there must be signs which point out that each official language is given equal prominence. Clause 29 says in part:

> —it shall communicate by using such media of communication as will reach members of the public in the official language of their choice in an effective and efficient manner that is consistent with the purposes of this Act.

Let me move on now to Part V. First I would point out Clause 30 of the Act which is all too often overlooked. The primary emphasis in Bill C-72 is service to the public. It is pointed out in Clause 30 that where there is an inconsistency between service to the public and the choice of language of work, the service obligation will prevail. As I said, I think that is sometimes overlooked.

In 1969 the Official Languages Act declared the equality of status of the two official languages and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all federal institutions. That fact was raised to the level of a constitutional principle by way of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We feel that the language of work regime set out in the Bill takes into consideration the linguistic reality of our country. It recognizes the existence of two types of work environments: first, those in the National Capital Region and the more bilingual parts of our country where both languages are commonly used; and second, where one of those languages predominates. Obviously the obligations of federal institutions are not going to be the same in both cases. I refer to Clause 33 of the Bill which states:

> English and French are the languages of work in all federal institutions, and officers and employees of all federal institutions have the right to use either official language in accordance with this Part.

I now want to look at some of the questions raised by this particular clause. For example, what about the right to work in either official language in accordance with this part? Does that mean this is unlimited? I think the right has to be understood in the context of the Bill which requires federal institutions to provide certain types of services to public servants in both official languages in certain regions and to create work environments conducive to the use of either official language in such regions. Therefore, the employee's right to choice of language of work is linked to these institutional duties.

As well, the Bill provides, and I stated this earlier, that where there is any inconsistency between the duties of the federal institutions to serve the public in both languages and the duties of those institutions in respect of the language of work of their officers and employees, the obligation to serve the public must prevail.

What about the question of supervisors? Does the Bill require all supervisors to be bilingual? In a bilingual institution as large as the federal Public Service there are work units composed entirely of positions requiring the use of only one language. To insist on bilingual supervisors in such units would be useless. On the other hand, the federal government policy will be to require supervisors to have a real bilingual capacity where the work environment requires it.

• (1150)

What about the work instruments that are referred to in Clause 35? Does that include all the technical manuals of the federal Government? The work instruments to which we refer in the Bill are the manuals, guidelines, circular letters, and forms which are regularly and widely used by employees and which are produced on behalf of the institution concerned. For that reason many technical manuals which are only used by a limited number of employees would not fall under this definition. It will be up to Treasury Board to set out the parameters on work instruments through the regulations and guidelines.

What about the participation of English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians? Our objectives are two-fold: first, that English and French-speaking Canadians should have equal opportunities to obtain federal jobs and promotions: and second, that the workforce of the federal Government should reflect the presence of English-speaking and French-speaking populations in Canada while respecting the principle of merit.

All of the comments which I have made with regard to the Bill, and I tried to be specific with regard to the sections under Treasury Board jurisdiction, should be read in conjunction with Clauses 81 and 82 which refer to the regulation-making authority of the Governor in Council and the Treasury Board. We are inviting suggestions as to whether or not this Bill brings together the old Official Languages Act and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We are inviting suggestions with regard to improvements to the Bill.

One suggestion which may be considered is the requirement that regulations under Clauses 81 and 82 be printed and distributed for a consultative process prior to their issuance and promulgation. In other words, these two sections seek the views of members of the English and French linguistic minority communities and, where appropriate, members of the public. Clause 82 also provides for a review by the permanent committees of the House of Commons and the Senate. This is another improvement which we think could be suggested at committee.

In conclusion, I want to suggest to the House that the Bill may not be perfect, that clarifications may be required, that there may be interpretations which could be requested in committee. We understand that. That is the process through which all Bills go.

I would like to comment on any suggestion by anyone that this Bill has been held up for an inordinate length of time. From memory I believe that there is on the Order Paper Bill C-30 still at second reading, Bill C-33 which has not had second reading, Bill C-54 which is at second reading, and Bill C-72. In other words, we have progressed in working our way through the Order Paper. Now is an appropriate time to deal with Bill C-72.

In doing so we seek tolerance and understanding in debate, in committee, and in implementation of the Act. Since