

Why is PetroCan buying an independent wholly Canadian-owned company? Why was it on the market? It was on the market because the monopoly structure and cartel at the refinery gate did not allow it enough room and freedom to operate within the marketplace.

The most recent first ministers' conference was held under the umbrella of a strategy designed to make the premiers look bad. A leaked document was proof of that. A litany of words was listed for the delivery of impressions to an unthinking and apathetic public. Mob manipulation has become the order of the day in Canada, I am very sorry to say. As I said, not one member of the House of Commons recognized that little clause which changed the nature of weights and measures in Canada.

In the Thirtieth Parliament, we became alarmed at the degree of corporate concentration which had taken place. With a great flair, the Prime Minister appointed the Bryce Commission on Corporate Concentration. What has happened since its report came down? The rate and magnitude of corporate concentration has accelerated. It is without restraint or bounds in this country at the present time.

Today, in Canada, we are rushing in both directions. On the one hand, corporate concentration is taking place, and on the other, there is rapid and accelerating state confiscation and state ownership of the means of producing goods and services.

As was demonstrated in Germany, excessive corporate concentration of power leads to a fascist state. As was demonstrated in the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries which have gone too far, excessive state ownership and control over the means of production leads to a communist state. In both political situations, man loses his freedom. When capital and property are removed from the people and concentrated excessively in corporations or the state, we lose the essence of a free economy. When we lose the element of freedom in the economy, we lose freedom. When people allow themselves to be manipulated into an egalitarian society by intellectuals and elitists, they are no longer free. People who are equal are not free. We are not born equal.

As I mentioned, our parliamentary system has great flexibility. It has built-in safeguards for second looks. Historically it has allowed for the forces of change through legislative debate and law. This resolution on the Constitution attacks the heart of these safeguards. It turns this duty and function over to the courts. Our courts and legal system address words, not issues. Our legal system is operating at the extremities of reasonable interpretation. Why should we turn over this vital function of our legislative assemblies to deal with issues to the word merchants in the courts?

There is a Machiavellian morality to this resolution on the Constitution. It delivers us into a structured society. It removes power from the people and delivers that power to the state. It uses the language of totalitarian societies in the wording of its rights. The state gives the rights to the people—it is not a Constitution by the people and for the people. It removes the right to private property, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is something that I am here to defend. It carries the

potential of eliminating the political power of our second level of government. It creates a unitary state with control at the centre, and the power of the centre is anchored permanently in one province. It creates different classes of citizens depending on the province or region in which they live and work. It does not address the national problem of regionalism but, rather, aggravates it. It attacks the very structures that have allowed change to take place and leave man with his freedom.

A new Constitution must come from a constituent constitutional assembly which represents all aspects and has inputs from society. Only then can Canadians feel secure and enjoy rights that will survive the abuse of power. This resolution must be defeated preferably in Canada.

Today the Right Hon. Prime Minister, in his address to this House, said, "... the people are the architects of its change, not the victims of the change." These words came from a brilliant political strategist who admits that he is capable of changing the course of the ship of state in the middle of the night while the people are asleep.

I have not spoken to the amendment on the resolution, Mr. Speaker, because I refuse to play with tinker toy amendments when the basic issues within the resolution carry such a threat to my freedom.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and indeed honoured to rise today to speak in support of this historic resolution before the House of Commons and the Senate. It has been almost 53 years since we in Canada began our attempt to patriate and have our own Constitution in Canada. It is four months since this government, after a great deal of thought, a great deal of soul searching and a great deal of effort to reach agreement with the ten provinces, assumed the responsibility it has as the national government with a mandate to break the constitutional deadlock that has existed for the last five decades.

On October 2, 1980, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said that building a country to match a dream is a long and painstaking process. But as each generation has made the sacrifices, so each has reaped the rewards. He said that every generation of Canadians has given more than it has taken and that now is our time to repay our heritage. He said that our duty is clear; it is to complete the foundations of our independence and our freedoms.

I had the honour in the last few months to be a member of the joint Senate and House of Commons parliamentary committee on the Constitution. Every member of that committee worked hard. I believe that members of all parties, when dealing with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in particular, approached their duties with honest and open minds and with the desire to give back to the people after all the debate had taken place, after all witnesses had been heard and after all the expert testimony had been analysed, the best charter of rights and freedoms possible at this point in our history.