

person will submit the same invention this week, and I believe it will be a good one. My constituent will be outstripped merely because he was not looked after immediately in his own language.

Therefore we cannot be patient anymore. We merely want justice. We merely want French Canadians to be looked after in their own language, nothing less.

That objective set for 1978 seems to us like a mere joke on Quebecers. I know that the government can afford to laugh at Quebecers when it gets massive support. However, I think that it is high time the truth came out on certain points.

The second principle of the motion is as follows:

(2) that positions will also be identified where English is an essential requirement of the job, where French is essential, or whether either French or English may be used;

Mr. Speaker, this is quite a find. It will be determined which positions require a knowledge of English, which require a knowledge of French and those requiring bilingual applicants.

The Prime Minister stated this afternoon, if I am not mistaken, that of the 250,000 positions of the Civil Service, 25,000 are bilingual.

I would have liked then to ask him: among the 225,000 other positions, how many will be for English-speaking applicants and how many for Francophones?

An hon. Member: He did not mention it.

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, it is all very well to say that, because one would be inclined to believe that the same applies to both, and of course that is probably what many of my colleagues would tell me. It is as true of Anglophones as of Francophones. However, let us not be so stupid.

We know full well that in the Public Service—and this is borne out by figures supplied in replies to questions placed on the order paper and statistics brought out over the years—there are virtually no Francophone units. As a matter of fact, in notices of Public Service competitions, one finds that in 90 per cent of cases the only language requirement is knowledge of English. Let us not wonder why graduates of Francophone universities, for instance, show little interest in coming to work in Ottawa. From the very start, they are frustrated by an organization conceived exclusively in terms of the Anglo-Saxon component of this country.

The third principle reads as follows:

A knowledge of French and English—

that is a good joke—

—is one of the qualifications required for the selection of applicants to bilingual positions;

Mr. Speaker, we could have been referred to the dictionary where the word "bilingual" is defined as someone who speaks two languages. That is the principle. We are told that a bilingual person is someone who speaks two languages. To get excited with that and make us believe that Canada's problem has been settled by telling us that a bilingual person is someone who speaks two languages, that is too much! The Larousse dictionary, the Webster

Official Languages

and all other dictionaries have said it long before the Prime Minister.

The fourth principle reads as follows:

Competitions to bilingual positions will be opened both to bilingual and unilingual applicants who have formally indicated their willingness to become bilingual;

Mr. Speaker, let us stop playing on words and handing out a convincing line. I know perfectly well that literally, I am compelled to say that I agree with that. Yes, I agree with that, literally, but when one is aware of the Canadian reality, when one is aware of the facts, this principle, stated in subsection (4) means: competitions for bilingual positions will be opened both to bilingual applicants and unilingual English speaking applicants, since they are the only ones to be unilingual. Then, when one considers this nice principle that, literally, one would be led to approve in contrast with Canadian reality, one realizes that once more it does not solve anything. That is why some people must be brave enough not to play the game of the traditional good understanding and say: That is very fine, we accept it and everything continues to be the same!

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I am fulfilling here tonight an important duty, so that we can, at a given time, think in a more realistic way.

The fifth principle reads as follows:

that competitions for unilingual positions will continue to be open to unilingual or bilingual candidates who meet the language requirements of the job;

I can hardly see how anyone really serious can find anything making any sense here. It is said: "for unilingual positions". Again, unilingual candidates, O.K., but it says bilingual candidates who meet the language requirements of the job.

Again, Mr. Speaker, if we stick to the present facts and circumstances, we know quite well that that does not mean anything whatsoever. Again, it all looks nice but when one stops and thinks about it for a while one realizes that it is simply another way of trying to please a certain part of the country which showed some dissatisfaction during the last election campaign, and rightly so. I will come back on that later.

The sixth principle reads as follows:

that unilingual incumbents of bilingual positions may elect to become bilingual and undertake language training, or transfer to another job having the same salary maximum,

Here again, why if it is a bilingual position, talk about unilingual incumbents. That I can understand, and I would agree if it were not for what comes after:

or, if they were to decline such a transfer, to remain in their positions even though the posts have been designated as bilingual;

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a negation of any intelligence in individuals and people. The principle is set that some positions will be bilingual. English-speaking or French-speaking unilingual; we have a bilingual position, and unilingual person gets it. The unilingual person can be transferred to another position at the same salary under that principle but if he does not want it he can stay there. I cannot get over how one can think of solving problems with such principles.

I will not read the seventh principle but it boils down to this: Those who have been in the Public Service for 17