

in the private sector. That is where the gains are to be made if we are going to make them.

Last summer we operated 300 special Manpower centres for students. We received co-operation from such organizations as the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and so on. That has an ongoing lower budget, but far more effective in results than even Opportunities for Youth and the more visibly direct higher profile job creation efforts.

We also addressed ourselves to the employment needs of youth who were no longer in school and had entered the labour market on a permanent basis. It is unfortunate that they encounter a very high unemployment rate. However, I believe the causes are extremely complex. They will not be solved simply by job creation or by the federal government alone.

As unpopular as it may be in certain circles, I am increasingly convinced that part of our problem lies in the school systems. I am not knocking the provincial governments, but I hope they will begin to take a deep look at some of the schooling ideas of the last few years. In too many cases they are not preparing our young people to find gainful employment when they get out of school.

We are consulting businesses and the provinces about the employment problems of youth, as was suggested by the hon. member. We introduced 18 pilot youth employment service projects across the country. They are designed to provide specialized intensive employment placement and counselling service to youth. We do not yet have an evaluation about which I am satisfied. It is not that it is not good; I am simply saying that it is not complete. However, it is the right route.

I indicated that we have worked in co-operation with the chambers of commerce across the country and certain local school boards. This was a special program of job exploration and so on. There are many things we are doing. I hope to have a more appropriate and lengthy opportunity to place on record our ideas in this field.

#### AIR TRANSPORT—INTRODUCTION OF BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL IN PROVINCES OTHER THAN QUEBEC

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock):** Mr. Speaker, on December 18 last I asked the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) the following question:

Since the introduction of bilingualism for air traffic controllers is based on constitutional grounds, can the minister inform the House as to his schedule for introducing bilingual services into airports in other provinces of Canada?

The minister replied:

The studies which have been carried out relate essentially to the Province of Quebec, although there was an examination of the question in relation to the National Capital Region. The question of any possible extension is a very difficult one indeed because of the nature of the bilingual quality of the controllers who would be required and there is therefore no plan in this regard. Our first and obvious step is to examine the use of both languages in air traffic control in the Province of Quebec, as the statement I made the other day indicates.

● (2220)

I am deeply disturbed about this issue. I believe the bilingual program was well intended and that it has certainly met the needs of thousands of people who previously had been deprived of government services because they

#### Adjournment Debate

were unilingual French-speaking or unilingual English-speaking. But I am deeply concerned because the program is now being applied to an area which, I am convinced, is not so much a matter of the constitution as one of safety. A spin-off has been the public reaction across Canada.

The promoters of this plan have alienated many people who travel by air in this country. For example, I had a call from a lady in my riding who evidently travels east a good deal saying she would no longer take a plane into Montreal. That is too bad. Then again, because of the haste with which this program has been introduced, a reaction has developed across the country which is unfortunate. It is the impression among many people that the pressure of the bilingual program is so inexorable that people who are not unilingual French or who are not bilingual will be obliged to become bilingual whether they wish to do so or not.

The official position is based on constitutional argument but all of us know that questions involving emotion cannot be solved by the law. There are other ways of solving such questions.

It is my understanding that to be a fully qualified pilot, qualified to fly by instruments, it is necessary to know only approximately 120 English words. That is not asking too much of anyone who really wants to fly. I should like to think it is not too great a burden to impose. The issue here is one of safety.

I had the pleasure a few months ago of visiting Mexico City and on my return from that city I was privileged to sit in the cockpit of the plane while awaiting clearance from the tower for the take-off. I was wearing a headset and listening to the instructions coming from the tower. Most of them were in Spanish but in the jumble of words coming from the headset there was one instruction in English. I did not catch it, but the pilot, with his more acute perception, had no difficulty in doing so.

It may be one's constitutional right to be able to use one's native language, but in my view the lives of hundreds of people are more important than my right to use a particular language. When I hear there have been approximately 27 near-misses since this program began, and when I learn that the Ministry of Transport is refusing to publish details of these near-misses so that the public might be in a position to know about them, I have still greater cause to be concerned. It is now a fact that the tower in Moncton refuses to answer a call that comes in another language.

I have before me the *Canadian General Aviation News*, the January 1976 issue—I believe a very responsible journal. In an article it has this to say:

The Ministry of Transport appears to be reacting to political pressures in its announced intention to introduce bilingualism into these vital areas. The aviation community is frustrated by the fact that the knowledge and experience it can offer have been ignored. In particular the two groups with the greatest knowledge of the situation, the operational air traffic controllers represented by CATCA and the airline pilots represented by the Canadian Air Line Pilots Association, have continually opposed such action.

This Association cannot stand by while misplaced linguistic passion, emotionalism, and political pressure degrade what has been up until now the safest air traffic control service in the world, and jeopardize the safety of the hundreds of thousands of airline passengers who each month go through the airports of the province of Quebec, or the skies overhead.