

there is room to accommodate the individuality and legitimate aspirations of all people. These are important values, important enough to enshrine in a constitution.

I said earlier that the motion before us aims at patriation of the constitution with conditions to which most people agree. These include, first, a charter of human rights, including mobility rights and language rights, and second, a commitment to promoting equal opportunities for the well-being of Canadians and to furthering economic development to reduce disparity in opportunities.

The rock on which many previous attempts at patriation have foundered is, of course, the amending formula. The proposal before us is that for the first two years after patriation, constitutional amendments should require the consent of the House of Commons, the Senate and all the provincial governments. Federal-provincial conferences would continue, and at the end of two years the amending formula could be either something new, agreed on by all parties, or the Victoria charter formula. There is also provision for a national referendum, if necessary. It may not be necessary. I hope that good will and the Canadian gift for conciliation and civilized compromise will carry the day.

Provincial premiers are elected to represent provincial interests rather than to take positions in the broad national interest, and they have bargained hard for their own regions. Although this has sometimes produced incongruous situations over the past 53 years when ten different prime ministers have tried to get agreement to patriate the constitution, one cannot fault the premiers for trying to get maximum advantage at federal-provincial conferences. Neither can we allow the deadlock to continue for another 53 years. The 282 members of the House of Commons are elected to think and work in terms of the nation as a whole. Many of the speeches we have heard in this debate have reflected that concern and have also reflected what we are hearing from our constituents. First, people are tired of indecision and want the constitution patriated, and second, people want to see this House deal also with the economy, with employment and with energy.

The House met a week earlier than planned, and, when this motion is passed, work on the constitution will continue in committee over the next three months, so that until the day set for the committee to report back, the House will indeed be free to deal with other matters.

I look forward to seeing the constitutional debate continue in the context of normal, orderly conduct of parliamentary business. I also trust that the provincial premiers will, in the best interest of all Canadians, find more areas of agreement with each other and with the Government of Canada.

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I enter into the debate on Canada's constitution. I first came to the House of Commons with patriotic feelings, a sense of Canadianship, wanting to Canadianize some of Canada's institutions and to Canadianize Canada's constitution, and also with a great will and desire to

see Canada's economy fall much more directly under Canada's control.

Many of these things have not taken place, but today we find that the debate on the constitution which is taking place in the House does deal with the Canadianization of our constitution. I note that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), in his remarks on Thursday when he first announced the resolution which was placed before the House, stated in part:

Earlier today, a joint resolution was placed on the order paper of Parliament, which, if Parliament approves, will provide a key to our future as a nation. The Speaker has asked that Parliament return on Monday to begin debate on that resolution.

That was a week later than we had originally thought we might come back. The Prime Minister went on to say:

Every member of Parliament from every corner of this land is asked to participate in this historic act.

The words "historic act" can only mean the debate of this resolution in Parliament. Fewer than 12 per cent of the members of Parliament have spoken so far. In fact, as I stand here speaking, I am the thirty-first member to have taken part in this debate. In the past, over 60 members of Parliament have participated in various debates, so I would anticipate that, at the rate we have been proceeding, this debate will carry on for a minimum of two or three weeks longer if everyone in the House speaks.

What has struck me as being fundamental to the debate up to this stage is the amount of agreement which all Canadians, including all members of Parliament, have reached. There is a great deal of agreement, there is consensus, I dare say. I took the opportunity of looking up the word "consensus" in the dictionary on the Table, the shorter version of the Oxford dictionary. It states that consensus in the sense of government and governing does not require unanimity; consensus is the majority view.

I think you will find that of the provincial governments, the government here in Ottawa and the two chambers representing Parliament, of those 12 institutions, the majority concur. In fact, I would say that there is more than consensus, that there is unanimity on the patriation of the constitution. Of course, this resolution deals with patriation. Second, there is consensus that there should be patriation with an amending formula. I think there is consensus, or a majority view, that there should be an amending formula. The amending formula would not be the one which is proposed only by the Liberal government in the House of Commons, which is the Victoria formula. The majority view which has been expressed by the provinces is that it should be either the Vancouver or the Alberta-Vancouver formula.

Should we be so partisan as to insist on our right to penmanship, or are either of those points of view or formulas workable? I really think that they are. I think that either one is workable, although I happen to believe that one is preferable to the other. The reason I believe that the Vancouver or the Alberta-Vancouver consensus is preferable is, frankly, that although I represent a constituency in Ontario which is the largest province in Canada in population, and although my