

*Supply*

If anything we should be moving toward trilingualism in Canada and not just bilingualism. The whole world is moving toward not just one or two but three languages. The hon. member should travel to Europe to see that. In Europe the vast majority of people speak at least two languages.

Is the hon. member suggesting we should deny the majority of the people who live in the national capital region the right to services in French as well as the right of other people in the national capital region to services in English?

**Mr. Gouk:** After that counter speech I am not quite sure where to begin.

First, does the hon. member who posed that convoluted question think that 55 per cent of the French speaking people who live in the national capital region go up to the cockpit while they are on some flight, use the radio and handle the aircraft control procedures for the pilot?

The two per cent is documented. It is the optimum figure in terms of the French language used in the national capital region.

I would love to compare passports with the hon. member. I suggest that I travel at least as much as he does and probably quite a bit more. English is the international language of aviation.

I have no problem with the idea of using French in Quebec because that is the language there. I would even go along with providing the service here. However, we are going so far beyond the amount necessary to provide the service to those who require it that it is absolutely ridiculous.

When the member talks of implementing this right across Canada it is no wonder the budget is so totally out of control.

**Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out there is some inconsistency in what the hon. member has said. He started out by saying that one of the problems with the official languages legislation is that it is divisive. I suggest that if there is a divisive element in this it is the putting forward of some of these bizarre notions as fact.

● (1600)

Twice categorically the member said that nobody in this country wants this. I do, so he is wrong. A lot of people do. Come visit New Brunswick and see how many people are lined up to get into immersion and programs like that. The suggestion that it is a failure disregards reality. Reality has it that in 25 short years in the context of the history of a country that large numbers of people are becoming conversant in a second language who would not have that opportunity outside of the official languages policy.

The suggestion has been made repeatedly that somehow this legislation forces people to become bilingual when in fact it has exactly the reverse effect of allowing people not to become bilingual and get services from their government.

If you speak French in Saskatchewan you do not have to be able to speak English to get services from your government. If you speak French in Fredericton, New Brunswick, you do not have to be able to speak English to get services from the government. That is what is provided, not the requirement to become bilingual but the opportunity not to be.

Finally, I would suggest that the cost argument that is put and is put often is very divisive in this debate. Consider the numbers of people who are being served by the provisions in this legislation relative to cost. I think of my province of New Brunswick and the numbers of people who get service. There are 250,000 Acadians who are being served by the federal government in their first language. Much of it is enhanced by this legislation. The cost relative to the numbers of people is not excessive at all. It is a divisive argument. It is an unfounded argument and I would ask the member to respond.

**Mr. Gouk:** Mr. Speaker, the member does not like my use of the word divisive but found many uses for it himself.

Yes I said that no one wants it and the member challenged that. I suppose he is right. There is absolutely nothing I can think of where there is absolute unanimity all across the line.

I would point out to the member that the last survey I saw suggested that 63 per cent of all those surveyed in Quebec did not agree with the national bilingual program and there was a higher percentage than that in the rest of Canada.

The hon. member suggest that because many people take French language training that they are in favour of this. I have taken Spanish and I have taken Portuguese and I am not in favour of Canada implementing bilingualism in Spanish and Portuguese either. Therefore, his argument does not hold much water.

With regard to the fact that no one is forced to take bilingual training because of the provisions of the bilingual service, tell that to the controllers at the Ottawa terminal.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, I will be dividing my time with the member for Carleton—Gloucester.

[*Translation*]

I am glad to speak on behalf of the President of the Treasury Board in this debate—