

The Address—Mr. Blenkarn

al or racial background. There is no distinction among Canadians on the basis of how long they or their ancestors have been in this land.

A Canadian who has recently obtained his citizenship from our citizenship courts and who has chosen to become a Canadian is every bit as much a Canadian and every bit as honoured as a Canadian as those who might trace their ancestry back to the United Empire Loyalists or back to the time of Champlain and Frontenac. We are all Canadians. There is no distinction between Canadians, and efforts by governments to make a distinction, to protect one group of Canadians against another or to favour one group of Canadians over another, are divisive and cause disunity in this country.

Second, it is my view that the least government is the best government. As I said in October, it strikes me that the more we attempt to solve people's problems by legislation, rules, statutes and administrative orders, the more problems we create. The cost of government in most cases more than eats up the advantage of any protection that rules prepared and promulgated by government are intended to provide. There is rarely any cost-benefit advantage to more government. It must be apparent to us all by now, looking at the growth of government over the last decade or so and the growth of disunity in Canada over the last decade or so, that there must be some definite relationship.

Lastly, as a member of Parliament I said that a member has a threefold obligation. The first is as a representative, and I will attempt in this Parliament, as I did in the last parliament, to convey the ideas of Mississauga South to this government and to represent the attitudes of the ministries to the people in my riding. My second obligation is as an ombudsman. Because of the mountains of legislation, regulation, red tape and so forth, every riding in this country needs a pretty active ombudsman. Indeed, if there were not members of Parliament acting as ombudsmen to their constituents, there would have been a bloody revolution because of the red tape we have.

Lastly, as legislators I deem it necessary that we look very closely at the legislation that is produced to make sure that that legislation, in attempting to solve problems, does not add to some of the economic concerns and the disunity we have in this country.

Today I want to expand on these three principles as they relate to my vision of Canada. What I am talking about today is in relation to the referendum in Québec, because that referendum makes us face up to some of the concerns which runaway big government, refusal to treat Canadians as equals and refusal by government to think seriously about the consequences of how they legislate have created.

The concept of Canada dates back to before confederation. It dates back before the union of Upper Canada and Lower Canada into one legislative unit. Indeed, it dates back to the time when young Canadians of French origin first looked at their country and said: "We belong here, and we are not going to pay attention to the kings of France and their rules; we are

going to become *coureurs des bois*, go out on our own and be Canadians". Two sons of Canada, Radisson and Groseilliers, formed the Company of Adventurers trading into Hudson Bay.

Today we see this Canada, a dominion from sea to sea, being torn apart. This threat demands that we as members of Parliament look at the concept of Canada, the vision of Canada of Sir John Macdonald, Laurier, Borden, King, Bennett, St. Laurent and, above all, the vision of John George Diefenbaker, an honoured son of this Parliament who just recently passed away.

In days past governments of Canada were prepared to lead. They were prepared to build railways, seaways, ports and transcontinental pipelines and airlines. They were prepared to inspire the private development of our farms and forests and to encourage immigrants to settle in this still pioneer country. This government approaches Canada without any vision. It takes a restrictive, bureaucratic, socialist-minded approach. It seeks to divide the pie into smaller and smaller pieces and more evenly rather than build a bigger pie. This government has become an irrelevant colossus approaching various parts of the country with offers of money. Money will never buy people to stay in Canada.

The concept of Canada is an emotional concept. Canada never made much economic sense in the first place. The natural economic divisions of this North American continent are north and south, not east and west. This government approaches Canada with a bookkeeping mentality. It approaches the people of Québec and says: "Vote No and you will make more money". We Canadians have had bookkeeping long enough. If it was bookkeeping or economic advantage we were talking about and a referendum was held in western Canada, people in western Canada would vote Yes for sure.

I have had the good fortune to be able to travel in a large part of Canada, much of it by canoe. I have paddled the rivers young French Canadians travelled when they were exploring this country in the early days. Some of those young French Canadians settled in Ontario in Essex county and in Penetanguishene in Northern Ontario. They settled in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and Yukon. How can they now be conned into surrendering that heritage? This government has created the climate for the Lévesque con.

Mr. Cousineau: Come off it.

Mr. Blenkarn: It has never talked about the huge realizable potential of Canada. It has never sold Canada to people; on the contrary, it has used all its efforts to speak about what the individual can get out of the system rather than to encourage Canadians to explore and take advantage of the growth of Canada. It has talked about linguistic equality rather than the equality of heritage and opportunity. It has promoted a limited, parochial Canada. It is no wonder the petty provincial future so well sold by Lévesque sounds so good.

An hon. Member: To you, maybe.

Mr. Blenkarn: We have all been told of the potential of the tar sands. Some of us talk about the potential of the Yukon