

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

The ruling in favour of bilingualism for all positions in the national capital area reduced job advancement opportunities for many from outside areas, he said.

The government, if it had the will, could ensure that its intent was carried through in application, he said.

"The cabinet cannot duck responsibility for the situation".

I agree with the parliamentary secretary. Something is wrong and unfair in our bilingual and bicultural regulations as they apply to the salaries and job opportunities of our public servants. That is why I asked the following question on April 24, as reported at page 7900 of *Hansard*:

Was the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister stating the view of the government when he said that departmental directives have pushed civil servant bilingual requirements beyond the intent of the legislation by parliament?

I also had a supplementary ready to ask. I did not ask it on April 24, but it would have been as follows: "Arising from the statement made by the parliamentary secretary that elected representatives should have veto power over regulations which interpret the law issued by senior public servants, will the Prime Minister indicate whether the government has any specific measure in mind to provide for the exercise of such veto power?"

What a strange anomaly now exists as a result of Mr. Pearson's legislation applying to bonuses for bilingual and bicultural public servants. Since the Prime Minister is the sponsor of the next big jump this country may take into more legislation respecting the status of the official languages of Canada—I refer to Bill C-120—why do not the opinions and remarks voiced by the parliamentary secretary come from the Prime Minister himself? This would be far better, since it is now agreed and stated by his able parliamentary secretary that mistakes have been made. This legislation does not make for a just society; it does not even amount to participatory democracy, both so-called unique and vaunted ideals of the Prime Minister. Why cannot this country now have some leadership from the Prime Minister?

• (10:10 p.m.)

We need a reconsideration of the legislation put forward by the previous government. We need a reconsideration of the 7 per cent bonus to bilingual public servants because of its trouble making and divisive results in our public service. No one can deny this, Mr. Speaker; ask any member of this house, any

member of the Senate, any member of the public service.

I have spoken out against this measure several times. In this connection I cite *Hansard* for November 18, 1966, November 22, 1966, November 23, 1966 and particularly November 24, 1966, where will be found opinions regarding public service regulations respecting bonuses for bilingual employees. This government has had ample warning about this, warnings that they would not heed. Now, the parliamentary secretary makes a strong protest and agrees with me as well as with all others who have argued against this measure. The parliamentary secretary recommends the typical Liberal dictatorial method of dealing with it, saying that elected representatives should have veto power over the very regulations that a Liberal government has created. Mr. Speaker, none other than parliament should straighten out this mess and amend this error.

While I am on my feet I want to warn the Prime Minister that he be very careful in his advancement of Bill C-120, especially regarding the provision pertaining to linguistic minorities of 10 per cent having lingual parity with the remaining 90 per cent of a district. What about the other ethnic minorities in this country which I mentioned in my remarks in 1966?

Yes, we are thankful for men who will fearlessly state their opinions, as the parliamentary secretary has done in this regard. I want the Prime Minister to know that the people of Canada will not swallow his hodgepodge of bilingual legislation in Bill C-120 with regard to the public service, such as the people of Canada were forced to swallow by the former Prime Minister and which they have now regurgitated.

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am very flattered that the hon. member agrees with what he thinks I said. In all friendliness, I must tell him that I do not agree with many of the things he has just said. Frankly, I prefer to quote myself and to make comments, rather than refer to the *Ottawa Citizen*, however good that paper may be.

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to reply to the hon. member. I simply say that because of my deep interest in parliament and in the vital role of the elected member in our system of parliamentary democracy, I recently expressed the view that the time might well be at hand when