

An hon. Member: Repeat that.

Mr. Nowlan: I will come now to the topic of Canadianization. I know that you read history, Mr. Speaker. You used to be a radio broadcaster long before you graced the chair. You will have heard the words of Hugh MacLennan, the Canadian novelist who wrote "Two Solitudes". It used to be that a member could not stand in his place in this House and mention two solitudes, without people immediately thinking of English and French or French and English. MacLennan wrote that book, a book which is still very applicable today but, Mr. Speaker, there are other solitudes. Never have those solitudes been more clear than in this debate on Bill C-48 tonight. Without getting into linguistics or even peoples, we get into the philosophy of people. That is what is missing, Mr. Speaker, and it is one of the problems with this country today—the philosophy of where the country is going.

Stimulated by the speech by the hon. member for Wetaskiwin, it hit me, as some things hit if one listens with an open mind, that tonight we are talking about those who are producers and those who are parasites; we are talking about those who believe in the profit motive and those who believe in penalty; we are talking about bureaucracy versus business; about initiative and incentive versus the chloroform of controls and regulation ad nauseam. Fundamentally, that is what we are talking about. I think there are some members opposite who share my philosophic view but I am sad to say that, unfortunately, what we are talking about on this bill tonight is the separation of Grits and Tories.

It is a sad irony, a sad paradox, that as the premiers and the Prime Minister sit down around the federal-provincial table at the beginning of next week to try to resolve the problems of the country, it has never been more clear in the House that the problems of the country are right here in this House, because we, the representatives of the people, have been separated by fundamental solitudes.

You have been in this House and I have been in this House as other members have tonight, Mr. Speaker. We have also heard some of the debate that has taken place over the last year or several months. What are we talking about? Canadianization.

● (2140)

Mr. Deans: That's a very good question.

Mr. Nowlan: Hon. members on the left can indulge in catcalls all they like and pretend they believe in the low income earner and the person who has nothing. I suggest that the persons who are watching the debate tonight in the House of Commons are not that excited or uptight on the matter of Canadianization and further extensions of Petro-Canada. They would like to know and have the security that they could Canadianize their homes—

Mr. Deans: At a price they can afford.

Mr. Nowlan:—and that the price of the interest rates will allow them to keep their homes. They would like to understand when the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) or the Prime

Canada Oil and Gas Act

Minister (Mr. Trudeau) says, as he did today, "There is a time and a place when governments have to cut and chop because there is no time for government to spend money forever. That is why we cannot spend on trains." There is more than the odd Canadian who would like to believe that if the government can spend \$1.5 billion for Petrofina and \$650 million for Pacific Pete, surely it can find \$100 million to help subsidize the trains until we can sort out a cost formula. VIA Rail cannot understand that, and CN and CP would never have the nerve to confess how they are raking off VIA Rail, which is supposedly the people's railway.

What else is fundamental to the people of Canada? There is nothing more fundamental to the people of Canada than something called—I do not want to get catcalls—it does not relate to languages but to weights and measures. It is an irony and a fundamental paradox that weights and measures, that is the metric system, and the essence of the metric system, have never been debated in the House of Commons. Does Your Honour know why people outside the House are a little alienated? They are alienated because these things that they think are fundamental are ignored by the House of Commons. What else is there that is fundamental and sacrosanct, without getting too political? It is something called the post office and the lack of service. That is something fundamental, and one can talk all one wants about Canadianization. Many hon. members on this side of the House have talked about Canadianization.

I am from a part of a country which believes that government must help those who cannot help themselves. I am proud to be a member of a party which has done things for this country in the short period of time that we were in office which have helped those who cannot help themselves, be it CBC, the CNR, the BBG, the Board of Broadcast Governors, you name it. In the short period of time we were in power, we added quality to public life, in spite of the narrow perspective of the period of time that we have been in public life, because we have not been in government long enough.

Frankly, I hope this debate continues for days until we really know what the premiers and the Prime Minister have to say about some fundamentals. However, those fundamentals are important for the long term. I am not denigrating the constitutional debate, but I am saying to Your Honour that never have the two solitudes—not meant the way MacLennan meant it, but in terms of a House of Commons—debated in this chamber for hours, ad nauseam, until the people of Canada outside wonder what the devil is going on.

We have had this debate for days. I am saying to Your Honour, with respect, that this House of Commons must start to come to grips with some of the fundamental problems which affect the people, the philosophy behind this bill. We can have all the federal-provincial conferences we want in the world, but we must define our philosophy. I admit reluctantly that although some of my friends to the left have a philosophy, I do not subscribe to it. That philosophy is not what developed this country into the type of country it is today. That philosophy is not the type which gives so many of those friends of mine in