

same time, it intends to present concepts and policies likely to constitute the elements of a third option for Canada."

The first inquiries of the commission have led to recognize that the various organizations of the federal government did not effectively represent provincial and regional interests. Those signs of dissatisfaction have led members of the commission to become aware that it is becoming urgent to define and work out changes to the institutions and to the political practices in order to make them more suited to the true needs of our time.

Therefore the commission has directed itself towards the search for an alternative, a third option, which will include listening to the population and experts but which is nevertheless inspired by certain principles.

The first of these principles is that Canada owes its origin to two founding peoples, one of which—the French-Canadian—has always recognized the principle of cultural duality while the other, on the contrary, never could accept it as exemplified by some recent events: the crisis over bilingualism in air traffic control and communications, the dispute over a French secondary school in Essex, etc.

For those who are claiming linguistic rights for Italians, Germans, in short for all other minorities, Mr. Robarts recalled that language is not a right that can be classified in the same category as freedom of speech or freedom of religion.

These two words are very, very important, Mr. Speaker.

Historically and constitutionally, French Canadians have the right to safeguard their language and their culture, and this right is inseparable from the "contract" signed in 1867.

Besides taking into account linguistic differences, the members of the commission will also be called upon to review regional differences and disparities.

During these consultations with Canadians, the commission will determine whether Anglophones are fully prepared to recognize the Canadian duality.

The first indications make us believe that it will be so, states Mr. Robarts, and tend to show a great gap in this government policy on bilingualism: the teaching of French in the English sector of Canada failed to gain prominence and that could have changed the whole picture.

After consulting the various groups, the members of the commission will present recommendations . . .

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the government-appointed commission. Such are the ideas put forward, and I think they are the result of the commissioners' travels. The other day, when I heard the Prime Minister suggesting we should not be deluded by that third option, I wondered if his statement does not hinder the commission from doing earnest and sincere work. I am anxious to see the results. I am especially anxious to see how the government will receive the commission's conclusions.

I would now like, Mr. Speaker, since I have a few minutes left, to deal with the unemployment situation referred to in the throne speech. Just recently the government pushed through a series of amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act. That once more harms the workers, who will pay more and get less.

That was a good deal for the government. They will be getting more money from the workers and give less in UIC payments, once more passing the buck to the provinces which are not the only ones responsible.

Looking at total benefits paid to the unemployed versus salaries received by the hundreds of technocrats and bureaucrats, we wonder whether the unemployment insurance program was created to the benefit of the unemployed or that of civil servants, because unemployment benefits deteriorate in direct proportion to the improvements in civil servants' monetary and other rewards.

The Address—Mr. Collenette

If benefits were on a universal basis or in the form of a guaranteed annual income with equal treatment for all, we would finally start on the way to the distributory justice we have been advocating for years. The Prime Minister gave us notice of an additional amount of \$150 million to fight against unemployment; if that kind of money were directly earmarked for the primary, secondary and tertiary sectors to create new industries, do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that such an investment would be much more profitable than to try once more to promote all kinds of make-work projects across Canada? I did not say that the minister took a wrong way, he is doing the best he can, but I think that the government's policy is not properly directed.

As for inflation, which is this government's main argument, I think they were unable to control inflation because this argument was borrowed from the Progressive Conservative Party. As we all remember, the Liberal Party went into the last election campaign saying that it was opposed to price and wage controls as recommended by the Progressive Conservative Party; what a surprise, for us, to see the Liberals use the Progressive Conservative argument as soon as they came to power. It was not the first time the Liberals had tried to lift the weapons of their enemies, they even attempted to have them cross the aisle—unsuccessfully as it turned out because they did not know how to handle them.

Government members are still wondering where inflation came from, yet they should know because they started the ball rolling ten years ago when they removed interest ceilings for banks and other credit institutions. Another reason is that the government did not control corporate prices and profits. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that you are about to stand up. I will simply say that if we do not work together to try and fight against inflation, and if the government does not take action to invest in primary industries, unemployment will keep on rising and our dollar will keep on sinking.

● (1522)

[*English*]

Mr. D. M. Collenette (York East): Mr. Speaker, before commencing my remarks I should like to congratulate the mover (Mr. Dawson) on his fine speech. Also I should like to take a few minutes to thank Her Majesty the Queen for making such an exhilarating visit to Canada in the past week. In my constituency in the east end of Toronto we have perhaps one of the last old, strong, British communities which has great links with the monarchy, and these people were extremely happy that Her Majesty's visit was such a success. As well, there are large numbers of newly arrived immigrants from Commonwealth countries in Asia and the Caribbean who have their own ties with the monarchy.

The throne speech provides a forum for the government to outline its general direction of thought in the governance of the nation. Similarly, the throne speech debate, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) this morning, provides an opportunity for backbenchers to talk on the general issues of the day. On Wednesday afternoon of