

sion, we would probably not be debating today the issue of national unity.

Mr. Stanfield: That is not true!

Mr. Grafftey: You are dreaming in colour.

Mr. Bussi res: It is you who is dreaming in colour.

This equal status for the French language and culture vis- vis the English language and culture is not yet a fact in this country. This equality is even fought by people who are sitting in this House, Mr. Speaker, by those who claim that this is not true. The efforts towards bilingualism have been questioned so many times. One feigns to agree on its principle but disapproves of its application. The millions of dollars spent are a pretence to demonstrate that the application is quite inadequate. Injustices against a few civil servants are a pretence to demonstrate that the application is out of tune. These are specious arguments, Mr. Speaker, so specious that they are not even clever enough to take the hypocritical disguise of sophism. The Leader of the Opposition was saying this afternoon that bilingualism is a dividing factor more than an unifying factor. This is an assertion which is too gross, Mr. Speaker, to be taken for a sophism.

For God's sake, we must go on investing millions of dollars for bilingualism. It is the price that we have to pay for the past stupidity and the past injustice. All hypocrites should stand to be counted. All those who believe in principles should accept the challenge of their application. It is unbelievable that after the claims of the 60s and of the 70s one is still reduced to go to court to be given the right to work in French, as is the case for the Air Canada employees in Dorval. It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, that one has to count on the fingers of one's hand the members of this House who were courageous enough to denounce the racism and fanaticism of the people from CATCA and CALPA when we were confronted with the crisis on working language in air communications. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, that these members are sitting on this side of the House.

Quebec Bill No. 1 has been readily mentioned lately with regard to bilingualism. How unwise, and above all, how stupid to put forward such an argument. Even after the adoption of Bill No. 1, no French-speaking minority in Canada will be able to boast of having an education system as comprehensive as the one provided to the English-speaking minority in Quebec. I too, Mr. Speaker, regret some provisions of Bill No. 1. However, I would feel much freer to oppose them if I could give examples of generosity towards the French outside Quebec, as we can boast of our generosity towards the English-speaking community in Quebec. The debts of history always manage to catch up with their creditors. We have now to pay the price, or rather to repay the debt of a century-old failure, a failure due to the obtuseness, the meanness and the quiet equanimity of those who form the majority.

Let us recognize that both languages and cultures are equal, let us be tolerant and generous and show all French Canadians that Canada is their country. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to

National Unity

deal with the second series of prerequisites for Canadian unity: constitutional reform. Mr. Speaker, the Canadian people never had the opportunity to state their wish to belong to this country. The Canadian people never had the opportunity to speak out for their political institutions. The Canadian people never had the opportunity to speak out for their constitution. The Canadian people never had the opportunity to define themselves. This has been done for them in time and by circumstances. After having accepted equality, I believe that the national unity crisis will have to be solved through a process which will enable all Canadians to identify themselves with their country, their institutions, their constitution. I also believe that this process must finally provide an opportunity for all Canadians to speak out through a plebiscite for these institutions and this constitution.

What should that process be? I believe it cannot consist merely of the joint committee suggested this afternoon by the Leader of the Official Opposition. In my opinion, it should take the form of a constitutional conference different from the federal-provincial conferences we have known in the past. That conference should bring together members of the Senate, members of all parties in the House of Commons, members of all parties in every provincial legislature, and members of the Yukon and Northwest Territories Councils.

Those parliamentarians should be joined by citizens who have demonstrated a particular interest for the Canadian unity issue. That conference should be called by and report to Parliament at the end of its study. Parliament would act on the report of the conference. First the conference should consider how Canadians can identify themselves with their country; second, it should study Canadian political institutions; third, the Canadian constitution and, lastly, a formula to allow Canadians to approve by plebiscite their institutions and the constitution.

It is startling to note to what extent Canadians know nothing about their country and it is also dramatic to note how Canadians are ignorant of each other as a group. How is it possible to understand people whom you do not know? How is it possible to love a country you know nothing about? We should see to it that every Canadian knows his country, that Canadians from all areas have an opportunity to know each other. I think that is the starting point of Canadian unity.

The conference should also consider as a second point our political institutions. We now have a national flag, a national anthem, but we have to Canadianize other institutions. The symbol of political institutions could be a factor of unification. But citizens must see their own image in that symbol, identify themselves with it. We must make efforts so that our political institutions reflect the present reality and those institutions must bring together all Canadians.

If we put aside the issue of equality for English and French and concentrate on regional disparities, transport, power sharing, we realize quickly that the frustrations of Quebecers are not different from those of westerners or Maritime residents. What is needed in Canadian political institutions is a mech-