

was displaced from a region or regions to other ones, and as our history unfolds, sharing is to the benefit of other provinces that at some earlier point also had to share with others.

By enshrining into our constitution that basic principle of wealth-sharing, and solemnly reaffirming in a constitutional document one of the principles behind our Canadian federalism, I fail to see how we could be detracting powers from the provinces and adding to central powers. What we are doing in fact is recognizing what has kept this country united, the generosity of Canadians, and reaffirming a solemn commitment in the constitution that such a bond will be maintained and strengthened by all governments.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in a last step, we give ourselves an amendment mechanism, a deadlock-breaking mechanism. Over these last 50 years we have gone through many attempts at constitutional negotiations. We realize it was not always easy to come to unanimity rules, we also realize the danger in unanimity rules. The danger is not to err but to do nothing, procrastinate and never progress. In order to avoid any recurrence of such deadlocks, there is provision for a deadlock-breaking mechanism.

As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, I am especially happy that the Canadian government allows this House and the Senate, by addressing this resolution, to break the deadlock of constitutional reform.

We have had tensions, we shall certainly have more in our country, but as we become able first to Canadianize our institutions, keep improving the way the various powers are used in our country, we shall have ever more chance of meeting more and more pressing requirements of the people who want a new constitution. Moreover, I am convinced that after the committee study and after the debate that will follow its report, we shall be able to proceed as quickly as possible to the patriation, to the entrenchment of a charter of rights into our constitution. We shall also be able to recognize equalization as the underlying principle of Canadian federalism and give ourselves an amending formula. Thus we shall have honoured the commitments we made to the majority of Quebecers who voted yes to the Canadian federation and to the renewal of the federation.

[*English*]

● (1730)

**Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, I feel grateful to be speaking in this debate. It is sad that a member should feel grateful that he is able to speak in a debate in the House, but I am pleased I was able to get in before the Liberals cut us all off at one o'clock tomorrow morning. I would like to express my appreciation to my colleagues, many of whom are not permitted to speak on this resolution and who are going to be deprived of their opportunities as members of Parliament to participate in the debate, thanks to the peculiar notions the Liberals have about what is fair debate in the House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada.

### *The Constitution*

Today we are under closure, which was brought in last night. I would like to comment a bit about that. Unusual as it is, this is the third time in our history that we have been gagged in this fashion. I am astonished at the New Democratic Party—with the word “democratic” in its name—for having raised no objection to closure yesterday. Today, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, the New Democratic Party brought in the most irrelevant possible motions which made no mention of our having to operate today under closure.

Again during the question period members of the New Democratic Party raised no objections to closure on an important item like this. I can hardly believe it.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Did we not vote against it?

**Mr. McKinnon:** They will probably vote against it.

**Mr. Orlikow:** We did vote against it.

**Mr. McKinnon:** They did vote against it, but they are there when the Liberals need them. The Liberals can always count on them. There was once a movie, and I believe it was Lauren Bacall who said to Humphrey Bogart, “If you need me, just whistle.” That is all the Liberals need to do, and members of the New Democratic Party will come. They do not have to be paid; they do not have to be given position; just whistle, and they will be there if they are needed, and members of the Liberal party know it.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and “simple Simon” came to an agreement as to what would be a suitable exchange for the loyalty of the members of the New Democratic Party at this time. As I understand the letter I read, there were three items. Mainly the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) was able to assure himself that not much would be taken away from the provinces, seeing that the provinces already own the resources, and that they would be given management and control while the ownership was taken away from them. To my mind, I would prefer ownership if I had a choice between owning something or managing and controlling it.

As I walked this morning and puzzled over how the Leader of the New Democratic Party could do it, I could think only of the poor provinces which are to gain nothing. Instead of Mr. Blakeney's dealing in the highly intelligent and forceful manner he does in negotiations with the Prime Minister, simple Simon went instead.

We heard much today from the Prime Minister about the necessity for this drastic measure because the matter has been discussed for 53 years. While he shed his crocodile tears here about the discussions he has gone through and the trouble he has seen, I was thinking about an article which appeared in 1971 written by the journalist Peter Ward. This is what the Prime Minister had to say about the charter in those days, and Peter Ward quoted the Prime Minister at that time:

Constitutional reform is something Canada can live without. A fact demonstrated by all the premiers at the series of conferences, said Mr. Trudeau. He reminded Toronto newsmen that in 1967 at the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference, he had opposed tackling constitutional reform.