

*National Unity*

slightly surprised, and on the other, a people that is impatient; surprised because it is true that until 1962 the people of Quebec, probably because of the collective decision it made, had refused to become educated collectively. However, since Jean Lesage, since 1962, it can be said that that failing was remedied; and besides, up to 1962, we were not the only people in Canada who had not taken great advantage of a department of education. There were other provinces, whose names I shall not mention, in the very same situation. Now, the truth about the years 1967, 1968, and 1969 proves that in Quebec, in Canada, French Canadians are every bit as well educated; that French Canadians are as scientifically, technologically equipped as the English-speaking Canadians. The time has come therefore for the Anglophones to accept institutional bilingualism; not only must they accept the fact that 27 per cent of civil servants should be francophones, but they must also accept the French fact in this country not as a Quebec reality but as a Canadian reality.

● (2200)

Francophones must be recognized not only in government institutions but also at the Royal Bank. They must accept that there be as many anglophones as francophones with MBAs, that there is room for them in the pipeline projects, in Calgary, Edmonton or Toronto. Members of parliament on either side of the House must defend energetically these lofty principles but, as the Prime Minister was saying, they must sell their convictions in their own ridings and come to grips with the problems, but I fear that they do it halfheartedly. And that is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. It is true that national unity is necessary.

Quebec's independence would be as bad for English Canada as for French Canada. I think the two provinces that can least afford to separate are Quebec and Ontario. Together, these two provinces account for 75 per cent of the manufactured goods produced in this country. As far as Quebec is concerned, we make the other provinces pay our manufactured goods 10 per cent more than they would pay elsewhere. Ontario makes the rest of the country pay its manufactured goods 7.5 per cent more than they would pay elsewhere. Some people suggest that the cause of Quebec separatism, of Quebec frustration is an economic one, others submit that bilingualism was implemented in a way that was unacceptable, that a committee should be appointed to solve the problem. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that since the coming of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, the Canadian who most ably describes the Canadian situation, those opposite have not yet grasped Canada's real problem, and appointing joint committees of the Senate and the House of Commons is sheer nonsense.

I am 100 per cent in favour of the suggestion made by my colleague from Portneuf (Mr. Bussi eres) that some sort of constituent assembly be established, with people coming from all parties in this House, all political parties in provincial legislatures, and representatives from municipalities, labour, universities and business. I feel that such a body would have many advantages. First, it would preclude any partisan views such as we have heard in this debate this afternoon. It would

[Mr. Loiselle (Chambly).]

also have the advantage of truly involving the people in such a public debate.

I challenge 20 per cent of the hon. members to tell me what one fiscal point is worth in each province. People want a change. Nobody is satisfied with the status quo. Some chose the easy way out, that of urging decentralization, as this pleases everyone. My friends, if we decentralize as much as the Parti Qu eb cois would have us, we would be compounding the problem. If we accepted that easy formula, with five provinces below the national average, we would be going against the basic principle of Canadian federalism, which is to fight regional inequalities. And yet, Mr. Speaker, no one seems able to give a precise definition of that easy solution of decentralizing. No one. Some people refer to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, others to immigration, but it varies from one province to another and even sometimes the same man has different views as he changes locations. I, for one, think that the real answer, Mr. Speaker, is to gather a group of men who will do some research, who will first of all analyse the present formula of federalism, study all the announcements concerning the constitutional issue made by the greatest Canadian of all, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, since he became Minister of Justice in 1966.

They will see, and I am referring now to Quebecers, that one must make a distinction between French-speaking Canadians, the government which really represents them and the importance to be granted to the Quebec government. I believe that if we have French-speaking Canadians, whether from Quebec or elsewhere who are making a full contribution to this House, no provincial government can rightly pretend to be the only one to represent any minority or any majority in Canada. I suggest that provincial governments, and as long as we shall not be more specific in terms of language, Mr. Speaker, we shall tend to say, like some old colleagues or former provincial ministers who were standing as champions of this philosophy, that the Quebec government should defend French-speaking Canadians throughout the country. Well, I tell them: "You fell right into the trap." Since 1970 or as early as 1966, the Quebec government and even now Peter Lougheed have caught the germ.

When the federal government administers a jurisdiction in a way they do not like, instead of criticizing it, they say: "We will take over your jurisdiction." It is somewhat like a company where there are four partners who have invested the same funds. They assume different responsibilities at the beginning, but when they realize that one is slower than the others, they say to him: "Listen, you have the same privileges as ours, but we will take over your responsibilities." The three others are overburdened and everyone becomes less efficient.

The answer Mr. Speaker is to call those individuals together and advise them that in Canada some rights are not negotiable. The best way to deal with the problem is to include the amended legislation on the official languages into the new Canadian constitution. We must dedicate ourselves forever to the purposes of this government, to this level of government, to the equality of both languages, to the equality of both cultures. We must consecrate the basic principle of redistribution of