

wealth and equality of men, whatever their sex, their language, their colour, before the law and institutions.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, whether one is a French-speaking Quebecer, an English-speaking Ontarian, or a Zulu, as far as all the rest of the problems in Canada is concerned, I think that when it comes to the development of territories, economic problems, the solution may have pretty well the same name, whether it is in Vancouver or in Montreal. Mr. Speaker, if for that matter we had programs in this country to promote exchanges, to allow the people of Newfoundland who are more different from the people of Calgary than I am from a guy from Toronto, if we get programs so Canadians would know one another, understand one another better, I am convinced that it might not be necessary to discuss those problems of Canadian unity.

Well, Mr. Speaker, and briefly, I subscribe to the formula proposed by my colleague for Portneuf (Mr. Bussières) and since this government has a proposal or a motion in that sense, that approaches this proposal, I will support it without reservations. And when we see those people, the only question we will have to ask them, Mr. Speaker, will be this: In Canada, we have three levels of government—municipal, provincial and federal. Which one is in a better position to administer most effectively such or such a power? Let us stop seeing in magic and easy formulas the solution of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, we only have to think that we are facing in Canada the same problems as all industrialized countries in the world. The two main ones are energy and the economy. In the nine years to come, Canada will have to spend \$120 billion in the public and private sectors in energy development. Only \$10 million will go to the James Bay project, \$4 million will go to the tar sands, and the rest of this sum will be spent in the Northwest Territories and the Arctic.

In all objectivity, can we think that it is possible to have ten or eleven energy policies in Canada? We are in a privileged situation in the economic sector while we are talking about unemployment and inflation, and in 1982 and 1983, according to the reports of the Economic Council of Canada and most economists in our universities, we will have to face some alternatives. Around 1985, our unemployment problem could become a lack of manpower. At that time, we will be able to re-orient our manpower to less efficient and less competitive sectors, and I believe that Quebec will benefit greatly if we can apply the strategy that our Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and our Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Chrétien) are now developing and introducing. Mr. Speaker, if we state the issue clearly to these people on the basis of the interests of Canadian citizens rather than on the basis of the political partisanship of the various parties or of the various provincial governments, I believe that Canada and Canadians, whether they be French-speaking or English-speaking, will have a marvelous future.

I am thinking of people my age. This might be the last comment that I make this evening. For my part, I have never really suffered from what the English Canadians have left as a legacy of the Plains of Abraham. Perhaps I was brought up in

National Unity

a privileged environment? Perhaps I have something of an advantage? However, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it would be a good idea for young Quebeckers and members of the opposition to go see them like we, the Liberals, are doing. Young Quebeckers are open. They want to know who are their neighbours and their brothers from the rest of the country.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I shall repeat what I said in Picton about a month ago: When a Frenchman lands in Dorval, we have a tendency to tell him: Welcome, cousin! I can hardly wait for the day when the Anglophones of this country tell me sincerely when I come to see them: Welcome, my brother.

● (2210)

[English]

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, Gladstone said that if he were to make a speech of ten or 15 minutes he needed about six weeks' notice. My hon. colleagues will be upset to learn that I was told of my impending intervention very late. I think they should be glad that there is a time allocation on my speech.

Some people who belong to service clubs—I do not want to be unfair—sing of brotherhood on Mondays and tell racial jokes on Tuesdays. As we reflect on what we say in these days when we are thinking about national unity, I suppose we realize that we should be thinking about our country every day. Things might be said that are blunt and direct—and why should they not be—but which are in no case hurtful of any individual. It is in this context that I want to say one or two things about the country and what I think about it.

On Friday evening, July 1, 60,000 or 70,000 people stood in the rain outside this building on grounds that are a part of the complex of Parliament Hill, waiting to make a commitment by a national anthem upon which we are apparently still unable to agree. They wanted to make this commitment to Canada. In a way they were lucky, although I would not have traded where I was on July 1 for being here. I was in a smaller place, but where the evocation of Canada was just as strong in feeling if not in numbers.

Reflecting on those 60,000 or 70,000 people it seemed to me they were representative of all of us who could not be here. I think in a way parliament is a commitment—not really “in a way”—we do have a commitment to people who wait outside, outside in all places in this country. This is an institution that curiously watches other institutions of our country reform themselves, yet does not seem to be able to find a formula not only to cope with its own business but for a new constitutional arrangement for the country.

I heard a wise, new member of parliament say in caucus that she was uncomfortable with the “we/they” focus of some of the debate on unity. It was a curious and very sensitive observation. I think there is too much of the “we/they” going on in our country. As we debate our future can we not do it as Canadians, not good guys and bad guys, federalists and others, but as Canadians who in different ways and with different talents care very deeply about our country?