

*Language Rights*

I might add that in the near future the government proposes to introduce legislation in relation to language rights before courts of criminal jurisdiction. It proposes to offer solutions which will guarantee language rights before such courts without adversely affecting the efficiency of the administration of justice.

It should be borne in mind that the provinces have an important role to play in the implementation of any proposed legislation. The views of the provinces have been solicited and the minister has been in consultation with his provincial colleagues in relation to what should be done. Legislation is now being considered with a view to drafting. We would like to commend the provinces for the co-operation they have shown.

Since we are dealing with a subject covering a wide field—there are a number of ramifications—I should like to move an amendment in the hope that, while we can continue to deal with these issues in the few minutes remaining to us, the subject matter of the bill itself will be referred to the committee, at which stage all members will have an opportunity to make their views known and to amplify their remarks.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I second that proposal.

**Mr. Young:** I therefore move:

That Bill C-210, to correct certain anomalies and inconsistencies in the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, pertaining to the protection of Canadian language rights be not now read the second time but that the order be discharged, the bill withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

**Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** The Speaker, I wish to say, first of all, that I appreciate the attitude taken by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Young) with respect to this difficult and vexing question, one which has troubled Canadians for years. I was also pleased to hear him say—and I am sure he was speaking for the Government of Canada—that his department has had the co-operation of all provinces with respect to this matter.

Discussions have obviously taken place between the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and the attorney general of Ontario, for instance. The parliamentary secretary nods his head in agreement. There have been negotiations, I am sure, with the attorney general of British Columbia and with attorneys general of other provinces. With respect to these discussions the parliamentary secretary has commended those concerned for the positive and helpful approach they have adopted.

I note that the bill itself provides for the immediate introduction of the services to which it refers. This does concern me in the light of the questions raised by the parliamentary secretary. The hon. gentleman called attention to possible adverse effects upon the administration of justice in a particular case even though we might be dealing, as we are in this bill, with the Federal Court of Canada. This is something we cannot ignore.

I have been concerned, also, by a line of questioning which has gone on in this House involving the hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) and the hon. member for

[Mr. Young.]

Madawaska with respect to the position of the government of Ontario.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** The hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) on a point of order.

**Mr. Corbin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I simply want to remind the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) that my riding is called Madawaska-Victoria.

[English]

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** I am sorry. I did not want to misname the hon. member's constituency. As I was saying, in light of the statement made just now by a representative of the government, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, with respect to co-operation, I am very much concerned about the maintenance of the goodwill which must exist between the government of Canada and the government of Ontario in the course of the discussions on this subject.

It is unfortunate that the questions which have been put forward by the hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier and by the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) have been somewhat provocative with respect to the position taken by the premier of Ontario, who has the political responsibility for the administration of justice and, indeed, for the administration of the government of Ontario. I just want to say to the hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) that while the premier of Ontario has indicated that perhaps there is a better way of moving than by codification, and that symbols are not nearly as important as substance, with respect to questions involving second language, whether it be in education, in the administration of justice or in the provision of schools for education in the second language of Ontario, I think the record of the government of Ontario is impressive, given the situation. I believe it is important that nothing happen on the political level which would harden attitudes and perhaps blind people to certain realities.

● (1752)

Yesterday or the day before the premier of Ontario, in speaking to the Canadian Club in Toronto, expressed his concern for those in the second language group in Ontario, French-speaking Ontarians, by saying that he did not want to repeat the errors on the provincial side, in his jurisdiction, that have been made by the Government of Canada.

**Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier):** What errors?

**Mr. Corbin:** He could have followed the example of New Brunswick.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** I am very glad that hon. members are listening to my argument because I intend to deal with the question of New Brunswick. New Brunswick, under the jurisdiction of the premier there and having regard to the situation in that province, decided to enact an official languages act in that province. As the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) will confirm, there is a tremen-