

The Address—Mr. Blenkarn

belongs to all of us as Canadians. I want to say, sir, that no petty provincial politician or individual has the right by referendum or challenge to take away from me or my children or from my constituents in Mississauga our rights in Canada. We are Canadians, and no reconstituted or renegotiated confederation or realignment of the powers of provincial legislatures or this national government can in any way reduce or affect my rights as a Canadian or my children's rights and heritage as Canadians to enjoy all of Canada.

The regionalisms and parochialisms in Canada did not exist 16 or 17 years ago. They have only developed since this government and its predecessor government took office after the 1963 election.

This government has attempted to maintain national unity by inventing a "newspeak". In this newspeak, a No vote means yes, we want to have a renewed confederation, and a Yes vote means no, we do not. Meanwhile, this government has fomented controversy among Canadians. It uses funds from secretary of state grants and other departments to fund particularized interests. In the name of representation, particularly in the last ten years, it has caused a fragmentation of this nation that, I am afraid, is likely to destroy the heritage of my children and my constituents.

This has allowed René Lévesque, whose little vision is limited to the narrow borders of Quebec, to speak to the hearts of Quebecers in his referendum. Liberals—the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy) was here a moment ago speaking in almost the same way—campaigning on the No vote in that province do not speak to the heart. They speak about how much boodle Quebec can get out of confederation and about the economic benefits of being associated with the Anglos. With a \$16 billion deficit on fiscal account, there is not much boodle left. If Quebecers vote Yes on May 20, it will be by reason of the heart; and if they vote No on May 20, also it will have to be by reason of the heart.

● (1640)

Within days of winning the election in February, this government went about creating one controversy after another. It stopped work on a uranium refinery for Eldorado Nuclear in Port Hope, just when the people of Port Hope were suffering from a devastating flood. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) made the suggestion that maybe he would not bother with the Ridley Island port facility at Prince Rupert, even though that facility is absolutely necessary for expanded grain, coal and sulphur shipments. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde), that wonderful minister—the "minister of national unity" one could call him—immediately started a confrontation with Alberta and Saskatchewan. When it came to the Syncrude matter, he did not even bother to consult his own partners in that agreement but proceeded to cancel it.

We heard the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Frith) seconding the Speech from the Throne. He seems to have the disease of this government. In his maiden speech, what did he do? He picked a fight with the hon. Bette Stephenson, the minister of

education in the province of Ontario, on a matter which does not affect his riding of Sudbury at all. It is a matter of provincial jurisdiction and in any event affects only the riding of Simcoe North.

I would like members of the House to remember who said, "Why should I sell your wheat?" We must remember who put French language television in Vancouver over the objections of members of his own party, even though there were no French-speaking viewers.

An hon. Member: Not true.

Mr. Blenkarn: Who imposed metrication on all sorts of Canadians without even a "yes" from the House of Commons? Which government forced Ontario into medicare despite the objection that the delivery of health service is clearly a provincial responsibility?

An hon. Member: Rubbish.

Mr. Blenkarn: Remember, this is the government that fomented endless wrangling at one dominion-provincial conference after another, so that in matters of legislative jurisdiction Canadians are faced with duplication and triplication. This is the government that refused to pay attention to the representations of the city of Montreal and the city of Toronto on matters of urban renewal and partially caused the problems we face in the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. This is the government whose former minister of finance, now the Minister of Justice and Minister of State for Social Development (Mr. Chrétien), otherwise known as the "minister of No" in this government, in a budget supposedly to stimulate the economy, jumped in with both feet on provincial sales tax collection.

When western Canadians see a bright future in the value of their resources on international markets, this government thumps them. When Atlantic Canada tries to get ahead by capitalizing on offshore resources, this government tries to welfare it to death. When the province of Quebec legitimately wants to take over cultural activities and communications, this government is not prepared to agree and holds a tight rein on their ambitions. Sometimes this government is not prepared—indeed, always not prepared—to enter into the real problems of confederation. I emphasize that this government is not prepared to step in on the problem of national unity because it will not step in on laws which prevent me as a Canadian from buying a farm in the province of Prince Edward Island or in the province of Saskatchewan. It will not step in and allow me as a Canadian to work as a construction worker in the province of Quebec. It will not do anything for me if I happen to want to export milk, chickens, eggs or what have you from one province to another. It imagines that as long as I am capable of paying a parking fine in English, it has done all it has to do an all that is necessary.

It is desperately necessary that the Government of Canada changes its direction, develops the vision of a Canada for all Canadians, gives Canadians a sense of belonging and a sense of freedom to develop a pioneering attitude, and gives Canadi-