

*The Address—Mr. de Corneille*

Jamieson, and the hon. member for Cape Breton Highlands-Canso (Mr. MacEachen), brought so swiftly to the level of infamy in the Year of the Child—*un enfant terrible*? Our foreign policy mast has also been snapped by the hoisting and dropping of sails in a cacophony of discordant orders from the captain and his first mates.

But, Mr. Speaker, these are but a few illustrations of how large and important areas of national and world concern, which have been in the headlines for months, are now passed over by silence and by evasion. The policy—and it is delivered—is evasion; the plan is that the way you keep the citizenry happy is by handing out the new Tory confectionery—Smiles and Chuckles, and snickers—while they divide up the spoils. And can you blame them for chuckling? If you managed to squeeze into power with the second largest popular vote, with a minority of seats in the House, propped up by hon. members belonging to another party which you are meanwhile privately and publicly seducing, and with a minority of seats in the other place, getting aid and comfort from the fact that you are doing so little that the media cannot get a target on you, you would chuckle too, Mr. Speaker.

● (1550)

Who could ask for more than a throne speech without commitment and a media that is left open-mouthed and speechless? The Speech from the Throne is amazing, not for what it says but for what it does not say. Never has so little said so little in so few words to so many.

Mr. Speaker, I have had to save till last my deepest concern. It frightens me the most. It has to do with the survival of this country, with the Canada I love. I see under this government the division of this country into satrapies like Chinese provinces under the war lords of the Kuomintang, each war lord reigning sovereign in his province, resulting in a confusion of policies, in competitive wars between provinces for businesses, head offices and investments, in raising barriers to migration of workers from other provinces, like the wars between the war lords of old.

What is the philosophical justification for a federal government that in the name of "less government" really means almost no federal government and more and more provincial government, which means more inequality and more divisive forces unleashed? This laissez-faire policy which sells out Canada comes under the confectionery name not of "Chuckles" but of "community of communities". Behind this exercise in semantics is the insidious suggestion that the way we can get unity is to stop the confrontation, and to hand over, in the interests of dialogue and understanding, those rights and responsibilities which our constitution and our Supreme Court state this Parliament, the Parliament of Canada, is expected to exercise. Some dialogue!

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I think I know something about dialogue. The dialogue that has come about through ecumenism has been the greatest event in this century. Religious wars and hatreds have given way to respectful dialogue between Catholics, Protestants and Jews. The ancient walls of

[Mr. de Corneille.]

contempt have fallen away through dialogue. And all this has been premised upon the concept that in dialogue you call people into being rather than to cease to be. It is right, and one thing to call the provinces into being. That the Fathers of Confederation more than did. But it is another thing to say that the federal government should not have that same right, which was the central goal and objective of the Fathers of Confederation—a strong central government.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of pious criticism from others about the danger of confrontation. But, Mr. Speaker, dialogue is called confrontation. One speaks of the "confrontation of dialogue". It means that in dialogue one does not evade the issues. One does not dissolve oneself. One does not diminish oneself. One does not assimilate, capitulate, surrender. So at present we are not getting dialogue. In fact, the terminology "community of communities", used in conjunction with the criticism that in the past we have had too much confrontation between the federal and provincial governments, is being used as a cover in the retreat from a federal system to a confederation of ten states, or is it twelve now? It seems to be part of the grand design of the Conservative party to hack us up. First we had the blueprint of "two nations"—*deux nations*. Now it has proliferated. Now it is a "community of communities", maybe something like "ten nations"—*dix nations ou plus*. And if you throw in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, maybe 12 tribes—*douze nations—ou presque!*

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, it is on a dangerous course that our ship of state is floundering. It is no course at all. It is not a dialogue. It is not a discussion out in the open. It is not a facing of issues and facts. There are secret discussions where the media are not present. There are, worse yet, secret deals. It is not just once or twice; it is the way things now are done. The war lords put down their demands, linked often with their political interests, and the federal government in private agreements gives away to them what belongs to the family of Canada and describes this process as a "community of communities". Mr. Speaker, that is not a community. Let us not hide behind the subterfuge of words. Canada is at stake. Evasion is not dialogue; evasion is anti-dialogical. It is unhealthy. Dialogue means confrontation. It means that the federal government, this Parliament and all of us who are members have the right to hear, to listen, to be in the dialogue. It means to have open deals openly arrived at.

Ontario has the right, not just the premier and his minority party but the majority of the people, like the people of my riding, the people of Toronto, the people of the province, to hear what those deals are that give away our future as Canadians. Our heritage, our offshore energy and mineral rights for 200 miles, our resources, belong to Canadians. We have to be at the table where all can see the hands and learn to share. The federal government has the right, nay, the duty, the responsibility, to stand for all of us, to protect all of us. Rather than for this government to appeal to the greedy hopes of war lords in each province that their area might strike it rich, we have to make sure that all Canadians strike it rich.