

Zellers put up some bilingual signs which were fire bombed. Is that fairness? Is this how the Official Languages Act of this country works? Is this how the Charter of Rights and Freedoms works?

If Meech Lake is passed and "significant demand" is instilled into the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and our Constitution then what will happen with Bill 101? Is there any element of English-speaking persons in Canada who want Bill 101 and want to institutionally and individually bilingualize the country the document which we have in front of us? I want a united Canada. I want an Official Languages Act that will work. But I do not think that any free people should ever have a minority language right enforced by the law of the country.

The Meech Lake Accord refers to distinct society. Is Premier Bourassa now waiting for the distinct society provision to take effect in order to legitimize this discriminatory Bill? What a hammer to have in place in conjunction with Bill C-72 as well. The distinct society provision could legitimize unilingualism while the rest of us would be struggling for a bilingual country.

Regarding the preamble of Bill C-72, there are two approaches to bilingualism in Canada today. One is that all Canadians have access to the institutions of Canada and essential services yet remain unilingual without jeopardizing their careers. We all support that. The second option is that everyone has the capacity to interchange language in any way, in other words, be fluently bilingual. Until now that has worked as everybody has been saying. It has been enshrined in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. However, for the first time, we have legislation through Bill C-72 which will force the abandonment of option one and pull this country inexorably toward institutional bilingualism.

The quote I have in my hand has been given in the House of Commons time after time. I will not go through the Alberta report again. What this quote is saying can and probably will be true if Bill C-72 goes through in its present shape and form.

I would like to quote what the Minister of Energy Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse) has said in his hiring practices. On page three under the objectives it is stated that the suppliers of goods and services of the Department in bilingual regions shall provide such goods and services in both official languages. This would pertain to any corporation in Canada doing business with the federal Government. The manual also identifies springboard positions that foster the accelerated development of incumbents and staff with high potential candidates, 30 per cent of whom are to be Francophones, not bilingual but Francophones.

• (1250)

The old Act was based on service to the public. Bill C-72 changes all that, giving every public servant the right to work in the language of his or her choice. The Language Commissioner would like us to believe that this will pertain only to the National Capital Region and designated areas. However, we

know that in reality, any supervisory position or opportunities thereto in the public service will have bilingualism as a prerequisite because of this Bill, just in case one should have to communicate in both French and English.

Bill C-72 states that the instruments of work must be provided in both official languages. I heard the Minister reply to this by saying that it was nothing to think about. Every piece of software, hardware and equipment for communication in Canada must be bilingual-capable. The DND regulations were just translated a while ago, costing tens of millions of dollars. The cost will be astronomical in the face of the deficit we are fighting so hard.

Both the federal and the Ontario Governments have designated Toronto as a city where French-language services are to be provided. They should be providing it in Italian. How can they justify this course of action when the 1981 Census figures show that the number of residents of Metro Toronto who speak French is only 0.69 of the population? To serve the people in French, 99.3 per cent of the population will pay the millions, and I mean millions of dollars, to have everything done in two languages. Obviously it means jobs, jobs for Francophone people. Unfortunately, that provision will not protect the ethnic people. The ethnic people of the City of Toronto and elsewhere will have to be bilingual as well.

Bill C-72 confuses two important issues. The present Official Languages Act commits the Government to bilingualism, not the country. Bill C-72 commits the country to such a concept.

The Official Languages Commissioner is above the law. He is a tsar. He is answerable only to the Charter of Rights, not to Parliament. He can charge, subpoena and accuse but he himself cannot have that done to him.

Language in the workplace will change the face of this nation. It will mean that the private sector doing business with the Government will have to have bilingual employees in order to serve public servants in the language of their choice. Bill C-72 does this by simply making a bilingual capacity a prerequisite for all government jobs.

Indeed, it is apparent by the thrust of the preamble that an ability to speak in both languages will become a prerequisite for all jobs in Canada. The Bill may not spell that out loud and clear, one may have to search a bit for it, but it is there.

Already the Act denies the right of unilingual Canadians to take any position in the Public Service with a supervisory capacity. It demands that all federally-appointed court judges with the exception of the Supreme Court be bilingual. My hon. friend, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn), suggested in his opening remarks that Bill C-72 would not do that, that although the actual legislation refers to all courts, somehow, some way, not all courts would be affected. One of the officers of the Law Society of Canada phoned me, however, to tell me of his grave fears about the whole issue.