

cannot print on both sides. That is the reason which the ministry gave to Ontario's francophones.

In 1994, a key year for Franco-Ontarians, the Auditor General of that province criticized the Ministry of Education for not providing francophones with good services and he says that the services given to francophones are inferior. Our friend from Carleton—Gloucester is quoted here: "Deploring the lack of bilingual judges, six-year wait for civil cases in Ontario, backlog of 1400 trials".

The gem is Mr. Vastel's article, where it mentions that someone is looking for "sewers, preferably bilingual". Let me explain. In Kingston, the city where they want to relocate the military college because it is bilingual, the Employment Centre has an advertisement for a "sewer"; let me spell it out in case I do not pronounce it correctly, so that there is no ambiguity. It should be translated in French as "couseur" or "couseuse", but the advertisement says "égout"—quite a different sewer!

Another situation. I just heard someone from Saskatoon ask the Minister of Heritage a question. There is an advertisement in the Saskatoon Employment Centre for a "cook for menu in family style restaurant", which was translated "faire cuire de menus dans famille coiffée de restaurant". Those are a few gems.

To get back to something more serious, although we need to laugh a little, we will talk about bonuses. I admit that bilingualism is costly. We talked about bilingualism bonuses, for example. Do you know that such bonuses have existed since 1888? In 1888, bilingualism bonuses were established. They were \$50 for any francophone civil servant who could take English dictation or for any anglophone civil servant who could take French dictation. So Canada has always wanted to recognize bilingualism with a bonus. In reality, in constant dollars, \$800 is not much compared to the \$50 offered in 1888 just for writing a dictation. Now they are given a bonus to be operational, so that they can respond and give service. I do not think that \$800 is a lot.

If you want to make cuts in bilingualism, I do not think that is the place to do it. Training is where the cuts should be made. If you need to be bilingual for a position, you should be bilingual before you are hired and not have someone take courses and more courses and still more courses, which is very expensive. Why take a public servant from his office and send him for three months of immersion somewhere, the Château Frontenac, perhaps, for the Christmas holidays, or maybe Toronto, if he is French-speaking.

• (1650)

I find it inconceivable that, 25 years after the passage of the Official Languages Act, we continue to send unilingual public servants on language training at public expense. If bilingualism

Supply

is a condition of employment, then they should be bilingual at the time they are hired. I am not talking about refresher or upgrading courses, which are relatively inexpensive. But to pay for the basic language training of unilingual civil servants is too expensive. We could easily save close to \$96 million a year, if you count the training costs plus the program administration costs. That is no paltry amount.

I would like to call imagination into play. In a draft article which was sent to me, Professor Bouvier calls it the ignorance bonus versus the bilingualism bonus. The latter, the bonus paid to those bilingual civil servants who fulfil their duties satisfactorily, should remain. As for the other one, the ignorance bonus, we could do away with it.

According to an article published in *The Ottawa Citizen*, the report just produced by Mr. Goldbloom must be seen as conveying a double message, both a judgment and a warning. Why a warning? Year after year, we are reminded in that report about all that is going well and all that is going wrong in Canada. Let us face it, it is not a bed of roses for francophones outside Quebec.

When you think about ways of preserving your language, it is important to know that you can get served in your own language. I can remember back in my youth, when we went out shopping. We could safely go to Dupuis Frères knowing that we would be served in French. But beyond Saint-Laurent Street, you were sure to have to ask to be served in French because it was not automatic; they would answer you in English. We had to besiege Sainte-Catherine Street to get the restaurants to translate their menus. Is it through these little day-to-day battles that Quebec was able to assert its French and French-speaking colour more and more.

I listened carefully to the hon. member for Nanaimo who spoke first, I think, on behalf of the Reform Party, as he enumerated all the milestones, but I could not help but notice that he had major memory blanks. He systematically failed to mention any legislation passed in Quebec that favoured anglophones. He only talked about those that anglophones had trouble with, like Bill 101 and Bill 178 on signs for example. When I travelled in Canada, I saw unilingual signs everywhere except in airports.

I drove to Calgary to visit the Dinosaur Museum—the real ones—and along the way I encountered no road sign that bore anything beside directions in English, not even international symbols. The same thing last week in Newfoundland, I saw nothing but English all over the place. So, when they come and tell us that there were trials and cases were taken all the way to the United Nations because poor little English Canadians were treated badly in Quebec, give me a break. People should come and see for themselves that it is possible to live both in French and in English in Quebec. In fact, it is the only place where it is