

The Constitution

many years. As such, the government proposal minimizes the long-term risk of conflict and political paralysis.

It is clear that nation-building is neither a smooth nor easy process. Nor is it furthered by giving in on all fronts to regional demands in a search for harmony. Nation-building is fraught with trials and challenges, and, to succeed, these challenges must be accepted and trials faced. Neither inaction and indecision nor mindless capitulation can long be tolerated. Time is certain to bury those who refuse to face these fundamental facts of life.

● (2250)

If the Fathers of Confederation had adopted a wait-and-see attitude or a negotiate-forever stance, I am convinced that we would not today have the privilege of holding Canadian citizenship. If the fathers of confederation had adopted "a province-building at the expense of nation-building" attitude, Canada never would have been formed in the first place.

I say to the Leader of the Opposition that we have no choice but to renew our constitution now, and that in view of the clear impasse which we face as a result of the current unanimity rule, the federal government has no choice but to act unilaterally and decisively.

In the words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau):

Now it is our time to repay our inheritance. Our duty is clear: it is to complete the foundations of our independence and of our freedoms.

After all, if it is not the role and responsibility of the national government, the government in which all Canadians are represented, to take action in the face of a clearly perceived need, then I ask hon. members opposite and hon. members on my own side, what is the role of the national government? I reiterate that decisive action in the national interest is indeed the role of the national government as perceived not only by ourselves but also by our founding fathers.

Much has changed since 1867, and the distribution of powers has shifted dramatically from this initial conception, but it is important in this debate to understand clearly that the initial conception of the distribution of powers between governments in Canada perceived the very real danger of political paralysis. To ignore the current fact of this paralysis would be to deny the wisdom of our founders.

The federal government has the responsibility and the duty to act in the national interest. The resolution before this House is consistent with this responsibility and duty. It is important for all of us to embrace the principles in this resolution. I sincerely believe that the risk of losing Canada is not presented by this resolution. Rather, it is presented by a continuation of the status quo.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, in all my life I have never seen so much hypocrisy as we have seen from the other side of this House. Hon. members opposite have been talking about being loyal to Canada, but not one of them, not

even the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), would stand up today when "O Canada" was being sung. When two Liberal members did stand up, they were beckoned to sit down. In other words, the party over there has become a bunch of Trudeau clones. Whatever Trudeau says, that is what they do. The people of Canada are catching on to this hypocrisy.

Another case of hypocrisy which is sickening to the people of Canada is that hon. members opposite get up now and praise the late Right. Hon. John Diefenbaker. When he was alive they insulted him and did everything they could to hurt him. They persecuted him. They thwarted his efforts. Now that he has passed on they are praising him. Such hypocrisy is sickening.

Hon. members opposite talk about having high principles. The other day when my hon. friend, the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Kushner), introduced a resolution asking that we support Terry Fox and those who are suffering and dying of cancer, the Liberals said no. They turned it down. I say, shame. They made a mistake that day. The hon. member gave them another chance. He introduced it a second time in order to help Terry Fox help the people who are dying of cancer, but the Liberals again said no. What high principles? What kind of outfit is this government which does not even want to help the cancer people of this country?

Besides hypocrisy, I have never seen anything more like a dictatorship than what we see on the other side of the House. I joined the Royal Canadian Air Force to fight against totalitarianism. I did everything I was told to do for three years. I never thought I would have to come back and fight totalitarianism in the House of Commons in Canada. However, that is what we are doing. We hear many fabrications and half-truths. We see efforts to fool the people of this country. It is no wonder hon. members opposite want closure. The people are getting their eyes opened, and if they had another week there would almost be a revolution in this country. There may be even now, because people are hearing half-truths from the government from the Prime Minister down.

During the election campaign the Prime Minister and Stuart Smith, the Liberal leader in Ontario, went from town to town telling the people of Ontario—endeavouring to brainwash them—that the oil and gas of Alberta belong to all the people of Canada. They forgot to say that the gold of Ontario belongs just to the people of Ontario. They forgot to say that the hydro of Quebec belongs just to the people of Quebec and that the timber of B.C. belongs just to the people of B.C. They defiled themselves by telling something which is completely contrary to the BNA Act. They said that these natural resources in Alberta, gas and oil, belong to all the people of Canada. They had to be elected by fabrication.

Here hon. members opposite talk about honesty and truthfulness. It is no wonder the people cannot believe the Prime Minister. It is no wonder they have no faith in the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!