

Supply

I am an anglophone from Quebec. I know of no provision that applies in a lesser way to the anglophones of Quebec than it does with the francophones outside Quebec. I was surprised to hear him say that.

Our problem in Quebec as anglophones has not been with the federal law. The federal law has protected our rights and enhanced those rights. Our problems have been with Quebec Bill 101, Bill 178, Bill 22 and others, not with the federal law.

I would like him to tell the House where the federal law provides lesser rights to the anglophones in Québec than to the francophones outside Quebec. I doubt that he can provide the House with that information.

Mr. Schmidt: Mr. Speaker, the point clearly is the difficulty with Bill 101.

Mr. Allmand: That is not a federal law.

Mr. Schmidt: That is correct. The fact of the matter is that the infringement on the constitutional rights of Canadians by the provincial law is not being enforced by the Canadian government. That is where the problem lies.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu): Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the members if they would accept reciprocity, that is, Quebec anglophones would be treated exactly as francophones throughout Canada. Use the rights of anglophones in Quebec as a basis. I am sure that if francophones outside Quebec received 25 per cent of what Quebec's anglophone minority gets, they would be very happy.

Would the ideal not be to have a kind of reciprocity? That is what I ask the hon. member, with respect for his opinion. Any right taken from Quebec's anglophones would be taken from francophones, but any right given to Quebec's anglophones would be given to francophones in the rest of Canada as well. Would he agree to that?

[*English*]

Mr. Schmidt: Mr. Speaker, that question is not answered easily. It takes time. It is a difficult question and a good question.

Reciprocity assumes that equality applies and that this is done logically. The point remains that the Court of Appeal in Ontario indicated that where numbers warrant, 12 people would constitute such a group. The Court of Appeal also said the only way the French language rights could be preserved in the educational system was by having separate French school boards.

If reciprocity means that in every community even where there might be five or ten people there would be a school board, we would end up with a proliferation of school boards which would add tremendous costs. This is only one example. There are many others. There are trustees to be paid, superintendents

to be paid, other administrative and professional staff, support and so on.

Therefore reciprocity is not an easy question to address directly. In principle I would agree.

The Deputy Speaker: The time is up for questions and comments.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, our motion today deals with facts.

The fact is that the Official Languages Act is a total failure. It is divisive. It is so overwhelmingly expensive it would even be impractical in a booming economy with an overflowing treasury, neither of which we currently enjoy.

One of the most curious aspects of the act is that no one asked for it. Quebec did not ask for it. Most certainly neither did the rest of Canada.

Quebec wanted the French language in its own province and we agree with that. It wanted access in French to key federal institutions such as Parliament and the Supreme Court and we agree with that. It expects federal services in French. We agree with that where there is sufficient demand to warrant cost effective provision of that service.

• (1550)

Given that the majority of the people in Quebec are not concerned about it and even a larger majority of Canadians in the rest of Canada are not in favour of continuing with it, why are we spending so much money to maintain a program that does not work, that we cannot afford and that no one wants?

One theory generally follows the concept of Newton's first law of physics that an object in motion will remain in motion unless acted upon by an external force. In other words, the status quo reigns supreme.

In actual fact, given that the program is in fact flourishing it appears many are operating under their own special agendas without concern for the fact that the time for this program to end has long since past.

I would like to focus today on one particular aspect of the bilingual implementation program. The area I am personally concerned about is the introduction of bilingual services to the air traffic control system. These implementation programs are horrendously expensive and at times compromise the safety of the Canadian traveller.

Air traffic control primarily uses two types of services: tower control, which controls the movement of traffic on and in the immediate proximity to the airport; and radar control, which controls aircraft flying by use of aircraft instruments within a defined area of airspace.

The Official Languages Act imposes a duty on all federal institutions to ensure that the public can obtain all services