## National Unity

What this paragraph means, Mr. Speaker, I have no idea. But what it says is that it is not beneficial to national unity for a parent to be able to place a child in school of his or her own language when moving from province to province. Surely the language in that document must be in error, because the statement goes on to say that facilities should be provided—we might conclude in the French language—for those transferring from the province of Quebec to any other province.

Already this has conflicted with the previous statement on incompatibility with national unity. The paragraph goes on to say that facilities will continue to be provided in the province of Quebec for those transferring into that province. How can English language facilities be continued in the province of Quebec when Bill 1 states that people coming into the province must be educated in the French language? In the next paragraph of this statement the government agrees with the policy that Bill 1 promotes, that immigrants into the province of Quebec must be educated in the French language regardless of their origin, or even their wishes. The government feels this must be the case if the province is to remain predominantly a French language province.

The government also states in the same paragraph that the same choice must be available to immigrants to other provinces. It would seem to me that there is no choice for immigrants in the province of Quebec.

We have allowed Quebec to have a double standard for too long now. It is time we realized that we cannot continue to live as a nation with ghettos of English and ghettos of French. We must become Canadians. And that goes for Quebec too; they must become Canadians if they are to remain in Confederation.

In closing, may I say that the Quebec story is a sad one indeed. It leaves all of us, in the maritime provinces particularly, in a peculiar situation. My suggestion is that the Quebec problem, the national unity problem, be taken out of the political arena. It is time that members of parliament, each and every one of us, realized that we do not sit here as party members but as the representatives of the people of Canada. It is time that the government turned to the realities of the situation at hand and stopped making a bit of a mockery of disunity. It is time it stopped making our disunity a popularity issue

It is perhaps true that if a non-partisan committee comprising members of parliament, Senators, MLA's and elected officials of all kinds met on a tripartite basis in all parts of the country, and non-partisan regional committees were set up across the country, we just might make some headway. But as it now stands the politicians are inflating the emotions of all concerned persons, so that soon a viable solution may not be possible due to emotion upheaval.

If unity is to be achieved, equality must be the law. It must be the rule. We must have equality of race, religion, creed, of province and region. Politicians alone cannot begin to mend the problems of the state. The people of this country must also be consulted. Unlike other members here, I suppose I have to say why I do not agree entirely with forcing the province of

Quebec to stay in Confederation, or in unity. Unity can be accomplished only if all parties are willing. There must be a consensus ad idem before we can reach any kind of agreement. Likewise, for reconciliation there must be some consensus.

## • (1720)

Unity can only be attained if all Canadians become true Canadians. Unity and the repairing of a state can be fulfilled only if we all take the time to work together toward a common goal. The best place to start uniting this country is with a common goal of work for all. Some refer to this as full employment. I suggest we can have something approaching full employment. In seeking truth and happiness, we will find unity and harmony in our country, and in seeking unity and harmony among our peoples we will find a better nation, one which is strong and free.

I find it difficult to bring myself to support a motion which alleges and states continuing unity. There has not been national unity but a great deal of disunity, and economic problems which have been caused as a result of improper implementation of programs, hastily and ill-conceived by the federal government, and by some of the provincial governments as well.

National unity cannot be achieved in debate by politicians, but like love and brotherhood can be only achieved by people working together with God's will and counsel. As to linguistics, which is only part of the national unity question—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I regret to inform the hon. member his allotted time has expired.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, my leader made a tremendous speech. I did not fully realize what a shattering day it was for the government until the two foxes in the government today concocted this method of trying to capture the media.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: The second fox being my old friend, the government House leader.

I enter this debate today with a feeling of great sadness. It is almost exactly ten years ago that I, as the premier of Nova Scotia, decided to enter federal politics. I thought I might be able to do something to strengthen our country, and in particular to improve the understanding between French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians, and also to improve economic opportunities in the Atlantic provinces. It makes me sad to view the sorry state today of the economy of those provinces, but it moves me almost to tears to see our country economically hobbled and menaced by threatened disintegration.

I wish to speak to this House very bluntly, and I should like to be heard, even though some members may not like what I say. What I say will be said very deliberately. I do not wish to add to the difficulties of our country, but we must be frank with one another and with Canadians. Disunity today is not entirely the fault of the government, but the government ought