

*Official Languages*

group by any majority, most certainly not against those of French origin. All have been treated equal, with no special rights or privileges, all working in a spirit of co-operation, sincerely desirous of building a great country founded on a multicultural mosaic wherein each group is given the opportunity to add to its character.

We in the west can in no way be attached to the so-called guilt complex of discrimination which seems to exist in the central part of Canada and resulted in bringing forth this legislation. The people of our land are of some 40 different origins. People came to this country of their own free will, with nothing but their own two hands and the desire and courage to make this country their homeland. These people have since intermarried. They have raised their families with one thing in mind, the promoting of Canadianism. The last thing that is considered is the brand of hyphenated Canadian that one is. In my part of the country there is only one kind of citizen, whatever his origin may be, and that is Canadian. There is no place in this country for second class citizens.

I believe that this bill has a tendency to create two categories of citizenship. For this reason I take particular objection to clause 38. We in the Conservative Party tried to amend it in order that the numerous members of Canada's third force might feel they have a place in the development of the nation's cultural life. But the government appears adamant that status within Canada shall be confined to two groups only, the English language group and the French language group. I know there are many hon. members on the other side of the house who feel as I do. Why did they not stand up and support our amendment? Perhaps they have been threatened by the powers that be and are not able to vote as their consciences dictate.

This bill is supposed to symbolize the government's choice of the multiple society over the melting-pot society. In my estimation its provisions simply ensure that instead of one melting pot there shall be two melting pots. Canadians of Ukrainian, German, Italian or Scandinavian origin will have no choice but to be absorbed either in the French melting pot or the English.

Another one of the principal points of this legislation that I believe should be made crystal clear is its effect upon public servants and public service careers. We tried to clarify the matter by proposing an amendment in an attempt to dispel fears of discrimination

[Mr. Mazankowski.]

within the civil service. However, the government, which evidently has a monopoly on all good ideas, rejected the measure. The fact is that the bill certainly raises a great deal of apprehension among members of the civil service.

We heard one minister, a Minister without Portfolio, explain to a western audience that no Canadian will have to be bilingual in order to be appointed to the public service, or once appointed, to be promoted. He suggested that a bilingual secretary in one's office may suffice. Yet we heard shortly after and in unmistakable terms from the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) that henceforth bilingualism would be a necessity in the public service and the chance of a unilingual person being hired, let alone promoted, would be nil. I believe that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) should immediately give the country reassurance on this point and spell out in clear, concise terms just what this bill will mean to public service careers.

The general idea behind this bill may be fine and quite acceptable to all reasonable Canadians, but its detail and the cloud of confusion and doubt that surround its portable workings have made many people suspicious of its purpose and its operation. Certainly there remains a great deal of suspicion and doubt about the duties of the language commissioner, his interpretations of the bill, his administration, his degree of neutrality and his degree of scrupulousness, which we in this party have tried to clarify. We have been sincere about making this a workable, practical bill, but here again our suggestions and proposals have not been accepted. Why, Mr. Speaker? Is it because the government purposely wants to leave certain clauses and regulations vague in order that it may apply its own interpretation?

• (5:20 p.m.)

The Prime Minister has blamed the press for failing to explain the bill adequately. Surely the onus for explanation rests primarily upon the Prime Minister and, second, upon the members of his government. If there has been, as he claims, a misrepresentation of this legislation, the blame rests solely on the shoulders of the government and no one else. I believe it is the government's duty to clear up this mystery in the interests of the nation.

Why does the Prime Minister not clear up some of the fears and doubts that exist about this bill, particularly in western Canada? In western Canada the bill is regarded merely as