

Government Orders

have addressed for many years in this House. The employee will be obliged to use the language of the administration. If it is French in Dorval, it will be to his or her detriment. If it is *anglais à Edmonton*, he will have to use the language of the administration. That will be the way the system will operate.

Using that same example, what happens if the travelling public, which by law is entitled to receive services in either language from the new commission, is not satisfied and wants to complain to the administration directly? It cannot do that.

If the language of work of the central administration is other than the travelling person's language, that is if it is French in Dorval or English in Edmonton and the travelling person happens to be from the other language group, he has a heck of a problem because the administration does not speak his language. That again presents us with a certain problem because, as is the case with the employees, the travelling public will be obligated to use the language of the administration. That is a problem which will have to be resolved.

One could say that we will wait before making any decisions on this subject. It has been two and half years since we have adopted this new Official Languages Act, and we have no regulations. We have no definition of what is an institution.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to remind the House of some definitions that are essential to our understanding of the regulations arising from legislation as important as the Official Languages Act.

We have waited two and half years for the government to table these regulations. We still do not have a definition of "significant demand", for instance. We do not have a definition of "office".

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, but we are still waiting. And how are we going to tell Canadians that an office is defined as— It could even be a horse, Mr. Speaker! It could be a horse ridden by a policeman who provides a service here at the House of Commons and is obliged to answer Canadian visitors in the language of their choice. In English or *en français*. If a policeman is not capable of answering Canadians who

visit Parliament Hill during the summer— Because that is his office, and he just happens to sit on a horse.

People ask him: sir, what is that statue? where's the washroom? what's that building? Well, if the policeman cannot answer, Mr. Speaker, his office, as I defined it—the definition may be a little farfetched, but it is there just the same—the office is incapable of providing the service.

I am sure hon. members will say: sure, but let us not exaggerate. I want a definition of an office. What constitutes an office? I want a definition of "significant demand".

[English]

What is significant demand? How do you define significant demand? These are the things we addressed in committee and in the House two and a half years ago, and the government has yet to give a definition. Yet we have a law before us today that says the Official Languages Act applies in regard to significant demand. Who will determine that?

I will quote the same article which states that the law applies with such modifications as the circumstances require. That is discretionary to the local commissions or boards, whoever it might be and however it be intended to apply the law of the land. If we do not tell the commissions what the laws are, and if we do not tell them what the federal government and this Parliament meant when it passed that law, how the heck are they supposed to do it?

I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have a serious problem here with interpretation and that we will want to question the minister on that article in particular at committee stage. I do not want to take any more time, but I would be more than pleased to answer any questions.

Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt): Mr. Speaker, I just have one very short question for my colleague. How does he see this bill affecting safety in airports? Two days ago there was a minor accident in the Pearson International Airport. How does he see the bill as it pertains to the safety of airports?

Mr. Gauthier: I thank my colleague for that question. I think it is a rather important question. These commissions or these new boards will operate at arm's length from the government. We must make sure that there are national standards that apply in regard to safety. We