the past, most complaints touched on language of service, particularly in New Brunswick where the RCMP's bilingual capability is below that warranted by the size of the French-speaking population the Force is called on to serve under its provincial and municipal police commitments.

Since investigation of these complaints and the Force's performance in answer to previous special study recommendations revealed wide-ranging and complex problems, our Office, with the full cooperation of the RCMP, conducted a second special study (summary below) of the Force as a whole which focused on its bilingualism policy, procedures and practices. In the months to come, we will continue to press for more vigorous action—hoping, someday soon, to join the Force... in a rousing bilingual chorus of "Rose-Marie".

In December 1974, the RCMP reported on the steps it had taken to implement the recommendations flowing from two special studies. The first study, completed in 1971, resulted in 19 recommendations. Of the nine concerning "A" Division (Ottawa), eight are said to be fully implemented, but once again this year, the Force stated that, despite its efforts, it was still unable to provide its Boat Details at Long Sault, Kingston and Sault Ste-Marie with a bilingual capability. The RCMP had also taken action to implement to varying degrees the ten recommendations regarding headquarters and "N" Division (Rockcliffe). It had, for example, sought to meet the recommendations relating to visual and written aspects of bilingualism. However, its administrative measures for planning, co-ordinating, implementing and monitoring a bilingualism programme differed from those recommended by this Office and, by December 1974, results appeared to be disappointingly inadequate.

The RCMP's response to the 30 recommendations resulting from the second special study, completed in August 1974, gave cause for serious concern. The Force reported that it had taken, or intended to take, action on some of the more easily resolvable questions, such as that

of providing its members with better information on the Official Languages Act.

The special study report explained the intent of the Act with respect to both the rights of members of the public to receive service in both official languages and the legitimate aspirations of Force members to work in their preferred official language; the report also suggested steps the Force might consider taking to adapt its present administrative structures to meet the requirements of the Act without occasioning drastic reorganization. Nevertheless, the Force continued to justify its drastic lack of positive action by making numerous references to inadequate funds, lack of availability of manpower resources, fears that standards of police work will be compromised, "actual needs", and ministerial approval of policy.

Notwithstanding the RCMP's less than positive response to this study, we are pleased to learn, in relation to recommendation 6, that no regulation exists preventing RCMP members from sending this Office complaints relating to possible contraventions of the Official Languages Act, whether these complaints relate to "language of service" or "language of work" questions. On another and quite different topic, we noted the Force's fear that the financial support and man-years provided by Treasury Board for the experimental bilingual troop training programme may be in jeopardy. We feel that the RCMP should nonetheless retain and expand this programme, since it is a positive step the Force has taken to increase its complement of operationally bilingual members.

SPECIAL STUDY

The purpose of this study, which owes its origin to a complaint concerning services provided to the public in New Brunswick, was to examine the degree to which the agency respected the Act, in terms of the language of service and certain aspects of the language of work. The investigation dealt with the headquarters in Ottawa, with divisions "C" (Quebec), "D" (Manitoba), "F" (Saskatchewan) and "J" (New Brunswick), and finally with the Basic Training Centre in Regina. Most of the data were gathered in January and February 1974.

In recent years, the RCMP has made a considerable effort to make its signs bilingual and, in certain regions, to ensure services in both languages to the public and to its own personnel. However, significant shortcomings were evident, namely, the scarcity of information concerning the requirements of the Act, poor supervision and monitoring of its application, and more generally, the lack of systematic planning and specific deadlines.

The advertising campaigns conducted by the agency in recent years made use of the country's major French- and English-language daily newspapers, specialized publications, and less frequently, radio, television and weekly papers. In addition to brochures and posters, there was direct contact with the public, for example, through prevention work. To meet staff requirements, the RCMP decided in 1974 to recruit single women and married men as regular members. One of the objectives of this campaign was to relieve the shortage of French-speaking and bilingual members.

In spite of these efforts, the percentage of bilingual personnel, in relation to the whole, actually decreased between 1971 and 1974, dropping from 10.6% to 9.3%. One of the main reasons for this decrease was the lack of definite objectives and a plan of action. In order to reach French-speaking minority groups, it would have been necessary, for example, to make better use of radio, television and weekly newspapers; distribute advertising material more effectively; use the services of well-trained French-speaking members for direct contact with the community; and finally, use knowledge and aptitude tests better suited to the cultural milieu of French-speaking candidates.

Not only were there difficulties with regard to recruitment, but the first date (January 1974) concerning the identification of language requirements of positions indicated that some sections had too few bilinguals or unilinguals of both languages on staff to provide services.

The RCMP provides training for recruits at the Training Centre in Regina. Trainees there may undergo examinations in the language of their choice; as a general rule, they also have access to texts and manuals in both languages. However, with the exception of the courses offered to trainees enrolled in the bilingual troop program, and although supplementary explanations may be provided in French, all courses are given in English only. No course is given on the provisions of the Official Languages Act, in spite of the lack of understanding demonstrated by the agency with regard to the Act and the means of conforming to it.

The purpose of the bilingual troop program is to provide recruits with bilingual training and, at the end of the training period, an adequate knowledge of their second official language.

The bilingual troop is composed of 32 volunteer members, of whom 16 are English-speakers and 16 French-speakers. After a training period of three or four months at the Public Service Commission Language School, the troop spends six months in Regina receiving basic training in both official languages. Members are then assigned to units in communities where their second language is spoken; they remain there for eighteen months or until they reach the highest level of

language knowledge, according to standards set by the Public Service Commission.

While the bilingual troop program is gradually giving French and English a comparable place in training courses, extracurricular activities are still carried on exclusively in English. Moreover, the atmosphere created by the geographical location of the Training Centre works against English-speakers who wish to use French. The atmosphere of the Centre could be improved by increasing the level of bilingualism of the permanent staff and by making a judicious selection of newspapers, magazines, records, films and reference works available to trainees.

The Canadian Police College in Rockcliffe, on the other hand, gave several of its most important courses in both languages and planned to offer its students an interpretation service and a library stocked with works in both languages. However, the College still had several improvements to make in order to meet all the requirements of the Act.

Finally, with regard to regular members as a whole, the study revealed a need to increase considerably the use of French in training courses given in the various divisions throughout the country, assign a greater number of students to language training and provide special assistance for French-speaking members who, after working for a number of years in English, need refresher training in their own language.

In order to improve its network of internal communications, the RCMP has made a considerable effort, especially in the past two years, to issue its administrative directives, forms and various other internal documents in both languages; this applies particularly to the *Operational Manual*, of which a large part is available in French. The RCMP has twenty-two French-language units: two at headquarters, two in "A" Division in Ottawa and eighteen in "C" Division (Quebec), representing about 150 employees out of a total strength of more than 15,000.

Nevertheless, with the exception of the Quebec Division, the working language in the RCMP is English. Thus, in New Brunswick, where 59 of the 419 employees were bilingual, the use of English was required at headquarters; in entirely or partially French-speaking detachments, internal reports could be prepared in the language of one's choice, but at the time of the study, any report submitted to headquarters had to be written in English.

In the Quebec Division, where 577 of the 953 members were bilingual, French was used for internal communications and the preparation of reports. In general, the same language was used in communicating with headquarters in Ottawa, even though the latter used French in only about ten per cent of its communications with "C" Division,

which meant that bulletins and directives were too often circulated in English only.

With regard to translation, the number of words translated will rise from 3,400,000 in 1973-74 to 5,000,000 in 1974-75. About a quarter of the translation is done into English, a situation resulting from the fact that correspondence, especially from "C" Division in Quebec, must be translated for unilingual English-speakers.

Turning to service to the public, the study revealed that most divisions were incapable of providing services in both languages, and specifically that telephones were not answered systematically in both languages and that bilingual staff in most services was insufficient to communicate with the public in both official languages. In addition, in airports, national parks and border stations and on the highways, the agency was often unable to offer services to travellers in both official languages.

There were, of course, exceptions: for example, Quebec's "C" Division, which seemed to provide all services to the public in both languages; or the three divisions in the National Capital Region, in which the increase in bilingual personnel improved the situation somewhat with regard to motorized patrols, guard services and various key positions requiring contact with the public.

The level of institutional bilingualism, however, remained insufficient in the majority of the provinces. This was the case in New Brunswick, where the headquarters and a large number of detachments were unable to provide services in both languages. There was, on the other hand, one notable exception—the northeast and northwest parts of the province, where the RCMP now seemed able to deal with the public in both official languages.

Finally, the RCMP has made remarkable progress in field of visual bilingualism: signs, inscriptions on cars, telephone listings, publications, printed forms—which personnel must now fill out in the appropriate language—brochures, folders and other printed material. With some exceptions, all this visual material was already bilingual or becoming so. One aspect remained to be improved, especially in the case of brochures and folders containing information for the public: some documents should be presented in a single bilingual version, in order to avoid the problem of distributing two separate unilingual versions.

In conclusion, it must be stated that while the RCMP has taken action in a number of areas to ensure respect for the Act, there are still a number of shortcomings or at least weaknesses that require active and continued attention on the part of the agency. In order to assist the latter in making the necessary changes, the Commissioner recommended that:

(1) the RCMP immediately undertake to revise its policy statement *Bilingualism within the Force (Official Languages)*, ensuring that its contents accurately and fully reflect the letter, the spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act;

(2) it complement this statement with an implementation programme indicating target dates and designating the responsibility centres for each activity;

(3) the RCMP use the findings, suggestions and recommendations of this study as a general but not necessarily exclusive guide for revising its policy statement on official languages, and integrate them into the implementation programme whenever appropriate;

(4) this revised policy statement on official languages be distributed in bilingual format to all members (regulars, specials, civilians, public servants, etc.), and recruits undergoing training;

(5) implementation of these recommendations not jeopardize the job security and career opportunities of Force staff, and include when applicable consultations with appropriate staff representatives;

(6) the RCMP develop and actively undertake an extensive staff information programme designed to familiarise all members (regulars, specials, civilians, public servants, etc.) with the purpose and intent of the Official Languages Act and with the practical ways and means of complying with the Act; check whether its regulations allow its personnel (all categories) to communicate directly with the Commissioner of Official Languages with regard to questions relating to the Official Languages Act and, if necessary, remove any obstacle;

(7) the Language Requirements Co-ordinator and/or the Bilingualism Adviser henceforth take all appropriate measures, such as regular field visits, surveys and assessments, to supervise and monitor the implementation of the Official Languages Act and the RCMP's policy on bilingualism at all levels of the Force;

(8) the Operational Audit Unit of the RCMP henceforth include in its duties an assessment of the implementation of the Official Languages Act in the management analyses it carries out;

(9) the RCMP take immediate steps to improve its recruiting procedures, especially in New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and other parts of Canada where the population is composed of both official language groups, by

(a) making a concentrated effort to attract to the Force an increased number of applicants with knowledge of both official languages or speaking the language of the official language minority not fully benefiting from RCMP services;

(b) making more systematic use of minority language press, radio and television for publicity purposes;

(c) re-assessing the recruiting ability at the detachment level and providing formal training in recruiting methods where necessary;

(d) increasing, where appropriate, the number of recruiters with the necessary language capabilities; and by

(e) re-examining the tests administered to applicants and taking the appropriate decisions;

(10) the RCMP henceforth administer language proficiency and aptitude tests to recruits at the appropriate point in their early training, so as to identify at an early stage those most likely to acquire, through subsequent language training, the level of bilingualism required of a member performing operational duties in both official languages;

(11) the RCMP provide as many as possible of the recruits identified pursuant to (10) with language training as soon as possible after their engagement;

(12) recruits who take language training prior to going to "Depot" as members of bilingual, regular or special constable troops, be provided with bilingual course notes or summaries and bilingual glossaries of terms and expressions relevant to the work of the RCMP;

(13) consistent with its efforts to increase the number of bilingual members, the RCMP continue to provide opportunities for members to take second-language training;

(14) the RCMP provide, on a voluntary basis, remedial language training for francophone members who, as a result of working and living in an English-speaking environment, are no longer confident of their ability to work in French;

(15) in view of the success achieved by its experimental Bilingual Troop Basic Training Programme, the RCMP continue the programme and increase the number of participating troops in proportion to the Force's expansion;

(16) in order to provide linguistic equality for francophone recruits, and at the same time provide bilingual anglophone recruits, on a voluntary basis, with an opportunity to improve their French, the RCMP form regular and special constable basic training troops, the members of which would receive their instruction in French;

(17) the basic training programme for both regular members and special constables henceforth include practical information on the Official Languages Act so that all recruits are aware of its significance and of the ways and means of complying with it;

(18) the RCMP henceforth ensure that its films, informational and teaching materials, reference books and documentation are available in both languages;

(19) in order to create a more favourable atmosphere for the use of the two official languages at "Depot", steps be taken to ensure that services provided to recruits by counselling, personnel and other staff in direct contact with recruits, be provided in both languages and that more written and audio-visual material, such as newspapers, magazines, library books, films, etc., be made available in French also;

(20) by 31 December 1974 or sooner, "HQ" and "J" Divisions start providing in the two official languages the training and development courses they conduct or arrange for regular members, special constables and senior staff; the RCMP continue and expand course offerings in both languages in "A" and "N" Divisions;

(21) the RCMP pursue and develop its plans to provide in both official languages all courses offered by the Canadian Police College, and to make available in the two official languages all the College's material and library

resources, and the services provided by its professional and support staff;
(22) the Force accelerate the translation of all basic operational manuals, forms, essential work instruments, together with written material used for training courses, and ensure that, henceforth, all memoranda, administrative instructions and other material emanating from Ottawa headquarters destined for distribution to the general public or to members throughout the Force be sent out in bilingual format;

(23) the RCMP ensure that, in keeping with its own policy statement on translation, general correspondence and other documents not included in (22) are not translated as a matter of routine, but only when required for operational efficiency;

(24) the RCMP give careful thought to posting a translator/revisor to "Depot" Division, Regina, Saskatchewan and pursue its efforts to engage a translator for sub-divisional headquarters, Moncton, New Brunswick;

(25) the RCMP achieve institutional bilingualism throughout the country and, by 30 September 1976 or sooner where possible, achieve it within, on a priority basis, "HQ", "C", "J", "A", "N" and "Depot" divisional and sub-divisional headquarters by staffing these components with personnel capable of handling internal Force communications, both oral and written, in the two official languages, so that communications within and between those divisions can be conducted in either official language;

(26) by 30 September 1976 or sooner where possible, the RCMP inform in writing the members of "HQ", "C", "J", "A", "N" and "Depot" Divisions that:

(a) members of these Divisions may communicate, both orally and in writing, with their respective divisional and sub-divisional headquarters in the official language of their choice; and that

(b) once the member's preferred language of internal communication is established, his respective divisional and sub-divisional headquarters will henceforth make every effort to communicate with him, both orally and in writing, in that language;

(27) by 30 September 1975 or sooner, the RCMP achieve the necessary level of institutional bilingualism in "HQ", "J", "A", and "N" Divisions to provide all its services to the public in both official languages;

(28) the RCMP, having achieved the required level of institutional bilingualism in the Divisions listed in (27), make it known to the public that its services are available in both official languages;

(29) by 31 December 1976 or sooner, the RCMP achieve the necessary level of institutional bilingualism among its field personnel serving a local official language minority and the travelling public in all those parts of Canada not served by the Divisions listed in (27);

(30) by 31 December 1974, the RCMP ensure that throughout Canada and elsewhere, all RCMP identificational, directional and informational signs, markings and insignia, as well as publications and forms used in dealings with the public, telephone listings, and all other written and visual manifestations of the Force, are bilingual; ensure that the equality of status of the two official languages is respected in all the foregoing and in all types of displays.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1708—A Security Guard at Dorval

A French-speaker alleged that a security guard of the Canadian Corps of Commissionaires at Dorval International Airport insisted on addressing passengers in English, saying "This way please" even after he had been asked to speak in French also. The complainant further stated that other guards, who were bilingual, first spoke English to the passengers until they became aware the latter did not comprehend, at which point they would repeat their remarks in French. The correspondent believed that at Dorval Airport priority should be given to the French language.

The RCMP replied that all commissionaires under its supervision at Dorval International Airport were bilingual in that they were capable of making themselves understood in both official languages. It further stated that the commissionaires were aware of the need to provide service to the public in either French or English, as required by the Official Languages Act.

The Commissioner then requested a copy of any written directives issued to the commissionaires with regard to their responsibilities under the terms of the Act. The RCMP answered that it had issued no written directives concerning the use of the two official languages in serving the public. This was primarily due to the fact that there was always the possibility of error when a commissionaire was the first to speak. If he used French first each time, there was the risk of the person addressed being English-speaking. The reverse could occur if he always used English first.

The Commissioner stated that, while silence may be golden, he found it difficult to believe that a commissionaire at Dorval International Airport never spoke to the public until he was spoken to. If such were the case, he wondered under what circumstances the phrase attributed to the commissionaire, "This way please", had been used. The Commissioner added that it had been his experience in dealing with government institutions that unless clear, specific, written guidelines and directives were issued, reliance on oral communication alone might lead to misunderstandings and an unintentional lack of compliance with the letter, spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act. Consequently, he recommended that:

- 1) at Dorval International Airport and other airports in Quebec, commissionaires use the French sentence "Par ici, s'il vous plaît" first, followed by the English version, "This way please"; and
- 2) at airports in other provinces throughout Canada, commissionaires use the English sentence first, followed by the French version.

The Commissioner of the RCMP informed the Commissioner of Official Languages that he appreciated his efforts to assist the Force in meeting the requirements of the Official Languages Act, but he would not be putting the recommendations into effect, as the Force's experience indicated it was better to leave to the commissionaire's discretion which official language to use first when serving the public. Because Dorval was an international airport, the official language of the travelling public varied there from day to day and even from hour to hour. Commissionaires had to be ready therefore to use English or French first, as the occasion and their judgment dictated.

The Commissioner of Official Languages, in turn, informed the Commissioner of the RCMP that he had carefully examined the reasons advanced for not implementing the recommendations and that he was obliged to fully set them out in his annual report to Parliament.

File No. 1753—Language of Work in Montreal

Several correspondents pointed out to the Commissioner that in certain sections of the Security Service of Division "C" of the RCMP in Montreal, officers had been able for the past several years to submit reports to Headquarters in the official language of their choice, but that in other sections, members of this Service always had to write their reports in English.

The RCMP informed the Commissioner that it was making an effort to arrange things so that all its officers could submit reports in the official language of their choice. However, it remarked that it was essential that this objective not be achieved at the expense of operational performance. The Security Service had a specialized role that did not allow for the assignment of inexperienced personnel to key positions, and it was important to make any staff changes gradually. According to the RCMP, this explained why the implementation of its policy with respect to the preparation of reports in both official languages in the Security Service was taking longer than changes in other areas of activity.

The Commissioner of the RCMP also said that he was fully aware of the necessity of implementing a bilingualism programme within the Security Service as was being done elsewhere. In order to do this the Force planned to transfer bilingual officers from other offices to the headquarters of the Security Service in Ottawa during the summer of 1973; it hoped that this would enable the sections concerned to submit their reports in either French or English. The Commissioner also repeated that it was essential that the writing of reports in French not prejudice operational efficiency.

In his reply to the RCMP, the Commissioner acknowledged the specialized nature of the duties of the Security Service. He advocated strongly that French-speaking federal employees and members of the Force in Quebec be given the right to work in French. This would make the French-speaking members of the Force more productive and hence contribute to operational efficiency and institutional bilingualism. He added that the problem could perhaps be solved if the RCMP assigned two or three translators to the appropriate section of the Security Service in Ottawa rather than transferring, against their wishes, French-speaking members stationed in Quebec, but he recognized that such administrative decisions were its responsibility. The Commissioner of Official Languages added that he would like to know toward the end of September 1973 whether the officers in the sections concerned were allowed to write their reports in either French or English.

The RCMP subsequently informed the Commissioner that the members of these sections of the Security Service in Montreal had been instructed earlier in 1973 to submit their reports in the official language of their choice. This had become possible because the Security Service had succeeded in recruiting a number of bilingual officers and because a personnel exchange program had been adopted under which bilingual members of the Force stationed in Montreal were transferred to Ottawa and replaced by English-speakers with some knowledge of French. These officers were able to improve their second language during their assignment in Quebec and thus increase on their return to Headquarters the number of bilinguals in the Security Service.

File No. 1953—Near Moncton

A French-speaking resident of Nova Scotia complained that he had been stopped by a unilingual English-speaking member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police on Highway 2 about twenty miles from Moncton, New Brunswick. Although the officer had apologized for not being able to speak French, the complainant was critical of the fact that service was not provided in both official languages, particularly in a bilingual area such as Moncton.

The RCMP explained that of the ten members of its highway patrol in Moncton, two were bilingual and two others had a working knowledge of French. The RCMP expressed regret that the complainant had not been able to obtain service in French immediately, but stated that this could have been arranged in a very short time had he requested it. The RCMP also printed out that it was continually studying the problem of increasing the number of its bilingual personnel.

The Commissioner pointed out to the RCMP that citizens are not obliged to request service in the language of their choice and that the

mere use of one or the other of the official languages constituted an implicit request to be served in that language.

The Commissioner also stated that in his opinion the number of bilingual officers on duty on the Moncton highway patrol seemed inadequate and he recommended that the RCMP expand it as quickly as possible in order to make service in both languages available to the travelling public at all times, as provided in section 10 (1) of the Official Languages Act.

In accordance with its policy of serving the public in both official languages in the Moncton area, the RCMP had another bilingual member transferred there. Although admitting that it could be useful to employ more bilingual people in Moncton, the RCMP pointed out that it was facing similar problems in other equally high-priority areas.

The Commissioner drew the RCMP's attention to the high demand for service in both official languages in Moncton and to the operation of the highway patrol in the area, and urged that the number of bilingual positions be increased.

File No. 2108—RCMP Curling Club

A French-speaking person complained that a unilingual English sign reading "RCMP Curling Club" was to be found at the intersection of St. Laurent Boulevard and Sandridge Road in Ottawa.

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police replied that the RCMP Curling Club was a private sports club and that the land on which the sign in question was situated belonged exclusively to the club. It undertook, however, to bring the matter to the attention of the club's directors.

In the light of the provisions of section 9 of the Canadian Trade Marks Act relating to the use of the initials "RCMP" and "GRC", which stipulates that any use of these initials must be authorized by the institution concerned, the Commissioner recommended that whenever the RCMP authorized the use of its name, it do so with the stipulation that the name appear in both official languages.

The RCMP replied that it was informing the directors of the club accordingly, but that it considered it unlikely that any further authorizations would be granted under the Trade Marks Act.

File No. 2115—Centennial Review in Moncton

A French-speaker drew the Commissioner's attention to a report in *L'Évangéline* which stated that the RCMP had presented its Centennial

Review in Moncton in English alone at the request of the City of Moncton's Director of Parks and Recreation. The complainant said that he understood that the RCMP organized the performance and the City rented the facilities. He believed that if the RCMP was able to provide one of the three performances in French, then it should have done so.

The sponsor at Moncton was told by the RCMP that it was prepared to present the Review in either or both official languages. The RCMP maintained that the sponsor was responsible for the language to be used as well as for such matters as the price of admission and the times of performances. In other words, because the sponsor undertook the financial risk, the type of performance was largely left to his discretion.

The Commissioner replied that he understood the RCMP's concern for the sponsor but he recommended that the RCMP itself should undertake the responsibility of determining the language or languages in which it presented the Review. He reminded the RCMP that the Official Languages Act placed upon it "the duty to ensure, to the extent that it is feasible for it to do so, that members of the public in locations . . . where there is a significant demand . . . can obtain available services from and can communicate with it in both official languages".

By this time, performances of the Centennial Review had almost come to an end. The RCMP therefore told the Commissioner what it proposed to do when it made arrangements for similar performances in the future. Where there was a significant local second official language population and the sponsor had not asked for or had declined a bilingual presentation, the RCMP would discuss the matter with him with a view to having him accept a bilingual format.

File No. 2160—Publications in English

A French-speaker reported that early in 1973 the RCMP published an Administration Manual in both official languages. However, since March 1973, the bulletins issued by RCMP Headquarters to amend the publication had been published in English only. As the amendments had to be distributed to French-language units of the Force, the complainant considered their arrival at divisional headquarters in English only to be a retrograde step. He also stated that the Force's General Orders and the *RCMP Quarterly* were still being published in English only.

The RCMP first emphasized that it was in a period of transition as regards the style and format of instructional material. This transition coincided with the implementation of bilingualism in the Force. The

RCMP was adopting a bilingual format for its publications, but the quantity of material to be translated was such that publication in the French language at the same time as in English had in many cases not been possible.

The RCMP indicated that it had fully intended to issue amendments to the new Administration Manual in the two official languages, but other priorities, coupled with the heavy workload of its translation unit, had caused lengthy delays. Frequently, during the time lapse, the approved directives were subject to revision because of changes in policy and procedures, and this brought about yet another cycle of re-editing, approval, translation, etc.

To minimize the problem and ensure that members were kept abreast of rapidly changing administrative requirements, urgent matters, etc., it was sometimes necessary, as a temporary measure, to publish new material initially in the English language only, with the French text following just as quickly as translation resources permitted.

The publication of General Orders in a bilingual format had been under periodic review since 1967. This weekly, internal and confidential publication dealt mainly with appointments, engagements, re-engagements, promotions, and discharges of members, and was mainly informative only to members regarding these activities. Priority had therefore been placed on providing bilingual operational manuals and forms. The publication of General Orders in both official languages would be considered as time and resources permitted.

The *RCMP Quarterly* was unique in that it was not printed or distributed with public funds and was not an official Force publication. Although the RCMP provided a very small staff and office space, the balance of funding was derived from subscription fees and advertisements. The publication contained occasional articles in the French language and it was anticipated that this policy would continue as long as suitable material was contributed to meet the interests of subscribers.

Finally, the delays experienced in the simultaneous publication of the Force's internal manuals and instructional material in both official languages were only temporary and should decrease gradually as revision of the Administrative Manual neared completion.

The Commissioner of Official Languages acknowledged that the expansion of institutional bilingualism within the Force placed a heavy burden on its translation unit and that priority should be given to

operational manuals and other documents required to support the needs of the French-language units of the Force at their main headquarters. He believed, however, that French-speaking members might question the firm determination of the Force to adopt a bilingual posture, when administrative documents emanating from RCMP Headquarters, after being first issued simultaneously in both official languages, were once more distributed in English only, with the French translation following weeks later, if at all.

