

High Park easily touches all corners of this planet. Its inhabitants include Canadian Indians, English, Polish, Ukrainian, Germans, Austrians, Lithuanians, Maltese, Italians, Spanish, Serbs, Croats, Slovenians, East Indians, West Indians, Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Greeks, Portuguese, Irish, Scots, Filipinos, Latvians, Estonians, French, and many others, including Inuit. There are Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Moslems, Hindus, Buddhists, and other religions too numerous to mention. There are some that are very wealthy and some not so wealthy. I have so far enumerated only the differences.

What binds these people together? They are bound by a common bond of being Canadians. They each have a personal identity based on their ethnic heritage which they have been encouraged to preserve. My identity happens to be Polish. I am proud to be a descendant of a culture that has a 1,000 year history of Christianity, and a culture that has been blessed with producing today's Roman Catholic Pope, John Paul II.

To answer the question further what binds these people together, I would like to quote from a speech made in this House 22 years ago by a gentleman who now sits in the other chamber after many years of distinguished service. The hon. Senator Stanley Haidasz said of the constituency which I now represent:

This enviable mosaic, composed of different shapes, sizes, and colours is, may I assure you, strongly cemented by a common allegiance to the Crown and a common Canadian citizenship but also by convictions of loyalty, pride, and faith in the past, present, and future of Canada.

As the present member for Parkdale-High Park, I would not hesitate to offer my riding as a model of co-operation amidst diversity for all of Canada. Racism is a reality in many communities today, a reality based on ignorance of the changing nature of Canadian society. Co-operation and living in harmony such as I see in Parkdale-High Park are based on knowledge, understanding, appreciation, and respect for each other.

I would be remiss if I did not at this time offer my congratulations to the community of Parkdale on this, the occasion of its centennial. The Parkdale crest bears the words "Progress and Economy", words which will be a guiding influence for the community during its next 100 years. Perhaps the present government would consider adopting them as its motto also.

A Speech from the Throne in essence is a blueprint for the future. The role of the government is therefore to lead us into that period. I regret that the Speech from the Throne which opened this Thirty-first Parliament is long on verbiage and magnanimous exhortations, but lacking in genuine commitment to action by this government.

One province is about to vote on its continued existence within the Canadian federation. This is not considered important enough by the government to require mention in the Speech from the Throne. We have a promise to amend the preamble to the Immigration Act to acknowledge the multicultural reality of Canada. If the government is serious about a commitment to multiculturalism, I challenge it to entrench the principle and support of multiculturalism in a revised Canadi-

The Address—Mr. Flis

an constitution, and I challenge the new government to bring the constitution home where it belongs. My constituents and I are insulted that a mature country such as Canada does not have ultimate authority over its own constitution.

The Prime Minister has said that he has contributed more to federalism since coming to power than the right hon. member for Mount Royal accomplished in 11 years. Ignoring the dubious nature of this statement, I would urge the government to put forth proposals leading toward the renewal of the federalism so as to convince Quebeckers that there is a new image and new substance to federalism as the Prime Minister indicated in Montreal last month. The time for action is now, in this Parliament.

The intent of the government with regard to Petro-Canada remains a puzzle even after the Speech from the Throne. Its fate was a major plank in the electoral platform of the present government, but no mention of it appears in the speech. The persistent equivocation which has been the hallmark of this ministry is most clearly demonstrated in regard to PetroCan. Let me read a few quotations. As quoted on March 24, 1977, in the Calgary *Herald* the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) stated:

Obviously, if it's a thriving operation, we'd be crazy to shut it down.

Given the multi-million dollar assets of the firm at this time, Mr. Speaker, I will resist the temptation to editorialize on that observation. On April 6, 1979, in Winnipeg, the hon. member for Rocky Mountain, now the right hon. Prime Minister, stated, "I believe that it's a dud". Well I believe that we have a "dud" of a government if that is his assessment of PetroCan. On July 20, 1979, in the Calgary *Herald* the headline read:

Andre easing PetroCan stance.

Again from the Calgary *Herald* on August 11, 1979, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Hnatyshyn) was reported as follows:

The minister said that the concept of the need for a state oil company had changed dramatically since 1974 when Petro-Canada was created. Since then, dwindling oil supplies have underscored the need to ensure security of supply, he said.

Pity the *Montreal Star*. Two days after reporting the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources as saying "PetroCan will stay", the Prime Minister said "PetroCan still goes". Who's on first? What's on second? The Canadian taxpayer—out at third! The new government had better stick to football.

One wonders why myopic party dogma should stand in the way of Canada maintaining its own national oil company, just as Britain and most other industrialized nations do. The multinational oil companies that would control our energy future in the absence of Petro-Canada have demonstrated that their supply objectives do not coincide with those of the Canadian people. Petro-Canada must answer to its owners. Its owners are the Canadian people.

● (1710)

The leaders of our new government have expressed a concern in the past over an alleged abrogation of the powers of Parliament during the last few years. This is certainly an