

Canada where the concern is deepest, the anger more justifiably acute.

There is no government subsidization in this program for opposition members of Parliament to explain the constitution which affects everybody in this nation. There is no hope at all for those who want to go out and express an opposing point of view. We have to do it at our own cost—and we will. The government is spending our money to promote one point of view, the Liberal point of view, and they ask us to keep this debate non-partisan?

The Prime Minister made an admirable start at a non-partisan, balanced and responsible approach to Canada's constitutional reform when he appointed two of Canada's foremost authorities on the subject to co-chair an important task force, the distinguished former premier of Ontario, the Hon. John Robarts, a master of consensus at gatherings like the Confederation for Tomorrow Conference, in Toronto, and his equally qualified Liberal counterpart, the amiable hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton (Mr. Pepin). They became the Banting and Best of constitutional change.

The Pepin-Robarts Task Force on National Unity went from coast to coast listening to the views of hundreds upon hundreds of Canadians as they poured forth their views almost nightly—on national television—on the kind of Canada they wanted to see. Having thus dramatically sampled the grass roots of this country, at a cost of several million dollars to the taxpayers, the task force handed down comprehensive and far-reaching recommendations for the future of the country. Indeed, pretty soon the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton became the constitutional expert most in demand on the nation-wide speaking circuit, through the media, almost eclipsing the acknowledged dean of constitutional commentary in Canada, former Senator Forsey.

But whose face did we see for seemingly endless hours and days on the TV screen right behind or beside the Prime Minister's at the recent federal-provincial conference? Who got the chance to go to London to see the Queen and explain Canada's case? Why, it was that renowned constitutional expert and household name, the Minister of State for Science and Technology and Minister of the Environment. Where was the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton? Did anybody ever see his benign countenance on the TV screen during that week-long "Operation Klieg-Light"? Does anybody know if the Minister of Transport was consulted before the Prime Minister's unveiling of this document last week, or whether he was offered any room on the government aircraft which flew off to the United Kingdom this past week carrying the other two ministers to meet the Queen and wine and dine the British press?

I should point out here I am not being mischievously partisan here. I am concerned and disappointed about the Prime Minister freezing out the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton from this historic, symbolic and cataclysmic move of the BNA Act from Britain to Canada. I am disappointed because the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton happens to be my MP. My family's Ottawa residence as opposed to our home

in Dundas, Ontario, lies deep within my hon. friend's riding. While I am hoping against hope that he will ever be able to do anything as Minister of Transport to satisfy those of us who are concerned about airport expansion, I had come to expect a somewhat higher profile and, I might add, a much deserved role as one of the fathers of reconfederation. The minister will know that my disappointment is sincere.

● (1440)

**Mr. Pepin:** I am helping both your airports.

**Mr. Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth):** The minister said that he is helping both my airports. I will believe that when I see the results. My concern about the minister's total exclusion from this exercise goes to the very root of this debate and forms the basis of my party's honest objection to what this Liberal government and this Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in particular are determined to do. Let me just quote a couple of key recommendations out of the Pepin-Robarts report:

Our conclusion, then, with respect to regionalism parallels our judgment about duality in two ways. First, we accept both of them as basic social and political realities, but we also recognize the legitimate claims of both and the potential they offer to enrich and diversify Canadian life. In other words we accept their existence, we also recognize their value . . . we also believe that regionalism in Canadian life is expressed primarily . . . within the framework of the provinces and we regard the provincial and territorial governments as critical agents in articulating the concerns and aspirations of these regional communities.

Clearly, that endorses the provinces as legitimate spokesmen for the concerns of their regions. One of the most telling sections of the Pepin-Robarts report reads as follows:

—our commitment to the constitution of the Canadian federation that a system with the authority of the state shared by two orders of government—

It says two orders of government.

—each sovereign and at the same time committed to co-operative association with the other under a constitution.

We think that the approach to Canada's problems must be as varied and comprehensive as are the problems themselves. There is no single answer that will do the job.

That, in my view, reflects a view of Canada that flies in the face of the Prime Minister's "this or else" approach. On language rights, which go to the heart of our debate on Canadian unity, the Pepin-Robarts report states:

The principle of the equality of status, rights and privileges of the English and French languages for all purposes declared by the Parliament of Canada, within its sphere of jurisdiction, should be entrenched in the constitution.

Each provincial legislature should have the right to determine an official language or official languages for that province, within its sphere of jurisdiction.

Should all provinces agree on these or any other linguistic rights, these rights should then be entrenched in the constitution.

The operative words there are "should all provinces agree". The Pepin-Robarts report favours entrenchment of rights. However, the implication is that entrenchment should be based on consensus in order to have uniformity. The list of rights should, if necessary, be limited to those on which there is agreement. Here is what the present Prime Minister said, according to an article in *The Canadian Forum*, published in June, 1962, and I quote from page 53:

I said it earlier: it is necessary to divorce the concepts of the state and of the nation, and to make Canada a society truly pluralist and multinational. And for