

*Official Languages*

An article in today's *Ottawa Journal* is headed, "Multi-Million Dollar Federal Plan to Aid Teaching of French," and in effect it supports the purposes of this amendment. Many people fear the scope of this bill. Clause 9 spells out its scope fairly clearly when it refers to:

Every department and agency of the Government of Canada and every judicial, quasi-judicial or administrative body or Crown corporation established by or pursuant to an act of the Parliament of Canada—

That covers a lot of ground. Clause 10 states:

Every department and agency of the Government of Canada and every Crown corporation established by or pursuant to an act of the Parliament of Canada has the duty to ensure that, at any office, location or facility in Canada or elsewhere at which any services to the travelling public are provided or made available by it, or by any other person pursuant to a contract for the provision of such services entered into by it or on its behalf after the coming into force of this act, such services can be provided or made available in both official languages.

Even contracts with the federal government fall within the scope of this bill. What does all this mean? The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) spelled it out very clearly as recorded in volume No. 1 of the Special Committee proceedings, at page 18, and I quote:

As I read clause 9, and the same thing applies to clause 10, these requirements about service in both languages are placed upon Crown corporations only. That is, when they are placed upon corporations, they are placed upon Crown corporations only. I leave out the civil service and the agencies.

What this means in practice is that, to take three examples, this requirement is placed upon the Canadian National Railways but not the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is placed upon Air Canada but not on Canadian Pacific Airlines or any small air line. It is placed upon the C.B.C. but not on the private television networks. It is obvious that the provision of services at the national capital or anywhere else involves an additional expense—

In that same paragraph, he pointed out that Crown corporations will be put to great expense that will not have to be met by private corporations with which they are in competition. He asked the minister was this fair, and why not encompass all corporations dealing with the federal government or having a federal charter. As recorded at page 20 of the committee proceedings, the Minister of Justice said:

Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the committee I want to make it clear to the hon. member that we are not relying on any constitutional argument in failing to move beyond the limits already set in

[Mr. Horner.]

the bill. I tend to agree with the hon. member that we would probably have legislative jurisdiction.

There are two points that I would like to make, probably by way of reiteration. The first is that the policy decision was to be limited to federal public institutions and agencies; if we were to take it into private enterprise we would have had the problem of deciding where to draw the line: should it merely be that part of private enterprise that competes with public enterprise as in the railways or in the public broadcasting system, or do we go into those other areas in which we have clear jurisdiction, banks, pipe lines, even companies having a federal charter? That is why the decision on policy was taken the way it was.

As recorded at page 19 of the proceedings, the minister said:

We hope that the influence of this bill will go beyond the strict legal limits, and the hon. member is right in assessing those strict legal limits.

Let us not kid ourselves. This bill will have an influence on a wide range of activities. It will affect the hiring and the promotion of many, many Canadians. To understand this, one has only to consider the interjection made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) this afternoon when the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) was speaking. At that time the minister said, "Why shouldn't a person have the right to be arrested or given a traffic ticket in his mother tongue"? This gives us some idea of the scope envisioned for this bill.

**Mr. Pelletier:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not make any remarks about traffic tickets or anything of that kind. I think the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) mistook somebody else for me and did not recognize my voice, which is something I would never do to him.

**Mr. Horner:** Well, I am not going to argue with the Secretary of State on that point. *Hansard* will prove whether I am right or wrong. But the Secretary of State was reported in this article in the *Albertan* as saying:

We should realize bilingualism is one of the necessities and wake up to the requirements.

Is this really true? Do all applicants for jobs in the civil service have to be bilingual? I do not think so, particularly in view of the information tabled this afternoon by the Minister of Justice.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Again, Mr. Speaker, we do not really know who will be responsible for seeing that the provisions of this legislation are carried out. We note that the Minister of Justice is being used to pilot the bill through the house. But will his fairmindedness be used in the