He expressed the opinion that confidence in Force's intentions would be enhanced were it to implement without further delay a policy, consistent with Objective 8¹ of Treasury Board Circular No. 1971-21 of 9 March 1971, whereby documents which best imparted the general character of the Force would be issued henceforth simultaneously in both official languages. He supposed that such basic documents as the RCMP's Standing Orders and General Orders would be included in the list of these documents.

The *RCMP Quarterly*, which fulfilled such an important role both within and outside the Force, should also be bilingual, including the editor's contribution and a short summary of each article in the second official language. This would perhaps result in an increase in the number of articles contributed in the French language.

The RCMP replied that it was still impossible for it to publish all its administrative documents simultaneously in both official languages, the main difficulty being the overtaxing of the translation facilities; the on-going rewrite of the Administrative Instructions contributed to this problem. However, the Force was continuously striving to surmount the problem, and good progress had been made towards increased simultaneous publication of administrative documents.

The Commissioner of Official Languages told the RCMP that this aspect of language of work would be taken into account by his Office's Special Studies team which was currently examining the implementation of the Act within the Force. (An account of that study appears above).

The RCMP had further replied that the recommendation concerning the *RCMP Quarterly* had been taken under advisement. It subsequently informed the Commissioner of Official Languages that the publication's editorial committee had decided to change it progressively into a bilingual format, starting with the July 1974 edition.

1. "To ensure that all internal communications of general interest to public servants, and for general circulation within government departments and agencies are prepared in both official languages."

File No. 2714—An Unsuccessful Applicant

A Member of the House of Commons asked the Commissioner to investigate a complaint which he had received concerning the rejection by the RCMP of an English-speaker's application to join the Force as a Special Constable for duty at the Ottawa International Airport. The applicant had told him that he passed three examinations but apparently failed the French test when asked to translate into English part of a French book. The applicant had told the RCMP interviewers that he was perfectly willing to undergo whatever training was necessary to fulfill the duties of his position.

The RCMP informed the Commissioner that its Ottawa Division had studied the complainant's application along with several others. Each application was handled in accordance with the RCMP's current selective recruiting procedures and several, including that of the complainant, were rejected.

The Commissioner of the RCMP assured the Commissioner of Official Languages that the complainant had not been discriminated against and that his linguistic handicap had not influenced their decision. The RCMP moreover indicated that it offered language training, when necessary, to Special Constables posted at the airport.

The RCMP stated also that it was conscious of its responsibility for engaging only the most qualified applicants so as to maintain a high level of service. Such decisions were made in the context of the best interests of the Force and of the applicants themselves. The Commissioner of the RCMP concluded his comments by stating that the complainant's application was studied by competent staffing personnel whose judgement had been that it would not be advisable to have him join the ranks of the Force.

The Commissioner informed the Member of the RCMP's reply and indicated that he had reached the conclusion that the complainant's application had been carefully considered and had been rejected because he did not meet the recruiting standards of the Force, not because of his lack of bilingual competence.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1880	Ottawa	A French-language cultural society was issued a receipt written in English.	Explanation offered
1944	Gatineau Park	Unilingual English-speaking officers were allegedly assigned to traffic patrol in the Park.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1991	Sudbury	Signs in English only.	Rectified
2018	Ottawa	Unilingual English epaulettes of the constables on Parliament Hill.	Rectified
2043	Regina	Publicity in English only.	Explanation offered
2135	Ottawa	The initials "RCMP" on two trucks.	Rectified
2158	Rockcliffe (Ontario)	Unilingual English posters, signs and publications: centennial booth, "N" Division.	Explanation offered
2170	Saint-Saveur (N.-B.)	A French-speaker was questioned by a unilingual English officer following a traffic accident.	Explanation offered
2173	Cape Breton National Park	No bilingual services in the Park. No bilingual officer in the Ingonish detachment.	Rectified
2174	Rockcliffe (Ontario)	Names of streets in English only: "N" Division. In addition, the Division was identified in English only on a building.	Rectified
2185	Regina	Scant use was made of French during the ceremonies marking the RCMP Centennial.	Explanation offered
2204	Ottawa	Only the initials "RCMP" appeared on a list of emergency telephone numbers in the 1972 Ottawa-Hull telephone directory.	Rectified
2319	Regina	Mediocrity of the French on signboards and posters in the RCMP Museum.	Rectified
2346	Ottawa	Unilingual telephone reception one Sunday.	Explanation offered
2370	Ottawa	A unilingual English-speaker believes he cannot become a Special Constable because he does not know French.	Explanation offered
2559, 2566, 2592, 2615	Ottawa	Lack of commentary in French during the RCMP concert at the National Arts Centre.	Explanation offered
2886	Montreal	RCMP Centennial booklet available in English only.	Not justified
2936	Ottawa	Unilingual English-speaking officer at the Lester B. Pearson Building.	Not justified
3160	Montreal	Service provided in English only by an officer.	Not justified

SECRETARY OF STATE—"A Million Dollar Baby . . . In a Five and Ten Cent Store (?)"

EVALUATION

During the period covered by this report, 30 complaints were lodged against the Department. After investigation, three-quarters of these revealed contraventions of the Official Languages Act. Two complaints concerning the language used during an interview and errors in translation required recommendations, with which the Department quickly complied. As befits this venerable bastion of B and B orthodoxy, other complaints were also dealt with promptly and effectively.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 2504—Language of Interviews

A French-speaker alleged that the handling of a competition for a bilingual position in the Social Action Branch in Edmonton, Alberta, was "biased". Although he filled out a job application form in English, the complainant indicated that he preferred using French and requested that the interview be held in French.

He complained of being invited to the interview by telephone calls in English. He reported that the interview was actually conducted in English despite the presence of a French-speaker from the Social Action Branch in Edmonton. He added that no other member of the selection board was qualified to accurately assess what he had to say in French. Consequently, he believed that the decision the board made concerning him was unjust. To top it all, the reply from the Secretary of State Department informing him that he was unsuccessful was written in English.

The competition for which the complainant had applied was nationwide, which meant that the preparations for and the times of the interviews had been scheduled mainly on a decentralized basis. Although there were bilingual personnel working in all the regional offices of the Department of the Secretary of State, it sometimes happened, unfortunately, that the requirements of bilingualism were not observed.

The members of the selection board, who had been told of the applicant's language preference, had begun the interview in French, but had requested permission to ask him a few questions in English. As the complainant had a thorough knowledge of both official languages, he seemed quite happy to comply with this request. Moreover he was told that if he felt at a disadvantage, only French would be spoken.

The French-speaking member of the board, who represented the Social Action Branch, was available for the express purpose of meeting candidates for positions with this Branch. The complainant had been selected as a candidate for a position with the Social Action Branch because of his abilities and experience and he was assessed accordingly.

The board believed that the complainant was qualified to fill a position at a level lower than the one he had applied for, and his name was added to the eligible list. It was, however, unable to offer him a position because better-qualified candidates had accepted all the available positions.

The letter that was sent to the complainant informing him of the results of the competition should obviously have been written in French. The Department of the Secretary of State apologized for this error and for any inconvenience or doubt which may have resulted from it.

The Commissioner recommended that the Department ensure from then on that all its offices send notices of interviews and competition results in the candidate's official language when it was known and by using a bilingual format in other cases. This last procedure would meet all needs on all occasions.

The Secretary of State Department replied that it would respect the Commissioner's recommendation and that it would take the necessary steps to prevent a repetition of such incidents.

Later on, during a special study on the services provided by the Public Service Commission, the Commissioner recommended that the Commission make sure of the ability of all members of a selection board, whether or not they are members of the Public Service, to fully communicate with the candidate in the language of his choice. (An account of this special study appears in this report.)

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1730	Saskatoon (Saskatchewan)	Opportunities for Youth: a project officer asked French-speakers to describe their project in English.	Explanation offered
1958	Ottawa	A French-speaker received a parking permit in English.	Rectified
2066	Ottawa	None of the equerries or press officers assigned to the Queen's service during her visit to Canada could express himself in French.	Not justified
2087	Ottawa	The volume of material composed and translated by federal government agencies should be in proportion to the country's demographic composition.	Explanation offered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2102	Lafontaine (Ontario)	The officer in charge of a project submitted by French-speakers was unilingual English.	Rectified
2190	Ottawa	Unilingual English sign.	Explanation offered
2206	Ottawa	Abbreviation in English only on statements of account issued by Opportunities for Youth.	Rectified
2214	Ottawa	A French-speaker received a receipt in English.	Explanation offered
2215	Ottawa	<i>Festival Canada</i> : French was not given equal consideration during a concert at the Astrolabe Theatre.	Explanation offered
2224	Thunder Bay (Ontario)	Unilingual English stamp.	Rectified
2393	Ottawa	An English-speaker who applied for a position as translator expressed doubts as to the examiners' objectivity.	Explanation offered
2453	Ottawa	Memoranda in English sent to a French-speaker.	Withdrawn
2501	Ottawa	Quality of translation services.	Explanation offered
2533	Ottawa	An English-speaker failed to obtain a position as a translator.	Referral
2554	Ottawa	A temporary employee lost his job because his position was identified as bilingual.	Explanation offered
2881	Ottawa	Letter in English sent to a French-speaking immigrant.	Rectified
3094	Ottawa	Texts in English only at an exhibition.	Rectified

STATISTICS CANADA—"Who (or where) is Sylvia?"

EVALUATION

The Agency's oracular but oscillating communiques on the cost of living index may give indigestion to those who can still afford to eat. Similarly, its performance index in regard to implementing our recommendations tends to fluctuate between the mildly soothing and the painfully upsetting—even though the agency settled with despatch all 13 complaints lodged against it. Readers will note from the evidence below that, despite some progress, Statistics Canada's achievement has not greatly improved since last year. One can also safely assume that,

at the time of the 1976 Census, many citizens will not receive service in the official language of their choice. Full equality of status for both official languages remained far from assured; it will not be assured until the agency clearly accepts, without technical or administrative pettifogging, that demand for service in English and French exists throughout Canada.

Seven recommendations resulted from our first study of Statistics Canada completed in January 1972. By November 1974, the agency had implemented four, two concerning the Publications Programme and two the Information Division. Of the remaining three recommendations, two, covering certain census procedures and publicity, are destined to be put into effect by the time of the 1976 Census; one, dealing with the recruitment of bilingual census commissioners, still poses problems.

Our second study, completed in August 1972, led to 13 recommendations relating to the 1976 Census. In order to carry out the majority of these recommendations, Statistics Canada needed to accept and put into practice the principle that a sufficient and regular demand exists across Canada for service in both official languages. Although the agency stated in its response to our Office in November 1974 that Statistics Canada accepted this principle, it did not put it fully into practice in planning the implementation of these recommendations.

Service to the public in both official languages will be limited mainly to enumeration areas in proposed or proclaimed bilingual districts and to other enumeration areas with an official language minority of 10% or more. This constitutes, in effect, acceptance only in part of the main recommendation that Statistics Canada adopt the basic principle that the demand for service in English and French is nationwide. The 10% criterion does not provide sufficient flexibility. For example, official language minority communities which do not constitute 10% of the total population may, nevertheless, be reasonably large and may be spread amongst two or more enumeration areas in which the other official language predominates. Another argument for less rigidity is that, in more densely populated enumeration areas, large numbers of citizens may be deprived of service in their preferred official language.

Statistics Canada reported that it planned to implement most of the recommendations when undertaking the 1976 Census. In particular, it agreed to maintain records of questionnaires returned in each enumeration area based on the official language used by respondents, use respondents' chosen official language when additional information is required and include an examination of the implications of the Act in training programmes for census commissioners. It also agreed to provide service in English and French at Telephone Assistance Service centres, make available additional funds man-years as required for implementation of the Act, and apply to other censuses where applicable

the recommendations this Office made as a result of the second study. Statistics Canada plans, however, to use bilingual interviewers only in primary sampling units with an official language minority group of 10% or more. If the agency fulfils its proposed plans, a number of problems associated with earlier censuses will be avoided; some, however, will remain.

The first problem relates to hiring policies. The agency expressed its intention to hire bilingual census commissioners in all proposed or proclaimed bilingual districts and also in census commission districts containing 10% or more of an official language minority group. Bilingual census representatives will be recruited in all enumeration areas which had, at the time of the 1971 Census, a concentration of 10% or more of an official language minority group; pay incentives will be offered for relocation purposes. In enumeration areas in proposed or proclaimed bilingual districts with an official language minority group of less than 10%, every effort will be made to hire bilingual census representatives, though relocation incentives will not be offered. As a result of these hiring policies it becomes undeniably clear that some members of the public will be deprived of services in their official language.

This Office also recommended that where Census Representatives are not bilingual, a bilingual capacity be present at no higher level than the Electoral District to ensure equality of service in both official languages. The agency plans to allow Regional Directors to identify the best method of providing a bilingual capacity in their region.

The agency claims that owing to allegedly insuperable technical difficulties involved in using a bilingual questionnaire, a further difficulty relates to questionnaire distribution. Separate English and French questionnaires will be used in 1976. However, Statistics Canada intends to offer questionnaires in the individual's preferred official language only to respondents who are at home when census representatives call; it does not plan to leave questionnaires in both official languages when respondents are not at home, or make a second call as recommended. Census representatives will, however, make efforts to determine the respondents' preferred official language and, if this determination is incorrect, respondents may make a special request using the Telephone Assistance Service to obtain delivery of the questionnaire in the appropriate language. In addition, Statistics Canada has so far made no effort to reach groups and associations representing English and French-speaking members of the public to inform them of its plans for implementing the Act, though it envisages contacting French-speaking groups to explain the action it intends to take to ensure that publicity in support of the 1976 Census is available in the individual's preferred official language.

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1789	Ottawa	Grievances concerning an employee's pay and classification.	Assistance rendered
2049	Ottawa	Error in the translation of the letterhead on a bulletin from the Education Division.	Rectified
2286	Ottawa	Unilingual English stamps.	Rectified
2326	Ottawa	Mediocre quality of French in a letter.	Rectified
2373	Toronto	Telephone call in English to a French-speaking person.	Rectified
2408	Ottawa	A unilingual English-speaking interviewer telephoned a French-speaking person.	Explanation offered
2484	Ottawa	In a survey on highly skilled manpower, no mention was made of bilingualism as a job asset.	Withdrawn
2632	Saskatchewan	Unilingual English questionnaire sent to a French-speaker.	Explanation offered
2643	Ottawa	Poor presentation of a bilingual calendar.	Explanation offered
3038	Ottawa	Unilingual English census form sent to French teachers by the Education, Science and Culture Division.	Explanation offered
3085	Ottawa	Mediocre quality of French in a form letter and use of a unilingual English stamp.	Rectified
3105	Ottawa	Reply in English to a French-speaking person.	Rectified
3358	Ottawa	Memorandum distributed in English only by the Personnel Administration.	Rectified

SUPPLY AND SERVICES—"Tea for Two"

EVALUATION

Although the Department is well supplied with professionally-trained management units, its linguistic services to government clientele as regards furnishings and other provisions are not free of imperfections. Of the 31 complaints received against this Department in 1973-74, two led to recommendations in accordance with the Official Languages Act. In one instance, however, this Office believed that an on-site

visit was required to study the use of French as a language of work in an Audit Services Bureau in Quebec. On the whole, the Department's posture was upright, and rarely uptight.

COMPLAINTS

File Nos. 1911, 1912—"Please fill out in English"

Two employees of the Department informed the Commissioner that their parking permit application forms, which they had filled out in French, had been returned to them with the instruction "please fill out in English".

The Department explained that the clerk who had asked the complainants to fill out their forms in English had done so in order that these could receive immediate attention. The Department added that forms completed in French were translated into English before being submitted to the person in charge of assigning parking space.

The Commissioner recommended that the Department take appropriate measures to have forms filled out in French examined as is and that it avoid all possible delay due to translation, in order to provide equally efficient service in both official languages.

The Department replied that it had identified the position of parking assignment clerk as bilingual, thus ensuring service in both official languages. This would eliminate the delays which necessarily resulted from having material translated.

File No. 2166—Language of Work in Montreal

The complainant alleged that French-speaking auditors with the Department's Montreal Audit Services Bureau had not been given the opportunity to work in the official language of their choice. He stated further that most directives of a general nature were distributed in English only.

The Department replied that, in accordance with government policy, employees of the Bureau were free to communicate in the official language of their choice. However, as the Bureau provided a client-responsive service, reports had to be prepared and issued in the language the client department indicated.

The Commissioner believed that it would be useful if two members of his Complaints Service, accompanied by a departmental official, were to visit the Quebec Area Audit Services Office and later the Montreal Audit Services Bureau and to familiarize themselves with the organization of the operations of these agencies vis-à-vis the implementation of the Official Languages Act. The Commissioner's repre-

sentatives conducted a number of personal interviews and left a detailed questionnaire on internal and external communications, which was completed by employees and returned direct to the Commissioner's office.

After having studied the reports of his officers, the Commissioner thought it necessary to make the following recommendations, not merely to correct noticeable contraventions of the Official Languages Act but also to assist the Department in the implementation of a policy which better respected the equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to the use of the English and French languages in the Audit Services Bureau. He recommended that:

- 1) the Audit Services Bureau issue written instructions indicating clearly to all its employees in the province of Quebec that they can work in the official language of their choice;
- 2) the Department of Supply and Services, in co-operation with the Treasury Board, study the possibility of creating a French-language unit within the Montreal Audit Services Bureau;
- 3) all operational documents, notices, instructions, memoranda, letters and notes issued by the Audit Services Bureau Head Office and directed to employees in the province of Quebec be distributed simultaneously in both official languages;
- 4) the Audit Services Bureau Head Office advise client departments that, after a transitional period not to exceed 12 months, all audit reports prepared by its employees in the province of Quebec will be prepared in the official language preferred by the auditor concerned;
- 5) the Department, in co-operation with the Treasury Board, assess anew, before the end of March 1974, the language requirements for positions in the Montreal Audit Services Bureau in order to identify and designate more unilingual French positions and positions where either French or English may be used, especially but not exclusively at entry levels;
- 6) before the end of March 1974, the Department, in co-operation with the Treasury Board, identify and designate as bilingual such coordinating and supervisory positions as are required to permit effective communication in both French and English between Audit Services Bureau employees in the province of Quebec and Bureau Head Office;
- 7) the Audit Services Bureau consider the advisability of creating sufficient bilingual editor/reviser positions both at Audit Services Bureau Head Office and in the Montreal Audit Services Bureau with appropriate classification levels to prepare and implement programmes to improve the quality of documents prepared in French and English, to enable employees to retain or improve their mastery of their second official language, to discuss with employees and give advice on particu-

lar language problems related to the preparation of audit reports, and to assist directors and other staff in the preparation of bilingual documents and manuals;

8) all efforts be made to provide Audit Services Bureau staff in the province of Quebec with training and development programmes in the official language of their choice; and

9) the Department accelerate the pace of translation for the Cost Audit Manual and begin translating the General Audit Manual while ensuring always that all related amendments are issued simultaneously in both official languages.

The Department expressed reservations about the recommendations in the light of the Audit Services Bureau's statutory obligation to provide services to its clients on request.

It replied to each recommendation in turn as follows:

1) All personnel of the Department had been advised that they might work in the language of their choice.

2) The mix of what were expected to be continuing audits was such that this would be difficult, but the Department was continuing to study the problem.

3) All general communications would be issued simultaneously in the two official languages and communications with respect to specific audits would be in the language of the auditor assigned.

4) Since the Department intended to assign auditors to work in the language of their choice, reports would normally be prepared in the language of the auditor. In certain circumstances, the language of the auditee, that is to say the organization being audited, and the language of the client might be different. If this happened, the report would be translated.

5) In 1973, the language requirements of all positions in the Department were identified and schedules were prepared for the designation of these positions in accordance with the policy of the government concerning bilingualism.

6) As indicated in 5 above, the language requirements of all positions had been identified, taking into account the need to identify and designate as bilingual all co-ordination and supervisory positions, as required under the government bilingualism policy.

7) The Department was heartily in agreement with this recommendation and would be discussing the matter with the Treasury Board when its Estimates were being reviewed. On its own initiative, the Bureau had already established its own auxiliary language proficiency programmes in both Montreal and Ottawa with the resources currently available.

8) All training sponsored by the Bureau was being made available in both official languages.

9) This work was proceeding as expeditiously as the translation resources of the Socio-Economic Division of the Secretary of State Department allowed. Amendments to chapters already circulated in French were not issued simultaneously in both languages.

The Commissioner also brought recommendations five and seven to the attention of Treasury Board since it had a role to play in their implementation.

After lengthy discussions, the Board informed the Commissioner that the Montreal Audit Services Bureau would be declared officially a French-language unit and that headquarters in Ottawa would do all that was possible to ensure that it could communicate with its Montreal staff in French. A corollary to this was that bilingual capacity in Ottawa would increase in accordance with the time-table set out for the identification and designation of bilingual positions.

Treasury Board and the Department also agreed to assess anew the language requirements for positions in the decision to create a French-language unit. Following this reassessment, consideration would be given to the need for bilingual editor/reviser positions.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1885	Ottawa	Possible discrimination against French-speaking employees.	Referral
1894	Ottawa	Grammatical errors in a notice written in French.	Rectified
1928	Ottawa	No service available in French.	Withdrawn
2096	Saint-Joseph (N.B.)	Unilingual English signs.	Not justified
2097	Ottawa	Letterhead in English only.	Explanation offered
2127	Ottawa	Error in the French version of an identity card.	Rectified
2351	Ottawa	Unilingual English cover on shorthand notebooks.	Rectified
2376	Ottawa	Error in the French text of a folder.	Explanation offered
2473	Ottawa	Delay in the delivery of cheques printed in French.	Rectified
2486	Ottawa	Appointment of an imperfectly bilingual English-speaker to a position requiring the maintenance of contacts with three French Language Units.	Explanation offered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2534	Ottawa	Unilingual inscription on a crown at the Cenotaph.	Explanation offered
2558	Hull	An English-speaker in a FLU wishes to improve his knowledge of French.	Assistance rendered
2590	Ottawa	Details of remittances given in English only.	Rectified
2873	Ottawa	Furniture loan form printed only in English.	Rectified
2884	Ottawa	Errors in the French of inscriptions on two trucks.	Rectified
2925	Ottawa	Family allowance cheques bearing the English courtesy title instead of the French sent to a French-speaking person.	Rectified
3010	Ottawa	Service in English only at the Central Travel Service.	Explanation offered
3097	Ottawa	Errors in French on a form.	Explanation offered
3150	Ottawa	Letter in English sent to a French-speaking person.	Rectified
3214	Ottawa	Unilingual English inscription.	Rectified

TRANSPORT—"Promises, Promises"

EVALUATION

In spite of serious continuing problems, the Ministry this year has shown a more positive and promising attitude toward the Official Languages Act. Most notably, the Ministry reacted quickly to this Office's 82 recommendations following a special study of MOT's Canadian Air Transportation Administration (CATA). It showed initiative in drawing up a preliminary plan for implementing these. However, four years after this Office made three recommendations to the Ministry (resulting from two relatively minor studies), only one, dealing with signs, approached full implementation.

Most of the 55 complaints received against the Ministry were directed, as in previous years, at the Air Administration. One finds it hard to understand how MOT, an institution interested mainly in transporting goods and people, could prove so immobile when it comes to complying with recommendations which, if applied to all airports under its control, could have avoided most of these complaints. As it was, travellers using airports continued to be irritated by infractions of the

Official Languages Act committed by concessionaire owners of restaurants, newsstands, car-rental firms, limousine services and parking lots. During the period under review, CATA was still inclined to act too slowly in reacting to criticism and, when it had decided to do so, it lacked vigour in implementing decisions.

On the positive side, it made real, if limited, progress that led to a greater use of French in documents related to pilots' licences, and to provision of the Flight Information Manual in both official languages. As a more general move toward change, the Ministry formed a Task Force on Bilingualism in Operational Communication.

All this is fine, if long overdue. But Parliament's wish for a Canada where Canadians can feel at home anytime, anywhere, will not be met until some hardly reluctant dragons in the Department's mandarinatone come to accept, if only with the feigned glee of clenched teeth, the clear prescription of the Official Languages Act (Section 10) that travel should broaden not only the personality, but the principle of linguistic equality.

In the studies of the Ottawa and Toronto international airports, concluded in December 1970 and April 1971 respectively, the Commissioner made essentially similar recommendations. These related to signage, to services offered by concessionaires and to use of the airport public address systems.

The Air Transportation Administration reported that it has almost completely realized its oft-postponed goal of making bilingual all internal and external signs for which it is responsible and which are visible to the travelling public at these two airports. However, certain signs along the approach road to the Toronto airport, which the Administration argues must at present remain only in English for reasons of traffic safety, will not appear in both official languages until the construction of a new airport access system has been completed late in 1977.

In November 1973, the Administration issued a policy statement concerning services provided by concessionaires at airports under its control. This policy required that all printed and written material displayed or available to the public at the Ottawa and Toronto airports be produced in both official languages. Additionally, it demanded that concessionaires "engage suitable bilingual personnel to provide service to the public in both official languages at all times" at Ottawa airport, and that they "engage or train (MOT's emphasis) sufficient bilingual personnel to provide a minimum of one bilingual employee on duty at all times" at Toronto airport. Although clauses containing these stipulations are to be inserted in all concessionaire contracts, the Administration intends to take a lenient approach to ensuring compliance with its policy. Significant differences are therefore likely to exist between concessionaires' formal obligations and their actual performance.

The Air Administration claims to follow a practice of paging members of the public in what is assumed to be their preferred official language—or in both if doubt exists—and has required that concessionaires do the same. However, CATA maintains that it has no means of obliging the most frequent users of the Ottawa and Toronto airport public address systems, the airlines, to follow corresponding principles when making flight announcements or paging their customers. The Administration currently intends to attempt to achieve this result through persuasion.

SPECIAL STUDY—CANADIAN AIR TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

Several considerations led the Commissioner's office to conduct a study of the Canadian Air Transportation Administration.

