

Order Paper Questions

CANADIAN LABOUR RELATIONS BOARD—OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Question No. 610—Mr. Cossitt:

1. Was a memorandum signed by Mr. Jacques Coallier, on behalf of the government, to all personnel of the Canadian Labour Relations Board bearing file number OLO-79-2 and, if so (a) on what date was it issued (b) what are the names of all personnel who authorized the memorandum?

2. Did the memorandum state in part, that the Board was immediately putting into practice, that internal written communications will be "in French if addressed to an Anglophone who had been declared bilingual by the Public Service Commission" and did it further state "in English, if from an Anglophone to a Francophone who has been declared bilingual by the Public Service Commission"?

3. Did the memorandum also suggest that the same situation applies to all "oral internal communications"?

4. Is the order still in effect and, if so, will it be reviewed, specifically to avoid bilingualism by force rather than by co-operation?

Hon. Lincoln M. Alexander (Minister of Labour):

1. Yes.

(a) January 19, 1979.

(b) Members of the subcommittee on Official Languages made up of Messrs. Claude H. Foisy, Norman Bernstein, Georges Champagne, G. A. Plante, L. Lavell and Jacques Coallier as co-ordinator and Mr. Marc Lapointe, ex officio.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

4. No.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I asked once before about question No. 384 which refers to the budget of CIDA. I have reason to believe there are some abnormalities in the budget of the minister responsible for CIDA, who is in the other place. I would like to have that question answered. It is not a difficult question. They should be able to answer it very simply. I ask the deputy prime minister if he will see, as he did last time, that I will get an answer to that question, and very soon.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern of the hon. member with respect to the answering of questions. As a result of representations by him and other members, I made inquiries respecting the frequency of answers. I am in a position to inform the House that in the last session of Parliament, before the hon. member came here, the record on answering questions was 7 per cent. The rate today with this government is 20 per cent.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): I am prepared to show the hon. member the figures. I want to indicate to him that we took his representations seriously. We are seeking to obtain the answers he has asked for and that will be done as quickly as

[Mr. Fraser.]

possible. I undertake that to him. That is the approach we take with respect to questions.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS*[Translation]***BUSINESS OF SUPPLY**

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—ALLEGED FAILURE TO ESTABLISH INDUSTRIAL AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE POLICIES

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Ottawa-Carleton) moved:

That this House regrets the inability of the government to conduct and develop effective Canadian industrial and international trade policies.

He said: Mr. Speaker, our motion deplores, I repeat, the inability of the government to conduct and develop effective Canadian industrial and international trade policies. I should have added, and perhaps that is understood, "contrary to the many promises they made and had made at the time they were in the opposition." I could also have added to this motion: "the inability of the government properly to administer and apply existing policies". Of course, that is another aspect of the problem I will be raising.

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party has now been in power for six months. It is appropriate to ask what it has done in terms of industrial and trade policies. Certain things, Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly deserve our encouragement, for example, the appointment of a Minister of State for International Trade is one I applaud. Also—and that might surprise some—the will expressed by the government to review the usefulness of certain commercial Crown corporations is something I applaud. I will come back to that later on.

We have had several statements, several of them highly philosophical, several of them hardly reconcilable. I will come back to that. We have had many announcements of studies, commissions being set up, conferences to come, several of which could have been made a lot earlier. We have also had decisions, rather limited action on the whole, some of which quite condemnable, and I will come back to that, of course. The general impression is that there is a certain competence, but not enough I believe to impress Canada and the whole world. The general effect of government action is a lot of uncertainty, and that is mainly what I want to deal with. Since the role of the opposition is to monitor the behaviour of the government, to criticize, to suggest, that is what we will be doing this afternoon to the best of our knowledge.