

The Address—Mr. MacGuigan

I believe very sincerely that much of the problem we have in Quebec is not associated with the fact that there is a French element in our country as well as an English element. It is associated with the fact that we have not had the courage, wisdom or strength, to adjust our institutions to accommodate to changing needs. There are many countries in the world where people live together who happen to speak different languages, who have found effective ways of governing themselves. Surely we can do as well as others.

One final thought. It is a great mistake for the government not to take Bill 101 to the Supreme Court of Canada and I will tell you precisely why. If we must have constitutional change to keep this country together, this country has to mean something. It has to stand for something. It has to stand above everything else for the proposition that to be a Canadian means that you have certain protections, rights and privileges that are inalienable, that no one can touch. This fundamental principle has to override all else, or what is the country for? What is the use of having a country? It is not acceptable for 1,100,000 Anglophones in the province of Quebec not to know their constitutional rights.

What I say is a fundamental belief that I have, that if you have a country it stands for something. It must mean something. It does not mean much if the people do not know their rights and privileges.

There is a great responsibility on this government to find out clearly for the people of the province of Quebec who are English speaking, what their rights are and what it means for them to be Canadian.

No one can ever accuse me of not being totally sympathetic to the aspirations of the Francophones of this country. They have developed their own culture. It is not a French or English culture. It is a French-Canadian culture. It must be preserved. Language must be preserved. However, a country must be certain that its citizens are all protected under the constitution and know what the constitution guarantees them.

It is not going to be easy to keep this country together. However, if we are not prepared to defend the fundamental rights of everyone, even if it is only one person, the task will be even more difficult.

We can continue to be a great nation. We have been unbelievably mismanaged in economic terms. We have great resources that are not developed. There is no imagination in our budgets. Trying to rely on the same procedures of economic management that were used in the past, will not work. And most unfortunately increasing unemployment, inflation and unrest, make it much more difficult to keep the country together. I say to everyone in this House of Commons that if you believe in this country and want to keep it united, you cannot support the motion contained in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to participate in this debate on the Speech from the Throne and to congratulate the mover and

[Mr. Gillies.]

seconded of the Address in Reply, my colleagues, for their fine contributions.

I would not have chosen to participate in the debate in such a constrained time frame, but I understand that my colleagues in the other parties have agreed that if a little additional time is needed, that will be agreeable, given the fact I have to be at the United Nations next week and cannot complete my speech if not today. If that is the case, I promise I shall not trespass upon their time very long.

My constituency is representative of the whole country in its French origin, in its continuing French presence, in its multicultural constitution, and in its industrial light.

The city of Windsor is rightly proud of the tradition, tolerance and good feeling which it has demonstrated over many years. One indication of that is the winning arrangement which it has had with the city of Granby, Quebec, in the Eastern Townships, for some 20 years. The relationship has not always been as active as it might have been, but it has recently been restored.

Granby citizens have officially visited Windsor, and on the first week end of this month I participated in an official visit by the mayor and members of the city council of Windsor and many citizens, including members of the Richelieu Club, to Granby. We were extremely well treated there and made to feel like brothers.

We believe this type of contact between citizens in Ontario and Quebec and those of other provinces with the citizens of Quebec, and indeed between Ontario and other provinces of Canada other than Quebec, is very helpful to national solidarity.

My constituency and my city of Windsor are willing to contribute to the solution of all our Canadian problems. However, in order to do so we must have our strength protected. We must build on our strength.

I therefore want to turn for a moment to problems of the automotive trade which are so vital to my part of the country. My constituency contains substantially the whole manufacturing operation of Chrysler Canada, although the new truck plant is just outside the boundaries. It contains plants of Ford and GM as well. It thus contains all the big three and many feeder plants as well.

We have different sets of figures with respect to the auto trade pact at the present time, or perhaps more exactly, we have different interpretations of the same set of Statistics Canada figures. As I understand it, the most accurate figures are those which Statistics Canada released on October 6. They show a slightly lower deficit in automotive trade for the first six months of this year than for the corresponding six month period last year.

Even if the deficit turns out to be slightly less this year than it was last year on an over-all basis, it is still \$597 million, as opposed to \$654 million for the first six months of last year. It is much more than we can possibly afford to have continue. If we look at it from the viewpoint of the auto parts industry, the deficit becomes spectacular.