As manager of all international and most domestic Canadian airports, the Air Administration is in daily contact, through either its employees or concessionaires, with a very large travelling public to whom it has clear duties under the Official Languages Act. As the agency responsible for regulating Canadian civil aviation, it plays a critical role in ensuring the safety of air passengers and pilots, both English- and French-speaking. As one of the largest organizations in the Public Service (employing approximately two-thirds of Transport personnel), it offers a wide range of career opportunities which French-speakers as well as English-speakers should be able to pursue in their preferred official language.

Two previous studies (Toronto and Ottawa Airports, 1971), subsequent follow-up work and a number of complaints to the Commissioner drew attention to certain difficulties which the Administration was experiencing in discharging its linguistic obligations. The team therefore decided to undertake a thorough review of Air Administration operations in order to examine the current status of all official languages policies and programmes aimed either at serving members of the public in the official language of their choice or permitting Administration employees to work in French as well as in English. To this end, all available documentation was carefully analyzed and 120 interviews were held with Administration managers, between November 1973 and March 1974, both at headquarters and at each of the six Regional Administration offices.

The team discovered that, at the time the Official Languages Act was passed, the Air Administration had made a promising attempt to

identify its obligations. It also took steps to establish a policy-making structure capable of translating these definitions into action. However, for a variety of reasons, this initiative failed: very few directives were issued and those produced were not sufficiently precise and specific. In recent years, the Administration has assumed an almost totally passive posture in regard to official languages policy-making, responding only when prodded by central agency guidelines or by recommendations from the Commissioner. Even then, its efforts have tended to be piecemeal.

This passivity has had consequences wider than the relative absence of effective programmes. Important administrative concepts concerning assumption of demand and the need for automatically offering services in both official languages have been improperly understood and Administration employees have received little information on either their duties in serving members of the public or their own legitimate expectations regarding language of work.

With regard to the Administration's dealings with its public, the team found that, outside the Quebec Region, written and oral communications of a general nature (telephone listing and answering, over-the-counter services, publications and correspondence) tend not to be regularly and equally available in both official languages. However, two important exceptions to this rule should be mentioned.

The team found that most forms for public use and virtually all airport signs had been made bilingual, on a national basis, by the time the study was completed. Significantly, it was observed that only in these two instances had the Administration applied its normal policy planning procedures, clearly establishing goals, identifying responsible managers and conducting periodic programme reviews.

The Administration has also made some progress in offering bilingual services to its more specialized publics. Tenders for construction and electronics projects are generally called by placing advertisements in French or in English as required in appropriate newspapers and trade journals; the linguistic preferences of the successful bidders are respected in issuing contracts at Headquarters and in the Quebec Region. Plans now exist to render the Administration's master specifications completely bilingual and make them readily available from a computer data-bank.

In addition, while the study was in progress, programmes aimed at solving two of the Administration's perennial and more intractable problems in providing service to the public were launched. The Directorate of Airports and Construction Services announced its intention to set up information booths at all international airports. These booths will be staffed at least partly with bilingual personnel to ensure that public information and concessionaire services are available in French and in English. Also, the Directorate of Civil Aeronautics took sig-

nificant steps towards recognizing French as an official language of aviation, first by authorizing its use in air-ground communications at five airports in Quebec and then by drawing up a long-term programme designed to provide all civil aeronautics publications in both official languages.

One problem faced by the Air Administration in attempting to serve its public adequately in both official languages is its relative lack of French-speaking personnel. In examining the Administration's internal structures, the team found this weakness reflected in the status of French as a language of work.

According to data presented to the team, only about 10% of the Administration's employees have French as their first official language. Given such a disparity between proportions of English-speaking and French-speaking personnel, it is perhaps understandable, if not excusable, that French is little used in day-to-day written and oral communication. The Quebec Administration is again an exception to the general rule, but only in respect to intra-regional communications. Most Quebec employees must deal with headquarters in English, even if they are members of French-language units.

The team also found that it would be possible to improve this situation considerably by creating the background conditions necessary to enable French to take its place beside English as a language of work in the Administration. For example, the Administration's own school, which is almost exclusively responsible for its employees' technical training, offers the great majority of its courses only in English. Moreover, a relatively small proportion of the manuals and work instruments used in the Administration are available in both official languages, and no clear programme exists for altering this state of affairs. Finally, outside the Quebec Region, French-speaking employees are not concentrated in numbers sufficient to support and promote work in their own language.

In order to assess these findings on the languages of service and the language of work, it is necessary to view them in their proper perspective. Air Administration operations are, to a significant extent, of a highly specialized, technical nature and carried out in fields which are presently "English-dominated", both domestically and internationally, in almost every respect. The scarcity of French-language resources in these sectors makes linguistic reform genuinely problematic. This difficult situation is further complicated by the fact that the principal goal of Administration activities is to ensure the safety of aircraft operators and passengers : there is often no margin for error, linguistic or otherwise.

The team encountered a tendency in the Air Administration to argue that these obstacles make compliance with the Official Languages

Act virtually impossible, and thereby to excuse deficiencies of performance. It may be argued that it is precisely the seriousness of these problems which necessitates a major reorientation of the Administration's approach to meeting the Act's requirements. Such difficulties can be overcome only if the Administration adopts a comprehensive, system-wide strategy for bilingualism, based on a solid analysis of its obligations towards its employees as well as towards resident and travelling publics, and centred on the creation of sound administrative structures for implementation and monitoring. This view is supported by the encouraging evidence, mentioned above, that good results have been achieved whenever such methods have been employed.

The Commissioner accordingly recommended that the Canadian Air Transportation Administration of the Ministry of Transport:

POLICY-MAKING PROCESS

(1) by 31 March 1975 and consistent with the ensuing recommendations, develop a coherent bilingualism plan which identifies all aspects of the Ministry's and the Administration's obligations to its publics and to its employees under the Official Languages Act and articulates the procedures to be adopted in fulfilling them, identifying the responsible managers and coordinators and setting appropriate priorities, administrative goals and time-frames;

(2) establish an overall bilingualism coordinating structure within CATA having specific responsibility to promote and evaluate implementation of the above plan and report regularly to the Air Administrator on progress made so that he may always be in a position to take necessary corrective measures and so that the Ministry might inform the Commissioner of Official Languages of the current status of the plan;

(3) undertake an associated information programme with respect to

(a) the Administration management's awareness, at headquarters and across the country, of the obligation

—to ensure that members of the public are fully aware of their right to receive all Administration services in the official language of their choice;
—to ensure that such a choice is offered fully and automatically, on an institutional basis, and not merely available on specific request;

(b) the Administration's obligations

—to offer members of the Administration's public their choice of official language;

—to ensure that requests for service in the minority official language are relayed to linguistically competent staff;

(c) the recognition by the Administration management, at headquarters and across the country, of what constitute employees' legitimate expectations

1. MOT and Ministry, wherever they appear, mean the Ministry of Transport; CATA and Administration, wherever they appear, mean the Canadian Air Transportation Administration of the Ministry of Transport.

in the domain of language of work and the steps taken or proposed by the Administration to comply with the Official Languages Act in this respect;

(d) advising all employees of their legitimate expectations as to language of work and the provisions that the Administration has made or intends to make to ensure implementation of the Official Languages Act where internal use of French and English is concerned, consistent with equality of status as laid down in Section 2;

(4) in terms of all aspects of its institutional compliance with the Official Languages Act, formulate and distribute to appropriate levels of management a comprehensive manpower planning programme, covering the fields of recruitment, deployment, training, career development, etc., which takes into account the administrative requirements (a) to provide all service to its publics in the official language of their choice, and (b) to give its employees every opportunity to work and to pursue their careers in either or both official languages;

LANGUAGE OF SERVICE—GENERAL

(5) assign members of the Administration's bilingualism co-ordinating structure to undertake, on the basis of the present report, a systematic analysis of all pertinent aspects of public contacts, at headquarters and in the regions, to determine

(a) the kinds and degrees of public involvement concerned,

(b) the present and potential levels of requirements for service in either or both official languages,

(c) the existing institutional capacity to respond to such requirements, and

(d) all possible means of distributing the present capacity and developing future capacity with a view to ensuring equality of service to English- and French-speaking publics;

(6) clarify, consolidate and administratively articulate any existing policy statements on appropriate language of service to the Administration's publics, so that all employees are fully informed of their obligations;

(7) develop and promulgate to all Administration units across the country an administrative concept of presumed demand which makes clear that, in any service situation where clients and Administration personnel are not of the same official language group, the onus is on federal institutions, not on the public, to respect the official language preference of the other party to the transaction;

(8) allocate to a particular manager within each Regional Administration a specific functional responsibility for coordination and control of the implementation of all those aspects of the bilingualism plan which concern its operational or service functions;

(9) adopt and apply a policy whereby, at headquarters and in all Regions, there be a sufficient bilingual capacity at all major, face-to-face, public-contact positions to ensure that members of resident, general aviation, "industry" or travelling publics can be offered services in both official languages during all operating hours;

(10) formally approach the Department of Communications with a view to ensuring that all Ministry and Administration listings in telephone directories across the country be published in both official languages and that any federal government directories in use be also fully bilingual;

(11) ensure that, for all Administration offices across Canada, where a general inquiries number is listed in the public directory, (a) the office is identified at that number in both official languages, and (b) as necessary, the call is appropriately relayed to an employee with the professional and linguistic competence to respond effectively;

(12) where the Administration's offices do not publish in local directories a general inquiries number, take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that any in-coming call is channelled through personnel capable of identifying the office in both official languages and relaying requests for service to professionally and linguistically competent officers;

(13) wherever the Administration is in regular correspondence with members of the public, specifically canvass them as to their preferred official language and, for all other correspondence, adhere consistently to its declared policy of answering in the client's language or originating communications in the official language which seems most likely to suit the addressee;

(14) at headquarters and in all Regions, ensure that all units are provided with adequate bilingual transcription and/or revision services and material facilities (eg. bilingual typewriter keyboards, etc.) to ensure that the quality of French and English texts originated locally is in all respects equal;

(15) publish and distribute all outstanding unilingual public-use forms originating in MOT/CATA headquarters in appropriate bilingual format by 31 March 1975;

(16) immediately take an inventory of all forms originated in the Regions and ensure that all such forms in public use be issued in bilingual format by 31 March 1975;

(17) encourage members of the public making use of any national or regional form to indicate clearly the official language in which they would prefer subsequently to be served, either (a) by incorporating a language preference indicator in the design of each form or (b) by enclosing with each form an invitation to stipulate the official language of their choice;

(18) henceforth conduct all promotional, informational or educational efforts directed to the public in both official languages, to the extent of (a) providing equivalent literature simultaneously in French and English, (b) making any audio-visual material concerned equally available in both official languages and (c) where appropriate, making oral presentations and answering questions in French and English;

(19) ensure that all informational material in the form of pamphlets, brochures, posters, etc., which is displayed and distributed on MOT/CATA premises, and which is originated either in the Air Administration and other federal institutions, or by any other organization or person providing services to the public pursuant to a contract with the Ministry, be henceforth automatically available either in bilingual format or in equivalent French and English versions;

(20) take any steps which may be necessary to monitor the linguistic quality of such informational material in order to ensure that the information is equally well presented and free of error in both languages;

(21) take steps, whether directly, through the Department of Public Works or any other agency concerned, to render all MOT/CATA building identification signs, directory boards or office identification and directional signs fully and correctly bilingual by 31 March 1975;

(22) ensure that any other items such as calling cards, stamps, logos, letterheads, badges, decals, etc., which serve to identify MOT/CATA, its employees, vehicles, airplanes or other equipment be rendered fully and correctly bilingual by 31 March 1975;

(23) henceforth make all leases and contracts with MOT/CATA available in both official languages and specifically advise all bidding contractors of the availability of such documents;

(24) ensure that, where tenders are called through regular or trade journals, every effort is made to reach possible contractors of both official language groups equally no matter what Region(s) may be involved;

(25) henceforth ensure that all standard (i.e. repeatable) plans and specifications for tenders which are called nationally or across Regions where there are firms working in both official languages be automatically available in French and English and that those firms tendering are fully advised of their availability;

(26) in the case of less standard contracts, henceforth ensure that plans and specifications be available in either or both languages, according to the official language(s) used by the firms and/or their employees;

(27) whenever payment or receipt of accounts, purchase of material or equipment, tender calls, etc., cause the administrative or financial services of any headquarters or regional office to have dealings with individuals, clients or suppliers, such dealings be automatically conducted in the preferred official language of the public concerned;

(28) when headquarters or regional personnel offices are responsible for publishing competition notices directed to the public, or federal public servants of both official language groups, these automatically be distributed in both official languages (regardless of the linguistic requirements of the position) and, where public media are used, to any available daily, weekly or trade journal which may be published in the minority official language of that area;

LANGUAGE OF SERVICE—AIRPORTS AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

(29) henceforth adopt and apply a policy that, wherever there are public meetings, correspondence or legal communications related to the construction, expansion or modification of major (and especially international) airports, the Administration will put out all public documentation in both official languages and, where the attendance of a public meeting is likely to contain representatives of both official language groups, the Ministry or the Administration will be capable of making any presentation or answering any question in either language;

(30) in conjunction with any other appropriate federal institutions, complete the computerization of master specifications in both official languages by 31 March 1976;

(31) ensure that information booths at all international airports be staffed in such a way that services in both official languages are automatically, spontaneously and equally available on all shifts and during all operating hours;

(32) for all airport public address or other public information systems owned or operated by the Administration,

(a) ensure that all flight announcements are made in both official languages,

(b) when members of the public are being paged, by MOT/CATA or other agencies making use of these systems, make every effort to determine and use the required official language or, where this cannot be ascertained, to page in both official languages,

(c) to avoid contraventions of the Official Languages Act in this domain, expand and encourage the use of fully bilingual visual display systems for announcements and paging;

(33) ensure by 31 March 1975 that all permanent signs at airports controlled by the Ministry are fully and correctly bilingual and that any temporary signs which have been or may be put up on such premises are in both official languages;

(34) with respect to concessionaires and lessees of space or facilities on Ministry or Administration premises, by 31 March 1975 formulate a policy, devise and take all appropriate contractual and other steps and afford all necessary assistance whereby, at all international and national airports with scheduled services,

(a) on a first priority basis, all large corporate concessionaires or lessees (e.g. restaurants, news stands, car rentals, etc.) will henceforth offer all oral and written services in both official languages during all operating hours;

(b) all other smaller concessionaires (eg. one man or family businesses) will by 30 June 1975, and with the Ministry's financial and technical help, offer all written services in both official languages and also undertake, in the longer term and with whatever financial, language-training, manpower or other assistance from the Ministry may be necessary, to ensure oral services at all times at the earliest possible date;

(35) make the necessary approaches as soon as possible to all passenger airlines operating at airports controlled by the Ministry,

(a) to request them to begin to provide, on a phased basis, all written and oral ground services at those airports in both official languages (the Ministry furnishing to the Commissioner of Official Languages, at his request, reports on progress achieved);

(b) to notify them that, when present leases are renewed, such services will become a contractual obligation in all future leases;

(36) formally request, before 31 December 1974, any advertising agency under contract to the Ministry to take whatever steps are necessary to induce its clients to advertise equally in both official languages on airport premises controlled by the Ministry and provide the Commissioner, on request, with reports of progress achieved;

LANGUAGE OF SERVICE—CIVIL AVIATION

(37) immediately elaborate specific bilingualism policies in the areas of Telecommunications and Electronics (Radio Operators Service), Accident Investigation, Flight Operations, Airways and Air Regulatory services, detailing for each Region the extent of their application, consistent with the intent of the Official Languages Act that members of the public, however specialized, have access to equivalent federal services in the official language of their choice;

(38) with regard to Civil Aviation publications, ensure that

(a) the list of Civil Aviation publications be issued, in bilingual format, with clear indication, for each item, whether it is available in separate French and English versions, in bilingual format, or in one language only;

(b) progressively and in accordance with systematic priorities, all publications directed or available to the flying public be issued in both official languages and, wherever practicable, in bilingual format;

(c) future editions of all air regulatory documents such as Air Regulations, Air Navigation Orders and their amendments be issued automatically in bilingual format;

(d) all licence-type documents be available in bilingual format by 31 December 1974.

(39) provide that henceforth Accident Investigation branches, at headquarters and in the Regions, have at the investigatory and supervisory levels a bilingual capacity sufficient to ensure that witnesses' statements, whether written or oral, can be taken and recorded in either official language, at the client's choice;

(40) ensure that the Flight Operations Division offer all its visual and oral services in both official languages by 31 March, 1975;

(41) take all necessary steps, through its Aviation Security Branch, to ensure, on such a phased basis as will achieve the results by 31 December 1975, that any security agency dealing with the travelling public on MOT premises, whether directly under contract to the Administration or otherwise, be capable at all times of effecting such communications as it has with that public in both official languages;

(42) in consultation with the Department of Communications, clarify and reformulate the proficiency requirements for obtaining a Radio Operator's Certificate (Aeronautical) to make certain that they cannot be interpreted to exclude the use of French for radio communications;

(43) for Air Traffic Services,

(a) given the apparent *de facto* use of French in air-ground communications, immediately redefine its policy guidelines to authorize and regularize this practice at least for those towers or centres where it is a current and unofficially accepted procedure;

(b) complete its current canvas of pilots, operators, controllers, clubs, schools and associations, to determine actual and potential requirements for air-ground communications in either or both official languages in those Regions under scrutiny, and specify the extent of such services by 31 December 1974;

(c) conduct a similar survey of requirements in other Regions across the country by 31 December 1975 and specify the extent of air-ground communications to be available in both languages accordingly;

(d) ensure that all other air traffic services, such as the filing of flight plans or dispensing of meteorological or other information, be automatically and equally available in both official languages, whether provided in writing, by telecommunication or face-to-face, wherever the aviation public to be served is composed of both official language groups;

(44) ensure that, wherever Radio-Operator stations or Air Traffic Services provide meteorological or general information to resident or flying publics composed of both official language groups, they have the capability to offer all such services in both official languages;

LANGUAGE OF WORK—GENERAL

(45) clearly define the degree of its proposed compliance with the spirit and intent and Section 2 of the Official Languages Act as they affect languages of work, as well as compliance with any government or central agency objectives and guidelines touching that subject; determine in precise terms the extent of its present compliance in practice, and elaborate specific, time-structured and measurable programmes to make up the remaining deficiencies;

(46) elaborate and publish to all employees the operational guidelines within which they may legitimately expect to work in the official language of their choice, together with any measures the Administration is taking to enlarge or improve opportunities of this kind;

Availability of Resources

in order that, in the Administration as a whole, the deployment of employees who regularly use French as a working language, by Region, occupational group and operational component, (i) increasingly afford access to equivalent employment to both official language communities and (ii) promote a more exact relationship between the extent to which French is used in the Administration and the number of employees whose "First Official Language" is French;

(47) through the bilingualism coordinating structure, establish a study group, representing both operational and service areas, to explore systematically and report to that structure on

(a) available or potential French terminological resources in those professional and/or technical domains which concern the Air Administration;

(b) the extent and accessibility of French-language professional and/or technical training in relevant operational areas through educational programmes outside the Public Service, wherever they may be located;

(c) the actual or possible availability to the Air Administration of graduates or recruits from such French-language programmes as those considered in 47 (b);

(d) the actual or possible availability in the aviation industry at large of competent professional or technical staff experienced in or capable of working in French;

(e) the measures required to convert the initial or advanced technical programmes provided by the Air Services Training School to the extent necessary to afford recruits or employees of both official language groups equal access to equivalent training in the language of their choice;

(f) provision in all operational areas of competent and authorized technical revision of translated documents to ensure uniformity, accuracy and reliability of the published texts;

(48) coordinate the work of such a study group to the fullest possible extent with the resources of the Translation Bureau of the Department of the Secretary of State in order to promote maximum uniformity and reliability of all technical translation in the relevant aviation fields;

(49) on the basis of the kinds of analysis recommended in 47 and 48,

(a) thereafter step up recruitment of professionally qualified personnel capable of working in French, in all operational and service areas;

(b) further encourage, in every way possible, officially French-speaking employees and their bilingual English-speaking colleagues to extend the operational use of French in internal oral and written communications;

(c) ensure that, by 31 December 1975, the Air Services Training School is comprehensively equipped to provide all technical training in both official languages and to offer equivalent development opportunities to recruits and employees of both official language groups;

(d) progressively and in accordance with systematic priorities, provide all units at the Administration where employees are called upon or might prefer to work in French with the terminological reference material and other documents or facilities necessary to ensure uniform and reliable use of that language;

(50) devise detailed manpower plans whereby, to the maximum extent which is operationally feasible, employees and recruits of both official language groups enjoy unilingual access¹ and equivalent mobility and career opportunities without thereby sacrificing the prerogative to use their preferred official language for purposes of internal communication;

In-house Personnel Services in Headquarters and the Regions

(51) accurately and regularly determine the official linguistic preference of employees who wish to be considered for in-house or other non-technical, professional² training programmes;

(52) ensure that employees of both official language groups genuinely enjoy equal access (as to location, subject matter and incidence of courses) to non-technical training of equivalent quality in their preferred official language;

(53) make any representations to the Staff Development Branch of the Public Service Commission which may be necessary to fulfil 52 above;

1. "Unilingual access" may be taken to mean that, to the extent that there are no impossible overriding operational constraints, qualified applicants from both official language communities should have equal opportunities to join MOT/CATA without a prior knowledge of their second official language.

2. i.e. training not offered by or through the Air Services Training School or the Public Service Commission Language Bureau.

(54) make certain that, to the extent which this is not yet the case, all staffing procedures, staff relations or other personnel services henceforth fully respect the known or anticipated language preferences of employees (See also 4 (b));

(55) evaluate the impact of the second language training so far undertaken as to its functional effectiveness as a means of increasing the use of French as a working language, specify plans and administrative steps to be taken to augment such impact and devise the requisite procedures and controls to ensure that employees systematically exploit acquired skills for purposes of internal communication;

Work Instruments

(56) see to it that all current and future policy directives, informational and administrative documents for general internal distribution are put out in a fully bilingual format (or, where this is not feasible, simultaneously in both official languages);

(57) take inventory of all internally generated technical and procedural manuals, establish their actual linguistic status and lay down clear priorities and time-frames to ensure that all such manuals and their amendments are fully available, appropriately distributed and up-to-date in both official languages not later than 31 December 1976;

(58) likewise determine the current linguistic status of all internal-use forms and ensure that, within the same priority framework, all those which may be used by employees of both official language groups are available in bilingual format by 31 March 1975 in the case of national forms, and by 31 March 1976 in that of regional forms;

(59) systematically explore with Canadian or foreign manufacturers, as well as with the United States Federal Aviation Administration, the actual or potential availability, in French and in English, of all maintenance and operating manuals for aircraft or other equipment used or serviced by employees, formulate by not later than 30 June 1975 a comprehensive policy position as to the short- and long-term possibilities of providing such manuals in both official languages to relevant employees and take whatever action may be necessary to develop and/or distribute such work instruments with the least possible delay;

(60) move immediately to ensure that all relevant data-processing facilities have the capacity to handle incoming information and produce appropriate print-outs in both official languages;

(61) to the extent that recommendation 60 cannot be implemented in the short term, ensure that the necessary bilingual personnel capacity is available at computer input and output points to relieve French-speaking employees of all unwarranted translation tasks by 31 March 1975;

(62) ensure that the acquisition and access policies of the Ministry's Central Library begin immediately to reflect the bilingual requirements of the Administration's personnel and that the Central Library develop and implement the following objectives:

(a) to ensure that all appropriate French-language reference material commercially or otherwise available be acquired without delay;

(b) to obtain and exercise functional control as to the language balance of reference works acquired by satellite units;

(63) to the extent that this is not yet the case, provide all organizational components having any internal requirement to work in the French language with all indispensable office equipment, such as stamps, typewriters, etc., which have the necessary bilingual characteristics;

LANGUAGE OF WORK—SPECIFIC

(64) as soon as the full provision of appropriate training and procedural manuals reasonably permits, promote the use of both official languages for internal operational administrative communications in Air Traffic Services and Telecommunications;

(65) immediately ensure that all necessary procedural instruments, regulatory documents and amendments such as Class II NOTAMs, Air Regulations, manuals, etc., which are currently produced in both official languages are automatically and simultaneously distributed in French and English to all operational units, in the Quebec Region or elsewhere, which employ French-speaking personnel;

(66) immediately undertake or complete the translation and distribution of all internal instruments, such as the Planned Investigation Program guide, Engineering and Inspection Manual, Accident Report Form and Manual of Procedures, etc., required by French-speaking employees in the various branches of the Civil Aviation Directorate;

LANGUAGE OF WORK—ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES

(67) review the feasibility of establishing formal and informal organizational structures which can and do regularly and primarily work in French, at all hierarchical levels, at Ottawa headquarters and in the Atlantic, Quebec and Ontario Regions, and lay down a practical time-frame and procedural framework for the development and promotion of such units by 31 March 1975;

(68) take all necessary steps to ensure that, in specific operational and service areas, on a systematic basis, headquarters components in regular oral and written communication with any regional units working primarily in French have the capacity to conduct both operational and administrative exchanges in French without resort to translation;

(69) clarify for the benefit of existing units working primarily in French (in Air Traffic or other services) their current terms of reference for internal *operational* and internal *administrative* communications and clearly articulate for those units any long- and short-range plans to bring such communications into fuller compliance with the spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act by 31 January 1975;

(70) provide units having any requirements to work in French with all internal and support instruments in French and, on a priority basis, ensure that units working primarily in French are so equipped by 31 March 1975;

(71) apply the principles involved in all of the above recommendations, as well as those practices which are appropriate, to all Ministry administrations and agencies with public contacts and all internal working situations where employees of both official language groups are or may be involved;

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

(72) ensure that henceforth, irrespective of origin, all press releases and other information destined for publication through the available media be automatically and simultaneously distributed in both official languages throughout Canada by 30 December 1974;

(73) in view of the existence in all the Regions in which the Ministry operates of French-language communities and media, Public Affairs units in all Regions have the capacity to provide oral and written services in both official languages by 30 December 1975;

(74) ensure that henceforth all public documents or audio-visual material relating to "special events" such as exhibitions, displays, openings or presentations be entirely, automatically and simultaneously available in both official languages;

(75) make certain that all informational material on airport services, or any other information from federal institutions, to be displayed or distributed at the airports in question or elsewhere be automatically available in bilingual format;

(76) ensure that the "Transport Canada" magazine henceforth fully reflect the bilingual composition of MOT personnel by publishing all articles in both official languages under one cover;

(77) in line with recommendations 74, 75, and 76, engage as soon as practicable a sufficient number of French-speaking or adequately bilingual officers and copy-writers to ensure that an increasing amount of published material is *originated* in both official languages rather than translated from one, whether it be destined for the public or Ministry personnel;

(78) wherever possible, to avoid problems of stocking, supply, display or distribution, produce all published material in bilingual format;

(79) where Public Affairs is responsible for mailing information in separate official language versions to members of the public whose linguistic preferences are not known, it henceforth take the precaution of sending both English and French versions of the material concerned until the client's choice is reliably ascertained;

(80) be at pains to ensure that the quality of any text produced or functionally controlled by Public Affairs is consistent with the equal status of the two official languages required by the Act.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

(81) in implementing this report's recommendations,

(a) not jeopardize the job security and career opportunities of Ministry or Administration personnel;

(b) maintain close liaison and consultation with its employee's unions and associations;

(82) maintain close liaison and consultation with professional associations and other groups, representing its publics, with a view to encouraging their active support for the recommendations contained in this report.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1572—Transport Development Agency

A French-speaking federal public servant drew the Commissioner's attention to an advertisement for a position with the Transport Development Agency in Montreal. The poster specified that a knowledge of English was essential, but made no reference to a knowledge of French. The correspondent believed that a knowledge of French was just as essential as a knowledge of English in view of both the nature of the functions described in the poster and the location of the position.

