

Just in the past month, the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) said:

The kind of opposition we bring against ourselves I find exhilarating.

He said this in the Liberal wilderness of British Columbia. This is perfectly in keeping with a man who would subscribe, in this day and age, to the manifesto of Machiavelli rather than to the supreme majesty of God. Nothing characterizes the spirit with which the Prime Minister entered into his latest attempt to change Canada through constitutional reform than that guiding epigram of the Italian manipulator. I quote from his epigram:

There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success, than the introduction of a new order of things.

The Prime Minister is fond of quoting classical dictums from sources as diverse as Shakespeare and Plato. Indeed, he values them not just rhetorically, but as matters of guiding principle. We saw this in his attitude at the first ministers' conference last summer. His being so keen a student of Machiavelli, I recommend this quotation to the Prime Minister and ask him to take heed:

Many have imagined republics but he who abandons what is done for what ought to be done, will bring about his own ruin.

By the way, Machiavelli also remarked, with admirable relevance for today, that:

When neither their property nor their honour is touched, the majority of men live content.

I suggest that the Prime Minister's greatest exhilaration—if, indeed, he is exhilarated by opposition—will come when the people of this country turf him and his party of sheep out of office for having impinged upon both their property, by failing to protect it, and their honour, by imposing closure on their elected representatives in this House. I might add that they are tarnishing the honour of all Canadians, as my friend, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), said, by: shaming and embarrassing them all by having the Parliament of the United Kingdom reject a joint resolution of the Parliament of Canada.

The Prime Minister is the first to take the unprecedented steps. He is the first to move unilaterally on matters of Constitution. Why does he speak in such horrified tones? Why does he speak in veiled and threatening language when the possibility of the British parliament using unprecedented steps is raised?

We are playing under the rules of the Prime Minister. It is he who has dictated the length of the game and the object of its goals. He has appointed the referee and the place where it is to be played. Why does he squawk now and say that he will take his ball home if people who are not on his team realize that his game is rigged from start to finish?

Since 1979 members of the Liberal Party of Canada have enjoyed absolutely no power at the provincial level in the country. In 1980, they were brought back, led by the invisible man, a non-leader, on false promises and big carrots. They have absolutely no representation west of Winnipeg, and representation there, for a start, has, rightly, alienated 51 per

cent of the population of Canada. More than half of their members are from the province of Quebec.

### *The Constitution*

It is absolutely ludicrous that the Prime Minister even presumes to speak for Canada on a matter such as this, on the matter of our futures and on the matter of the futures of every single person in Canada now and who will arrive in the future. Does it have to be reiterated that fully eight of our provinces, two of them original partners in confederation, vehemently oppose both the matter and the manner of his initiative—or, should I say, his ambition? In the face of this, in Vancouver he said that he has managed, to use his words, to split both parties on this side of the House. He has the unmitigated gall to say such a thing when he alone is responsible for perhaps the biggest split and the gravest divisions which have confronted our country for generations.

How is it that the Canadian people, at least as far west as Winnipeg, allow themselves to suffer what has been termed, in philosophical studies by Lacan and others, as "charismatic abuse"? Why do they allow this same abuse to be brought down upon them to the extent that their Prime Minister, their political leader at home and abroad, feels that he can afford to provoke a confrontation between Canada and Britain for internal political gain which threatens to poison relations between our two countries for years and decades to come?

Is this the image they want abroad, the "tough-guy" Trudeau sneering behind his cloak of innuendo, misstatements and false report? His Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacGuigan) is the laughing stock of the diplomatic world, when the Department of External Affairs was the hero of the world a mere 14 months ago. His representative at the court of St. James consider themselves latter-day gumshoes—the James Bonds of the north—and make ridiculous suggestions and equally ridiculous recommendations as their strategy for the coming fray.

Good Lord, I daresay that Canada's image abroad has taken such a beating that the prestige gained from the great diplomatic triumphs of the fifties and the sixties have undoubtedly been lessened. This crew, this band of cowed and deluded people across the floor, presumes to carve out a new constitutional image of Canada, new rules of life and new rules of behaviour. It has the audacity to point to alleged splits in the opposition—especially with regard to members of the left—thereby demonstrating again its collective vanity and arrogance. At least in the socialist party there is some attempt to provide for sincere dissent in the ranks. At least in their position one can see some co-relation between party philosophy and party action.

What of the sheep opposite? What, in their constitutional manifesto, is markedly and specifically Liberal as opposed to Conservative or socialist? What separates them from other policies such as the National Energy Program, which confirmed them to be socialists in sheep's clothing?

I am sure that a classic and quite recent definition of political Liberalism would be instructive at this juncture in order to inform members opposite what it is they purport to be. Liberalism in politics, said Wayne Lyman Morse: