

has been passed in the Quebec legislature. Under the British North America Act, the Prime Minister has two avenues open to him in his approach to the legislation passed in Quebec. The approach we have advocated is a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada to test the validity of the legislation.

The second avenue the Prime Minister has open to him under the British North America Act is that, if the federal government so desires, it can disallow provincial legislation, as long as it does so within one year. The Prime Minister has not seen fit to take either avenue, and we wonder where is his leadership in this issue. It is obvious when we travel through our constituencies that the two main issues in Canada today are national unity and the economic policies of our present administration. We have stated what we would do, in the event that we were the government, with regard to Bill 101, but let me share with the House why I feel the Prime Minister will not take this approach. I feel that the Prime Minister himself is in support of Bill 101. René Lévesque and our Prime Minister are in bed together.

Mr. Crouse: The odd couple.

Mr. Elzinga: When the sheets are pulled over their heads they are holding hands and laughing at the gullibility of the Canadian people on this issue, but when the sheets are pulled back they have a mock pillow fight simply for public consumption. Bill 101 is a fine example of that, and I hope the Canadian people will realize just what is going on between their Prime Minister and the leader of the government party in Quebec, who is dedicated to the break-up of Canada. There can be no doubt in the mind of anyone who has heard our leader speak in the national unity debate before this parliament recessed, about where our party stands on this issue.

● (1752)

An hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Elzinga: If the hon. member had listened to what our leader said he would be aware of where we stand. He should read *Hansard*, or listen to the debates.

We saw the government bring in wage and price proposals. We hoped that during the period wage and price controls were in effect the government would re-think its economic policy. In the 1974 election campaign this party stated that wage and price controls should be a temporary measure in order that we could realign the economic policies of the government if we should take power. The government has not taken advantage of the time available to it while wage and price controls were in effect.

When I speak of realigning the economic policies of the government I would point out that it is essential that it curb government spending and that there be a realignment of fiscal policy. This is what we advocated in 1974.

Traditionally a country grows according to its leadership. It becomes obvious not only to those who are sitting in this Chamber but to Canadians at large that Canada has been deprived of leadership for the past ten years. Canada is

The Address—Mr. Elzinga

begging, searching, for leadership. In 1968 when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) took the reins of power with this government, very little was said about separation. Now in 1977 we have the government of one province dedicated to its separation.

I have dealt briefly with the economy and the national unity debate, Mr. Speaker. There is one other issue that I wish to share with you, however, and I do so with a certain amount of reservation. One is elected to parliament to express the views of constituents and often one feels rather hesitant about baring one's heart when aware of one's shortcomings.

This country was built by pioneers who had a deep dedication not only to their country, Mr. Speaker, but also to God. That is what is lacking today from parliament even in the direction that this country is going. We lack the moral idealism that is essential for a country to survive.

Let me just close by sharing with you the thought that it is time that we, as members of parliament, realized that governing Canada is expressed in the words over the doorway to the Parliament Buildings—"God shall have dominion from sea to sea."

Let us strive to show Canadians that we have set that example for them here in Ottawa.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith).

● (1756)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

There is hardly two minutes left and we agreed with each party's representatives to adjourn the debate at six o'clock to allow the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) to have the floor at eight o'clock. The minister would be followed by a speaker for the Progressive Conservative Party, one for the New Democratic Party and finally one for the Social Credit Party of Canada. The agreement was that the previous speaker—the one who just spoke—would close his remarks at six o'clock. Since it is now a few seconds to six, I ask that the House call it six o'clock to comply with the agreement we had reached.

[*English*]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that is the case. There are two and half minutes left and I understand that the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith) wishes to speak and will complete his remarks by six o'clock in order that the arrangement the parliamentary secretary has mentioned can go ahead.

● (1758)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Under these conditions, Mr. Speaker, and since we will come to nearly the same results, I have no objection to