

without precedent, accompanied by a firm declaration of principles, thus creating the opportunity to revise our constitution here in Canada so we could make changes in it which would satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the French-speaking people of Quebec, of minorities all across Canada and of individuals in all areas.

That is, Mr. Speaker, my humble contribution to this great debate on national unity.

[English]

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, discussions on the subject of national unity have taken place certainly in this nation for the past 120 years. In most cases, these discussions have centred around what could and should be done to keep Quebec happily in the union. Many have suggested adjustments to the constitution while others have felt that an entirely new constitution is in order. Aside from the numerous conferences and propaganda being distributed promoting national unity, members of parliament have, for the most part, discussed this topic in their constituencies. But truly, what good have all these discussions and talks done?

The situation has gone to the extent that even Canadians from the extremities of this country—east and west—are considering thoughts of their own independence. But here we as members of parliament sit, further discussing an issue that has already been used and abused, thinking to ourselves that maybe in some small way we are aiding the situation when, in actuality, we should be waking up to reality and realizing that our discussions are not even going to influence the situation. The unity of Canada now is up to Quebec.

Since 1963 the federal government has been attempting to court the province of Quebec, first of all by establishing a royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism and empowering it to recommend ways in which Canadian confederation could be developed "on the basis of an equal partnership of the two founding races." The wholesale revision of the language clause, section 133, in the British North America Act, which the commission recommended in order to extend the legal limits of bilingualism, failed for the simple reason that the province of Quebec vetoed it. And to quote a well-known Canadian historian who has already been quoted today:—despite this crushing disappointment, Parliament tried to carry out as many of the Commission's recommendations as it was constitutionally capable of doing. It passed the Official Languages Act which established federal bilingual districts wherever the minority official language was equal to, or more than, 10 per cent of the population. It appointed the Commissioner of Official Languages and began an officious attempt to promote bilingualism in the federal civil service. The English speaking provinces, impressed with all this federal business, started to enlarge the place of French in their school systems.

But the results have not been cheering. This historian goes on to say:

The results were certainly mixed and doubtful. Bilingualism in the federal civil service cost vast amounts of money, produced negligible results, and aroused angry resentment among English speaking bureaucrats. The office of the Commissioner of Official Languages was soon crowded with a robust army of dedicated snoopers and the Commissioner himself appeared to think that his most important public duty lay in abusing and hectoring English Canadians for their neglect of a language only an infinitesimal minority would ever have the occasion to use. The bilingual colleges had the tendency to remain only theoretic-

cally bilingual and the French total immersion courses in the schools did little more than deepen the illiteracy in English with which pupils tried to enter the universities.

As I listen to the speeches here today I am amazed at some members who seem to have their heads in a bucket. Certainly none of us really wants Canada to be divided like a piece of pie. Certainly this country is worth saving and worthy of our loyalty. But the fact which most of the members here today do not realize is that the federal government—and members of all parties are to blame—has allowed the decisions in this country to be made by one province, one province that is a nation unto itself.

What more can we do to appease this province now? Quebec alone received the greater part of the budget of the Department of Health and Welfare. For the year ending 1976 about 50 per cent of the DREE grants went to the province of Quebec. The minister of justice for the province of Quebec now wants, I believe, about \$11 million in return for assistance which the Montreal police have given the RCMP. Just this last week the federal government spent \$3.5 million on what was called Canada Week in an attempt to unite the country. It is indeed all well and good to want to keep this province in the geographical union of Canada as we know it today, but I would not think that this should be done at the total expense of the other provinces which wish, desire, and want to stay in this union voluntarily.

● (2250)

Absolutely no attention seems to be paid to the other provinces. Quebec is becoming a spoiled child—not a prodigal child but a spoiled child. Nowhere in Canada is the unemployment rate as high as in the Atlantic region, but what has the federal government done about this reality? It has merely continued to pour money into its favourite charity—Quebec. And what has the province of Quebec done to thank the federal government for its undying donations? It has introduced bill 1. It has as much as spat in the eye of its benefactor, the Parliament of Canada. Bill 1 is the only document ever produced which preaches the antithesis of the bilingualism program and the antithesis of democracy so eloquently.

The federal government and its programs are being totally ignored by the province of Quebec except, of course, when it is on the receiving end. So why should we continue to give and continue to coax a province to be in the union if it has no will to be there?

Quebec's new language bill states specifically that the language of business in that province is to be strictly French. There is to be no bilingualism there. Is this then not going to hamper the operation of federal government business in that province? The Government of Canada seems willing to ignore these factors. While ignorance may be bliss in the short term, it certainly cannot be the rule in the long term. Something must be done to halt the actions of Quebec, whether it is by disallowance of the bill or in some other way. Bill 1 is causing major inequalities for many Canadian citizens, not only in the province of Quebec. For example, to prevent the use of English public signs, to forbid the use of an English corporate name in