

about the condition of the country as a result of 12 years of Trudeau administration.

I and many of my colleagues in the House were deprived of the right to speak in the Parliament of our country by the high-handed, dictatorial imposition of closure by the government. The government has no comprehension of the aspirations of western Canada. There is no appreciation of the western point of view. Instead, there seems to be a deliberate attempt by the Prime Minister to isolate western Canada.

We are all aware of the actions of the Prime Minister and his government during their first term of office from 1968 to 1972. They were typified by his classic statement, "Why should I sell your wheat?" Promises have been made to western Canada to come to grips with the sources of western discontent, to rectify the discriminatory freight rates. The promises were made but they were never kept.

After introducing a constitutional amendment act which strikes at the very heart of the federal system, making the provinces second class citizens and the western and Atlantic provinces third class, we are presented with a budget that is essentially a massive confiscation of western economic power.

When westerners voice their disapproval of these actions, the Prime Minister goes out of his way to add insult to injury and calls us "hysterical", "irrational" and "lacking in reason". It has a very familiar ring. In the spring of 1976 the Prime Minister proclaimed that Quebec separatism was dead. In the fall of 1976 René Lévesque and the Parti Québécois were elected to office in Quebec. So much for the views of the Prime Minister as to when discontent becomes separatism. Late last week surveys were taken which showed that one out of four Albertans believed Alberta should separate. It is frightening that 25 per cent of the population wishes to separate and the Prime Minister says that the feeling for separatism is nil in western Canada.

I should like to refer to a meeting held in my riding approximately two weeks ago at which the hon. member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) was the guest speaker. The feelings that were vented at that meeting were such as to cause tremendous concern. They represented a reaction to the government's policies and attitude toward western Canada. One businessman said afterwards, "I travel around all the time and I talk to a lot of people in this community. What I hear scares me. I am afraid, I am afraid". Yet the Prime Minister said the feeling of alienation and separatism in western Canada was nil. I say he does not know what he is talking about; he does not know how the people feel. We in western Canada are not hysterical; we are not lacking in intelligence or reason; we are not irrational. For the benefit of the Prime Minister and everyone else involved in this regionally-based central Canadian Liberal government, I must state categorically that I do not appreciate certain things and I reject them. I reject the unilateral constitutional proposal of the Prime Minister. I reject his unilaterally and federally imposed charter of human rights and its eroding of parliamentary supremacy by transferring legislative powers, including those concerning the natural resources dealt with in the budget, to the federally appointed

The Budget—Mr. Patterson

supreme court. I reject the proposal of the Prime Minister to turn British Columbia and the other western provinces into second and third-class citizens. I want no part of colonial status. I reject the concept of having another nation amend our constitution in a way which would never be approved by Canadians. These things were all tied up, not only with the constitutional debate, but with the budget debate as well. We reject the massive transfers of jurisdiction over property and civil rights and education to the federal government under the constitutional proposal.

● (1750)

We have talked about the rights that were supposed to be enshrined in the constitution. With this in mind I want to quote the words of Harold Laski—at least my friends in the New Democratic Party will realize who he is. He said:

A vigilant legislature and the existence of a citizen body which is conscious that rights do matter and is willing if need be to fight for those rights is the best guarantee of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to have the opportunity to speak some time later in the constitution debate. I wish to reiterate what several of my colleagues from the west have said in their own way and I advise the Prime Minister and his cabinet to withdraw the suggestions and proposals which are before us and start over again so as to bring something back which will be acceptable right across the country.

I move on, now, to the catalogue of broken promises which have become evident in this budget. I suggest that the budget is the epitome of hypocrisy. In his press conference a week ago the Prime Minister in the same statement in which he said separatism in the west was nil, went on to admonish western Canadians for not electing members of Parliament to the national government. I was amazed that none of the reporters challenged him on that point. I remind the House that a little earlier he had said there were no members elected. But there had been members elected in the previous government. It was not satisfactory as far as he was concerned.

The Prime Minister promised there would be no excise tax on gasoline. The Minister of Finance makes provision for what he calls a Canadian ownership charge of up to an extra \$4.50 per barrel. During the election campaign last February the Liberals were promising some form of assistance to lower income Canadians. The budget has done nothing at all in this area of assistance. It provides that the cost of oil will be 85 per cent of the world price by 1984. That is exactly what our budget provided. In addition, the minister neglected to add his Canadian ownership charge, which all Canadians will have to pay on home heating oil, gasoline and oil products.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired. I believe he is nearing the end of his speech but if he is to continue, unanimous consent would be required.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Patterson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A major part of our policy when we were in government was to cut deficit and