

typical case—the special requirements read as follows:

The performance of the duties requires a knowledge of the English language but a knowledge of French will be considered an asset in the assessment of candidates.

Therefore for the performance of those duties, a knowledge of the English language is required, but a knowledge of French is an asset for the candidates!

Well, Mr. Chairman, that is watered-down bilingualism.

I noticed that, in this specific case, another candidate was perfectly bilingual, while that one was imperfectly bilingual. Their qualifications seemed to be equal—at least for three or four of the candidates—except that one had been told for six, seven, maybe eight months or a year to prepare himself, to attend certain courses in order to qualify, that the position would be open precisely because the person occupying that position was going on pension within a few weeks.

But other candidates, who are all French-speaking and perfectly bilingual, would have jumped at the opportunity to attend the same courses but they were not able to do so, because their superiors told them: You understand, at night, I lecture in English. You do not have to attend those courses and your chances are just as good. But when the time of the appointment came, the one who had attended five or six superficial courses, who had managed to gather some knowledge, was classified by the civil service as more competent than the others, even is he was not, simply because he is not adequately bilingual; I do not say perfectly bilingual, but adequately bilingual.

I should not want anyone to lose his job because he was not sufficiently bilingual, but I would like to know whether the policy of the government is something real, something to be observed, or if it is only a bluff, in cases where division heads of various departments can allow themselves to protect their friends by advising them months in advance to do this or that to qualify themselves and thus get around the government policy. It seems to me that for a position like this one, where at least 65 per cent of the employees—and I am not thinking of the customers—speak French, the director of production should be bilingual.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned that case in a constructive way and I should like it to be well understood that I am not attempting to complain merely to try to pick a quarrel with

### *Supply—Defence Production*

the government. I am convinced that the government sincerely wants to draw up legislation which will recognize, in fact, the question that may have been debatable, that there are two founding peoples here, but that in various departments, amongst the division heads there are people who thwart government policy.

And so, I draw this to the attention of the minister, whom I feel is sympathetic. I mention a typical case, but there are dozens of others involving other departments where the interdepartmental protection of heads of services eliminates people who are perfectly bilingual on all sorts of pretexts and false representations, so that this government policy is not respected.

I do not ask the minister for an answer tonight, because I realize that I am drawing his attention to a case which perhaps he does not know about. I am ready to give him additional information and I must tell him that there are other similar cases in other departments.

In my opinion, this matter is much more important than is generally believed, because if government policy of implementing bilingualism in actual fact in the public service is not respected, the confidence of that part of the French-speaking population which wants to find a way of reconciling the two racial elements in order to avoid a division of the country will be undermined. It will be very difficult to establish a climate of understanding afterwards, when the government will want to introduce a constructive measure intended to consolidate the future of the Canadian confederation.

[*English*]

**Mr. Nasserden:** Mr. Chairman, before items 6c and 7c are carried the minister should answer the questions which have been asked. If the answers are not available tonight from the officials in the gallery, maybe we should postpone consideration of these items until tomorrow and proceed with some other business. I would like to see the questions answered before we pass these items.

• (9:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Drury:** Mr. Chairman, I must reply first to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain).

As far as the boundaries of designated areas are concerned, I think he fully realizes that such boundaries are established by the Department of Manpower and Immigration