

amendment. Ultimately, we would not have a country at all but a checkerboard of jurisdictions, each with what would amount to its own constitution, which would make a mockery of the mobility rights and other rights which have been guaranteed in this charter. I am sure that if he were alive, the Right Hon. John George Diefenbaker would agree with me on this point.

**Mr. Keeper:** One Canada, not a two thirds Canada.

**Mr. Rose:** There are some who say, "What is all the rush? Why risk all this conflict and controversy? Why not take a little more time? Let's polish up the package into one more acceptable to more people."

To answer the last statement first, I believe that if we worked ten years more, we would never create a blue print for Canada that was perfect nor one which would avoid all criticism. Our country is too diverse for that to happen.

As a New Democrat I find the perpetuation of the powers of the Senate so intensely unpalatable that for that reason alone I am tempted to vote against the whole bundle. I will leave that to other members of my party because I am quite sure we will not hear much about Senate reform from either the Liberals or the Conservatives. I will leave it to others in my party to rage over the continued power and presence of that unelected Upper House made up largely of retired Liberal and Tory bagmen and political rejects. But I would like the House to know that the continuing presence of an archaic and unchanged Senate resting sheltered and snug in our brand new Constitution is, to me and many other people, both odious and unacceptable.

**Mr. Blaikie:** It is an affirmative action program for disabled Liberals.

**Mr. Rose:** In spite of the government cop-out which deleted Clause 44, which would have weakened the powers of the Senate, I feel that the gains obtained by my own leader in granting extended powers to the provinces in resource management and indirect taxation, plus improvements in the charter of rights for women, natives, the handicapped and for multiculturalism, do more than enough to justify my support for the package.

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

**Mr. Rose:** But what is this rush to patriate, anyway? Following on the heels of the Quebec referendum of May 20 last a follow through was promised on the commitments made by several political leaders and parties. They promised to renew our Constitution as a means of dealing with the particular needs of the province of Quebec. Beyond that, we are all aware of the strong expressions of deeply felt alienation by the people of western Canada toward the federal government, so that there is now at least a willingness, in some cases at least and in some provinces—and involving many people—to discuss our Constitution and to expect that there will be significant movement on this matter of constitutional change.

### *The Constitution*

Should we falter and return to the interminable and boring rounds of federal-provincial conferences, whatever momentum has been built up among the people of Canada could well be lost. So the time is now. I disagree with those who strongly advocate that this is not the time. This is the time to act decisively with respect to the patriation of our Constitution. The mere transfer of a document from one country to another is not sufficient. We must show the people of Canada that we are prepared to change decision-making processes in order to correct these sources of alienation. I insist that nothing can be achieved by further foot-dragging or delay.

I have dealt with the features of the constitutional debate which are important to me. Admittedly, much more could be said, but I have commented on initiatives I support, such as the charter of rights and freedoms, MP participation in constitution building and added provincial resource protection. I admit I have said nothing about equalization or language rights and very little about legal rights. I have been sharply critical of perpetuating the Senate prerogatives, and in addition I have made suggestions about improving the amending formula to make it more fair and just to western provinces.

Symbols are very important to any nation. We have our own flag. We have our own national anthem. Soon, if we are statesmen instead of mere politicians, I think we will be able to boast of our own Constitution. A few members are still sitting among us who furiously and sincerely fought the new flag both inside and outside the House of Commons. Who today, however, would stand up and say we should rip up the Maple Leaf and unfurl the good old Red Ensign? Who are they? They are darned few.

The same is true with respect to the Constitution. Once we get it home and it becomes part of us, which politician will stand up during the next federal election campaign and say, "Vote for me and I will send our Constitution back to England"?

I recognize that there are some who oppose bitterly what we are doing here. That is inevitable. These things are never easy. Still, passions do cool eventually, and although it is trite but true, time is a great healer. Surely the glue holding Canada together is strong enough to resist our disintegration merely because the federal Parliament, in desperation, seized the initiative to bring our Constitution home.

● (1620)

The Tories are fond of repeating ad nauseam a Gallup poll published some weeks ago which reported that 64 per cent of Canadians opposed unilateral patriation. They use this as an argument for rejection of the package. I know that I have quoted the late John Diefenbaker a number of times but he said that polls were "only for dogs."

I think very few people are aware of what the former, fighting United States president, Harry Truman, had to say about using polls as a basis for political decision-making. In 1954 Mr. Truman is reported to have said:

I wonder how far Moses would have gone if he'd taken a poll in Egypt? What would Jesus Christ have preached if he'd taken a poll in Israel? Where would the