

**Mr. MacGuigan:** The hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman) showed what I have to call, I hope not unkindly, a naive understanding of the benefits of a referendum yesterday when he said that if the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had taken action on his motion in February which called for consideration of such referendum, much of the uncertainty which pervades the country today would never have occurred.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is that we cannot decide on a referendum now. It looks as if the Parti Québécois is determined to have an unfair referendum in Quebec, one which will not safeguard the rights of assembly, of association and free speech. In those circumstances, obviously the results of the referendum will not be reliable and we may have to use a federal referendum. But that is a decision to be made then. All we are talking about now is the power to have such a referendum; we are not making a decision to go ahead with it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, just a word about spirit. It seems to me this is really much more important than structural changes. After all, we have no one to negotiate with right now while we are awaiting the referendum. It is really the spirit of our country, the spirit of our government, the spirit of our people which counts.

It seems to me that we ought to have a national nationalism—not one of Quebec, nor of the west, nor of the maritimes, nor even one of Ontario which likes to regard itself as the heartland of the country; not nationalism of that kind, but one which tries to embrace the whole country, one which gives all people in the country a feeling of “at homeness”. It should be one based upon survival—the survival which we achieved over so many centuries here—upon the land and the people—upon the French fact and also upon the multicultural nature of our

*The Address—Mr. MacGuigan*

country. It should be based on the social tolerance that we have. In some ways, perhaps the most important of all, because it sums all the others up, is our sense of liberty, as meaning variety or diversity, a kind of fullness which allows us to choose among various kinds of life modes and lifestyles and ways of living in our country.

The Canadian sense of freedom stems in part from the British tradition, which is more relaxed than that of the American because it is less conceptualistic. But I believe that its principal source is the French fact in Canada, which has compelled the recognition of diversity from the Quebec Act on. This in-built diversity has never been entirely welcomed by some Anglo-Saxon elements, but it has had to be accepted as the condition of national existence. In my view it is the foundation stone of our political independence from the United States and of our national uniqueness. The English tradition prepared us for the intellectual acceptance of diversity; the French Canadian presence rendered diversity a necessity.

Our national experiment is only beginning to mature. It arrived at formal acceptance of official bilingualism in the sixties and of multiculturalism in the seventies. It needs to be understood and consciously embraced by the mass of Canadians. It also requires an expansion of outlook to include equality, so that the colourful mosaic does not remain fixed as a permanently vertical one. Here is enough for decades of national striving. It is a goal well worth the efforts of a free people. It justifies, even demands, the preservation of Canada.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Order, please. According to the unanimous consent received earlier I see it is now five o'clock. This House stands adjourned until Monday until 11 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(2).

At 5.09 p.m. o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.