The Ministry first replied that although the position was located in Montreal, the incumbent would be working most of his time outside the province of Quebec. Moreover the Ministry had been awaiting the Treasury Board guidelines on identification and designation of bilingual positions, after which it would be able to make a decision on the matter.

The Commissioner pointed out that the functions of the position as described in the poster included participation in a great diversity of studies and presentations dealing with government, university and business organizations which constituted a "public" of the Department, within the meaning of the Official Languages Act, that was entitled to be served in the official language of its choice. In addition, the incumbent would supervise personnel that included French-speaking staff who were entitled to work in their own language and to communicate with their superiors in their own language. For these reasons, the Commissioner recommended that:

- 1) the Department of Transport review the matter of language requirements for the position in question, bearing in mind Section 39 (4) of the Official Languages Act; and
- 2) a new competition poster and advertisement making knowledge of both official languages an essential requirement be issued annulling and replacing the advertisement published on 14 December 1972.

The Ministry agreed that the incumbent of the position required a knowledge of both the English and French languages, then presented a number of extenuating circumstances to justify why the position had been advertised as requiring only a knowledge of English. The Transportation Development Agency was a new organization which, because of its highly technical functions, its research orientation and its location,

the Ministry had had great difficulty in staffing. The competition, advertised nationally, had attracted 14 applicants of whom only two were sufficiently qualified to be interviewed and only one possessed the qualifications required. Consequently, the Ministry was anxious to confirm the appointment of the candidate selected, who would of course be placed on language training at the earliest possible date.

The Commissioner replied that if it were urgent for the incumbent to be on the job, as the Ministry had stated, it appeared that "the earliest possible date" at which he could take language training was likely to be delayed for some time, nullifying, for all practical purposes, the existence of a bilingual capability in the position. The Commissioner did not discount the difficulty of finding a qualified bilingual candidate, particularly since the Ministry claimed to have located the unique person qualified for the job. He offered his congratulations on this stroke of good fortune.

The Commissioner avowed that since he had been somewhat slow in replying to the Ministry's first reaction he was ill-placed to try to insist that his recommendations be adhered to. However, he recommended the Ministry to observe the letter, spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act in any future similar appointments by designating such positions as bilingual and by doing its utmost to staff the positions with personnel who were bilingual as well as otherwise qualified.

Some weeks later the Ministry advised the Commissioner that the candidate selected had accepted alternate employment, that the position had been designated as bilingual and that the Public Service Commission was seeking to fill it. The Ministry further enlarged upon the Transportation Development Agency's staffing difficulties and its efforts to achieve bilingual capability through language-training programs and recruitment of bilingual staff at all levels.

The Commissioner informed the Ministry that he appreciated the difficulties encountered in staffing the new organization with bilingual personnel and was pleased to note the Ministry's resolution to continue its efforts to ensure that the public obtain services from, and could communicate with, employees of the Agency in both official languages. He asked to be kept informed of developments.

Five months later the Ministry informed the Commissioner that it had located four persons who were sufficiently qualified to justify an interview and that it would let him know the results as soon as a decision had been made.

In due course the Ministry informed the Commissioner that the position had been filled by a person who had passed the Public Service Commission's language knowledge examination and had been declared bilingual.

A French-speaking traveller objected to the fact that buses used to provide limousine service at Ottawa Airport were identified only in English with the word "Airport". Since the owners of these vehicles were operating this service on behalf of the Ministry of Transport, the complainant asked the Commissioner to see if he could get the Ministry to have the French word "Aéroport" inscribed on the vehicles.

The Ministry explained that the limousine service was provided by the Blue Line Taxi Co. Ltd., a licenced operator and owner of the vehicles in question. The Ministry added that the company had been made aware of the complaint and would be making the necessary arrangements to have all buses serving Ottawa International Airport on a regular basis marked with bilingual signs.

The Commissioner was pleased with the action taken by the Ministry and was about to close the file when he received a telephone call from the President of the Blue Line Company. The case then proved to be a good illustration of some of the problems encountered by government contractors who have not been made aware of their duties with respect to the Official Languages Act.

The President of the Blue Line Company stated that his company had recently expanded its airport service at the request of the Ministry. Eight new buses had been ordered, four of which were already in service. He stated that having the bilingual lettering done on his vehicles would cost his company \$700.00 for each of the four buses already in service in view of the need to have them virtually repainted. To this he added the loss in "down-time" while the buses were taken out of service to have the repainting done. The President made it clear that, had his company been informed of the need for bilingual lettering before or at the time the buses were ordered, the whole procedure could have been carried out at relatively low expense.

Since he did not really understand why his company was suddenly obliged to have the lettering done, the President asked for explanations. The Commissioner pointed out that since the Blue Line Company was engaged in providing services to the travelling public on behalf of a federal department, it was obliged to provide these services in both official languages by virtue of Section 10 (1) of the Official Languages Act.

The President accepted this obligation but stated that he believed his company should have been informed long ago of its duties under the Official Languages Act by the Department of Transport.

The Commissioner agreed with him and recommended that the Ministry immediately undertake to inform all its concessionaires engaged in providing services to the travelling public on its behalf (in

all cases where this had not yet been done) of their duties with respect to Section 10 (1) of the Act.

Several months later the Ministry informed the Commissioner that upon promulgation of its Policy and Guidelines for concessions, a letter was sent to the regional offices requesting that the requirements be brought to the attention of the concessionaires. Upon learning this, the Commissioner closed the file.

File No. 2308—Pickering

A French-speaker complained that documentation now available on the proposed Pickering airport is only in English.

On the basis of statistical data in the 1971 census the Ministry replied that in the Metro Toronto region there were 165,115 French-speakers or bilingual persons, in a total population of 2,628,125, and that of this number only 20,580 ordinarily spoke French at home. It also noted that Toronto was not a federal bilingual district within the meaning of the Act.

The Ministry stated that to date it had received only one request for general documentation in French which it had been unable to satisfy. Further, the Ministry had been able to reply in the language of the correspondent to all other requests for information made in French and dealing with a particular aspect of the airport.

Finally, it assured the Commissioner that the group responsible for the Toronto airports project had at its disposal a number of brochures translated into French, and a French version of the other brochures would soon be published.

The Commissioner stated that in his opinion the statistical data from the census could be regarded as one of the criteria for determining the demand for bilingual services, but other factors should also be considered. Complaints in themselves were an indication of demand, and the offering of bilingual service on a trial basis often disclosed the existence of previously unsuspected demand. Finally, in the present case, the Ministry had acknowledged that a number of persons had requested information in French, which was clear evidence of such a demand.

Further, in the case of major projects such as the Pickering airport, demand should not be determined solely on the basis of the local population. In fact, requests for information might come from various parts of the country, as was indicated by the present complaint, which had been filed by a resident of the National Capital Region.

Accordingly, the Commissioner recommended that any documentation on the proposed Pickering airport likely to be made public be issued in both official languages, and that steps be taken immediately to translate existing documentation as soon as possible.

After discussions with the Commissioner's representatives the Ministry advised him that since very little documentation had been requested in French, since the publication of unilingual material had caused very little complaint, and since translation would involve considerable cost and a lengthy period of time, it had decided not to have translations made of certain material of a highly technical nature, prepared by specialist personnel solely for their own use. In addition, the Ministry would attempt to meet specific requests for technical documentation in French so far as possible. Finally, in the view of the Department this solution was in accordance with the Official Languages Act.

The Commissioner felt the Ministry's solution was a reasonable one; however, he advised the latter he would have to investigate any complaint arising out of this procedure and related either to language of work or the distribution of unilingual material to the general public.

File No. 2468—English in Large Letters

A French-speaker visiting Vancouver was surprised to see that the signs at the airport, although bilingual, had the English in large letters and the French in very much smaller letters. She wondered if this was because one of the official languages was more equal than the other.

The Ministry told the Commissioner that it was aware that the signs, although bilingual, did not conform to the standards it set out in its *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices*. It was, however, giving first priority to the conversion of unilingual signs and would start replacing non-standard bilingual signs after March 1974.

The Commissioner was unable to obtain a clear indication of when the replacement would be made at Vancouver. He therefore made the recommendation that all bilingual signs at the Vancouver International Airport should give equal prominence to the two official languages. He further recommended that signs which did not do this should be replaced by 1 June 1974.

The Ministry informed him that the work would be done by mid-June and later informed him that the signs that had given rise to the complaint had been changed.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1238	Ottawa	Poster advertising the availability of the <i>VFR Chart Supplement</i> is in English only. The publication is also available in English only.	Explanation offered
1281	Toronto	Unilingual-English receipts still in use at Toronto International Airport.	Rectified
1609	Dorval (Quebec)	French text of signs leading to airport are in larger type than the English text.	Explanation offered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1709	Timmins (Ontario)	Unilingual signs at Timmins Airport.	Explanation offered
1716	Ottawa	No French-language course in Records Management.	Rectified
1903	Earlton (Ontario)	Unilingual interior signs at Earlton Airport.	Rectified
1947	Ottawa	Unilingual signs at Ottawa Airport.	Rectified
1989	Toronto	Airport restaurant at Toronto International Airport uses unilingual-English receipts.	Rectified
1999	Toronto	Unilingual signs at Terminal 2 at Toronto International Airport.	Rectified
2026	Ottawa	A French-speaker receives a written communication in English.	Rectified
2028	Montreal	A French-speaker receives a student glider pilot permit in English only.	Rectified
2045	Regina (Saskatchewan)	Bilingual sign containing an error in spelling in the French text.	Rectified
2065	Montreal	Signs on Murray Hill buses unilingual English.	Rectified
2079	Toronto	Signs at new Terminal 2 at Toronto International Airport are unilingual.	Rectified
2140	Ottawa	A French-speaker is unable to leave a message for a passenger at Uplands Airport.	Explanation offered
2151	Fredericton (N.B.)	Lack of simultaneous translation at public inquiry.	Not justified
2252	Quyon (Quebec)	Unilingual-English signs on ferry.	Rectified
2253	Sept-Iles (Quebec)	A pilot is told to speak English by an air traffic controller when landing at Sept-Iles.	Explanation offered
2263	Toronto	French versions of 2 pamphlets unavailable at Toronto Airport.	Rectified
2279	Dorval (Quebec)	Unilingual-English rubber stamp used on a cheque by a restaurant at Airport.	Rectified
2335	Ottawa	Unilingual-English stamp on envelope.	Rectified
2368	Toronto	Unilingual signs at Toronto Airport.	Rectified
2485	Montreal	Unilingual-English stamp used on departmental envelopes.	Rectified
2517	Ottawa	Pilot license with unilingual-English text.	Rectified

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2628	Ancienne Lorette (Quebec)	Unilingual-English bill at a restaurant at Airport.	Rectified
2652	Montreal	Difficulties arising because of a transfer to a new job.	Withdrawn
2711	Montreal	English-speaker is offered a French-language menu at Montreal Airport.	Rectified
2731	Ottawa	List of central library accessions takes little or no account of books published in French.	Rectified
2868	Ottawa	Important positions in a section of the Department are all occupied by English-speakers.	Withdrawn
2955	Ottawa	English version of documents produced by pilotage authorities not available.	Not justified
2980	Ottawa	"Flight Information Manual (1974)" available in English only.	Rectified
2989	Ottawa	Press releases received in English only by the librarian of a French school.	Rectified
3066	Ottawa	Telephone service available in English only.	Rectified
3096	Ottawa	Alleged irregularities in the drafting of pilotage regulations.	Referral
3147	N.S. N.B.	Some safety instructions on Cape Tormentine/Borden and Woods Island/Pictou ferries are in English only.	Rectified

TREASURY BOARD—"The Great Pretender" (The Platters, of course)

EVALUATION

Where else can courtiers seduce one another by means of Memoranda to Cabinet? Whether or not consummation invariably occurs, 'tis the art that truly matters. A parade of administrative reorganizations, a roundabout of monographs, the dragooning of consultants—all this makes a brotherly bureaucratic observer just a little giddy with envy.

Not with envy but with admiration, however, one must note that this busy activity is far from vain. There are signs, indeed, that we are finally entering the Year of the Treasury Board Secretariat. Its Official Languages Branch has strengthened its leadership vis-à-vis departments

(for whose management of "bilingualism" it is responsible), clarified objectives and begun to think seriously about monitoring reform. Tangible results should begin to appear in the next 12 months in the form of policies (notably on language of work), programmes and definite procedures to implement more fully the Official Languages Act.

If one relies only on the veiled comments the Secretariat sent this Office in response to requests for following up our special study recommendations (made as a result of a complaint from the editor of the Montreal newspaper Le Devoir), it would appear that only 5 out of 19 have been implemented fully, and 3 partly. As for the other 11, we have heard nothing. We hope that next year, the Year of the Secretariat, will produce results more befitting its leadership role.

The above-mentioned special study was not intended to examine the status of the official languages within the agency itself, but rather to evaluate the Treasury Board Secretariat as a public service employer and administrator in the area of the official languages, and thus to appraise the effectiveness of the measures taken by the Secretariat to ensure that the Official Languages Act is respected by federal departments and agencies.

Among the activities the Secretariat informed us about are the reorganization and increased importance of the Official Languages Branch, the measures provided for in Circular 1973-88 to ensure respect for the Official Languages Act in carrying out the identification and designation of the language requirements of positions, and the efforts of the Administrative Policy Branch to comply with the Act in its directives. Finally, Treasury Board provided this Office with detailed statistics concerning the identification of the language requirements of positions.

Unfortunately, the Secretariat's zeal is tempered with excessive moderation and a tendency to procrastinate; and while it "studies" many problems with a certain perseverance, the goal is far from being reached, as can be seen from the proliferation of verbs in the future tense when it lists its "accomplishments". For it must be admitted that no concrete action has been taken in support of its intention to deal with the second part of the Resolution of Parliament of June 1973, although the Official Languages Branch states that a policy on the language of work will be announced shortly, and the Administrative Policy Branch will soon take important measures relating to the Federal Identity Programme. On the other hand, there is nothing to indicate that the Secretariat has monitored implementation of our recommendations to the federal departments and agencies, in spite of the fact that it regularly receives these recommendations through the Clerk of the Privy Council.

Our recommendations dealt with two other important subjects. First, four recommendations concerned the establishment of updated procedures for implementing the objectives set out in Circular 1971-21 of March 1971, the most complete statement of objectives issued to date by the Secretariat; these recommendations seem to have remained in limbo. Second, with regard to the identification of the language requirements of positions, we had recommended several measures that the Secretariat seems not to have taken into consideration. Finally, three recommendations concerning the language of work are still awaiting action.

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1870	Ottawa	Lack of language training for wives of lower-ranking public servants.	Explanation offered
2048	Ottawa	Government departments unable to receive TELEX communications in French.	Explanation offered
2274	Ottawa	Errors in the French text of the Treasury Board's guidelines on the Official Languages in the Public Service.	Explanation offered
2378	Ottawa	Inconsistencies in the English text of the Treasury Board's guidelines on the Official Languages in the Public Service.	Explanation offered
2460	Ottawa	Partly bilingual form bearing a unilingual English heading and completed in English only sent to a French-language association.	Rectified
2552	Ottawa	Parts of Treasury Board form 360-5 worded ambiguously.	Referral
2579	Ottawa	Some public servants taking language training are reimbursed for excursions during courses.	Referral
2594	Ottawa	Bilingual public servant using both languages in his work does not receive the 7% bonus.	Referral
2600	Ottawa	Alleged irregularities in a competition due to lack of information about the staffing of bilingual positions.	Referral
2956	Ottawa	Successful candidates for bilingual programme analyst positions are unilingual English-speakers.	Referral
3111	Ottawa	Poor quality French on French version of a circular on the distribution of pay cheques.	Rectified
3211	Ottawa	A letter in English was sent to a French-speaker.	Not justified

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—"Can You Give It All To Me?"

EVALUATION

The Commissioner and his colleagues look forward to the day when the absence of linguistic complaints will entice them to collect the many benefits the Unemployment Insurance Commission offers. However, this Office is obliged to report that it received 37 complaints over the past 21 months, to which UIC's reaction was satisfactory, though occasionally slow. The Commission offered explanations and corrective measures for all of them. In only one case did this Office find it necessary to make a recommendation.

The UIC reported in December 1974 that it had made substantial progress towards implementing all 15 recommendations of our special study completed in August 1973. Despite some problems in providing service equally and automatically in both official languages, it had taken short- and long-term measures to correct the situation and was continuing its efforts towards complete implementation.

The Commission reported that, from early in 1973, an Official Languages Branch with regional representatives in Moncton, Montreal, Belleville and Winnipeg had been coordinating, administering, evaluating and monitoring all official languages programmes. The Commission had kept its employees informed about these programmes by providing them with Treasury Board directives, UIC guidelines and information sessions at head, regional and district offices. In addition, an audio-visual information programme was being developed for employees.

With respect to its staffing programme, the Commission had carried out Treasury Board's instructions for identifying and designating the language requirements of positions. Within this context, it had viewed and revised its classification and staffing procedures as an initial basis for taking into account, within an operational context, certain requirements of the Official Languages Act. For example, at least two officer positions in each UIC district office were identified as bilingual as a step towards ensuring service to the public in both official languages throughout Canada. The UIC admitted, however, that automatic provision of services in English and French was still confined to areas such as Quebec, where traditionally the demand for them had been high. Elsewhere, the Commission was dependent on the eventual development of bilingual personnel through language training. Part of the Commission's current policy was to recruit bilingual casual or term employees to replace personnel on language courses.

On the question of providing bilingual services in person or by telephone, the Commission reported that it had taken measures to ensure

that bilingual personnel were appropriately deployed; to this end, a memorandum issued in November 1973 provided instructions to UIC employees on the proper bilingual identification and response to be used when answering the telephone.

With respect to correspondence, the Commission continued, as at the time of the study, to respond in the official language of the addressor, and to encourage its personnel to draft replies directly in the appropriate language.

Visually, the UIC appeared to project the image of a bilingual federal institution in the following aspects: the signs inside and outside UIC offices were reportedly bilingual; all Commission offices were to be listed bilingually in the new telephone directories; forms and publications were available in both official languages and when these were available only in separate English and French version, care was taken to distribute sufficient numbers of each version to all district offices. Furthermore, the Commission had used the English and French media to publicize its ability to provide bilingual services, and as of December 1973 and February 1974 respectively, included on its Application for Benefit and Record of Employment forms a request that the user indicate the official language of his choice. The Commission had found various solutions to the problem of translation in its regional offices. A translation unit had been established at Moncton, and telex had been introduced in Vancouver and Belleville. Vancouver already had access to telecopier service, and the UIC and Secretary of State's Department were studying the possibilities of a similar service or translation unit to cope with the high level of demand in Belleville.

The Commission reported that, in order to ensure that appeal procedures met the requirements of the Official Languages Act, it had identified 44 of 83 Boards of Referees as bilingual; in other words, each member of such bilingual boards had to be able to speak, understand, and read the official language of the appellant.

SPECIAL STUDY

The purpose of this study, which was completed in September 1973, was to determine the extent and availability of bilingual services offered to the public by the Unemployment Insurance Commission (UIC). The study concentrated on policy, personnel, telephone and reception services, correspondence, translation, public relations and Boards of Referees; it also dealt with certain stock-in-trade aspects of bilingualism such as forms, publications and signs. Interviews were held at the UIC head office in Ottawa, at regional offices in Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver, and at district offices in Halifax,

Hull, Toronto-South, Sudbury and Edmonton. The regional office in Moncton was excluded as it had been the subject of a study in 1972¹.

The study revealed that the Commission had taken commendable steps towards meeting the requirements of the Official Languages Act. It had begun issuing policy statements on bilingualism in 1968. Responsibility for planning and over-seeing the implementation of this policy and its related programmes had been delegated to the bilingualism adviser who is now in the newly created Bilingualism Development Office. Also, this adviser was recently given the responsibility for the evaluation of results. Since the inception of the Commission's bilingualism programme, considerable progress has been made in offering language training and in providing information services to the public as well as in formulating guidelines for translation, correspondence, forms, publications and signage.

The study also revealed, however, a certain number of omissions and inadequacies in the Commission's bilingualism programme. Several directives in force at the time of the study specified that the number of employees proficient in the minority language should be in proportion to the percentage of the population represented by the minority group. The replacement of this mathematical criterion by one based on the simple presence of an English- or French-speaking minority would have been better suited to the provision of prompt service of equal quality in both languages and, consequently, more in keeping with the intent and spirit of the Official Languages Act. This applies to offices serving transient clients as well as to Canada Manpower Centres. Study data also showed a need for improved and more centralized coordination and monitoring of the Commission's bilingualism policy and for a continuing staff information programme.

The study focused upon three subjects in particular : recruitment, deployment of employees, and language training. Some of the difficulties encountered by the Commission in its efforts to develop an adequate linguistic capability could be overcome, at least partly, by more actively recruiting bilingual permanent and casual personnel, and by redeploying bilingual staff among the different sectors of activity so as to achieve a better balance. Additional measures were required to eliminate anomalies which occurred now and then in the linguistic composition of Boards of Referees: at times one or more members of a Board were unable to assess, at first hand, an appellant's representations. Lack of information on the availability of courses, absence of clearly set priorities, and interruptions of lessons because of work pressures were weaknesses observed in the Commission's language training procedures. There was also a need for language retention programmes as well as

1. See *Third Annual Report*, pp. 484-85.

for a special programme designed for those French-speakers who wished to acquire anew language skills lost as a result of working for many years in English. These interrelated problems pointed to the need for a language training programme more consonant with specific duties and individual requirements.

Various aspects of the Commission's oral and written communications with the public were also examined. The Commission's policy on correspondence was found to be in keeping with the requirements of the Act. However, occasional mistakes about a client's preferred language might have been avoided, had the client been asked initially to indicate a preference on Application for Benefit forms.

Inaccuracies sometimes resulted from the practice of having bilingual employees, who were not professional translators, translate correspondence for the benefit of unilingual colleagues in order that an answer be sent within twenty-four hours. With regard to telephone calls, the study revealed that unilingual employees were not always able to identify the office in both official languages or to refer calls to employees able to provide the information desired in the official language used by the caller.

The public relations staff had made laudable efforts to keep both linguistic communities informed. Nonetheless, the Commission could have made more judicious and more extensive use of French- and English-language communications media and could have taken steps to ensure that all informational material prepared by district and regional offices was always available in both official languages preferably in the same document. Finally, the study showed that some internal and external signs and inscriptions at UIC offices across the country were still unilingual.

