

The very fact that Canada is a federalist state already should be an indication to all of us that we have a unique situation in this country. The fathers of Confederation did not choose a unitary state. When only four provinces were joined, a federalist state was created. It was recognized then that the various parts did not have the same background or the same language, and while their first aspiration was a united country, they also knew that that country would not survive if the decisions of a central body were to be forced on the collective parts. The very fact that we have a federalist state demands from all of us that tolerance has to be shown and, especially in a federalist state, that need for tolerance is extremely important.

In 1968 the Prime Minister came to power. He was elected by the majority of Canadians. I think all of us would admit that he was the repository of a tremendous amount of good will throughout the country. In fact, even those of us who did not support his party in 1968 had to admit that many people in our areas supported the Prime Minister and what he stood for.

Mr. Brisco: How times have changed!

Mr. Epp: Indeed, how times have changed! But I think we would all admit that that was the case in 1968. The Prime Minister said very clearly at the time that he was going to bring Quebec into the mainstream of Canadian life. The majority of Canadians accepted those words at face value, hence the election of the Prime Minister. That question has dominated Canadian affairs for the entire tenure of the Prime Minister. What have been the results? In a long and wide-ranging article which appeared in the *Economist* dated February 12, 1977, the writer went into great detail not only with regard to Canada's federalist future but also with regard to an analysis of the various parts of Canada. The writer said this about the Prime Minister's record:

Canada is not a unitary country and never has been; it is Mr. Trudeau's tragedy that he has failed to make it one. Perhaps he has exhausted his role as a leader of all Canada by concentrating too exclusively on federal solutions for Canada's problems, when the provinces have been demanding more room in government for themselves.

Further in the article the writer said:

From the Pacific until one reaches Ontario, Ottawa and Mr. Trudeau are anathema—focal points for a paranoid hatred of so much that the federal government has done to redistribute their wealth to the poorer provinces east of the Ottawa valley and to force them, as they say in their morbid shorthand, to learn French when they did not want to. To this observer, federal Canada seemed vulnerable—

An hon. Member: Who wrote that?

Mr. Epp: At the beginning of my remarks I said I was going to try to show the House the point of view of western Canada on how to bring about a united country. The carping of hon. members opposite will not help in any way. However, I want to continue what I have to say. What about the view which has been expressed so frequently in the last few days? In the press there has been an overabundance of speculation that in the west there is no recognition of the aspirations of Quebec. I was deeply moved by the comments of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta) yesterday. He spoke as a western Canadian and

put forward his view, and the view of his constituents with respect to Quebec staying in confederation, very clearly. As western Canadians, we want Quebec in confederation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp: As western Canadians, we also want to be part of confederation. That is Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp: With great respect to hon. members opposite, I say that more attention will have to be paid to what the west is saying—although not by way of blackmail. It is saying it has some legitimate grievances and legitimate aspirations. We in the west believe that we can contribute to the Canadian confederation.

Mr. Speaker, if I may call it five o'clock, I will continue at eight o'clock.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 40, it is my duty to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain)—Fisheries—Extensive herring kill in Bay of Fundy—Request for determination of cause and assistance to fishermen; the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Transport—Request of Atlantic provinces for funds to improve TransCanada Highway—Government position; the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen)—External Affairs—Cuba—Suggested reconsideration of relationship in view of support of Rhodesian guerrillas.

[Translation]

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills and notices of motions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion No. 12, in the name of the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard).

Some hon. Members: Stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion stands at the request of the government.