

Considering that the President of the Treasury Board came back yesterday after the oral question period and that penalties have already been applied to Montreal civil servants who refuse to speak the second language, and in view of the government refusal to give them the bilingualism bonus, does the Prime Minister intend to support the President of the Treasury Board who favours the implementation of penalties or instead does the Prime Minister intend to commit himself personally in the debate to invite the minister to deal with this matter before it is too late, again in order to prevent this bilingualism crisis which would be deplorable?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I have had time to check the answer I gave yesterday and I think that what I indicated is right: the President of the Treasury Board has already undertaken with the civil service union negotiations to implement proposals made a few years ago. If I remember correctly, the decision was to take effect around last November. These contacts have already been made; in this sense, I am convinced that the civil disobedience the hon. member seems to defend, is in no way justified. If there are people who refuse to serve the public—after all they are hired in the civil service to serve the public—then, they should be punished. In this sense, I absolutely support the suspension measures approved by the minister concerned. But, in the meantime, as I said, we do indeed intend to follow up the assurances that have been given a few years ago to the effect that bilingual service would warrant special treatment; in any event, for a certain period of time. And the minister has already taken the necessary steps to solve this problem.

**Mr. La Salle:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question. I understand from the answer of the Prime Minister that he agrees with the President of the Treasury Board, but such a promise was made about two years ago by his predecessor. Considering the lack of guarantees and the delay as regards the qualification of the positions, I ask, in order to prevent this unfortunate problem from arising again—it is getting more serious and I think the Prime Minister is aware of that—I ask once again whether the Prime Minister is prepared at least to guarantee to the House by tomorrow a short term settlement which would be in line with the just society which he was advocating 10 years ago.

**Mr. Trudeau:** I repeat the same answer with somewhat different words. It has been some time since the President of the Treasury Board was authorized by his cabinet colleagues to settle this matter on a just and reasonable basis. The negotiations are going on and we are confident that they will soon be successful. All I ask the hon. member is not to encourage those who, in the meantime, and it is just a small minority, decide to violate the law.

### Oral Questions

● (1450)

[English]

### HARBOURS

HALIFAX—SUGGESTION AGREEMENT FOR SECOND CONTAINER PIER SIGNED—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport, who will recall having told me recently in the House that in his judgment the time for a second container pier in the Port of Halifax-Dartmouth has not yet arrived. Has the minister any comment to make about the statement made by a minister of the government of Nova Scotia to the effect that the government of Nova Scotia has signed an agreement with the government of Canada for the construction of such a second container pier. Who is kidding whom? Has the minister's department been negotiating an agreement without the minister's knowledge?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, the more exact reply I gave the hon. member was that there was some question as to exactly when the container terminal would be needed. There is a difference of view involving a matter of months, rather than one year or more. The question therefore was, when should construction start. The government of Nova Scotia wanted to be sure that as much as possible could be done in advance, to be ready for earlier construction. Accordingly, it asked if we would object to their plans to go ahead with site preparation. That led us to discussions about the necessary lease arrangements. These are now in the final form, and matters are likely to proceed in accordance with the intentions of the government of Nova Scotia.

**Mr. Stanfield:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Am I to understand from the minister, despite what he intimated a few weeks ago, that the government of Canada is now prepared to start construction at an early date of a second container pier in the port of Halifax-Dartmouth, and prepared to support this financially? Is the minister saying this now, despite what he said previously?

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, in line with what I said before, the decision with respect to the actual construction of the container terminal has not yet been taken. The arrangement which is being reached, and is in its final stages, is for putting the province into the position of being able to invest significant amounts of money in site preparation. Since it is agreed between us that a container terminal will be required, and it is only a matter of judgment based on growth of traffic as to when construction should begin, the government of Nova Scotia is interested in making sure steps are taken so that when it decides to go ahead with construction of the container terminal, the shortest time will elapse before it can be put to use.

**Mr. Stanfield:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Am I to understand from the Minister of Transport that the government of Canada is not yet committed to the construction of a second container pier at any particular time? Am I