

Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) actions on the language issue have been an incomparable act of cynicism, more so than that of any prime minister in the history of our country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roche: The hon. member for Halifax told the truth and it cannot be denied.

Yesterday my leader made a magnificent speech on national unity which showed why this country would be so much better united if he were the prime minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roche: Time is short. Alberta wants action, not oratory, on national unity, so I will take only one minute to make four points.

First, Alberta is committed to Confederation. The outflow of dollars from Alberta to Ottawa has averaged \$172 per person per year. Our contribution to the well-being of Canada, through staging in oil and gas increases, will soon be measured in the billions of dollars.

Second, Alberta believes that the Prime Minister is black-mailing the Canadian people by insisting once again that languages are at the heart of the national unity problem. Rather, national unity demands a redispersal of power and economic advantage based on the principle of stronger rights for all provinces. We will not accept language problems in Quebec as an excuse for not dealing with Alberta's economic problems.

Third, Alberta supports linguistic fairness, but the application of the Official Languages Act has divided Canadians, and that is why the act should be re-examined. Bill 1 in Quebec, if passed, should be sent to the Supreme Court. Minority rights in every province should be strengthened, including more services for ethnic Canadians.

Fourth, Alberta wants a new national economic policy that recognizes western Canada not only as a region of primary producers but as a major manufacturing complex. We want new transportation and tariff policies that will accelerate development of secondary industry and secure greater markets for Alberta petrochemical and manufacturing exports.

A renegotiated Confederation demands not a public relations task force but fundamental economic and social changes. A stronger Alberta is good for a unified Canada.

Let us stop this lament for a nation and get on with an all party parliamentary committee to draw blueprints for the rebuilding of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, never has my country been more deeply divided than it is today, more deeply at odds with itself, inside itself. It has been threatened before, but it is deeply divided today. It is threatened today, not because of the government which was elected

National Unity

in Quebec on November 15 last, but because of the policies of this government, its confrontational stances and its rigid centralism. These things had much to do with the separatist vote in the province of Quebec last November. That vote prompted uneasy stirrings, moreover, elsewhere in this land, to which I shall come.

Today in this House we witnessed two events which indicated to me that the policies of the government will continue unchanged and that the government has learned no lessons from the past. Even in the face of the unity crisis the government is concerned only with its perpetuation in office.

The first of these incidents was a statement on motions on a matter which has been before this House for, I would say, four or five months. It was brought to the attention of this House by members of the party which I have the honour to represent. After almost five years of dead silence this statement came in the midst of this debate which, despite what the government House leader said, was not brought on by his initiative but by the initiative of hon. members on this side of the House. We had that interruption because of the outstanding speech made yesterday by the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition (Mr. Clark), which captured the imagination of the press. As the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) said, one of the "foxes" tried to get into the act today to draw attention away from yesterday's speech. That was the first indication that the government had one interest and one interest alone, namely, its perpetuation in power.

The second incident took place when the government House leader misled the House and was not required to withdraw his remarks. I came into this House with an innate Canadianism, which I hope all of us in this House have. I have studied Canadian history, political philosophy, and political science. I served in the defence of my country when it was threatened. I proudly represented my country abroad, but only up to a point, until I ceased to represent my country abroad. I came into this House thinking that with that background I could represent my constituency well in this forum and believing I could make some contribution to my country. But what do I find? I find this kind of jiggery-pokery, this nonsense of choosing this time in the midst of an important debate to draw attention away from a good speech, for a political end.

While the hon. member for Halifax was speaking, an hon. member opposite had the downright effrontery to say that the hon. member was feeling bitter. Of course he retaliated quickly. The hon. member for Halifax said he was feeling bitter because of the mess this country is in, and I am feeling bitter because of that too. It is very sad that, considering my record in defence of my country and in representing my country, I have cause to be bitter.

• (1850)

I am glad we had no part in drafting the resolution under debate although I think we had a hand in bringing about the debate. The resolution begins:

That members of this House dedicate themselves anew to the continuing unity of Canada . . .