To correct these deficiencies, the Commissioner made the following recommendations :

(1) (a) replace the criteria based on the proportion of the minority population and on the proposed bilingual districts now used to identify which of its offices should offer services to the public in both official languages by a criterion based simply on the presence of a French- or English-speaking minority in order to more clearly reflect actual and potential demand;

(b) in order to determine personnel needs in the offices identified by using the criterion described in (a), replace its criterion of a percentage of bilingual personnel equal to the percentage of the minority population by a criterion which:

(1) takes into account the necessity of ensuring for its clients prompt service of equal quality in the language of their choice, during all business hours;

(2) takes into consideration the special need of offices which, because of their geographic location, receive applications from and initially serve transient customers whose files are later forwarded to the offices normally responsible for serving them;

(c) take account of the criteria described in 1(a) and 1(b)(1) in establishing needs for bilingual personnel to provide the public with information in Canada Manpower Centres;

(d) take the necessary steps to meet as soon as possible and permanently, the needs established, through use of the preceding criteria, and base itself on the concept of optimal distribution of its unilingual and bilingual strength among the various sectors of its activity that involve contacts with the public;

(e) adopt all such temporary measures as would best ensure compliance with the requirements of the Official Languages Act in the short term and, until the capability has been developed among its permanent employees of ensuring bilingual service to the public, consider using supernumerary bilingual back-up personnel to ensure that service;

(2) make use, where necessary, of all appropriate means so that, regardless of the official language used by the appellant, all persons sitting on Boards of Referees shall have the same opportunity to evaluate the representations made to them;

(3) in order to better project the image of a bilingual institution and to make maximum use of its bilingual personnel, proffer its services to the public in both official languages automatically rather than in response to requests for service in the minority language, wherever its capability of providing service in both languages is reasonably adequate, and elsewhere as soon as that capability is developed;

(4) in order to avoid misinterpretation and to introduce a certain uniformity into the carrying out of its bilingualism policies, consider instituting a continuing information program aimed at making and keeping employees at all levels and from one end of the country to the other aware of all aspects of the Commission's program for implementing the Official Languages Act. The program might include an explanation of how to assess existing and potential demand, the distinction to be drawn between service made available upon request and service offered automatically in one or the other official language, and other essential matters;

(5) use its public relations program or any other means it deems suitable to let the public know that it is in a position to provide its services in the two official languages wherever the capability to do so has been developed;

(6) devise and implement a language-training program embodying inter alia the following characteristics:

(a) access would open as a matter of priority to employees who occupy or likely will occupy public-contact positions where it is necessary to use both official languages;

(b) it would extend to the employees concerned conditions conducive to the acquiring of the desired linguistic skills, especially by providing for the administrative measures required so that the training of these employees is not unduly interrupted;

(c) it would include arrangements for maintaining the language skills acquired, and finally

(d) it would enable employees in contact with the public to increase their skills in their own official language, if they and the Commission saw that advantage could be gained by doing so;

(7) remain committed, as in the past, to corresponding with its clients in the official language of their choice, continue to encourage its employees to originate correspondence in the official language used by its various clients, and enable those employees to improve the linguistic quality of their texts;

(8) reach an agreement with the Translation Bureau in the Department of the Secretary of State on the additional steps to be taken, where the procedures in effect for translating correspondence fall short of present and future needs, for ensuring the equal quality of texts in both official languages while avoiding disparity between the one and the other official language in the time taken to answer;

(9) devise a means by which its clients may indicate explicitly, for example on the initial application for benefit form they fill out, the language in which they wish to be served, in this way ensuring their freedom of choice, facilitating the adherence to that choice in later contacts, and additionally perceiving the volume of demand for services in each of the official languages;

(10) in order to convey to its clients its willingness and ability to serve them in the language of their choice, make arrangements to answer in both official languages telephone calls to offices serving the two linguistic communities, if those offices are equipped with a telephone switchboard. For offices not so equipped, consider inserting in telephone directories and other appropriate informational material one or more numbers that the public can dial to contact employees fluently speaking the official language of the minority;

(11) (a) take steps to ensure that English- and French-speaking communities across the country are kept equally informed in their respective official language;

(b) to that end, make sure in particular that regional and district offices make judicious use of both French-language and English-language communication media for disseminating information and for advertising and publicity purposes;

(c) and ensure that all informational material prepared by those offices and directed to a public consisting of English- and French-speaking members is always in both official languages in the same document;

(12) (a) see that all publications containing both language versions under one cover and displayed in its offices are so arranged that both official languages are equally in view;

(b) in the case of publications in separate French and English editions, make sure that both official-language versions are available and displayed simultaneously;

(13) take steps immediately to render bilingual as soon as possible:

(a) unilingual outside signs and inscriptions at all Commission offices;

(b) all unilingual listings identifying the Commission in telephone directories across the country;

(c) unilingual signs and inscriptions located inside buildings and visible to the public, as well as unilingual entries on directory boards in all Commission offices serving the two linguistic communities, regardless of the office's level;

(14) make arrangements so that all aspects of its program for meeting the requirements of the Official Languages Act are co-ordinated at some central point and institute a system of control, also centralised, comprising elements integrated into the various levels of its administration to ensure that the Commission as a whole complies with the requirements of the Official Languages Act;

(15) make sure that implementation of these recommendations does not, in any way, jeopardize the job security or the career opportunities of the Commission's employees and in carrying the foregoing recommendations into effect, the Commission, as the occasion arises, maintain liaison with the unions to which its employees belong.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 2328—Poor Translation

A French-speaking person reported that a group of regulatory clerical staff at the Montreal office of the Unemployment Insurance Commission had taken a test dealing with unemployment insurance matters, and the quality of the French on this test was below standard. Some questions were even unintelligible, and conflicts of meaning were found between the French and English wording of some questions.

The Unemployment Insurance Commission advised the Commissioner that the sole purpose of the test in question was to determine the training needs of employees, and it was originally to have been officially translated into French. However, the personnel assigned by the Quebec region to participate in preparation of this test found that the translated version contained terms which would be unfamiliar to French-speaking employees, and decided to prepare another test.

The errors referred to in the complaint were brought to the attention of Commission personnel immediately after the employees had taken the test. The Commission at once recognized that the wording in French of certain questions could be misleading. With the agreement of the employees' representatives, steps were taken to ensure that the results of this test would not be prejudicial to the employees concerned. Accordingly, highest marks were accorded on each of the disputed questions. In addition, no employee was excluded from the staffing process for having obtained low marks.

Employees who had obtained relatively low marks were simply offered a longer period of training than those who placed higher. As a result, the ambiguity of certain questions on the test could not have had any effect but to prolong the employee's technical training period.

The Commissioner agreed that in the present case the test in question had not had any prejudicial effect on the employees' careers. However, the equal status of the two official languages required that

employees who elected to sit for a test in French should not be at a disadvantage as compared with those who preferred to sit for it in English. Consequently, the Commissioner recommended that any test that had been or would be translated into French be carefully checked from a linguistic point of view to ensure that the language used was both in accordance with correct usage and intelligible to employees.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1710, 1845	Ottawa	Precedence given to English in identifying the Commission in French-language newspaper advertisements.	Explanation offered
1776	Ottawa	Difference in meaning between English and French versions of a form.	Rectified
1818	Edmonton	A francophone experiences delays in obtaining premiums because forms are completed in French.	Rectified
1822, 1906	Sudbury	Correspondence from the Sudbury office addressed to two French-speakers is in English only.	Explanation offered
1838	Vancouver	Difficulty in obtaining services in French in Vancouver and Burnaby.	Explanation offered
1855	St. Catharines (Ontario)	Correspondence in English sent to a French-language association.	Explanation offered
1878	Ottawa	A French-speaker received an Income Tax form printed in English.	Rectified
1909	Halifax	Loss of benefits allegedly because certain forms were completed in French.	Rectified
1965, 2155, 2248, 2315	Toronto	Services available to French-speakers in English only.	Rectified
1985	Ottawa	An English-speaking public servant wishes to obtain more French language training.	Assistance rendered
2478	Rivière du Loup (Quebec)	An English-speaker alleges that her benefits were cancelled because she could not speak French.	Explanation offered
2503	Frobisher Bay (N.W.T.)	Competition posters for positions in French only.	Explanation offered
2524	Ottawa	Delay because a form is completed in French.	Rectified
2563	Ottawa	Unilingual French-speaking telephone receptionist.	Rectified
2618	Moncton	Letter in English to a Francophone.	Explanation offered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2758	Halifax	A French-speaker alleged that her benefits were cancelled because she could not speak English.	Explanation offered
2808	North Bay (Ontario)	Advertisement in English only in town's only newspaper.	Rectified
2960	Yarmouth (N.S.)	Services available in English only.	Explanation offered
2995	Welland	Difficulty in obtaining services in French.	Explanation offered
3017	Winnipeg	An English-speaking public servant has difficulty in obtaining French language training.	Explanation offered
3058	Montreal	Unilingual English cancellation stamp.	Rectified
3153	Calgary	A bilingual employee is obliged to do translation	Referral
3162	Regina	Ethnic discrimination is alleged.	Referral
3202	Vancouver	Telephone service not available in French.	Explanation offered
3208	Vancouver	A French-speaker received a notice in English.	Rectified
3240	Vancouver	Poor quality of French of two letters.	Rectified

D. Chart-Bound, If Not Always Duty-Bound

This section lays out data about departments and agencies for which not enough facts are available this year to offer a balanced assessment of linguistic performance. New Special Studies and complaints may give them a chance to shine next year.

ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA LTD.

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2059	Ottawa	Unilingual English historical plaque.	Referral
2418	Earlton (Ontario)	Unilingual English place-mat.	Rectified

BANK OF CANADA

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2377	Ottawa	Poor quality of French used in a folder advertising Savings Bonds.	Withdrawn
2433	Ottawa	Incomplete listings in French in Ottawa-Hull telephone directory.	Rectified

CANADIAN CONSUMER COUNCIL

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2495	Ottawa	Unilingual English telephone operator.	Rectified

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

COMPLAINTS

File No. 2104—In the Latin America Division

A French-speaking resident of Ottawa wondered why the position of Chief Planning Officer in the Latin America Division, a French-language unit, was occupied by a unilingual English-speaking person.

The Agency informed the Commissioner that the Latin America Division had just been declared a "French-language unit" and that positions in this Division had previously been occupied mainly by English-speaking people. This change therefore involved a progressive introduction of the use of French. The Division was already asking that candidates possess a knowledge of French as well as Spanish or Portuguese, as required, in order to be considered for a position. In addition, intensive French-language courses were being offered to the English-speaking staff, all memoranda for internal use were being drafted in French and all French texts for external distribution were being revised beforehand.

In addition, the Agency stated that it was implementing procedures for the identification and designation of bilingual positions. The position of Chief Planning Officer in the Latin America Division had just been designated as bilingual, within the meaning of the Treasury Board

directives. The Agency stressed that the Chief Planning Officer was not yet strictly required to be bilingual but it assured the Commissioner that before the deadline set out in the directives on the designation of bilingual positions, the incumbent would meet the necessary language requirements.

In view of the impossibility for a French-language unit to function satisfactorily if its members are unable to communicate with their superiors in French, the Commissioner recommended that:

- 1) the position of Chief Planning Officer be designated as bilingual as soon as possible;
- 2) the incumbent of the position be sent on language training without delay;
- 3) the person assigned as a replacement be able to meet the language requirements of the position.

The Agency announced in December 1973 that the position identified as bilingual would be so designated on 31 March 1975, that the incumbent would begin his language training course shortly and that his replacement would have to meet the language requirements of the position.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1908	Ottawa	Lack of bilingual employees in the Non-Governmental Organizations Division.	Explanation offered
2029	Ottawa	English-language job description given to a French-speaker.	Explanation offered
2133	Ottawa	Unilingual receptionist.	Rectified
3005	Montreal	Priority given to English in the identification of CIDA in an advertisement appearing in <i>La Presse</i> .	Explanation offered
3135	Ottawa	An English-speaker believed that the French course she took did not enable her to write French.	Assistance rendered

CANADIAN OVERSEAS TELECOMMUNICATIONS AGENCY

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2318	Montreal	Availability of language training during working hours.	Referral

CANADIAN PENSION COMMISSION

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1976	Ottawa	English-speaking veteran alleges French-speaking public servants show bias in rejecting his appeals.	Withdrawn
3227	Ottawa	Telephone service available in English only: Medical Advisory Branch	Explanation offered

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION COMMISSION

COMPLAINTS

File No. 2644—New Criteria

A French-speaking resident of Ottawa sent the Commissioner a copy of a letter he had addressed to the Chairman of the Canadian Radio-Television Commission after the latter had announced its new standards requiring 75% of the music played on Quebec radio stations from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. on weekdays to be in French and French-language musical compositions to account for 65% of the overall musical programming. In his letter the complainant reminded the CRTC that the Canadian government had accepted several recommendations by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, including Recommendation 14, which states that the CRTC should, in granting future licences and renewing licences presently held, give priority to the principle of linguistic equality in the national capital area. The complainant wondered, therefore, whether linguistic equality actually existed as far as broadcasting stations in the Ottawa-Hull region were concerned or whether this principle of equality meant a growing number of private English-language stations, and increased bilingual programming in the case of French stations. Dissatisfied with this state of affairs, he asked the CRTC's new criteria be amended so that the "bilingual" radio broadcasting stations in this area, namely CKCH (Hull) and CJRC (Ottawa), would become exclusively French-language stations.

The CRTC sent the Commissioner a copy of its reply to the complainant. According to the CRTC, French-speaking residents in the national capital area were served by three CBC radio broadcasting stations and one CBC television channel. Those with cable subscriptions could also receive Télé-Métropole, and in September 1974 the area would be provided with a second French-language channel by a local

television station, CFVO. In addition, the Ontario Educational Communications authority had pledged to offer the French-speaking population programs suited to its needs, in so far as possible, when the educational television channel began broadcasting in Ottawa. In short, the CRTC felt that there was equality in the provision of broadcasting services in the Ottawa-Hull area.

With regard to the standards, the CRTC had chosen to announce first the criteria on which it would base its evaluation of the musical programming of French-language broadcasters, instead of enacting regulations on the matter. This step had made it possible to establish a certain number of objectives with which the broadcasters apparently agreed. The Commission expected to reveal in due course the results of its consultations and the objectives set for the broadcasters.

The Commissioner felt that the CRTC's reply explained the situation fully. Nevertheless, he asked the Commission to inform him of the results of its consultations with French-language broadcasters in Ottawa-Hull.

The Commission subsequently informed the Commissioner that the programming policies of CKCH and CJRC would be amended so as to comply, by the summer of 1975, with the same criteria as those that applied to all French-language radio stations. The two stations would gradually decrease the proportion of vocal music in the English language in their musical programming so that by the summer of 1975 75% of the vocal compositions broadcast during prime time, that is, from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday to Friday, would be in French. Furthermore, French-language vocal compositions would account for at least 65% of their overall popular music programming.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1893	Ottawa	No French-speaking or bilingual information officer.	Explanation offered
2407	Edmonton	The CRTC did not announce a public hearing in the weekly <i>Le Franco-Albertain</i> .	Rectified
2459	Ottawa	Unilingual English stamp.	Rectified

CANADIAN TRANSPORT COMMISSION

SPECIAL STUDY

This special study of the Canadian Transport Commission dealt with both the language of service and certain aspects of the language of work. Between 19 December 1973 and 3 May 1974, representatives of

the Commissioner made 27 visits, mostly to the agency's head office, but also to the regional offices in Ottawa, Montreal and Moncton. The purpose was to examine how the Commission, in seeing to the orderly and efficient operation of telecommunications and the various modes of transportation in Canada, was respecting the requirements of the Official Languages Act.

In the autumn of 1969, soon after the proclamation of the Official Languages Act, the Commission took steps to provide the public with bilingual services. The language used in correspondence is accordingly that of the addressee. Official documents issued by the Commission, such as ordinances, decisions, judgments, regulations, notices and permits, are disseminated in both languages. In addition, both languages are generally used for letterheads, calling cards, telephone listings and signs. Finally, the annual report and documents emanating from the various committees operating within the Commission are also produced in both official languages.

There are shortcomings, however. Almost all the reports of studies are prepared in English, and only about one-seventh of them have been translated into French. With regard to oral communication, Commission personnel do not automatically offer their services in both languages on the telephone; for their part, secretary-receptionists are not always able to reply to the public in French. Finally, simultaneous interpretation is not always available in public hearings held by the committees.

The Commission had not informed its employees that they could work in the language of their choice. In any case, the exercise of this option at the present time would have mostly negative consequences. There are a number of reasons for this. First, most of the working instruments are available in English only, a situation due in part to the fact that some documents come from the private sector (the United States in particular). Second, English is the dominant language of both oral and written communication throughout the Commission; this holds true for communication within the same service, between services, between services and management or between individual employees. This preponderance of English, which is difficult to reconcile with the equal status given to the two languages by the Act, may be explained by a combination of circumstances. First, it should be noted that senior management and the managerial staff in general are largely composed of unilingual English-speakers. Two of the fourteen English-speaking Commissioners are bilingual; the two French-speaking Commissioners are bilingual. Moreover, there is little or no French-speaking or bilingual employee representation in the "Scientific and Professional" and "Technical" job categories. The bilinguals, who incidentally are rather numerous, are mainly employees whose mother

tongue is French, and they are concentrated in other categories. It is true the Commission has set up a program to remedy the absence of documentation in French and taken steps to encourage the training of specialized French-speaking or bilingual personnel in various disciplines, but the results will not be evident immediately. Finally, even the language training of qualified unilingual employees does not meet the Commission's needs.

In consideration of the measures adopted by the Commission to conform to the Official Languages Act, its accomplishments to date and the findings noted in the study, the Commissioner recommended:

- (1) that the Commission develop, by 1 April 1975, a general policy designed to achieve full compliance with the letter, spirit and intent of the *Official Languages Act*;
- (2) that this policy go beyond the measures spelled out in general rule 293, and that it take fully into account all the requirements of the *Official Languages Act* with respect to the equal status of French and English both as languages of service and as languages of internal communications;
- (3) that the Commission appoint a permanent bilingualism co-ordinator to formulate its policy, to carry it out and to monitor the results; that this person also be responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the recommendations contained in this report;
- (4) that this person be appointed at a level which will enable him or her to ensure the implementation of the Commission's programmes and of the Commissioner's recommendations throughout the Commission, and to establish a system of feed-back and corrective action;
- (5) that the Commission immediately devise and carry out an information programme designed to make its employees aware of the rights and obligations that follow from the implementation of the *Official Languages Act*, and of the administrative measures being taken by the Commission to comply with that Act;
- (6) that the Commission immediately make its public (at the federal, provincial and municipal levels and in the private sector) aware of its capability to communicate with it in both official languages;
- (7) that, notwithstanding how positions have been identified and designated, the Commission ensure that the requirements of the *Official Languages Act* are fully met, and that the linguistic skills of incumbents of positions, particularly at the supervisory level, correspond to the real requirements of the jobs and to the needs of the public and of the staff of the Commission.

THE USE OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH AS LANGUAGES OF SERVICE

- (8) that in order to project the image of a bilingual federal institution, and to respond in all circumstances to the demand for bilingual service, the Commission immediately ensure that all communications (oral and written) addressed to the public can in fact be transmitted in both official languages;

- (9) that the Commission immediately issue directives to ensure that:
- a) the Commission is identified in both languages on the telephone;
 - b) there is always someone available to reply in the language of the caller;
 - c) the persons answering the telephone, if they do not speak the caller's language, master at least a few set phrases in that language to indicate that another employee, capable of providing service in the appropriate language, will take the call;
- (10) that the Commission ensure that, by 1 April 1975:
- a) all forms, such as applications for licences and for the filing of rates and tariffs, and requests for subsidies available to the public be in both official languages, preferably in a single document;
 - b) in all its offices, and particularly in the Ottawa district office, calling cards and other items of identification (rubber stamps, signs, etc.) be in both languages;
 - c) all publications, which are not legal instruments, made available to the public, either directly by the Commission or on its behalf by Information Canada, be issued simultaneously in both official languages;
 - d) as far as items a, b and c of this recommendation are concerned, the equality of quality and prominence of both official languages is respected;
- (11) that the Commission ensure that henceforth, on all notices of hearings, the public, interveners and parties to the proceedings be made aware that:
- a) all documentation and exhibits may be submitted in either French or English;
 - b) all evidence (oral and written) may be presented in either French or English;
 - c) all witnesses may testify in either French or English;
 - d) all interventions may be made in either French or English;
 - e) all proceedings may be conducted in either French or English;
- (12) that the Commission provide two-way (English-French, French-English) simultaneous translation for the entire proceedings of all hearings throughout the country, so as to
- a) avoid trying to predict or determine the possible linguistic composition of the public attending hearings;
 - b) respond to all possible demand for such services from the public, the interveners and the parties to the proceedings, thus avoiding the possibility of receiving complaints;
 - c) accord equal status to both official languages;
- (13) that in order to ensure that the quality of translations of research reports into either official language is equal to that of the original, and that such translations are done within a reasonable period of time, the Commission immediately seek, in conjunction with the Translation Bureau of the Secretary of State Department, effective solutions to its problems in this regard;

THE USE OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH AS LANGUAGES OF INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS

- (14) that, as soon as its policy on bilingualism (as mentioned in recommendations 1 and 2) is formulated, the Commission issue directives regarding all communications (written and oral) at headquarters, at district

offices, between district offices, and between district offices and headquarters, to ensure that, in general, either official language can be used by the originator of any internal communication;

(15) that the Commission immediately take all necessary steps to encourage the use of French in communications (written and oral) in both directions between the Montreal district office and headquarters in Ottawa, and that it adopt the same policy in its dealings at least with the Quebec provincial departments and with French-language private concerns;

(16) that the Commission immediately adopt all necessary measures to ensure that communications of a general nature to its personnel are in future distributed simultaneously in both official languages, preferably in a single document;

(17) that the Commission's Newsletter, since it is intended for Commission personnel as a whole, be issued in future in bilingual format;

(18) that the Commission expand its programme with French-language institutions, with a view to recruiting qualified French-speaking personnel on such a scale as will enable the Commission to ensure the equal status of French and English as languages of internal communications;

(19) that henceforth the Commission make use of all resources available (universities, information centres, provincial and federal government departments, international agencies and the private sector) so as to provide its staff with such working materials in French as will afford it equal opportunity to function in either official language;

(20) that before 1 June 1975, the Commission

a) evaluate the effectiveness of second-language training courses in terms of their impact upon the quality and use of French and English as languages of internal communication, and

b) in light of the results of this evaluation, initiate if need be, and possibly in collaboration with the Ministry of Transport, the Department of Communications, or any other federal department or agency, a specialized second-language training course adapted to the particular technical and professional requirements of the Commission and designed mainly to improve oral and written comprehension of the second language;

(21) that the Commission establish French-language cells, especially in the field of research, so as to provide employees with an equal opportunity to work on research projects and to write research reports in the language of their choice;

(22) that implementation of the recommendations contained in this report be conceived and carried out without jeopardizing in any way the job security or career opportunities of the Commission's personnel;

(23) that the Commission, in carrying out the preceding recommendations, maintain close liaison with the unions and/or associations representing its employees.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1824—Railway Crossings

A French-speaker took exception to the fact that the French text on signboards at railway crossings read "TRAVERSE DE CHEMIN

DE FER”, which he considered to be incorrect French. He also complained that texts on such signboards were in both French and English in the province of Quebec only.

The Canadian Transport Commission (CTC) gave the Commissioner a history of the Regulations governing signs at railway crossings as well as a brief review of how the actual sections of the French versions of the Railway Act had evolved from 1888 to the present, to show that the expression “TRAVERSE DE CHEMIN DE FER” originated in an Act of the Parliament of Canada, which had doubtless led the Commission and its predecessors to select this expression as the appropriate one to have painted on railway crossing signs. However, the expression “PASSAGE À NIVEAU” did appear in the current Railway Act and was put forward as the correct equivalent of the expression “RAILWAY CROSSING”.

The CTC wondered if, considering the familiarity and long-standing use of the expression “TRAVERSE DE CHEMIN DE FER”, there was much to be gained by substituting the expression “PASSAGE À NIVEAU”. In raising this important question, the CTC was mindful of its serious responsibility for railway safety.

The CTC had noted a trend to convert word signs to pictographs. It was unable to give any timetable for the conversion of railway crossing signs from words to symbols but this possibility was being actively considered, and, provided the Commission could be persuaded that the use of such symbols would not compromise safety, it would encourage the conversion to symbols and would also, in appropriate circumstances, contribute to the cost of such conversion.

With reference to the second part of the complaint—bilingual signboards in the province of Quebec only—the Commission doubted that it had the jurisdiction to order the railway companies to install and pay for bilingual signs in provinces other than Quebec. A careful examination of subsection 2 of Section 207 of the Railway Act revealed that, while the obligation was absolute, its application was territorially limited to a named province. At the moment, General Order E-4 obliged railways under the CTC’s jurisdiction to comply with the last-mentioned subsection of the Railway Act with reference to erection of crossing signs in Quebec; the Commission was satisfied that the railways had met their obligations in that regard.

To support the use of the expression “PASSAGE À NIVEAU”, the Commissioner quoted a certain number of lexicographers and added that no dictionary gave the word “TRAVERSE” the meaning that had been commonly given to it until then.

In any case, in order to comply with Section 2 of the Official Languages Act with regard to the equality of status and equal rights and privileges of both official languages, the Canadian Transport Commis-

sion bore the responsibility of finding a way of indicating a correct French equivalent of the English phrase "RAILWAY CROSSING" if words continued to be used. The Commissioner did not consider "TRAVERSE DE CHEMIN DE FER" proper French usage.

As for the second aspect of the complaint—that of the bilingual signboards of railway crossings existing in the province of Quebec only—the Commissioner was of the opinion that in accordance with Section 10(1) of the Official Languages Act, all signboards bearing railway inscriptions throughout Canada should be bilingual wherever a road crossed a railway used by the CN. He therefore recommended that all necessary steps be taken in this regard.

The CTC informed the Commissioner that it was seriously considering using symbols or pictograms and eliminating the use of words. This could only be achieved, however, after consultation with, and the agreement of, the highway authorities of each province. The Commissioner, in spite of his enthusiasm about proper French usage, trusted that any such changes will continue to give full attention to the overriding factor of safety.

As a result of further discussions between the Commissioner and the CTC the Commissioner revised his earlier opinions and recommended that, in accordance with Section 31(1) and (2) of the Official Languages Act, measures be taken to amend Section 207 of the Railway Act to permit the installation of bilingual signs or symbols (pictograms) at all railway crossings in Canada, and that pursuant to such an amendment the Canadian Transport Commission work out a programme for the installation of such signs of symbols (pictograms).

In reply the CTC stated the matter would now receive the attention of the Railway Transport Committee in the light of the Commissioner's recommendation under Section 31(1) and (2) of the Official Languages Act. The proposal was that after the necessary authority had been obtained by means of an amendment of Section 207 of the Railway Act, the signs now in use be replaced by pictograms.

File No. 2267—Language Requirements

A French-speaking person drew the Commissioner's attention to the fact that the language requirements in the notice of Competition No. 73-CTC-CC-19 for a position as assistant secretary in the office of the Secretary of the Commission should include a knowledge of French. The duties of the position are essentially to maintain relations between the public and the Commission.

The Commission admitted that the Secretary's office dealt with the public. It added that the Secretary had taken language training and was bilingual. The position of assistant secretary would later be identified as

bilingual. On the other hand, two bilingual candidates had applied in this competition, although the position was not bilingual, and the Commission felt that designating the position as bilingual would not have made any difference in the number of entries or the type of candidate applying.

The Commissioner indicated to the Commission that the position should have been identified as bilingual before the notice of competition was published, since it was known at that time that the duties would include service to the public. In view of Treasury Board's responsibilities in this area, the Commissioner had referred copies of the correspondence exchanged with the Commission to the Board.

The Commission decided to cancel the competition. The position, identified as bilingual, would be filled by means of another competition.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
3244	Ottawa	Unilingual English stamp.	Rectified

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1304—"The Seed Among Thorns"

A French-speaking person from Alberta complained that the Canadian Wheat Board had sent him two unilingual English booklets—*A Report to producers on the 1971-72 Crop Year, challenge and change* and *Grain Handling and Transportation, Studies in Progress*.

