

because of the rise of the entrepreneurial class within Quebec and the outflow migration from Quebec of anglophones.

As a final parting shot, I would like to mention the irony of getting a lesson in minority language rights for the rest of Canada from the perception of the rest of Canada having been a witness to Quebec Bill 101 knowing the rancour and disbelief generated in the rest of Canada by Bill 101. There is some irony to now be getting this lesson in understanding.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: Before recognizing the hon. member for Portneuf, I have to tell him that he will have as much time as the hon. member for Edmonton Southwest used.

[English]

Mr. de Savoye: I am surprised at being asked how we think this or that could work. We are not the ones putting forward a motion. The Reform Party is putting forward a motion. They should tell us how things would work for the French speaking communities outside Quebec.

• (1330)

How will the Reform Party ensure that these French communities evolve and the French speaking people get good jobs and good salaries? They are the ones who should be supplying those answers.

What we are saying is that Quebec, as a sovereign state, will continue and enhance its effort to support all French speaking communities from coast to coast. That has been pledged over and over again. I am not going to explain why I believe these people will make it. They have done so against tremendous odds up to now. Hopefully if the laws of the country continue to support bilingualism and if—this is the second if—they are implemented correctly, which they are not at the time, then these communities will be able to sustain themselves.

However, I am asking the question again. It is not for me to answer those questions. The Reformers are putting forward a motion. Let them support how it will work in the real world for the French speaking communities from coast to coast or do they want them to be eradicated?

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert): Mr. Speaker, before I start my speech I would like to make a comment to answer the final remarks of the previous speaker who talked about when Quebec is a sovereign state it will look after its language policy from coast to coast.

We understand that if Quebec ever becomes a sovereign nation it will not have to worry about coast to coast because the small shore of the St. Lawrence will be the only coast that it has.

Supply

The motion put forward today shows that the Reform Party has concern as a federalist party for Quebec, for French and for our language policy from shore to shore, and let it always be from shore to shore.

The Official Languages Act is designed to ensure that the people of the province of Quebec and French speaking people from elsewhere in Canada have the opportunity to be able to participate and enjoy the benefits of this country using their own language. That is why we want to discuss it today because unfortunately the language act is not working.

In 1968 the then Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, mentioned in the throne speech the need to create some linguistic justice in the country and to forestall what was perceived to be Quebec separatism. In his speech, Mr. Trudeau said:

You will—be asked to consider measures relating to—citizenship, to national symbols, to cultural agencies—Some of these proposals involve the righting of wrongs and other the opening of opportunities long denied. Together they exemplify the essential connection between justice and national unity.

Unfortunately he did not adopt the recommendations of the language commission that had reported up to that point in introducing territorial bilingualism. He introduced a personal bilingualism. As I mentioned, it was to forestall Quebec separatism that was seen to be rising again. Little did he think, back in 1968, as he sat in that seat over there that after 25 years the present Prime Minister would be looking across the floor at 54 MPs who are committed to taking Quebec out of this country. Unfortunately it demonstrates that the Official Languages Act has not worked.

We need change to ensure that they stay in this country, that they do not pack their bags and leave as the 52 people in this House wish to do.

Language fractures a country. In a multicultural, multi-language situation, it is perhaps the most divisive thing that we have to deal with, not only in this country but we see it around the world. A large part of the tensions in Yugoslavia today are racial, ethnic and language oriented. The divisions in the Soviet Union are degenerating into nationalism and cultural ethnic groups and language again. Around the world language is a problem.

• (1335)

However, we thought that we were mature enough to work together and achieve some sort of harmony. We thought we could work together and overcome our difficulties. However, the unfortunate thing is we cannot legislate morality and we cannot legislate the way people think.

Therefore, if we are to have harmony in language let us recognize that the road ahead will be difficult. We have to work