

town you get one type of editorial policy. In a one-paper town the message does not get out. Here we have the other side of the coin, using television for manipulation through advertising. We all know that the television medium is the message. It is very good for propaganda, but it does not get the message out. When you get these ingredients, this flaw in federalism, you start to get false notions about what this country is all about.

The Prime Minister said over television that Thursday night, we should not have a checkerboard across this country. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) commented that in terms of our history and social fabric, "checkerboard" is not a pejorative word. The reality is this: when you get outside of Ottawa, west of the Lakehead or into the deep east of Atlantic Canada, it is not a checkerboard but a mosaic of people from different countries who have made this country the way it is.

There is no way in which the Prime Minister can homogenize the Canadian personality from coast to coast to produce some superhuman or Canadianized individual. We are from very different regions. Different groups of new Canadians have formed the vitality of those regions. You do not get homogeneity.

The whole insular thinking of Ottawa was shown by the Prime Minister on that Thursday night when he said we do not want a checkerboard and that is why these rights must apply to everybody.

Let us look at question of rights. There is a double standard here. I will not go too far down the road, because the subject does not involve me as much as many sincere members across the way who are from Quebec. However, there is a real paradox when you talk about rights. Some members across the way have made very impassioned speeches about freedom when it comes to rights, yet no freedom of choice for education. This leads to a double standard. I just throw the observation out.

In terms of the amending formula, my leader said there was a double standard. I say there is a triple standard. There is unilateral action today if you are the Prime Minister, unanimity if you are among the premiers for the next two years and a referendum for the people who are not part of those first two groups. There is a triple standard, so let us not talk too much about standards.

I know my time is moving very quickly. However, there are many things I would like to say in terms of the bill of rights. While the language of a bill of rights is something I can accept, I have real apprehension about the dangers of entrenchment. There is a snare and delusion along with entrenchment.

I have here the constitutions of the U.S.S.R., Cuba, Chile, the German Democratic Republic and East Germany. If I had the time to read the sections I have outlined, you would hear beautiful prose about the rights of people, equality, no eavesdropping, judicial systems that are perfect and so on. The most beautiful bills of rights are in these constitutions. However, there is the strange paradox that you more often see an entrenched bill of rights in the constitutions of totalitarian governments than in other parts of the world.

### *The Constitution*

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**An hon. Member:** Just like Idi Amin.

**Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi):** As in the U.S.

**Mr. Nowlan:** The hon. member refers to the United States. Did that bill of rights help the Japanese Americans any more than Japanese Canadians who did not have any? Not at all. Take our bill of rights, so called. Fifty-one years ago this month, women in this country finally received a constitutional status. When Nellie Murphy was appointed to the Senate, a woman was finally acknowledged to be a person and could therefore be appointed. Until that time there were no women in the Senate. They were not persons.

The Supreme Court of Canada refused to acknowledge that women were people and could be appointed to the Senate. It was the Privy Council of England which made the final decision. Now that right of appeal has been taken away. She was not a person and they made her a person.

Imagine if that situation had arisen with an entrenched bill of rights in 1929. The last real constitutional change was in 1927. We would be in the snare that is troubling the United States right now with their ERA amendment, trying to amend a constitution to make women people. Thank goodness we were able to make that appeal to England. But even without such recourse we could have done it by our own statute.

My time is very limited, so I will conclude even though there are many other things I would like to say. In terms of the bill of rights, what bothers me most is that another level of government is being established which will interpret the rights. I do not have time to review the rights. Capital punishment will be affected as will the rights of unions. Will there be boys and girls mixed basketball teams, because there is no discrimination between the sexes? Will retirement still be compulsory in many cases at certain ages? Will the Senate go on in perpetuity? There are many questions which arise.

What is important is that you cannot revise the constitution unless you reform this House of Commons. It would take a long time to convince me to go for entrenchment because under our system at the moment, we do not have the other ingredient that comes with entrenchment, a legislative sanction or review of judges. Do we want to go the American way and elect our judges? Will judges at least come before some committee of this House for questioning? Unless we start to hammer this out, we will see a real mutation take place.

The Secretary of State is not here, but other ministers heard him say at the federal-provincial conference that those who are against rights must be in favour of the pressure lobby. Do you want to litigate rights or do you want to exercise pressure and talk to your member of Parliament? The minister said at the federal-provincial conference that the option when talking about rights is to litigate or to lobby. My answer to that is, if you litigate you have to pay a lawyer. When you lobby, the legislature has a chance to vote on the problem you want changed.