The Canadian Wheat Board informed the Commissioner that it had published only the first booklet and that the other was a publication authorized by the Government of Canada. Moreover, these two publications were intended for 180,000 to 190,000 farmers in Western Canada, only a few thousand of whom lived in districts that were to be designated as bilingual. The Wheat Board therefore saw no need to publish booklets of this kind in both official languages.

The Commissioner reminded the Wheat Board that it was, in fact, connected in some way with the second booklet because it had been published with the authorization of the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board.

The Commissioner also pointed out that by virtue of section 9 of the Official Languages Act the Wheat Board was required to provide services in both official languages in the National Capital Region, at its

head office (Winnipeg), in federal bilingual districts (when designated), and in all other localities where there is a significant demand for such services. He therefore recommended that all booklets intended for the public and published by the Wheat Board, or prepared by it and authorized by the Minister responsible for this agency, be issued in both official languages.

Although the Wheat Board did not entirely agree with the Commissioner's interpretation of the Official Languages Act, it decided to include in publications of this nature an insert, in French, indicating that a French translation was available on request.

The Commissioner informed the Wheat Board that although this new procedure was an improvement, it would not meet the requirements of the Act. He expressed the opinion that such publications should automatically be sent in French to French-speakers and in English to English-speakers unless someone indicated that he wished to receive them in the other language. He informed the Wheat Board that he intended to mention its unsatisfactory response in his report.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2851	Winnipeg	Letter in English sent in reply to a communication in French.	Rectified

COMMISSIONER OF OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2225	Ottawa	A representative of the Commissioner replied in English to questions worded in French, at a meeting.	Not justified
2293	Moncton	Precedence given to the French language on letter headings.	Not justified

CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

COMPLAINTS

File No. 2226—Trade Marks Journal

A French-speaker expressed the view that all texts of the *Trade Marks Journal* should be bilingual. He added that such a practice would

prompt Canadian companies to offer their products in both official languages.

The Department replied that it had been studying this matter for well over a year, in consultation with the Department of the Secretary of State; it was also considering the possibility of translating the *Patent Office Record*, which lists some 400 patent abstracts every week. Although, according to the Department, cost was not an important factor, it was clear that much difficulty would be experienced in finding a sufficient number of translators who could work continually on the *Patent Office Record* and meet the publication dates required under the regulations of the Patent Act. Twenty-five full-time translators, each with a background in engineering or chemistry, would be required for this work. Translation of the *Trade Marks Journal* presented fewer difficulties. However, the Department emphasized that the study concerned both publications.

The Commissioner appreciated the difficulties encountered in translating a heavy volume of highly technical material for the *Patent Office Record*. He pointed out, however, that the complaint was made in respect of the *Trade Marks Journal*, and recommended that the necessary steps be immediately taken to make this publication bilingual as soon as possible. The Commissioner also asked to be informed of the Department's final plans with respect to the translation of the *Patent Office Record*.

The Department informed the Commissioner that a Registrar of Trade Marks had just been appointed and that he had been instructed to make the *Trade Marks Journal* bilingual as a matter of first priority. It added that the *Patent Office Record* would be made bilingual thereafter.

File No. 2564—Letter in English

A French-speaking person complained that he had received a letter in English from the Department.

The Department replied that it would place the complainant's name on its list of French-speaking correspondents so that in future he would receive all documents in French.

Although a surname is not an absolute indication of a person's mother tongue or preferred language, it can be used as a guide in most cases. Accordingly the Commissioner pointed out to the Department that he could not understand why the complainant's name had been placed on a list of English-speaking correspondents in the first place, when his name was obviously French.

He therefore recommended that the Department revise its lists periodically so that every correspondent would receive documentation

in the official language of his choice, whenever it was possible to determine this preference.

The Department subsequently informed the Commissioner that it had duly revised its lists of correspondents.

File No. 3024 — Unilingual English Publications

A French-speaker from St-Jean-Chrysostôme, Quebec, objected to the fact that, in reply to a request in French, the Department sent her unilingual English publications.

Upon receipt of the complaint, the Department sent the complainant all the requested publications in French together with a letter of apology.

In order to avoid problems of distribution, the Commissioner recommended that all printed material intended for public use be produced in both official languages in one document, that is, in a single bilingual version.

The Department stated that its policy was to consider each publishing project individually and to determine at the outset whether a bilingual format was desirable or essential. If the method by which the particular document might be distributed to the public could give rise to distribution problems then a bilingual format was clearly in order.

When the Department is certain that controls exist to prevent errors in distribution, it usually produces texts in separate English and French versions. In practice this generally means that small pamphlets and leaflets are bilingual while larger, more complex and more expensive publications are produced in separate volumes.

The Department also set forth an economic argument in favour of separate English and French volumes where the possibility of error is minimal. The ratio of demand for the publications is currently 3 to 1 or 4 to 1 for the English versions, consequently the production of bilingual material adds significantly to the printing costs. With the extraordinary rise in the costs of fine paper, the total cost of the bilingual approach could add tens of thousands of dollars to the Department's printing budget. In addition, the Department said that it believed there was some advantage (again where there is minimal risk of error) of providing material to Canadian citizens in the language which they have requested and no other.

The Commissioner believed that the arguments the Department advanced against adopting his recommendation outright were reasonable. He therefore invited it to apply in the broadest and most generous manner possible, article 6 (b) of its Policy on Bilingualism which said that where practical and feasible, both language versions of a departmental publication would be issued under the same cover.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1959	Toronto	Letter in English sent to a French-speaker by an advertising agency on the Department's behalf.	Rectified
2728	Hull	A French-speaker is dismissed allegedly because he cannot speak English.	Explanation offered
2834	Ottawa	Delay before regulations on bilingual labelling came into effect.	Explanation offered
2959	Ottawa	A French-speaker was still receiving the English version of the magazine <i>Contact</i> .	Rectified
2982	Hull	A stenographer claimed that she had been refused a job because she did not know English.	Explanation offered
3152	Ottawa	Captions in English only in two bilingual magazines.	Rectified
3171	Ottawa	Letter in English addressed to a French-speaking person.	Withdrawn

DEFENCE CONSTRUCTION (1951) LIMITED

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2244, 2325, 2403	Ottawa	Use of the company's English name in French-language newspapers.	Rectified

ECONOMIC COUNCIL OF CANADA

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2750	Ottawa	Six studies published in English only.	Rectified

ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES

COMPLAINTS

File No. 3018—Memorandum in English

A French-speaking person objected to the fact that a branch of the Department distributed the English version of a memorandum and

application form concerning flexible working hours eleven days before he received the French version. He believed that both versions should have been distributed at the same time even though this meant a delay in introducing flexible working hours. The Translation Bureau should give priority to the translation of the document.

The Department explained that the memorandum and application form had been distributed only in English because of the extreme urgency of the situation: the memorandum was dated 25 March and the policy it announced was to take effect on 1 April. This had been explained to the complainant by letter on 27 April and he and others were sent the official French version of the document on 5 April. The Department was acutely conscious of the government's policy of ensuring that all internal communications of general interest to public servants or for general circulation were prepared in both official languages. It regretted that this policy had not been complied with in this particular instance, but managers were being reminded of the Department's responsibility in this regard, to avoid a recurrence of this type of error in the future.

The Commissioner was, however, of the opinion that the internal communications mentioned by the Department should not only be prepared in both official languages but also be distributed simultaneously in both languages. He therefore recommended to the Department that in future all internal communications of general interest to public servants or intended for general circulation be distributed simultaneously in English and French.

The Department sent the Commissioner a copy of the Treasury Board's Circular No. 1971-21 of 9 March 1971 on "Management Objectives for Bilingualism" and pointed out that paragraph 8 required only that internal communications be "prepared" in both official languages, although it could be assumed that in virtually all cases both versions were to be distributed simultaneously. Nevertheless, the Department continued, the directive did recognize the fact that exceptional circumstances might exist, where, because of the urgent need for communication, distribution would be made in one of the official languages, to be followed by a communication in the other official language as soon as the translated version was available.

The Department assured the Commissioner that his recommendation for simultaneous distribution in both official languages of communications that were of general interest to public servants would be followed in the future, unless there was an urgent need for immediate communication and if it was not possible to obtain the necessary translation services in sufficient time to meet the publication deadline.

The Commissioner told the Department that he was of the opinion that its interpretation of paragraph 8 of the Treasury Board circular and the assumption based on that interpretation were in conflict with

the provisions, spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act. In his view, the Act required that the English and French versions of the communications in question be distributed simultaneously. The Commissioner thought, moreover, that the phrase "prepared in both official languages" in paragraph 8 of the Treasury Board directive was used in a concrete sense to mean "prepared in a bilingual format", that is to say with the English and French versions appearing side by side (as in the case of the circular itself) or back to back. In any event, he took the view that, since the Treasury Board's directive did not say that departments might not distribute both versions of internal communications simultaneously, they should abide by the law and do so.

Finally, the Commissioner informed the Department that he was forwarding a copy of the correspondence to the Secretary of the Treasury Board who might wish to amend paragraph 8 of his circular No. 1971-21 of 9 March 1971 to avoid possible misinterpretation.

The Commissioner then asked the Treasury Board to comment on the important question raised by the Department's interpretation of the paragraph and asked whether the Treasury Board proposed to amend it to avoid misinterpretations that could lead to violations of the Official Languages Act.

The Treasury Board replied that the intention behind the paragraph was certainly that internal communications of general interest should be made simultaneously in both languages. Simultaneous distribution seemed to be the best way of respecting the Official Languages Act, which established the principle of equality of the two languages as to their use. Moreover, a recommendation of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, accepted by the government and included in the Prime Minister's Statement of 23 June 1970 (Part B, paragraph 6), was to the same effect. An examination of the French version of the paragraph also supported this interpretation. Finally, the Treasury Board did not think there was a need to amend the paragraph in question, since it could simply interpret a directive of its own. Besides, it hoped guidelines being studied by the Official Languages Branch would clarify the position.

Subsequently, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources informed the Commissioner that it had reviewed the correspondence on the subject and now wished to assure him that it would abide by the provisions, spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act with respect to the preparation and simultaneous distribution of internal communications.

The Commissioner thanked the Department and the Treasury Board for their co-operation and informed them that he was closing the file.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1997	Ottawa	French geographical names rendered in English on maps published by the Department.	Not justified
2032	Ottawa	Poor quality of the French version of a competition poster.	Rectified
2038	Ottawa	Most forms, memoranda and directives of the Surveys and Mapping Branch are issued in English only.	Rectified
2371	Ottawa	A brochure was bilingual in title only; the body of the text was in English.	Rectified
2448	Ottawa	Masthead in English only: GEOS magazine.	Rectified
2586 2607	Ottawa	Publication in English only of brochure "Energy and Our Way of Life".	Rectified
2608	Ottawa	A position in Tuktoyaktuk (N.W.T.) should be designated as bilingual.	Not justified
2943	Ottawa	At the Surveys and Mapping Branch documents distributed in English only.	Rectified

FEDERAL COURT

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2390	Ottawa	Use of the English expression "Statement of Claim" in a Public Notice published in a French newspaper.	Explanation offered

FEDERAL ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION FOR ONTARIO

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1760	Toronto	Receipt of two letters in English from the Commission by a French language association.	Explanation offered

FINANCE

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1746 — Notice of Ways and Means Motion

A French-speaker complained that the text "Notice of Ways and Means Motion" (February 1973) contained numerous errors and some serious mistranslations.

The Department believed that some of the complainant's remarks arose from a strictly legal interpretation of the text which was, in fact, published for information purposes only and which had to be as precise as possible and yet clear enough to be understood by the public for which it was intended. Nevertheless, the Department recognized that the text of the notice of motion contained a number of errors.

The Commissioner recommended that translation of all the Department's publications be started at the time the drafts were being prepared rather than afterward; that the correction and revision of texts to be published be assigned to experts in the Department or to revisers or to both at the same time so that translations would be as faithful and correct as possible; that the Department request the necessary technical and terminological assistance from the Translation Bureau; and, finally, that the Department study the possibility of preparing parts of publications in French.

The Department explained that it was making every effort to have drafts rather than the final text translated, with corrections being made along the way. It had just concluded an agreement with the Translation Bureau whereby more translators and revisers would be assigned to the Department. They would work there at least two years so that they could become familiar with the specific translation requirements of the Department. Furthermore, in order to be able to meet its obligations with respect to the government's bilingualism programs and the Official Languages Act, the Department had set up a language planning and control section to co-ordinate its efforts in this area.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1680	Ottawa	Availability of services in French from Physical Security Service.	Rectified
2015	Ottawa	Knowledge of English stated as being essential to fill certain positions.	Explanation offered
2522	Ottawa	Unilingual English seal on Canada Savings Bonds.	Rectified

FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2690	Ottawa	Unilingual French post-card sent to English-speaking person.	Explanation offered

GOVERNOR GENERAL

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2671	Ottawa	Unilingual English-speaking doorman during the New Year's levee.	Rectified

JUSTICE

COMPLAINTS

File No. 2083—Trade Marks Act

A member of a French-language association pointed out to the Commissioner that the text of the Trade Marks Act had not been revised in the light of the provisions of the Official Languages Act.

The Justice Department expressed doubts as to the Statute Revision Commission's power to make minor modifications to the French text of the Trade Marks Act and suggested the Commissioner bring the complaint to the attention of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, since it is charged with the application of the Trade Marks Act.

The Commissioner pointed out that Section 2 of the Act respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada clearly gave the Statute Revision Commission, of which the Minister of Justice is a member, the authority to "arrange, revise and consolidate" the Revised Statutes of Canada. He added that Section 5 of the same Act, referring to Acts or parts of Acts, stated that the Commission "may make such alterations in their language as are necessary to preserve a uniform mode of expression . . .". The Commissioner believed that the Department's doubts should be resolved before the time came to undertake the next revision

of statutes and recommended that the matter be clarified so that the Statute Revision Commission would be free to make textual changes which took into account the provisions of the Official Languages Act—notably of Section 2.

The Department replied that the Statute Revision Commission would become *functus officio* upon the completion of its duties under the Act of 1965, and that another Act would be required for the purposes of another revision. Because of the experience gained from the last revision and a fuller knowledge of the problems of bilingualism and “bilingualism” in the federal statutes, the Department intended to recommend to the government that the next revision Act enable alterations in language to be made for the purpose of bringing the two official languages more into accord with each other—subject to the necessary safeguard that no substantive change be effected thereby.

The Commissioner was satisfied with the action taken by the Department and closed the file.

File No. 2198—Two Letters in English

A French-speaking person complained of receiving two letters from the Department of Justice in English.

The Department replied that its policy was that all correspondence intended for French-speaking addressees be written in French and that the two letters in question had been written in English in error.

The Commissioner agreed that errors were always possible. In the case in question, however, the mistake was difficult to explain, since it was clear not only from the name but also from the address that the correspondent was French-speaking. The Commissioner recommended, therefore, that the Department remind its employees of its bilingualism policy, in order to ensure that, in future, communication with the public is always in the appropriate official language.

File No. 3249 — Personnel Inquiries

A French-speaking person telephoned Personnel Inquiries and was not able to speak to anyone who could understand French.

The Department replied that the number called was a common line branching out to five extensions. Although calls were generally taken by one of two designated employees (their positions being declared bilingual), it sometimes happened that another employee answered and transferred the call by means of the intercom. The Department had not been able to investigate fully the situation which gave rise to the complaint because the two employees mentioned had since left the Department. The Department indicated that it would staff the two vacant positions and that it had in the meantime reminded employees in the section of their obligation to make a serious attempt

to find a person in an office nearby able to answer calls from French-speakers.

The Commissioner suggested that the Department inform the employees concerned that service must be offered in French automatically to French-speaking callers without their having to persist in speaking their language before the call was referred to the right person. Since calls were received on a "party" line and any employee might reply, the Commissioner also recommended that employees abstain from speaking English to French-speakers and say rather "Un moment s'il vous plaît, ne quittez pas" (One moment, please hold the line). Lastly, he believed that those answering should ensure, when possible, that delays are kept to a minimum.

The Department accepted the Commissioner's suggestions and recommendations and issued instructions accordingly.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1967	Ottawa	Unilingual English-speaking telephone operator.	Rectified

LABOUR

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2305	Ottawa	Department's address in English only on an order form.	Rectified
2785	Ottawa	A fire prevention talk was given in English only.	Explanation offered
2992	Ottawa	Unilingual English heading on a bilingual document.	Rectified
3099	Ottawa	Unilingual English stamp on correspondence.	Rectified
3128	Ottawa	Request that the Department publish "Teamwork in Industry/Travail d'équipe dans l'industrie" in a bilingual format.	Assistance rendered

NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD

SPECIAL STUDY

The National Energy Board invited the Commissioner to undertake a special study in order to assess its present practice vis-à-vis its

obligations under the Official Languages Act. The Board itself recognized a continuing need to develop and sustain its bilingual capability to provide service adequately to both language groups.

In ensuring that the best interests of Canada are served in the use and development of energy and its sources, the Board exercises various regulatory and advisory responsibilities. Consequently, it maintains contact with industry, federal departments and agencies, provincial and municipal governments, and with financial communities at provincial, national and international levels.

The study focused on the internal operations and on the services provided by the Board which, with the exception of a small research office in Calgary, are confined to Ottawa. All aspects of language of service to the Board's public and certain basic aspects of language of work were investigated.

Although the Board had introduced certain measures designed to achieve institutional bilingualism such as language training and retention programmes, no official policy had been formulated in this area, nor had overall responsibility for bilingualism been assigned to any one individual. The Board also lacked a manpower planning policy and programme, as well as a recruitment policy devised to increase bilingual capability. In addition, the absence of formal directives and staff information programmes hindered the Board's efforts to achieve compliance with the Act.

An examination of the language requirements of positions revealed that only 31 of the 172 positions identified as bilingual according to Treasury Board guidelines were occupied by bilingual staff, that only two of the nine Board members were bilingual, and that there was no bilingual capability whatsoever in the Law and Oil Policy branches. Eighteen positions had been identified as requiring either English- or French-speaking incumbents but no French essential positions had been identified; the belief at the Board was that the current level of its institutional bilingual capability would not permit unilingual French-speakers to function effectively.

Language training was considered important but the Board's schedule for achieving an adequate bilingual capacity made no allowance for and took no advantage of its annual rate of staff turnover (approximately one-third). The Board had difficulty in replacing employees taking continuous language training and in providing opportunities for employees who become bilingual to use their newly acquired language skills. The Board's experience with language retention programmes had not proved very successful.

External and internal oral communication, such as telephone contact, was conducted almost exclusively in English. Although simultaneous translation facilities were generally available to participants at

public hearings, these were provided from French to English only. This was also the case with translations of transcripts of the hearings. Moreover, the published Notice of Hearing did not indicate that evidence could be given in either official language.

Signs, publications, telephone listings and notices were usually bilingual, though errors in spelling, missing accents and the lack of a standardized identification of the Board in French indicated that equality of status of both official languages was not always respected. Forms, the library catalogue, library holdings, and information kits on energy for students were on the whole available in English only. However, outside correspondence was normally dealt with in the language of the originator, though letters in French usually required translation and, on occasion, were delayed.

Because the Board lacked a clear bilingual policy and an adequate bilingual capacity, services could not be provided automatically in both official languages at the time of the study, and French did not have equal status as a language of internal communication. The absence of a systematic manpower programme and failure to make allowance for the high rate of staff turnover in fulfilling bilingual requirements, impede the Board's progress in meeting its obligations under the Act.

In the light of these findings, the Commissioner recommended:

Policy and Programme on Bilingualism

(1) that the Board develop and issue, by 31 October 1975, a formal policy and programme, both long-term and short-term, designed to meet the requirements of the Official Languages Act across its organization, which would include a system for accurately determining at regular intervals real demand in each language and which would take into account both language of service and language of internal communication, as well as the recommendations of the Commissioner of Official Languages;

(2) that steps be taken to appoint without undue delay an officer highly and strategically placed in the institution's hierarchy who will bear operational responsibility for the proper implementation and co-ordination of the Board's policy on bilingualism. His duties would include but not necessarily be restricted to:

(a) presiding over the establishment of objectives and the planning and implementation of consequent programmes, accompanied wherever possible, by implementation dates, and

(b) supervising and monitoring all activity related to the different aspects of its bilingualism policy;

Manpower Planning Policy and Programme

(3) that appropriate steps be taken to develop and issue, by 30 November 1975, a formal manpower planning policy and programme both to define and to fill the basic staff needs of the Board for meeting the language of

service and language of internal communication requirements of the Official Languages Act. Such a policy should include a systematic, well coordinated, step-by-step plan of action dealing with all pertinent areas as, for instance, language training, language retention, recruitment, attrition, deployment;

Information Programme

(4) that appropriate steps be taken to establish and have in operation, by 31 December 1975, a staff information programme on the requirements of the Official Languages Act and on the administrative measures, including those relating to bilingualism and manpower planning, necessary to bring the Board as an institution more closely into compliance with those requirements;

(5) that all personnel at the Board's head office and at its research-oriented office at Calgary be fully informed, upon establishment of the above information programme and thereafter at regular intervals, of those requirements and measures, as well as of the policies developed pursuant to recommendations 1 and 3 and the action being taken to implement them;

Public Hearings

(6) that the Board ensure that henceforth, on all notices of hearings, the public, interveners and parties to the proceedings be made aware that:

(a) all documentation and exhibits may be submitted in either French or English;

(b) all evidence (oral and written) may be presented in either French or English;

(c) all witnesses may testify in either French or English;

(d) all interventions may be made in either French or English;

(e) all proceedings may be conducted in either French or English; and

(f) simultaneous translation of the entire proceedings will be provided in both official languages and that receiving equipment will be automatically offered at all times to anyone in attendance;

(7) that, in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act, the Board provide simultaneous translation, at all public hearings, of the entire proceedings in both official languages, and that receiving equipment be automatically offered at all times to anyone present;

Oral Communication

(8) that where the capability already exists or is in future developed within the Board to communicate internally and externally in both official languages automatically rather than only upon request, that capability be made known immediately to the public, thus enabling the public to assert its entitlement to service in the official language of its choice;

Correspondence

(9) that appropriate measures be instituted to ensure that, henceforth, incoming correspondence is answered in the official language of the correspondent without undue delay in one official language as compared to the other;

(10) that where the language preference of a correspondent or addressee is not known, all available means be used to determine in advance the language preferred by the correspondent or addressee;

Internal Communications

(11) that internal communications of a general nature such as directives, memoranda, notices, etc., be henceforth issued in both official languages under one cover;

(12) that the Board take all necessary steps to encourage its staff members to originate internal communications such as memoranda, technical and other reports etc., in the official language of their choice;

(13) that all administrative and other services, both oral and written, furnished by the Board to its employees, be henceforward made available automatically to those employees in both official languages, wherever such is not already the case;

Translation

(14) that Board personnel, other than professional translators, not be called upon or indirectly required to do translation, as this practice could jeopardize the equal quality as well as accuracy and clarity of the message in the two official languages and thus constitute a contravention of the Official Languages Act;

(15) that the Board reassess periodically its present and future needs for translation to comply fully with the Official Languages Act, and communicate its findings to the translation unit at the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, so that the latter may properly equip itself or take such other steps as will enable it to satisfy the Board's requirements;

Language Training

(16) that, before 1 October 1975, the Board:

(a) evaluate the effectiveness of second-language training courses in terms of their impact upon the quality and use of French and English as language of internal communication; and

(b) in light of the results of this evaluation, initiate if need be, and possibly in collaboration with the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources or any other federal department or agency, a specialized second-language training course adapted to the particular technical and professional requirements of the Board and designed mainly to improve oral and written comprehension of the second language;

Language Training (Offered Outside Normal Working Hours)

(17) that the Board:

(a) inform all its personnel of the opportunities that exist for receiving second official language training outside prescribed working hours (Treasury Board Circular, 1974-91 dated 29 May 1974);

- (b) encourage its staff to participate in such programmes; and
- (c) make adequate budgetary provision to absorb the cost of such training;

Language Retention

(18) that in order to ensure that the investment in language acquisition is not subsequently lost through disuse, the Board henceforth:

- (a) establish effective language retention programmes;
- (b) encourage active participation in such programmes; and
- (c) encourage the increased use of French as a working language.

(19) that, wherever feasible, newly bilingual employees be deployed, at least on a rotational basis, to units within the organization where they can enjoy the opportunity of perfecting their newly acquired skills;

Manpower Planning & Development Programme

(20) that in order to permit the Board to reach a level of institutional bilingualism capable of satisfying the requirements of the Official Languages Act, the Board:

- (a) determine the actual manpower it needs to meet these requirements for both language of service and language of internal communication purposes;
- (b) consider the attrition rate factor as an integral part of all future Manpower Planning and Development programmes;
- (c) explore all possible sources of supply of bilinguals so as not to neglect any portion of the available manpower market;
- (d) ensure that equal consideration is extended to qualified unilingual individuals from both linguistic groups;
- (e) devise means of maximizing public awareness of present and future career and employment opportunities at the Board; and
- (f) take all possible steps to ensure that optimal use is made of linguistic skills possessed by the Board's staff at any given time;

Publications and Printed Matter

(21) that measures be adopted to ensure that the French and English texts contained in all publications and printed matter intended both for internal use and for public distribution are of equal quality, enjoy equal prominence and are distributed simultaneously;

(22) that all remaining unilingual publications, manuals, booklets, statements of duties, etc., (excluding library holdings) used for internal purposes be rendered bilingual by 30 June 1976;

(23) that where publications from other federal government institutions are distributed by the Board, copies in both official languages be available where possible. Where bilingual copies are not available, the Board should encourage the provision of such publications in both official language versions;

(24) that, in order to avoid problems of distribution, stocking, display, etc., the Board consider printing future material in both official languages under

one cover where possible, rather than in separate French and English versions. Where this is not feasible, it is recommended that the Board, in all future printings, include a statement in French in the English text to the effect that the publication or other printed matter is also available in French, and vice versa;

Library

(25) that the Board, henceforth, ensure that where its Library holding include publications issued by federal institutions or other agencies and printed in both official languages, a copy of each version is retained;

(26) that the Board initiate early and appropriate action to:

(a) determine the availability of French reference texts (books, articles, periodicals, encyclopaedias, technical dictionaries, etc.);

(b) determine the suitability of such material; and

(c) acquire such quantities as will enable staff members to do research in French on the same range of subjects as in English;

(27) that appropriate steps be taken to render the Board's Library catalogue and shelf labels bilingual by 30 June 1976;

Telephone Listings

(28) that a review be carried out of the Ottawa-Hull, Calgary and "in-house" telephone directories to ensure that future listings identifying the Board, its offices or personnel adhere to the principle of equal quality and prominence in both official languages;

Telephone Answering

(29) that employees answering telephone calls identify offices of the Board henceforth in both official languages. Where those employees lack the linguistic proficiency to provide the information subsequently requested by the caller, it is further recommended that the employees be trained to use a list of courteous phrases enabling them to inform the caller that he or she will be referred without delay to another individual capable of providing the required information in the language of the caller's choice;

Signs

(30) that a survey of all internal and external signs be carried out in the Ottawa and Calgary offices to ensure that, by 30 June 1975:

(a) all remaining unilingual signs are rendered bilingual;

(b) all texts have been rendered accurately and correctly in both official languages; and

(c) both official languages enjoy equal prominence and status in all cases.

