

Let there be no mistake about the intention of Mr. Fulton. He said:

Our department would try to do that job for you, holding the balance between the various points of view that have been suggested.

That should clarify the matter. Because of the importance of the question, the wording was to be such that it would encompass the views of all the parties in the House of Commons.

There is a further point that should be made with regard to when the bill was in committee. We must remember that the rules have changed since that time. When second reading of the bill was being considered, it was considered as a matter of principle; members voted on a matter of principle. There was unanimous consent in the House at that time. No one objected to the way the bill was worded when it was sent to committee. Any changes that came about were with the concurrence of the government.

A large section of our society is now apparently being disregarded. Many people are inspired by the religious training they received when they were growing up. Many still turn to religion in order to instil in their families the belief and moral fibre they feel necessary.

I cannot help but think that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) receives his inspiration while travelling to atheist countries like China and Russia. Therefore, future generations will not have the same recognition of the values we have held in the past. I am sure that many members opposite believe there should be a reference to the supremacy of God but are prepared to go ahead with this Constitution in order to satisfy one man's ego.

This Constitution is incomplete, inaccurate, and does not go in the direction this country desires. This should be corrected before this resolution is dealt with by this Parliament. We should not be burdened with a deadline simply because the Prime Minister has his own personal deadline. If we continue in this direction, to whom will we pray? The Prime Minister? Will he be supreme? If we remove reference to the supremacy of God, there is only one man at the head of this country who is supreme.

This should be a very happy occasion for all Canadians. We are in the midst of constructing a Constitution. The foundation is being laid for the future. When planning the construction of a home, recognition is given to all the requirements. The housewife has certain requirements for the kitchen. The children may want a certain type of room. You try to accommodate everyone within the means available. We certainly have the means in this instance. We should have all the time that is necessary. Why lay the foundation in such a way that it will crumble within a few years?

When building a family home, if all the family requirements are not taken into account, regardless of the cost of the structure the family will not be happy. This is the kind of situation we are creating for future Canadians. We should therefore take into account all the requirements.

I now want to deal with the provinces. On the question of the unilateral action taken by the federal government, an

### *The Constitution*

amending formula and the inclusion of the Victoria formula, two provinces are given veto power. We are going to have three different categories of province in this country by the time we are through if we proceed on the present basis.

• (1520)

First of all, the two provinces that have the veto power, Ontario and Quebec—it has been that way up until the present—shall continue to do so. For some reason, these people in that part of Canada have a special choice in the matter. That should not be continued.

If we are to construct a new constitution, we should remove these inequalities; rather, we are putting in greater inequalities. For example, there is the requirement in the veto power that you have two provinces in the Atlantic region, and in western Canada you require two provinces, the total population of which should be what? Fifty per cent.

The city of Regina has a population which is almost twice that of P.E.I., and yet P.E.I. has more strength than all the province of Saskatchewan. What does that do to poor Premier Blakeney? He cannot join up with another province, Manitoba, if he wants to promote his socialism in the country, which the Liberal government is only too glad to promote. Where does that put him? Can hon. members not see why he is rejecting the package that is presented?

Therefore, we have three levels of province. I think this amounts to a castration of the provinces, because you cannot move without the prior consent of that man who sets himself up to be as supreme as God. God is no longer to be recognized. Only the Prime Minister can suggest the timing, the wording; of course, he has the resources of the whole country to promote his ideas. What you are doing is resorting to the castration of the provinces. That should not be perpetuated.

What do hon. members think the citizens of those provinces are going to think in the future? Do they think they will be happy in this family which is called Canada? Forever and a day, we will be reminded of that provision. It should certainly be excluded from the Constitution which has now been drafted.

In this country we have had a Liberal government for 38 of the last 50 years.

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

**An hon. Member:** Thank God.

**Mr. Korchinski:** Somebody said "Thank God". Because we have had a Liberal government which never recognized the requirements of the provinces, we now have five different political parties in Canada that have resorted to other political parties in the province to provide a counterbalance. The Liberal government is only interested in its own preservation in Ottawa, and that is why it is wording the Constitution. Why do you think we have to resort to Social Credit in B.C.?

**An hon. Member:** What's your reason?