

(c) promotions in each department shall be based exclusively on merit.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I must say that this proposal was integrally included in our election program, and that if we have included it, it was only after finding out that this was the true solution for all Canadians. We realize very well that a Canadian from an entirely English-speaking community, as soon as he feels that they want to impose on him the knowledge of another language, is perfectly right in protesting and we want to satisfy him. The same could apply to a Quebec French Canadian from Quebec who could also protest in the same circumstances.

Now to avoid any friction or misunderstanding and to preserve—as one likes to say—unity and harmony in this country, why not accept the sole solution which I find realistic, that is to enable each ethnic entity to gain freedom and self-fulfilment as it may see fit.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding I would like to refer to the Beaudet report which has never been made public by the President of the Treasury Board. We are still waiting for it. It is a negative report about the government policy on bilingualism. Indeed, when I read therein that it costs \$29,000 to make an employee bilingual and \$55,000 to have him gain some insight into the other culture, I say that it costs nothing to stay as you are.

● (2150)

[English]

An hon. Member: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) for having given the Chair notice of the motion that he proposed to move and which he read into the record a few minutes ago.

In order to avoid a long, time-consuming procedural debate I should indicate now to the hon. member my reservation about the motion. My reservation is that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) in his speech earlier this evening moved an amendment which would seek to incorporate by way of legislative action the purposes of the resolution that we are now discussing. It seems to me that what is proposed by the hon. member for Champlain is a matter entirely different from the one incorporated in the amendment presented to us by the Leader of the Opposition.

I also have some doubts about paragraph 5 of the proposed motion of the hon. member for Champlain. Be that as it may, I suggest to the hon. member that he is not restricted either from participating again in debate or from having a colleague participate in the debate at a future time in order to move exactly what he has presented, after the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition has been disposed of. This does not prejudice the hon. member's rights at all.

I say again that I have read paragraph 5 of the proposed motion and it gives me some concern. However, that is not a question we need to decide immediately. All I am saying is that the hon. member will have an opportunity to move his motion at a future time, but it cannot be accepted now.

Is it agreed that we call it ten o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Adjournment Debate

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT
MOTION**

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

**BROADCASTING—SALE OF RADIO STATION CKSB,
WINNIPEG, TO CBC—ACTION TO SET ASIDE CANADIAN
RADIO-TELEVISION COMMISSION DECISION**

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments, in the brief time available to me, about a situation which has already been raised in the House on numerous occasions, namely, the takeover of radio station CKSB, Winnipeg, by the CBC. First I should like to make some comments about the Canadian Radio-Television Commission itself. It appears to be most insensitive to the meaning and import of section 38 of the Official Languages Act and insensitive to the concept of multiculturalism as proclaimed by this government on several occasions in the past year and a half.

When the application was made to the CRTC and it was asked to consider the matter in Winnipeg, it decided to hold its meetings in Montreal. That decision was hard to understand; it did not make any sense at all. Representations were made to the CRTC prior to the meetings. Nevertheless, the commission insisted on holding the hearings, not in the city involved where people who were concerned could be present in sufficient numbers to make reasonable representations on their own behalf, but in another city, Montreal. I know that a few representatives travelled from Winnipeg—so far as I know, at government expense—to make representations but this was by no means satisfactory and did not obviate the need to hold hearings in Winnipeg where proper representations could have been made by all groups concerned.

I think the decision of the CRTC to allow this sale to go through constitutes blatant disregard of the established rights of the people in the Winnipeg area who have been accustomed to using this radio station for the purpose of third language broadcasts. I think the minister should explain to the House why the CRTC was so unreasonable in refusing to hold hearings in Winnipeg and, secondly, why he refused to direct the CRTC to the extent that he has any influence over it. The Minister of Communications (Mr. Pelletier) is here this evening. I hope he will take this opportunity to explain what has happened.

We also had a communication from the Commissioner of Official Languages who was requested to investigate this takeover and see whether it was contrary to section 38 of the Official Languages Act. The commissioner's report indicated that station CKSB had been broadcasting in a third language for 20 years. In his report he repeatedly used the words "foreign languages". These words are offensive to Canadians who speak a language other than the two official languages; they object to having a third language referred to as a foreign language on so many occasions in the report of the Commissioner of Official Languages.

In any event, the commissioner concluded that in his opinion this takeover and the consequent loss of rights for ethnic groups with regard to the use of a third language in