(31) that all signs posted or otherwise displayed, at sites and relating to hearings being held, be in the two official languages, with both languages enjoying equal prominence and status, and with precedence given to French

at all sites in areas where Francophones form a majority of the population, and to English elsewhere;

Calling Cards, Rubber Stamps, etc.

(32) that, by 31 October 1975, calling cards, identification cards, rubber stamps, the official seal and similar articles used by employees be rendered bilingual so as to ensure that equality of status of the two official languages is respected. It is further recommended that, upon receipt of such bilingual articles, all unilingual versions thereof be withdrawn from use;

Forms

(33) that, by 30 November 1975, all present forms, including file jackets, minute sheets and questionnaires, deemed necessary for the Board's internal and external operations, be rendered bilingual and with both languages on the same copy whenever possible;

(34) that all future forms be automatically published bilingually, with both official languages on the same document;

Unions

(35) that the Board, in implementing the preceding recommendations, maintain close liaison and consultation with its employees' unions and staff associations;

Careers

(36) that the Board, in implementing the recommendations listed in this report, not jeopardize the job security and career opportunities of its personnel;

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1764	Montreal	English article inserted in a French publication.	Rectified
2008	Halifax	Lack of services in French at the Halifax office.	Rectified
2256	Ottawa	French headings in the English text of a brochure.	Referral
3168	Toronto	Unilingual English stamp.	Rectified

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD

COMPLAINTS

File No. 3365—Without Accents

The Board ran an advertisement in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* to call attention to the advantages which the port of Montreal offered to shippers. Throughout the advertisement, Montreal and Quebec were spelt in the French fashion, with accents. The complainant pointed out to the Commissioner that the English spelling was used in the English version of the National Harbours Board Act. He added that the Board used the French form of names such as St. John's (Saint-Jean) in its French-language publications.

The Board said the advertisement was designed to reflect the truly bilingual flavour of the port. It was felt that either spelling was correct but the French version would be more eye-catching.

The Commissioner recommended that where two forms of a place-name exist, the English form should be used in English texts and the French form in French texts.

He also told the Board that a bilingual logo would have drawn attention to the bilingual character of the port.

The Board informed the Port of Montreal of the Commissioner's recommendation and said it would exercise more caution in future.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2347	Ottawa	English abbreviation used in advertisement in French.	Rectified

NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1340

A French-speaking person employed in a power plant in Yellowknife lodged a grievance with the Northern Canada Power Commission

for having dismissed him on the grounds that he did not speak English well.

The Commission replied that the complainant did not meet the language and technical requirements of the position he had been given. It had examined the possibility of assigning him to other duties, but the complainant preferred to work in the same field.

Having explained to the Commission that the complainant was convinced he had been dismissed for linguistic or ethnic reasons, the Commissioner recommended that the Commission examine with the complainant the possibility of assignment to a position in which imperfect knowledge of English would not be a handicap.

The Commission accepted this recommendation and met with the complainant.

NORTHERN TRANSPORTATION CO. LTD.

COMPLAINTS

File No. 3419—"Sorry, the Office is Closed"

A French-speaking person telephoned the Company's office in Ottawa at 4.40 p.m. on Friday, 15 November 1974, to obtain information. The person who answered said: "Could you not speak English?"

The Company replied that the incident had occurred about ten minutes after closing time and that the receptionist, who spoke both official languages well, had already left.

The Commissioner recommended that the Company instruct employees answering telephone calls from French-speakers after hours in the use of the following formula: "Désolé, le bureau est fermé; pourriez-vous rappeler demain à partir de . . . heures" (Sorry, the office is closed; could you please call again tomorrow after . . . o'clock").

The Company readily agreed to this recommendation and assured the Commissioner that it would be implemented immediately.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1847	Ottawa	Budget tabled for the House of Commons' approval in English only.	Rectified

PUBLIC ARCHIVES OF CANADA

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1917	Ottawa	Incorrect wording on a French stamp.	Rectified
1981	Ottawa	Bilingual forms completed in English sent to a French-speaker and services provided only in English by an agency engaged on a contract basis.	Explanation offered
2307	Ottawa	Unilingual "OHMS" initials on a truck.	Rectified
2421	Ottawa	Film sub-titles in English only.	Explanation offered
2712	Ottawa	Telephone directory published in English only.	Rectified

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1860, 1861	Ottawa	Two French-speaking public servants received the French version of questionnaire No. CC01-04 from Information Canada.	Explanation offered
1961	Ottawa	An English-speaking public servant was refused admission to language courses.	Explanation offered
2223	Ottawa	Brochure published in English only.	Rectified
2391	Ottawa	Address in English only.	Explanation offered

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY AUTHORITY

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2360	Montreal	A French-speaking employee was required to take an examination prepared in English only. In addition, the personnel officer was unilingual English.	Rectified
2824	Ottawa	The Authority's name appeared in English only in an advertisement in <i>Le Droit</i> .	Withdrawn

SOLICITOR GENERAL

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1804—Both Texts Are Authoritative

A French-speaker complained that the preface to the inquiry report on the April 1971 riot in the Kingston penitentiary reminded readers that the French version of the document was a faithful translation of the English, but if “complete accuracy” was required one should refer to the English edition.

The Commissioner suggested that the Department change the preface to avoid any misunderstanding as to its attitude toward French-speakers and to better uphold the spirit of the Official Languages Act.

The Department stated that, if ever the report were to be reprinted, it would gladly change the preface to the French edition. It added that in similar situations it would henceforth only indicate which of the two texts was the original.

After considering the problem at greater length, the Commissioner concluded that these measures did not go far enough, for as soon as a department made a report available to the public this constituted a service to the public. If the French version of a report could not be considered authoritative, the French-speaking public was definitely not receiving the same quality of service as the English-speaking public. This contravened the provisions of the Official Languages Act, particularly sections 2 and 9. Believing that a department is responsible for all its publications and for the French or English translations of them, the Commissioner recommended that in all similar cases, the Department include a sentence or two in the prefaces stating that both the original texts and the translations of the reports are equally authoritative. The Commissioner added that where problems of interpretation arise, the Department should settle them by giving preference to the version which, according to the true spirit, intent and meaning of the text, best ensures the attainment of its objects.

The Department replied that in future it would refrain from indicating in its publications which of the two texts is a translation. In cases where a preface is required, however, the Department stated that it would be happy to comply with the Commissioner’s recommendation.

CANADIAN PENITENTIARY SERVICE

COMPLAINTS

File No. 2024—Memorandum in English

Several French-speaking public servants in Montreal informed the Commissioner that the National Parole Board had sent them a bilingual circular letter to which it had attached a memorandum from the Canadian Penitentiary Service written in English only. They had written a letter of complaint about this in French to the central administration, and sent the Commissioner the reply they had received, which was written in English.

The Commissioner of Penitentiaries said he regretted that the memorandum in question had been published by mistake in English only, contrary to the Canadian Penitentiary Service's bilingualism policy. He said that the branch concerned had received a warning and that a directive had been issued requiring that its circulars be published in both languages.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2188	Ottawa	The results of a language knowledge examination were questioned.	Withdrawn
2330	Kingston	French-speaking inmates at the Prison for Women complained of inadequacies in the area of language and culture.	Rectified
3004	Ottawa	Unilingual English form.	Rectified
3026	Agassiz (B.C.)	Francophone inmates experienced language difficulties in dealing with the classification service.	Explanation offered

NATIONAL PAROLE BOARD

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2374	Ottawa	Memorandum concerning the United Appeal (Ottawa-Hull) circulated in English only.	Explanation offered
2774	Ottawa	Problems experienced by unilingual incumbent of a bilingual position.	Withdrawn
2924	Ottawa	Three unilingual English markings on an envelope.	Rectified

URBAN AFFAIRS

COMPLAINTS

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2200	Montreal	Receipt by a French-speaker on two occasions of unilingual English brochures.	Rectified
2659	Vanier	A position should have been identified as bilingual.	Explanation offered

VETERANS AFFAIRS

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1159—Queen Mary Hospital

A French-speaking member of the RCMP in Montreal said that he had been unable to obtain service in French at the ophthalmology clinic and the prosthesis service in the Queen Mary hospital in Montreal.

The Department of Veterans Affairs, which is responsible for the Queen Mary hospital, informed the Commissioner that there were five doctors in the ophthalmology clinic, and that of these, four spoke French fluently and one had some knowledge of the language. The Department also said a translation service was always available to patients who wished to speak to unilingual doctors in the hospital.

As for the prosthesis service, the Department said that the person in charge of this service, although English-speaking, was able to communicate with French-speaking customers in French that was adequate for the purpose of supplying glasses. If language difficulties arise, the hospital administration provides translation services.

In view of the fact that doctor-patient relations are confidential and very personal, the Commissioner recommended to the Department that all medical care be provided automatically to patients in the official language of their choice by doctors who have a good knowledge of that language. Regarding the other services provided by the Queen Mary hospital, the Commissioner recommended that the composition and assignment of the personnel in the various divisions and services in the hospital be such that service of equal quality is available at all times in both official languages.

The Department took due note of the Commissioner's recommendations and assured him that it would try to recruit as many bi-

lingual doctors as possible. It also said that every effort was being made to ensure that all divisions and services in the hospital had the necessary personnel to provide service in both French and English at all times.

File No. 1883—English Manuals

A French-speaker complained that the Department of Veterans Affairs did not make forms, manuals and directives available to its employees in both official languages.

The Department replied that a program of revision, rewriting and translation had been in existence for the past few years for the purpose of making all forms bilingual or available in both French and English. Priority was being given to forms intended for use by the public. Once this stage was completed, attention would be given to forms for internal use.

As well, the War Veterans Allowance Board was reviewing all the forms relating to war allowances for civilians and veterans in the light of administrative and legislative changes made over the past two years. Nineteen of the thirty-nine documents in question were bilingual or available in both French and English, but after the current study a number of these documents will be discontinued or rewritten. The office consolidation, which contains the legislation and regulations governing the Department and its agencies, is bilingual or published in French and English versions. Previously, when amendments were made, the covering letter for both versions was written in English only. Henceforth, the covering letter will be in the same language as the document. The Department's ten-chapter guide relating to war allowances for civilians and veterans is bilingual, as are a number of other volumes.

Because the Commissioner believes that the translation of administrative manuals and directives for use by federal employees is an essential element in the implementation and promotion of French as a working language in the Public Service, he recommended that the Department have the unilingual sections of the guide translated as soon as possible, and, in general, that delays in translation be reduced to a minimum. He has also recommended that a check be made with the regional offices to ensure that the above-mentioned documentation is always available in both official languages.

The Department expressed its intention to have the guide distributed as soon as possible in both official languages.

File No. 2550—Letter in English

A French-speaking Albertan complained that the Department of Veterans Affairs wrote in English to a veteran. The latter had subse-

quently asked him to translate the correspondence and reply to the Department in French.

The Department informed the Commissioner that it had sent the first letter to the veteran in English, and that he had replied in French through a third party. Later, when the veteran himself had written in English, the Department had answered him in English.

The Department stated that, as a rule, it answered its correspondents in the official language they have used. When a correspondent used both official languages, the Department believed that it was within its rights to follow suit, which explained why it wrote to the veteran in English. If, however, someone clearly stated that he wished to be served in one of the official languages, the Department used that language. According to the Director of Veterans Welfare in the Edmonton office, this policy had been applied in his office.

The Commissioner pointed out to the Department that the duty of ensuring service in both official languages was incumbent on Canadian government institutions, whereas the public had the choice of using either of the official languages.

In this case, the Commissioner felt that the veteran had indicated to the Department by the reply in French that he wished to correspond in that language.

The Commissioner then recommended that:

- 1) the Department use the official language of its correspondents when it is known, and
- 2) indicate that it is prepared to use the preferred official language of its correspondents in other cases.

The Deputy Minister replied that the first recommendation coincided with a long-standing policy of the Department. He was unable to affirm, however, whether this policy had always been applied, particularly in the western regions of Canada. The Department was trying, however, to correct the situation through its program for recruiting bilingual public servants and its language training program.

The Deputy Minister, nevertheless, asked the Commissioner to elaborate on his second recommendation. The Commissioner did not believe that the use of writing paper with a bilingual letterhead showed an implicit willingness on the part of the Department to correspond in either of the official languages. Referring to his *First Annual Report* (page 26), the Commissioner pointed out to the Department that, as a general rule, the fact that a person had a French name was sufficient indication for the Department to write to him in French. He suggested that the Department use a form on which the correspondent could indicate the official language of his choice, or that it

include this information on questionnaires and other documents as the Unemployment Insurance Commission had done. These forms would, of course, have to meet the Department's needs.

In response to these clarifications, the Deputy Minister told the Commissioner that the Department was prepared to implement his second recommendation and would discuss it with the Department's other agencies—the Canadian Pension Commission, the War Veterans Allowance Board, the Bureau of Pensions Advocates, and the Pension Review Board.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2033	Ottawa	Military emblems with English wording used in advertisements in a French-language newspaper.	Explanation offered
2179	Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue (Quebec)	Bulletin in English only announcing a visit by the Minister.	Explanation offered
2232	Ottawa	The complainant failed an English examination.	Withdrawn
2406	Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue (Quebec)	Notices posted in French only on three occasions.	Rectified
2701	Montreal	Queen Mary Veterans' Hospital: delay in the translation of medical reports.	Explanation offered
2789	Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue (Quebec)	Instructions given in French only on the public address system.	Explanation offered
3014	Ottawa	Nurses at the Rideau Veterans' Home were allegedly forbidden to speak French.	Not justified
3267	Ottawa	Letter in English sent to French-speaking persons.	Explanation offered

YUKON TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT

COMPLAINTS

File No. 1428—An Emanation

A French-speaking person from Dawson City complained that the enrolment card for the Yukon Territory Health Care Insurance Plan

(Y.H.C.I.P.) was available in English only. The complainant alleged that none of the forms, signs and services of the Yukon Territorial Government were, to his knowledge, available in French. He also added that the Territorial Government was an "emanation" of the Federal Government, in particular of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

The question was first brought to the attention of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, which replied as follows:

"Although the Territorial Government in the Yukon is established by the Yukon Act, which is a Federal Statute, and the Commissioner administers the Territory under the direction of the Federal Government, the legislation establishing Territorial Government forms, signs and services must be passed by the Territorial Council, which is a legislature elected by the people of the Territory in much the same way as the legislatures in the Provinces. Accordingly, the Commissioner is limited to some extent by the scope of the legislation passed by the Territorial Council. Since French-speaking people in the Yukon constitute such a small percentage of the total population [2.4% (1971 Census)], the Council has not considered it necessary for Territorial forms, signs and services to be made available in French.

While there is no legislative requirement for Territorial forms, signs and services to be made available in French, [we] know that the Commissioner and his officers are sympathetic to the particular needs of individuals in the Territory. [We are] sure that if the person submitting the complaint is concerned with specific forms or signs, or is encountering some difficulty with a service of the Territorial Government, the Commissioner would be prepared to take appropriate action. We would be glad to refer the matter to the Commissioner, if you wish, or the person who registered the complaint may prefer to write to the Territorial Government on his own."

In reply to the Department's letter, the Commissioner of Official Languages agreed that the complaint be referred to the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory and passed on to the Department the opinion of his legal adviser on his jurisdiction in this matter:

a) The first issue is whether the Yukon Territorial Government is an "institution of the Parliament and Government of Canada" within Section 2 of the Official Languages Act. While one is tempted to analogize the Territorial Government to that of a province, it clearly is not so under the BNA Act. It is a creature of the Federal Government, and a perusal of the Yukon Act demonstrates the continued Federal presence (for example see Section 20(1) and (2) and Section 26(5)). Nevertheless it is clearly not as directly controlled by the Federal Government as is a department or ministry and perhaps, for that reason,

would not be covered by Section 9. In any event, the question to be explored is whether it is an "institution of the Parliament and Government of Canada" under Section 2 and therefore obliged to respect the "equality of status and equal rights and privileges" conferred on French and English.

b) Legally, French is still an official language of the Yukon Territory for the reasons set out by C. A. Sheppard in his Study No. 10 of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism on pp. 86-87 (*The Law of Languages in Canada*, Information Canada, Ottawa, 1971).

The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development had undertaken to fund the translation and publication of the Yukon Ordinances in the French language and was prepared to fund the publication of the Territorial Regulations in French. This was the opportune moment to deal with the particular matter of the Y.H.C.I.P. form.

Discussions had begun between officials of the Translation Bureau, the departments of Justice and of Supply and Services, and the Yukon Territory, during which it had been suggested that it might be advantageous to start the project by selecting ordinances on a priority basis for translation and publication rather than by attempting to translate all of them before printing began. Perhaps the main priority could be given to the law which most closely governed the daily lives of the residents, but it would be advisable first to develop a set of criteria for use as a guide in establishing this context, including ease of translation, local interest and importance, legislation repealed and replaced in its entirety, social and labour legislation and legislation of common use in the territorial courts. The Territorial Government added that there was also a need to translate the regulations promulgated under the authority of the various ordinances and proposed that any regulations issued under a particular ordinance should be translated and published in French at the same time that the ordinance was translated.

However, the Territorial Government agreed with the Department's opinion that "since French-speaking people in the Yukon constitute such a small percentage of the total population, the Council has not considered it necessary for territorial forms, signs and services to be made available in French". The Territorial Government added that "it should be reiterated that Council might become very reluctant to provide this additional service if it were required to raise these funds locally".

In view of the small percentage of French-speaking people in the Yukon, the Commissioner considered that the Territorial Government's

decision to have the territorial ordinances and regulations translated was a satisfactory interim approach to the question.

With regard to federal institutions, however, the Commissioner recommended that, wherever the linguistic composition of their staff allowed it, they offer their services to the public in the official language of its choice.

The Commissioner asked to be kept informed of all steps that the Yukon Territorial Government might decide to take in order to comply with the requirements of the Official Languages Act.

A year later, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development assured the Commissioner that territorial ordinances and regulations had been sent for translation to the Translation Bureau of the Department of the Secretary of State.

File No. 2340—Tourism

A French-speaking person wrote to Yukon House in Vancouver for information concerning tourism in the Yukon. He received a reply written in poor French telling him that the required information was not available in French.

The Commissioner of the Yukon Territory said he was sorry that the form letter sent to the complainant was written in faulty French, and indicated that it would be corrected as soon as possible. He was not sure, however, whether the government of the Territory would be able to have its tourism publicity translated.

The Commissioner recommended that the government of the Territory set up a program for translating its publicity aimed at the travelling public.

The government of the Territory took steps to ensure the availability of all its tourist information in both official languages. Translations of existing printed matter had been prepared and a bilingual brochure was to appear in 1974-1975. Moreover, it hoped to obtain additional funds so that all brochures could be published in French in 1975-1976.

E. Non-Federal and Other Heavenly Bodies

Finally, we summarize a few transactions with individuals or agencies beyond the baleful pale of the Official Languages Act.

1. Education

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1859	Quebec	The Province of Quebec did not offer enough French courses to English-speaking children.	Referral
1881	Ontario	Public transportation system serving English-speaking students in Etobicoke should also serve Francophones attending the Downsview school.	Referral
1884	New Brunswick	Students objected to the situation at the Restigouche Polyvalente (composite school).	Explanation offered
1899	New Brunswick	An advertisement for recruiting bilingual teachers stipulated that the candidates' mother tongue should be French.	Referral
1901	Ontario	The French Language Advisory Committee of the Carleton Board of Education found it unfair that the Secretary of State Department allocated funds only to school boards in the National Capital Region for teaching French as a second language.	Assistance rendered
1915	New Brunswick	Participation of French-speakers in decisions made by the Department of Education.	Explanation offered
1952	Ontario	The Ministry of Education should reconsider the age limit in order to enable younger students to take advantage of the program of grant-aided second language summer courses.	Referral
1966	Ontario	A complainant expressed her dissatisfaction with the paucity of French taught in Temiscaming public schools.	Referral
1973, 2118	Ontario	A French-speaker wondered what use was made of federal grants for the teaching of French and the provision of schooling in French.	Assistance rendered
1992	Ontario	An English-speaker objected to the Ottawa School Board's decision to concentrate its French immersion courses in only a few schools.	Referral
1998	Quebec	Difficulty in obtaining financial assistance in order to take courses leading to a certificate for teaching French as a second language.	Referral
2063	Ontario	Availability of funds for the teaching of French as a second language.	Explanation offered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2069	Ontario	Request for assistance in obtaining a bursary for French summer courses.	Assistance rendered
2142	Ontario	Courses for learning French as a second language should be offered to the age group between five and fifteen instead of those between the ages of forty-five and sixty.	Explanation offered
2169	Nova Scotia	An English-speaking student in Nova Scotia was unable to take French courses at Mount Allison University within the context of the program of grant-aided summer language courses because the university in question was located in New Brunswick.	Explanation offered
2195	New Brunswick	A Campbellton secondary school drew up separate timetables for French-speaking and English-speaking students.	Explanation offered
2201	Quebec	French was not compulsory in English-language CEGEPs whereas English was compulsory in French-language ones.	Referral
2483	Ontario	Alleged violation of the right of French-speaking parents in Halton County to provide their children with schooling in French.	Referral
2639	British Columbia	A French-speaker wished to learn the Commissioner's opinion on the administration of programs for the teaching of French in the province.	Referral
2689	Ontario	A school in which classes were conducted in English was to become a French school.	Explanation offered
2699	Quebec	An English-speaking student in Alberta applied for a summer job in Quebec and received a letter and forms in French only.	Referral
2854	Quebec	Delay in obtaining a reply concerning a program of grant-aided summer courses.	Assistance rendered
2875	Quebec	Three-month delay in obtaining a bursary application form for summer courses from the Department of Education.	Referral
2920, 3087	Manitoba	The St-Boniface School Board proposed to close down <i>L'École Taché</i> , the only elementary school where lessons were taught exclusively in French.	Assistance rendered
3044	Ontario	Request for exemption from entrance examination.	Explanation offered

2. *Private Enterprise*

File No. 2152—Eastern Airlines

A French-speaker travelled to Washington D.C. by Eastern Airlines in January 1973. He complained that during the entire flight from Ottawa to Washington, all announcements were in English only and instructions on what to do in an emergency were printed in English only.

The Commissioner explained that the Official Languages Act did not give him jurisdiction over private enterprise. He undertook, however, to get in touch with the airline unofficially and see what could be done.

Eastern Airlines informed the Commissioner that it was trying to provide more bilingualism in its services in Canada but it had encountered a number of practical problems. U. S. federal law prevented the airline from hiring Canadians and it was not easy to find French-speaking U.S. citizens who wanted the kind of work offered. In addition, the airline's labour contracts prohibited it from confining flight attendants to particular routes: flight attendants bid monthly for the flights they prefer to work and bids are "awarded" on the basis of seniority.

Eastern Airlines proposed to redesign instruction cards and print them in English, French and Spanish. International pictorial signs would be used instead of written directions in the airline's newer aircraft. Eastern was also looking at the possibility of prerecording in-flight announcements in the appropriate languages and was thinking of offering French conversation courses to volunteers on the same basis as it now offers Spanish courses.

The Commissioner replied to Eastern Airlines that he greatly appreciated its interest in bilingualism. He said that he particularly hoped that language courses would prove popular and successful because of the importance of personal communications in the case of illness, change of plans or in moments of stress.

File No. 3161—Eaton's

A French-speaking woman informed the Commissioner of an unfortunate incident in which she was involved at the Scarborough branch of Eaton's. Having bought a few things, the complainant sought to pay for them by writing a personal cheque in French. This led to dealings with the saleswoman, her supervisor and the store manager. Finally the client told the manager that she would not buy the goods unless her cheque was accepted as written, in French. The manager then remarked to the saleswoman's supervisor: "Well, after all, there are only two words in French (he had not seen the date), have someone check if it is the right amount, and don't forget to phone the bank Monday to see if they'll accept the cheque. . ." The client felt certain

she had misheard. Noticing that she appeared flabbergasted, the manager hastened to add: "You understand if we . . . start this we might end up doing it for the Italians, etc." The complainant stated that that Saturday (13 July 1974) was the last time she set foot in an Eaton's store and that she strongly urged all French-speakers to do likewise.

The Commissioner informed the complainant that her complaint did not come under the purview of the Official Languages Act. Nevertheless, he offered to take the matter up unofficially with the President of the Company in Toronto, noting that the complainant had already sent the latter a copy of her letter.

The President of Eaton's replied that he regretted the unfortunate blunder and informed the Commissioner that his Company sought to offer Canadians the possibility of expressing themselves and conducting their business in either of the two official languages throughout Canada. He added that the Company would formalize a hitherto informal practice which had been followed outside Quebec. The Company would:

- a) undertake to communicate in writing with all its customers wherever they may be located, in either French or English, according to their choice;
- b) ensure that its employees accept written documents in either language, including payments;
- c) attempt to assure that, in facilities outside Quebec, of appropriate size, a bilingual capability is available.

