

political leader to the effect that only French should be used in the courts of Quebec. That is the type of suggestion that flies in the face of everything this land is supposed to stand for, and it is the type of suggestion that indicates how important this debate is and can be. Yet, to be frank, many provinces with French speaking minorities have not progressed as far as Quebec with reference to its attitude toward its English speaking population.

I say quite candidly that the report issued by the French Canadian Association here in Ontario must be disturbing to all men and women of decency. In a nutshell, the reports indicate that earning opportunity is limited for Franco-Ontarian families when compared with other Ontario citizens. Surely if this were true, this would be the type of *de facto* economic discrimination that Canada could do without. If bilingualism is to work, it must be the product of not only faith, of which the Prime Minister spoke, but also of trust. The resolution proposed by the government relates to the issue of faith. Indeed, it constitutes an affirmation of faith by this House. The amendment put forward by my leader makes this resolution an instrument of trust. I beseech my colleagues on all sides of the House to make use of that instrument.

• (1440)

[Translation]

This position being established, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely wish with so many others that by the end of this debate, the primary intention of the 1969 Parliamentarians will come out clearly, firmly and neatly. Let the whole federal Public Service and the 150 federal agencies realize the urgency of making bilingualism a reality within the federal Public Service. Let all Parliamentarians—all of us—realize the importance of their role before the Canadian public in this respect. All of us, from all political parties, must buy 100 per cent in order to sell 100 per cent the objective of the Official Languages Act. Let provincial governments, various agencies throughout the country, private firms, be more and more aware of their social role, as Mr. Keith Spicer so rightly put it, and let them follow suit. The final solution to the problem of bilingualism—and this will never be said enough—cannot come from the Parliament of Canada alone.

As for myself, further to the remarks that I am making today, I intend actually to become the apostle of bilingualism. More specifically, I shall see to it that in this Parliament the objective of the Act is respected.

As a Quebecker, I shall also see to it that Quebeckers, and generally French-speaking Canadians, be served in good French. Along with others, I do not want, for instance, that our French-speaking farmers be wronged—even only temporarily—in their rights and their dues, because of badly filled out forms, which were worded in poor French;

Furthermore, in due time, I intend to deal with, the comments made by the Commissioner to the official languages, concerning bilingualism within the External Affairs Department. The image of Canada as a bilingual country, must stand out throughout the world.

Finally, within my party if need be, I intend to be consistent as my remarks will show. And at this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like once again to pay another tribute

### Official Languages

to Leader of the Official Opposition for his stand concerning this motion, and for his commendable efforts, which are already paying off, to master the French language.

In closing, I join with Mr. Keith Spicer is saying:

Plainly, departments and agencies must find more room for unilingual French-speaking Canadians, or the vicious circle of low French-language recruitment and few federal opportunities to work in French will go on forever. Easy slogans can neither solve nor disguise this problem. The Commissioner hopes that the Government will move quickly to find policies on linguistic work rights, on administrative settings where French-speaking Canadians feel at home, and on more balanced opportunities in recruitment. All these, and nothing less, can make the Official Languages Act the instrument of full linguistic equality which Parliament intended.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to borrow these words from the founder of the Jeunesse ouvrière catholique canadienne, and say to you, by changing his words a little: Canada will end in triumph or in disaster.

It depends on you, it depends on me, but you and I, can change the course of history.

[English]

**Mr. John Harney (Scarborough West):** Mr. Speaker, it was only a few weeks ago that we were debating a resolution on this question presented by the members of the Social Credit party. Those of us who spoke at that time will find ourselves more or less forced to repeat some of the things we said then. I used to worry about this matter of repeating one's self. As a matter of fact, I come from a profession where repeating one's self was a necessity, but now I discover I am in one where repeating one's self is a virtue, and so I will not hesitate to go over a few of the points I made at that time and to add a few new ones, particularly on matters that have come to light and to consideration under this particular resolution.

The other week I made some point about the importance of making distinctions in this very important question, and I am glad to report what I am sure many members have noticed over the past few years, that we have all learned more about the matter that is before us as the years have gone by and as our deliberations have become more informed and more searching. I would ask members of the House to remember the days in 1963-64 when the debate on bilingualism and biculturalism, as it was called then, began in earnest, and to recall some of the terminology we used to try to describe for our own understanding the state of affairs that existed in Canada, and to try to describe the goals we would seek to achieve. If we were to go back to those documents, indeed to the statement Prime Minister Pearson made on the day he announced the establishment of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, we would see that we have come a long way. Some of the terminology we used in the past we would now find totally inadequate. Indeed, in this process we may note that our learning process had accelerated in the past four or five years.

I could not help but listen yesterday to the remarks made by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and compare them with the remarks he made a few years ago. I listened to his use of the terms that are so important in this great national debate. In his speech yesterday, he was very careful to limit the debate on this point to the application and working out of the Official Languages