

which is simply to make certain that the English get so fed up with arguments about Quebec, about French and language and everything else that they will say, "Let them go." Then there is the other tactic of saying the federal government will withdraw support and the French will say, "They do not want us." The tactic is not that he will succeed with separation and constitutional matters: it is separation by attrition.

I faced that two weeks ago when I went back to Quebec to bury my brother, Mr. Speaker. On his deathbed he told me that one son was staying and taking a bilingual job, and one son was leaving. I know of other people who moved out of Quebec, not because they were English and would not stay but because their company moved. And who will move in, Mr. Speaker? Who wants that French force here, or the English force outside? That is separation by attrition. I have no time for it.

Having done the research, I identify the problem as one of communication. We now have a commission which will travel across the country. We have no right, as members of parliament, to make all these decisions. There are people in St. Louis, there are people in Skeena, people in Hamilton Mountain who have something to say. It is their right to say it to the commission and to make recommendations. The kind of thing I would recommend may not be terribly important, but at least it is practical.

I have prepared a paper to present to the commission, saying that we are long past the date when we should have created a department of provincial affairs, and the first minister of each province should name a contact to that group so that when people in the province want information they can get it.

If members of this House want information from the government, not a grant for a new speaking tour but something that will enable them to make a case for federalism in their constituencies, they should be able to get it from the department I propose. Such a department should deal with bilingualism and multiculturalism. We have to accept that we have come a long way and have reached the stage of talking about two founding races. It is like those great slats of wood on a stained-glass window. Because of multiculturalism, we recognize the colours of the glass. This is the mosaic that is important, supported by two founding races and many minorities.

How is a separatist Quebec going to support the minority and guarantee their rights in the west or in the east? How is the province of Ontario going to guarantee the rights of the English in Montreal? One of the first priorities of the federal government is to guarantee the rights of the minorities. Nobody else can do it. I have heard members on both sides of the House express anger because their country has not done what they thought it should do. The expression of such sentiments is perfectly justifiable. Such hon. members can disagree with me. However, I suggest I have put on record some of the reasons for our country's present condition and some of the ways out of the impasse. Others in the House have said what I have said. I have listened to the contributions hon. members made in this debate and I can say that at this moment in this

country there exists a greater will than many would believe for going forward and solving our difficulties. I recall the words of John Donne:

● (1720)

No man is an Island, intire of it selfe; every man is a piece of the Continent, a part of the maine; if a Clod bee washed away by the Sea, Europe is the lesse, as well as if a Promontorie were, as well as if a Mannor of thy friends or of thine owne were—

If Quebec goes, Canada is less. Do not ask for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee. For the first time since coming to parliament I feel that the member for Hamilton Mountain may stand in his place, say what he feels, and influence the course of events in this country. Mr. Speaker, I speak for the people of Hamilton Mountain, the people with a Scottish background, who recall the words of the Scottish poet to this effect, "Let us say God Save the Queen, but let us not forget the people." And the words to this effect, "It is coming yet, and yet shall be, when man to man shall brother be." We have this opportunity; we have this right.

I have great pride in serving on this side of the House and under our Prime Minister, but I will join hands with anyone on the opposite side or on my side, including the Prime Minister, join hands with any single, living soul who will say, "Let's work it out." Because, Mr. Speaker, we are going to work it out.

[Translation]

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that I am speaking in the House as a member of a political party and as the representative of a province and constituency which have shown much concern and uncertainty for some time now. As all members of this House, we are seeking that harmony, but how?

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate our leader for his brilliant speech and for sternly reminding us of the responsibilities of Parliament. I would be remiss if I did not mention the excellent speech made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), an experienced man who has been shrewd and farsighted, of whose valuable advice the government is being deprived.

I cannot ignore the sad incident which happened this afternoon. I would like to congratulate the member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) who raised the basic question, the basic objective of the Prime Minister in 1968: bilingualism in federal institutions. As a result, we saw the members of the Social Credit who withdrew, surely humiliated and frustrated. Personally, I was very disappointed to see some Quebec members or French-speaking members on the government side refuse to warn the minister responsible for such frustration involving all French-speaking people in Canada. It is most humiliating not to have seen fit to get action today and, in the Prime Minister's image, we have seen the party in power give lip service only. It is true that we are being accused about the objective of the official languages.