

Over the past years it has appeared to me that the governments of Lester Pearson and Pierre Trudeau, in their policies of loose permissiveness, have been more interested in establishing a permanent power base for their Liberal party than in establishing a distinctive Canadian power base through sound policies.

Mr. Anderson: Nonsense.

Mr. Alkenbrack: They have had all the ingredients of a strong, productive country that could have provided adequately for all its citizens. They have played a foul game of politics with the issue of French Canadianism versus English Canadianism rather than of French Canadian and English Canadian side by side in one society. In this, to our sorrow, they were well aided by Charles de Gaulle, one of the leading actors on this stage not so long ago. As a result, organizations such as the FLQ are able to come into being to flourish like a cancer in the body of an otherwise healthy being. As a result, this great country has the largest percentage of drifters, disolutes and unemployed in the western world. As a result of the playing off of one culture against another, we are experiencing a state of turmoil in our civil service. People with long service in our government fear for their future because they have lived and worked all their lives in only one language.

We are faced with a situation wherein our two founding races are beginning to eye each other suspiciously as they jockey for position in a national power struggle. Up until now, the Liberal party has managed to use these manoeuvres to stay in power and to keep the Canadian people off balance as it strengthens its position. The recent Speech from the Throne is the latest case in point. Instead of proposing ways and means to solve our pressing social and economic problems, the government takes great pains to avoid present issues and states that more government departments will be set up and more ministers will be added to the largest federal cabinet in the history of our government. No one would quarrel with a federal cabinet, large or small, if the individual ministers were coping seriously with national issues. If it were possible to solve all or most of our problems, and if Canadians were given an opportunity to work for a living wage without fear of being displaced for purely political reasons, I would even be in favour of a cabinet of 50 ministers. But if 30 ministers in the federal cabinet cannot come up with answers to even the most basic issues facing our country, then I wonder how long we can stand the expense of what appears to be pure political patronage.

I think the people of this country must soon ask themselves what they are doing with the single most potent force in our country, their votes. In my view we must take a close look at where we are going. We must ask ourselves if this is where we really want to go. We must also ask ourselves what has happened to our national goals and aims. It is time that we demanded of our federal government that it begin to give us leadership of a kind that will take us out of the wilderness which the Liberal party appears to find more acceptable than

national prosperity and the sovereignty of the Canadian individual.

In the Speech from the Throne the Prime Minister admitted that his much-touted just society is now out of reach. He then followed up with his enigmatic statement that we are on the threshold of greatness. This is contradiction without parallel. Worse, this is evidence of indecision and perhaps even a measure of panic. How much greatness can there be in massive unemployment? How much greatness can there be in a situation where Canadians are penalized for speaking only their native language? How much greatness can there be in a system where a small group of renegades can terrorize the whole country and bring political activity to a virtual standstill while their ransom demands are discussed and negotiated. I am inclined to agree with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) when he said that the Prime Minister's promises of greatness apparently referred to the impending Conservative victory at the polls in the next federal election.

Let us now turn to the thorny issue of bilingualism. There is a growing awareness in this country that the present government is attempting to reverse the tide of Canadian history, and that an attempt is being made to force the great river of Canadian nationalism to flow uphill. Over and over again, we have been told the only road to true Canadian nationalism is through forcing all federal employees to learn two languages and the creation of enclaves throughout the country based on one or other of the two founding languages. We are told these moves are necessary to ensure that the two founding cultures of Canada are preserved and allowed to flourish. No one is opposed to the philosophy that the two founding cultures of Canada should be preserved and encouraged to manifest themselves in private and public life. However, we are being led along a road on which we will see the emergence of a power play between the English Canadian and French Canadian factions in this country. I say factions, Mr. Speaker, because that is what is happening. The country is already being set apart into two factions, each vying for preferred position in the federal civil service.

Almost daily we see increasing evidence that the traditional and ethical merit system in the government service is being compromised in favour of bilingualism. We are told that the merit system is circumvented only occasionally in order to give preference to bilingual candidates for positions or promotions. The mere fact that personnel boards however, are allowed to use this device at all is clear evidence of the government's intent. This past summer Mr. Keith Spicer, who holds the position of official languages commissioner, made a number of comments to the press concerning his mandate. Those comments give us pause for concern. I must admit that Mr. Spicer was candid about his qualifications, but I do not feel inclined to accept his view that bilingualism can be imposed on the country in the span of three to four years. It is interesting to note that Mr. Spicer took pains to state that before he was appointed languages commissioner he had not administered anything larger than a two-hole outhouse. That might be appropriate if applied