

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. member intend to move his motion under the provisions of Standing Order 6(5)(a)?

Mr. Crosbie: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

While you are considering that, Mr. Speaker, I will close on this note. Dr. Pottle in his book—

Mr. Collenette: Have you moved the motion? Did you say Standing Order 6(5)(a)?

Mr. Crosbie: I take my orders from the Chair, not from any Liberal parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I understand the hon. member is proposing to move his motion under the provisions of Standing Order 6(5)(a).

Mr. Crosbie: Precisely.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, I refer to Dr. Pottle's book which is very valuable. At page 199 he asked, of Canada:

What are those dreams, he queried quietly, of hope that leap to life in your fair land?

And further down the page we read this:

What do you hold supreme in unison? What is the good for which you stand on guard?

The good for which we stand on guard is not closure on the fundamental issue of the constitution. We do not stand on guard for the bullying of small provinces, underdeveloped provinces and poor provinces, because they dare to speak out. We do not stand on guard for that, and we do not agree with that. We do not stand on guard to change the whole nature of Canadian federalism without the consent of the provinces which help make up the 11 governments. We believe in 11 strong governments, not one super government and ten counties which the government can bully at will. We believe that that protects freedoms, and that is the only way freedoms will ever be protected.

We do not stand on guard for the referendum technique of the fascist states. They always have their referendums and they can get the people to agree to everything. We do not, and I do not, stand on guard for the despotism of an arrogant and unbending ideologue who is going to force this country to suit his tastes before he goes, he thinks. Well, he will suffer a lot of resistance on that.

I do not stand on guard for the use of polls and advertising which misinform the public and keep people's minds closed when they should be open. This is done not to help them understand the issue but to help them not to understand the issue. I do not stand on guard for that, and I feel shame for those who do. I do not stand on guard to use any means at all to keep ourselves in power. That is already obvious. We believe that a government has to work for the good of the people, not just to use every sleazy trick it can to stay in power and never accomplish anything. We do not stand on guard for that. We stand on guard for a Canada that has some democratic

freedoms, and economic freedoms. We are not even free to enjoy property under the Prime Minister's new charter.

We believe that standing on guard means standing on guard for conciliation and compromise, for consent and for a confederation, not a unitary state with everything imposed on the rest, where a minister of justice—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Order, please.

Some hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion (Mr. Crosbie) agreed to.

• (1720)

[Translation]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of State, Finance): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to have the opportunity to take part in this extremely important debate on the future of our country. I am somewhat surprised at the comments made by the previous speaker, especially the impassioned rhetoric he used to make a review of the constitutional problems which our country is facing, problems which we have been considering for years.

I have been especially astonished by his intervention because, in my opinion, the process which will be launched with the passage of the resolution introduced by the government, that is adoption by both Houses, the House of Commons and the Senate, is indeed the ideal opportunity given to all governments in the country, federal and provincial, and to all Canadians to untangle the constitutional issue. And I know that this constitutional solution is a concern for most Canadians as well as for a great majority of members of this House, especially for those who were involved in the Quebec referendum.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, as we all remember, a commitment was made to get the constitutional revision under way as soon as possible, a process which has been going on for years and has always pitched headlong into a dead end, not necessarily because of ill will, but because of certain restrictions. We now have the possibility, by accepting this resolution, of launching that constitutional reform. As I said, those of us who were closely involved in the Quebec referendum promised to spare no effort in breaking out of the impasse and breaking new ground in the constitutional revision process. I am happy that the government should have taken steps to respect that promise by bringing in this resolution to the House and referring its study to a committee which, contrary to some of the remarks we heard here today, is not subject to closure, but will have every opportunity to question and hear Canadians who will doubtless have extremely interesting views on this resolution.