The President also sent the Commissioner an English translation of a letter of apology that the Vice-President of the Quebec region had sent the complainant.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1826	Montreal	According to a French-speaking dentist, his Association's bilingualism policy discriminated against its French-speaking members.	Referral
1877	Verdun (Quebec)	Services provided in French only by an electrical appliance store.	Withdrawn
1898	Mackay (Ontario)	Advertising leaflet in French only.	Withdrawn
1927, 1934	Bonnyville (Alberta)	Advertisement published in a western newspaper inciting the public to demand that English be Canada's only official language.	Withdrawn
1957	Ottawa	Mediocrity of the French in instructions on the use of a screwdriver.	Withdrawn

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1968	Montreal	Mediocrity of the French in a booklet containing instructions on the maintenance of an electrical appliance.	Referral
1974	Gaspé Peninsula (Quebec)	Mediocrity of the French on place mats used in several good restaurants in the Gaspé Peninsula.	Assistance rendered
2007	Dorval (Quebec)	The catalogue of a duty-free store listed some items in French only.	Assistance rendered
2013	(British Columbia)	A professional corporation required members who wished to work in British Columbia to take an English language knowledge test.	Withdrawn
2031	Toronto	Unilingual English labels on a toy.	Referral
2041	Montreal	Bilingual form, the French version of which contained four spelling mistakes: Canadian Bar Association.	Referral
2106	Ottawa	The Ottawa Civil Service Recreational Association published a unilingual English newspaper.	Referral
2110	Ottawa	Bulletin containing numerous mistakes in French.	Referral
2146	Winnipeg	No service provided in French by an airline company.	Withdrawn
2208	Charlotte-town (P.E.I.)	Disparity between the services provided in English and in French during an interprovincial conference on teachers' pension plans.	Referral
2213	Ottawa	At the National Arts Centre there were four window displays of English books but only one of French books.	Withdrawn
2240	Ottawa	A French-speaker received the magazine <i>Canadian Consumer</i> instead of the French version, <i>Le Consommateur Canadien</i> .	Referral
2241	Quebec City (Quebec)	Unilingual English label on a chemical product.	Referral
2261	Ottawa	The French version of an advertising leaflet was riddled with spelling mistakes. The explanatory notes on several items were unilingual English.	Referral
2309	Toronto	Mediocrity of the French translation of an advertisement.	Referral
2327	(Ontario)	Brochure explaining how to assemble storage sheds written in almost incomprehensible French.	Referral

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2357	(Quebec)	Wrapping paper on a pound of butter printed only in French.	Referral
2411	Ottawa	Unilingual English epaulettes.	Referral
2414	Ottawa	A French-speaker received three unilingual English magazines.	Withdrawn
2422	Toronto	An English-speaker experienced difficulty in obtaining a catalogue in English.	Referral
2482	(Ontario)	A French-speaker accused his union of discriminating against him: Ontario Hydro.	Withdrawn
2508	Hull (Quebec)	Unilingual English stamp imprinted on a Canada Savings Bond.	Referral
2541	Montreal	Letter of protest sent by a French-speaker to an English-language department store.	Withdrawn
2544	Quebec City (Quebec)	Statement of account in English sent to a French-speaker.	Referral
2576	Montreal	Documentation in French sent to an English-speaker.	Referral
2577, 2609	Montreal	Mediocrity of the French in a brochure issued by the Royal Life Saving Society of Canada.	Referral
2582	Montreal	Letter in English sent to a French-speaker.	Withdrawn
2584	Saint-Jean (Quebec)	Unilingual English receipts issued to French-speaking customers.	Referral
2593	Ottawa	Envelope with return address printed in French addressed to an English-speaker.	Withdrawn
2596	Ottawa	A French-speaker complained about the advertisement of products labelled in English on French-language television.	Referral
2601	Hamilton	Advertisement published in English and Italian in a Hamilton daily.	Not justified
2604	Ottawa	Official prospectus and application form printed in English only.	Referral
2605	Ottawa	Manual available in English only.	Referral
2613	Quebec City (Quebec)	No documentation in French available from a car dealer.	Referral
2617	Montreal	A company used reply envelopes addressed only in English.	Referral
2623	Don Mills	No service in French offered to customers.	Referral

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2645	Quebec City (Quebec)	Mediocrity of the French in a bilingual magazine.	Explanation offered
2648	Dorval (Quebec)	No telephone reception in French provided by an airline company.	Explanation offered
2653	Toronto	Statements of account in English sent to a French-speaker.	Referral
2654	Montreal	Correspondence courses offered in English only.	Referral
2661, 2686	Lucerne (Quebec)	Program printed in English only.	Referral
2688	Montreal	Letters in English sent to French-speaking tenants.	Referral
2703	Quebec City	Envelopes addressed in English.	Referral
2736	Quebec City	Wrapping paper printed in English only.	Referral
2755	Montreal	Reply card in English only sent to a French-speaker.	Referral
2768	Quebec City	French-speaking employers required transactions to be conducted in French.	Referral
2769	Quebec City	Documents in English sent to a French-speaking person.	Referral
2773	Ottawa	Documents in English sent to a French-speaking person.	Explanation offered
2780	Montreal	Unilingual English company name, correspondence and advertising material.	Referral
2797	Ottawa	No telephone service in French provided by a taxi company.	Withdrawn
2806	Ottawa	Service not available in French at the Civic Centre.	Referral
2807	Ottawa	No service in French at a well-known jewellery store.	Referral
2878	Montreal	Invoice in English only sent to a French-speaking person.	Explanation offered
2908	Ottawa	Concert program printed in English only.	Assistance rendered
2933	Ottawa	Lack of services in French at the municipal hospital.	Explanation offered
2965	Montreal	Menu written in English only.	Referral
2970	Montreal	French-speaking employees required to work under unilingual English supervisors.	Referral

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2985	Campbell's Bay (Quebec)	Unilingual English counter clerks.	Referral
2986, 2990	Wawanesa (Manitoba)	Mediocrity of the French on an application form.	Referral
3043	Ottawa	The Ottawa Civil Service Recreational Association allegedly did not offer swimming lessons in French.	Explanation offered
3075	Quebec City (Quebec)	An association used envelopes with the letterhead, address and emblem in English only.	Referral
3112	Montreal	Lack of services in French: International Congress of the World Confederation for Physical Therapy.	Explanation offered
3141	Ottawa	A French-speaking commissionaire was required to write an examination in English.	Referral
3309	Hull (Quebec)	A French-speaking person received a catalogue in English from a major hardware store.	Explanation offered
3353	Chomedey (Quebec)	A French-speaker received a catalogue in English.	Explanation offered
3367	Ottawa	A confusing listing in a directory	Assistance rendered

3. *Members of Parliament*

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1956	Ottawa	Circular letter from a Member of Parliament written in English only.	Explanation offered
2060	Ottawa	Letterhead of a letter from a Member of Parliament bore only the unilingual inscription "House of Commons".	Withdrawn
2273	Ottawa	A few errors in the French of a letter sent by a minister to the employees in his department.	Explanation offered
2848	Ottawa	Letter from a Member of Parliament to his constituents written in English only.	Referral
2993	Ottawa	Poor quality of the French in a letter from a Member of Parliament to his constituents.	Assistance rendered

4. Provinces and Municipalities

File No. 2451—Summons In English (Ontario)

A French-speaking person from Quebec told the Commissioner that he had received a summons in English from the Ontario provincial court (Ottawa-Carleton judicial district) following an infraction of the regulations governing traffic on Government of Canada property.

The Commissioner informed the complainant that he was not empowered to investigate his complaint since the summons had not been issued by an institution under the jurisdiction of the Parliament or Government of Canada. He said, however, that he had often brought similar complaints to the attention of the provincial official concerned.

In Ontario all writs, pleadings and proceedings must be written *in English* pursuant to section 127 of the Judicature Act (RSO 1970). However, the Ontario judicial authorities in Ottawa will send out an explanation of a summons in French upon request.

File No. 2452—Manitoba

A Franco-Manitoban was charged with exceeding the speed limit in a 30-mile-an-hour zone. The summons he received was in English only.

He wrote to the Queen complaining that his linguistic rights had been denied. In his letter, he pointed out that when Her Majesty visited his village in 1970, she spoke to the people there in French.

The Lieutenant-Governor replied to the letter explaining the law as it applies to language in the Manitoba Courts; stated briefly, it is that English is the only language to be used in defence or prosecution or in a decision in a Manitoba Provincial Court. In practice, however, the courts do hear witnesses in a variety of languages and, when the court and the parties involved agree, the proceedings may be in French.

Not satisfied, the complainant wrote to the Commissioner, soliciting his aid.

The Commissioner informed him that the legal position was as described by the Lieutenant-Governor. However, the Commissioner said he would suggest to the Attorney-General that he consider providing supplementary information in French, as was done in French-speaking parts of Ontario, when a summons was issued to a French-speaker.

The Commissioner then sent the Attorney-General of Manitoba a copy of the notice in French used in conjunction with summonses in Ontario and suggested that he get in touch with General W. A. B. Anderson, the bilingualism co-ordinator for the Province of Ontario, if we wished to have further details.

File No. 2740—British Columbia

A correspondent from Vancouver protested that if a French-speaking person wishes to obtain the services of an interpreter at the driver licensing office in Vancouver, he must pay for them himself.

With the complainant's permission, the Commissioner referred her complaint to the British Columbia Minister of Transport and Communications.

The officials in the driver licensing office replied that in future the services of an interpreter would be available free of charge to those whose mother tongue was French, Cantonese, Hindi, Punjabi, Spanish or Portuguese.

File No. 2932—Ottawa Civic Hospital

A French-speaking person dialed the number he found listed in the telephone directory under "Hôpital Civic d'Ottawa". The switchboard operator did not understand French.

At the Commissioner's request the bilingualism adviser at Ottawa City Hall passed this complaint on to the person responsible for bilingual services at the Civic Hospital. After admitting that telephone service was not always available in French, the latter said that twenty-five per cent of the personnel assigned to the switchboard were bilingual. However, calls had to be answered twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week and this required dividing the personnel into five shifts a day, a procedure which gave rise to many difficulties. Current policy was to bring in a bilingual replacement for any employee who left his job, until 50% of the staff was bilingual.

File No. 2999—In Court in Chilliwack, B.C.

A unilingual or almost unilingual French-speaking resident of Quebec was arrested in Chilliwack, British Columbia, for possession of marijuana. He went to court and pleaded guilty. His wife telephoned the Commissioner's office and said that her husband was to be sentenced at 2:00 p.m. that same day. She said that he had been refused the right to explain himself in his own language and that no reasons had been given for this refusal.

The Commissioner asked the legal aid lawyer in Chilliwack and the Provincial Court Administrator for information on the case. He was told that the person detained had been sentenced to pay a fine of \$25. He had apparently then left the area with his family to return to Quebec.

The Commissioner also tried to find out whether the accused had chosen to plead in English and whether the provincial court in question

had complied with the requirements of Section 11(1) of the Official Languages Act when exercising a criminal jurisdiction.

According to the legal aid lawyer in Chilliwack and the Provincial Court Administrator, the accused was able to speak English fairly well. Moreover, the lawyer had apparently asked him in French whether he required an interpreter, but had concluded that he wished to go through the summary proceedings in English. The complainant had said during a second telephone conversation that her husband had not wished to wait until the services of an interpreter were available. As for the denial of the right to speak, the accused seems to have been mistaken. He had wished to address a few words to the judge before pleading innocent or guilty but the judge declared that this was irregular. Moreover, compliance with Section 11(1) of the Act by provincial courts exercising a criminal jurisdiction is exclusively the responsibility of these courts and the provinces have authority to establish procedural rules under subsection 5 of this same section.

Finally, since the administration of justice is the responsibility of the provinces and since the court in question is a provincial court, the Commissioner did not have the statutory authority to make recommendations to it. Persons who have been deprived of their rights have the normal recourses available when a court does not comply with a law of the country, including the right to appeal their case. In addition, the provincial courts must themselves ensure that this right is respected and erroneous decisions may be quashed by a higher court.

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1173	Sudbury (Ontario)	Announcements made in English only on the public address system in the Sudbury airport; plaque bearing the names of members of the airport commission in English only.	Explanation offered
1962	Hull (Quebec)	Unilingual French signs in the court-house.	Referral
2005	Hull (Quebec)	Inadequate signs on highways No. 16, 17 and 31 in the Province of Ontario.	Referral
2039	Saskatchewan	Problems faced by the civil servants of the Province of Saskatchewan who wished to take advantage of language courses offered by the federal government.	Referral
2077	Toronto	Telephone reception in English only at Queen's Park.	Referral
2094	Ottawa	Summons in English sent to a French-speaking person.	Referral

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2123	Quebec City	A reply card from the Department of Transport in French only.	Referral
2143	Quebec City	Unilingual French particulars on an envelope addressed to an English-speaker by the Justice Department.	Referral
2161	Montreal	A publication was printed in French only.	Explanation offered
2165	Ottawa	Summons in English sent to a French-speaker.	Explanation offered
2207	Ottawa	Unilingual English "Driver's Handbook" published by the Province of Ontario.	Assistance rendered
2210	Deux-Montagnes (Quebec)	Unilingual French leaflet on the demerit system issued by the Province of Quebec.	Explanation offered
2212	Ottawa	Road signs on the Queensway and near Ottawa Station in English only.	Referral
2324	Saskatchewan	Summons in English received from the province.	Explanation offered
2331	Ottawa	The "Driver's Handbook" published by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation and Communications was available in English only.	Suggestion offered
2339	Ottawa	Summons in English sent to a French-speaking person.	Explanation offered
2386	Upper Canada Village (Ontario)	Visitors provided with services in English only at Upper Canada Village.	Referral
2472	Ottawa	French treated as a foreign language in provincial courts.	Explanation offered
2474	Ottawa	Summons in English only sent to a French-speaker.	Explanation offered
2494	Ottawa	Signs in French only on the tenth floor of a building occupied by the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.	Referral
2551	Ottawa	Summons in English only sent to a French-speaker.	Referral
2629	Bathurst (N.B.)	Request that French be used in the provincial court.	Explanation offered
2635	Ottawa	Summons in English only sent to a French-speaker.	Explanation offered
2668	Ottawa	The Provincial Court, the Ministry of Revenue and the Ministry of the Solicitor-General of the Province of Ontario sent unilingual English documents to French-speakers.	Referral

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2675	Quebec City	The leaflet describing the Province of Quebec's demerit system was unavailable in English.	Referral
2700	Ottawa	Postdated cheque accompanied by an explanation in English sent back to a French-speaker by the Treasurer of the City of Ottawa.	Referral
2765	Bathurst (N.B.)	Unilingual English signs in garages and warehouses belonging to the Department of Highways.	Referral
2801	Rockland (Ontario)	Reply in English from the municipality to a tender submitted in French.	Referral
2836	Montreal	A Montreal taxi driver was allegedly unable to renew his licence because he had failed the prescribed French language knowledge examination.	Referral
2887	Blind River (Ontario)	Lack of services in French at Ontario Hydro's Robert Saunders Generating Station and at Upper Canada Village; request that vehicle licence plates and driver examination forms be bilingual.	Explanation offered
2898	Ottawa	Ticket in English issued to a French-speaker by a unilingual English officer on the municipal police force.	Referral
2907	Ottawa	Unilingual English sign placed on the Queensway by the Province of Ontario's Ministry of Transportation and Communications.	Referral
2941	Sudbury (Ontario)	No service in French at the Ontario Provincial Police Station.	Referral
2953	Toronto	No service in French at the Ontario Science Centre.	Referral
2987	Ottawa	No service in French at the Clerk's Office.	Withdrawn
3002	Hawkesbury (Ontario)	Documentation in English concerning a traffic violation sent to a French-speaking person.	Referral
3006	Ottawa	A French-speaker received a summons in English.	Withdrawn
3047	Edmonton	Summons in English issued to a French-speaker by an RCMP officer.	Explanation offered
3067	Toronto	Poor quality of the French in a letter from the Ontario Municipal Board.	Explanation offered
3195	Ottawa	A French-speaking person received a summons in English.	Referral

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
3203	Ottawa	A police officer was unable to express himself in French.	Referral
3295	Ottawa	A French-speaking person received a summons in English.	Referral
3231	Charlotte-town	Some signs in the Confederation Centre of the Arts were unilingual English.	Rectified
3351	Ottawa	Summons in English sent to a French-speaking person.	Explanation offered
3372	Alberta	A birth certificate with incorrect accentuation issued.	Rectified

5. Public Service Unions

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1984	Hull (Quebec)	The presence of a unilingual English union representative hindered a French-speaking employee in the performance of his duties.	Explanation offered
3055	Ottawa	The Public Service Alliance of Canada sent a circular in English to a French-speaking member.	Assistance rendered
3073	Ottawa	A meeting of the Public Service Alliance of Canada was not completely bilingual.	Referral
3212	Ottawa	A press release was issued in English only by the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada.	Referral

6. Telephone Services

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
1654	Ontario	Inadequate services in French in the Blind River region.	Assistance rendered
1809	British Columbia	The British Columbia Telephone Company did not offer services in French.	Referral
1862	Quebec	Small businesses tended to list their names in English in the telephone directory.	Referral
1994, 2792	Ontario	Inadequate services in French provided by Bell Canada.	Assistance rendered

FILE NO.	PLACE	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	DISPOSITION
2507	Ontario	Lack of bilingual service from Bell Canada telephone operators in the St. Catharines region.	Explanation offered
2581	Quebec	No service provided in French by the Bell Canada Treasurer's office in Montreal.	Referral
2583	Nova Scotia	No service in French.	Assistance rendered
2729	British Columbia	No service provided in French by the telephone operators of the British Columbia Telephone Company.	Referral
2754	Ontario	A client in Toronto was unable to obtain the services of a French-speaking telephone operator after a ten-minute wait.	Referral
2813	Ontario	Unilingual English service provided by Bell Canada in Copper Cliff.	Referral
2837	Ontario	Telephone operators on the night shift transfer incoming calls in French to Montreal or simply hang up.	Referral
2843	Ontario	Northern Telephone Limited and Ontario Northland Communications offered no services in French.	Explanation offered
2922	Ontario	Confusing listing in the Ottawa telephone directory.	Assistance rendered
2931	Ontario	Letter in French sent to an English-speaker by TeleDirect, a Bell Canada subsidiary.	Explanation offered
2997	Ontario	A French-speaker telephoned Ottawa from Sudbury and when she addressed the operator in French, the latter hung up.	Referral
3052	Ontario	No service in French for a long-distance call to Toronto.	Withdrawn
3091	Ontario	Bilingualism labelled "ridiculous" on a notice board in Place Bell Canada in Ottawa.	Assistance rendered
3106	Ontario	Difficulties encountered when placing long-distance calls in French.	Referral

Madrigal

Ask not of this book that's bound to die
To what dusty shelf it will go;
The months and years all flutter by,
It's best (dear readers) not to know.

Appendix

A Few Figures For Doctoral Candidates

TABLE I. Linguistic Status of Positions in the Public Service of Canada, by Region (November 1974)

Region	Bilingual			English Essential			French Essential			English or French			Total		
	No.	%		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%	
British Columbia	218	0.8/	0.4*	27,072	99.1/	15.6	40	0.1/	0.1	3	0.0/	0.0	27,333	100.0/	9.5
Alberta	249	1.4/	0.5	18,100	98.5/	10.4	21	0.1/	0.1	2	0.0/	0.0	18,372	100.0/	6.3
Saskatchewan	95	1.2/	0.2	8,040	98.7/	4.6	7	0.1/	0.0	1	0.0/	0.0	8,143	100.0/	2.8
Manitoba	301	2.5/	0.5	11,852	97.2/	6.8	37	0.3/	0.1	5	0.0/	0.0	12,195	100.0/	4.2
National Capital Region	36,646	44.1/	66.7	22,233	26.8/	12.8	4,198	5.0/	11.5	19,981	24.1/	84.6	83,058	100.0/	28.8
Ontario	2,223	3.7/	4.0	56,198	94.5/	32.4	202	0.4/	0.6	841	1.4/	3.6	59,464	100.0/	20.6
Quebec	12,967	27.6/	23.6	592	1.3/	0.3	31,834	67.8/	87.0	1,529	3.3/	6.5	46,922	100.0/	16.3
New Brunswick	1,576	19.3/	2.9	5,483	67.3/	3.2	138	1.7/	0.4	955	11.7/	4.0	8,152	100.0/	2.8
Prince Edward Island	33	2.4/	0.1	1,357	97.3/	0.8	2	0.1/	0.0	3	0.2/	0.0	1,395	100.0/	0.5
Nova Scotia	486	3.0/	0.9	15,418	94.9/	8.9	60	0.4/	0.2	279	1.7/	1.2	16,243	100.0/	5.6
Newfoundland	35	0.7/	0.1	4,900	99.2/	2.8	3	0.1/	0.0	0	0.0/	0.0	4,938	100.0/	1.7
Northern Canada	21	0.9/	0.0	2,204	97.5/	1.3	9	0.4/	0.0	26	1.2/	0.1	2,260	100.0/	0.8
Outside Canada	65	33.1/	0.1	105	53.6/	0.1	19	9.7/	0.0	7	3.6/	0.0	196	100.0/	0.1
TOTAL	54,915	19.0/100.0		173,554	60.1/100.0		36,570	12.7/100.0		23,632	8.2/100.0		288,671	100.0/100.0	

SOURCE: Treasury Board Secretariat.

*The 218 bilingual positions in British Columbia represent 0.8% of all positions in that region and 0.4% of all bilingual positions. (The same explanation holds true for the other columns of percentages.)

TABLE II. Linguistic Status of Positions in the Public Service of Canada, by Employment Category (November 1974)

Category	Bilingual			English Essential			French Essential			English or French			Total		
	No.	%		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%	
Executive	996	92.6/	1.8*	75	7.0/	0.0	4	0.4/	0.0	1	0.0/	0.0	1,076	100.0/	0.4
Admin. & Foreign Service	18,075	36.5/	32.9	25,614	51.6/	14.8	4,112	8.3/	11.2	1,801	3.6/	7.6	49,602	100.0/	17.2
Scient. & Professional	7,159	26.4/	13.0	14,555	53.7/	8.4	2,908	10.7/	8.0	2,494	9.2/	10.6	27,116	100.0/	9.4
Technical	4,245	15.1/	7.7	18,899	67.0/	10.9	2,200	7.8/	6.0	2,852	10.1/	12.1	28,196	100.0/	9.8
Administrative Support	19,476	24.8/	35.5	42,356	53.9/	24.4	8,019	10.2/	21.9	8,774	11.1/	37.1	78,625	100.0/	27.2
Operational	4,964	4.8/	9.1	72,055	69.2/	41.5	19,327	18.6/	52.9	7,710	7.4/	32.6	104,056	100.0/	36.0
TOTAL	54,915	19.0/100.0		173,554	60.1/100.0		36,570	12.7/100.0		23,632	8.2/100.0		288,671	100.0/100.0	

SOURCE: Treasury Board Secretariat.

*The 996 bilingual positions in the Executive category represent 92.6% of all positions in that category and 1.8% of all bilingual positions. (The same explanation holds true for the other columns of percentages.)

TABLE III. Linguistic Status of Federal Public Servants Occupying Positions Requiring a Knowledge of French or English, by Employment Category (November 1974)

Category	Unilingual Incumbents						Bilingual Incumbents			Total		
	English-speakers			French-speakers								
	No.	%		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%	
Executive	1	50.0/	0.0	1	50.0/	0.0	0	0.0/	0.0	2	100.0/	0.0
Admin. & Foreign Service	740	77.3/	6.8*	114	11.9/	4.1	103	10.8/	2.4	957	100.0/	5.4
Scient. & Professional	1,343	80.7/	12.4	94	5.6/	3.4	228	13.7/	5.4	1,665	100.0/	9.3
Technical	1,486	71.3/	13.7	218	10.5/	7.9	379	18.2/	9.0	2,083	100.0/	11.7
Administrative support	3,919	64.4/	36.2	1,204	19.8/	43.4	960	15.8/	22.7	6,083	100.0/	34.1
Operational	2,925	46.4/	27.0	1,061	16.8/	38.3	2,317	36.8/	54.8	6,303	100.0/	35.3
Others	417	56.4/	3.9	80	10.8/	2.9	243	32.8/	5.7	740	100.0/	4.2
TOTAL	10,831	60.7/100.0		2,772	15.6/100.0		4,230	23.7/100.0		17,833	100.0/100.0	

SOURCE: Treasury Board Secretariat.

*The 740 positions in the Administrative and Foreign Service category, the incumbents of which are unilingual English-speakers, represent 77.3% of all positions in that category and 6.8% of all unilingual English-speaking incumbents. (The same explanation holds true for the other columns of percentages.)

TABLE IV. Appointments* to Bilingual Positions in the Public Service of Canada, by Preferred Language of Work of Incumbents 1971-1974

Preferred Language of Work	1971		1972		1973		1974	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
English	1,109	18.3	1,154	17.1	1,934	25.2	8,873	44.9
French	4,938	81.7	5,590	82.9	5,740	74.8	10,900	55.1
TOTAL	6,047	100.0	6,744	100.0	7,674	100.0	19,773	100.0

SOURCE: Public Service Commission.

*All appointments (new appointments and appointments from within the Public Service).

TABLE V. Use of Second Language by Graduates of Language Training

Position and language studied by graduates	Use of acquired language when working								Data not usable
	No use made		Occasional use made		Extensive use made		Total		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<i>Bilingual positions</i>									
Graduates of French language training	664	36.9	951	52.8	185	10.3	1,800	100.0	127
Graduates of English language training	56	5.4	222	21.5	753	73.0	1,031	100.0	61
<i>Unilingual English positions</i>									
Graduates of French language training	205	53.4	169	44.0	10	2.6	384	100.0	16
Graduates of English language training	0	0.0	2	1.8	108	98.2	110	100.0	15
<i>Unilingual French positions</i>									
Graduates of French language training	9	27.3	12	36.4	12	36.4	33	100.0	2
Graduates of English language training	99	31.6	156	49.8	58	18.5	313	100.0	31
<i>Optional positions</i>									
Graduates of French language training	45	40.2	61	54.5	6	5.4	112	100.0	9
Graduates of English language training	6	6.9	9	10.3	72	82.8	87	100.0	3
ALL POSITIONS (TOTAL)									
Graduates of French language training	923	39.6	1,193	51.2	213	9.1	2,329	100.0	154
Graduates of English language training	161	10.4	389	25.2	991	64.3	1,541	100.0	110