

tions for the purpose of implementing the bilingualism policy of this parliament.

In essence, in his speech on March 8, 1974, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton said that he has received more mail and more telephone calls on this question than on any other subject. As reported at page 342 of *Hansard* for March 8 the hon. member said:

From the tone of these letters and telephone calls it is alarmingly evident that the difficulty of implementation of a policy of unilingualism in the public service that was to be overcome by the guidelines approved by parliament has in fact become more intense and as a result I believe the morale of the public service is being seriously undermined. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the service is being damaged as a result.

By virtue of this statement the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton is again demonstrating his lack of understanding of the fundamentals of bilingualism. As the *Ottawa Journal* stated in their lead editorial of February 20, 1974:

Neither Grenville-Carleton MP Walter Baker nor anyone else is able at this time to say whether 50,000 bilingual positions out of some 260,000 positions in the public service are too many or too few. It is unfortunate that Mr. Baker rushed in so quickly with his intemperate criticism. His impetuosity and his apparent failure to recognize all the reasons for bilingualism call into question once more his commitment to the Official Languages Act beyond lip-service and mere tokenism.

Such an attitude may be understandable, even excusable in MPs from out of the way places; it is not to be condoned in any MP — from any part — representing a constituency in the National Capital region. Mr. Baker has yet to achieve the breadth of vision on this subject of his leader, Robert Stanfield.

I agree with the *Ottawa Journal* that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton is only paying lip-service and giving mere tokenism to bilingualism, and by so doing he is rendering a disservice to Canada and Canadians.

To further demonstrate his lack of understanding, he stated, as reported on page 342 of *Hansard*:

The 1976 deadline was established for an estimate of 25,000 bilingual positions.

It has been stated time and time again by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) that the target date aimed at is 1978, not 1976. This is evidence again of his lack of understanding of bilingualism and, more importantly, its implementation as it affects the public service.

In the interest of truth and accuracy, I want to make it clear that the target date for designation of bilingual positions within the public service is 1978 and that it never was 1976. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton also stated on the CTV network on Saturday last that the target date was 1976, and this, as I have stated, is not true. It is now very apparent that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton's avowed policy of unilingualism in the civil service and, in the words of the *Ottawa Journal*, "his apparent failure to recognize all the reasons for bilingualism" call into question once more his commitment to the Official Languages Act beyond lip-service and mere tokenism. That, coupled with his inexcusable ignorance of the target date with respect to implementation and designation, indicates quite clearly that this House and the general public have been misled, not through dishonesty but through his ignorance of the facts.

This attitude does not surprise me. It is witness to his real intention and possible thoughts on this whole ques-

*The Address—Mr. J. R. Gauthier*

tion, and it supports the position some of his colleagues in this House have expressed frequently. These ardent supporters of the status quo have been crying and moaning about things bilingual for the last six years. It is always, in their view, being implemented too fast, too much, too costly. The only avowed policy some Conservative members seem to extol regarding bilingualism is to give lip support to the principle, but by all means slow down and stop the implementation of this important and vital national policy.

**Mr. Paproski:** That is not true.

● (1500)

**Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier):** That is what you say. Rather than help in the difficult task of achieving the effective implementation of institutional bilingualism, some members of the Official Opposition cultivate the fear psychosis, and suggest that whatever is done is always too fast, too costly and too much. As a matter of fact, some members in the opposition have become the moral guarantors for every bigot across this country who quotes them and uses them to destroy rather than to build this Canada of ours. At this time no one would deny that the working language in inter-departmental exchanges is English. I do not dispute this fact. No one can read anything into the present law in respect of such exchanges. Neither this parliament, the staff associations nor public servants are advocating a policy of unilingualism, and I suggest that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton is retrograde in this approach.

Many bilingual Francophones have come to work and have had to work in the English language, not because of preference but because of necessity. In a document filed by the Public Service Commission it is stated that in 1971, for example, of the 88,484 public service appointments in that year 21.4 per cent claimed French as their working language, yet only 11 per cent were appointed to positions requiring this language. In subsequent years, 1972 and 1973, the same report stated that an increased percentage of Canadians working in the Public Service are able to work, if they so desire and are needed, in the official language of their choice. It is only fair to say that if anybody should be pressuring and showing their impatience it is the thousands of bilingual civil servants who have been working in their second language, or the unilingual French, for that matter, who have had little chance of making a career in the public service.

The resolution adopted by parliament last year is not a threat to job security or promotion; it is a reasonable plan for equilibrium and equality. Nobody is born bilingual; he or she must be trained. This government is making a determined and commendable effort to promote institutional and individual bilingualism through training and understanding. The Official Languages Act and the program of bilingualism in the federal public service simply recognizes the realities of Canada as it is today.

The real solution lies in our educational system. This government has, for this obvious reason and also because of the previous unproductive system of teaching a second language in our schools, encouraged language training, and has dispensed in the last five years \$300 million to our provinces. These special educational grants were for the