

The budget of the Official Language Minority Groups Directorate for fiscal year 1980-81 is \$15,000,000.

| (a) and (b) | Francophones outside Quebec | Anglophones in Quebec |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Allocation of budget 1980-81 (%) | \$ 14,073,800 (94%) | \$ 926,200 (6%) |
| Per capita (1976 Census) | \$ 15.63 | \$ 1.16 |
| Amount committed as of January 15, 1981 | \$ 13,411,276 | \$ 895,617 |

Does that smack of human rights or does it smack of something we want to do under bilingualism? This must be done by moral suasion not by threat of fiat, not by the spectre of being red circled in the public service because you do not speak French. It should not be done by the lack of mobility, the inability to move freely from province to province because you do not speak both official languages fluently.

I placed question No. 1,731 on the Order Paper. It was answered on February 23, 1981, as reported in *Hansard* at pages 7557 and 7558. The federal government has wasted billions of dollars to produce a functionally bilingual public service, but it has not worked. Part of the answer to my question was that it cost \$5,390 for 849 hours of instruction for a public servant. The hidden costs are much higher, such as the time away from the job while on immersion, the costs to pay a replacement to cover while that person is away on language training, the costs of removal expenses for the fortunate few who are chosen to study in total immersion in France, Quebec, or elsewhere, on full salary for one year. The answers provided to me by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Johnston), who I see in the House, are only the tip of the iceberg. What the government revealed in its answer is that it does not really know how much it has cost for language instruction in the public service.

Bilingualism should mean that not only Anglo-Canadians learn French but unilingual French, or English Canadians, should not be discriminated against because they speak only one language. It should mean that the Kelsos of this world are not banished because they are unilingual. This was pointed out only yesterday by the hon. member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie). It should mean that unilingual Canadians are not forced to ride on the back of the bus because of an accident of birth, language or geography. It should mean that unilingual security guards and protective staff, who we see in this House, are not made second-class citizens because they speak one tongue. It should mean that every Canadian is able to communicate with his government in his or her language. It should mean that Anglo-Canadians in Quebec should be accorded the same rights that Franco-Canadians are seeking elsewhere in Canada. It should mean that the federal policy be administered sanely, not rammed down the throats of Canadians, and not in such a fashion as to force a backlash against our French partners in confederation.

Think of what might have happened had those federal billions of dollars been used in language instruction in the

The Constitution

public schools, instead of having been wasted trying to make 45, 50 and 55-year-old civil servants bilingual. Today we might have had a vastly different Canada. French and English now have never been more alienated.

I do not want rough justice for members of a majority of the Canadian population, those whose mother tongue is English, just as there should not be rough justice for those whose mother tongue is French. I want real rights. I fear this document in respect of all our rights.

I respect Quebec, and I respect the French language and culture. We all spoke in this House to keep Quebec in confederation. I want to see the growth and development of a vibrant, bilingual Quebec. I do not want to see hyphenated Canadianism. If we are ever to be a united country we must build on the basis of equal partnership for all Canadians, not only a partnership of two founding races. If we are not a united country we are a divided country. If we are divided we will never achieve our destiny and we will continue to be two nations "warring within the bosom of a single state".

If this nation is to become truly bilingual, it must be done gradually through attrition. If that is the way it should be, so be it. But let it evolve under Parliament and provincial legislation, not through grass-bound, granite-etched pronouncements in a constitutional document such as the one proposed.

Many Canadians do not want to become bilingual. They do not need to become bilingual. They do not feel the need to become bilingual and they are probably not capable of becoming bilingual. This should be their choice. We must respect the right of the individual to that freedom of choice. Bilingualism must remain a matter of personal choice, not of entrenched legislation from on high.

Canada is now badly crippled because of the mailed fist of the federal government's Official Languages Act, national standards which are unacceptable in most of the provinces and territories. It is essential that we learn to distinguish between individual bilingualism and national bilingualism because the one creates unity and the other causes division.

Individual bilingualism is not only accepted, it is welcomed and sought after and is, in fact, essential to the achievement of national unity. National bilingualism is unnatural, undesirable, unwelcome and it is one of the central causes of national disunity. We must all try to remember that we are nation building, not province building, and that if Canadians are to achieve their destiny as one people, Canada must ultimately be united by language, not divided by languages.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You have got them yapping now.

Mr. Stewart: But the *coup d'état*, the *coup de grâce* is the bringing home of our Constitution with a veto-included amending formula and the most imperfect charter of rights one could imagine. This charter will give the people not more rights but less. It comes through grovelling at the feet of Westminster to include the charter and amending formula.

If it is so great, why is the Prime Minister setting time limits on debate? Why were time limits set for the constitutional