

structure within which we can live and work in the years to come. They want this Parliament, while the matter of the constitution is before the committee and, we hope, in a quieter way, back before the federal government and the provincial governments, to get down to dealing with many of the other day to day issues, such as the economy, the budget and, I hesitate to say, the Bank Act, as well as other issues with which this Parliament is vitally concerned.

Having said that, I wish to begin by reading a poem written by Earle Birney some years ago entitled "Canada, a Case History". It reads:

This is the case of a high-school land,  
 deadset in adolescence,  
 loud treble laughs and sudden fists,  
 bright cheeks, the gangling presence.  
 This boy is wonderful at sports  
 and physically quite healthy;  
 he's taken to church on Sunday still  
 and keeps his prudence stealthy;  
 He doesn't like books except about bears,  
 collects new coins and model planes  
 and never refuses a dare.  
 His Uncle spoils him with candy, of course,  
 yet shouts him down when he talks at table.  
 You will note he's got some of his French mother's looks  
 though he's not so witty and no more stable.  
 He's really much more like his father and yet  
 if you say so he'll pull a great face.  
 He wants to be different from everyone else  
 and daydreams of winning the global race.  
 Parents unmarried and living abroad,  
 relatives keen to bag the estate,  
 schizophrenia not excluded,  
 will he learn to grow up before it's too late?

The question we must ask ourselves is whether he will grow up before it is too late. We hope, Mr. Speaker, that Canada will grow up before it is too late and we believe that now is time for this country to grow up. Quite frankly, we do not need any Canada goose ads or goose Canada ads to tell us so.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kristiansen:** We were able to figure that out all on our own. I only wish some other members, particularly in the party sitting to my right, would recognize that there is a certain degree of urgency in this matter because, quite frankly, I have had enough of the "nattering nabobs of negativism" who refuse to recognize the limitations of the roles within the political process or the limitations of the bargaining process. This party is not the government—I wish it were—and if we were the government, I am sure we would be introducing a package which is substantially different from that which the government of the day has introduced.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kristiansen:** We are not the government and therefore our approach to the issue is different and the proposals which we put forward are not what we would consider to be ideal. But we will play our role and, if the government demonstrates good faith over the next few weeks and months, we intend to play our role in a constructive way to ensure that we grow up as a nation and begin the job of settling down to the kind of work that has to be done if Canada is to grow and thrive.

Perhaps my view is somewhat jaundiced but I have my own definition of the democratic process. It is that democratic political action is the process by which you stop worse things

from happening. It is also hoped that somewhere along the way something of positive value can be accomplished. Perhaps that is too limited a view, but in the current context of our present role as a third party it is perhaps the most we can achieve in the life of any Parliament, and that is the role we intend to pursue now.

What is in the resolution which we are considering and what are the motives for its presentation? The Minister of Justice (Mr. Chrétien), speaking to the Canadian Club in Toronto yesterday, said that the government was acting for three reasons. He stated that the second reason for acting now was to provide a momentum for some change. I have been around a sufficient number of bargaining tables, I think, to know that when matters of vital interest are at stake, people and major forces seldom move unless a gun is put to their head. I do not find that insulting. Other people seem to be threatened by it, but this is part of the daily process in the business world and certainly in the world of industrial relations. I do not feel the least intimidated by it. Rightly or wrongly, the government finds it necessary, or says it finds it necessary, to do a little sabre rattling and to say to some of the provincial jurisdictions that if some accommodation is not reached soon—and I hope the federal government is willing to make some as well—the matter will be decided unilaterally. It is in our interests as a people and as a party, and in the interests of the gentlemen and lady to my right as a party, to realize that the invitation is there to take part in a realistic way. We should do so. To sit there in petulance, as the people to my right have done on other issues, sucking their thumbs and feeling sorry for themselves is not being realistic. They sit there and say, "Why did you not give us a chance to go ahead and do all these wonderful things?" For a government, the first cabinet in history to swear in using the kamikaze oath, to take that kind of position is absolutely incredible. They say we did not give them a chance. They did not give themselves a chance. The first time they had a prime minister during the course of my lifetime, in effect they murdered him. This time they did not have to; he committed suicide. We have had enough of that.

● (2130)

I should like to comment on one major change we feel the government must make if we are to give serious consideration to the many other important proposals before us. My leader said that we support in principle most of the items, if not all, in the current resolution. We agree that patriation is necessary. We agree, historically and now, that a charter of rights is a good thing, though we may have differences as to some of the wording and the possible implications of the government's current wording. We agree in principle to the incorporation of language rights into the constitution. We have some concern over the manner in which that will be interpreted. We hope that is an issue which, along with other items, the government will sit down in good faith and discuss in the weeks to come.

I think all of us in the House agree with the principle of equalization. Certainly we understand that an amending formula of some type is necessary. While we are concerned with certain of the implications of the specifics in the resolution, we hope the government will prove to be open and receptive to suggestions during the course of the negotiations which lie ahead and that the committee will keep an open mind.