

*The Constitution*

**Mr. Ellis:** Of these two men, I leave you to judge who would carry the admiration of the majority of Canadians.

So that when the Prime Minister says it is not possible for him to achieve an agreement with the premiers of Canada to go to Westminster, as he should with their unanimous support for this package, maybe, just maybe, it is not the fault of the ten premiers. Maybe, just maybe, it is the fault of an arrogant Prime Minister who will not listen, who does not understand and cares little for the fabric of life of most Canadians, the same Prime Minister who for a number of years got away with arguing against wage and price controls and then put them into effect, who argued against an increase in gasoline prices and home oil costs and then implemented higher prices, who talked about free enterprise and now nationalizes the Canadian oil industry. Is it any wonder that a growing number of Canadians, some 64 per cent at last count and probably much higher now, want nothing to do with the Prime Minister and his package?

His Excellency, Jules Léger, in a speech to the Prime Minister at the time of his appointment as Governor General, finished with these words of Paul the Apostle:

Who makes you, my friend, so important? What do you possess that was not given you? If then you really received it all as a gift, why take the credit to yourself?

How different, when on June 17, 1864, in order to gain co-operation for his dream of a new nation, John A. Macdonald went the extra mile and called on George Brown in his St. Louis Hotel to bring about the broad coalition that ultimately became the federation we call Canada. It was not the first time he had bent, had compromised and, through discussion and negotiation, brought about an agreement between opposing views. How different the persuasion by logic and reason to the confrontation tactics of our present administration.

His Grace, Archbishop Ted Scott appearing before the committee said:

Governments have jurisdiction but they do not have rights in the same sense that people do—they are called to be servants of the people.

And I would quote, Mr. Speaker, the editor of the *Trentonian*, a small newspaper published three times a week in a town just adjacent to mine where my hon. friend, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Hees) has his constituency, and distributed in my riding, who said this:

● (2150)

Thus the problem which is the major one in what is now happening is one that has affected everything the Trudeau government has done since it first came to power. It tries to do essentially right things by wrong methods. In a true democracy, which is what we are supposed to be, the method is as important as the end in view. Trudeau's present course of action reveals an attitude on his part which we have seen all too often, which being spelled out, means that he seems to think the end justified the means. That is bad philosophy.

Finally, the last of my quotations, Mr. Speaker, is from my good friend, Phil Dodds, the sage and conscience of Cherry Valley. Writing in the *Picton Gazette* he said:

The change will not mean a great deal to the majority of Canadians; it will not provide jobs and help the million unemployed; it will not reduce the crushing

burden of debt; it will not reduce inflation, or in any general way make for a better life. One thing it is sure to do is to cause further disunity in a country that can only really progress if there is unity and co-operation.

Certainly there is need, and I think an expressed desire by many, perhaps the majority of Canadians, to have their own Constitution in Canada. I feel that way. Certainly it is time that it was done. But the reason for doing it should not be to satisfy one man's ego. It should be done by Canadians, for Canadians, with the help of all Canadians.

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

**Mr. Ellis:** Our party has offered an easy out for the Prime Minister, and that is to split the bill, bring back the Constitution with an amending formula that, while not entirely agreed upon, is very nearly so. It seems to me that the best thing the Prime Minister could do for his country would be to step down, retire and allow someone else who has the best interests of this country at heart to a far greater degree, rather than personal egotism. I am confident that those ten men, whose various backgrounds I described a few moments ago, would come together with someone of the right calibre and move ahead to make this a better Canada.

**Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, at seven minutes to ten I am not about to embark on the substance of my remarks. But tonight I want to put in the right perspective what I will say tomorrow.

When I first came here, which is longer ago than I want to reflect upon, we in Yukon felt neglected. There was a sitting Liberal member at the time who had been here for eight years. We have had a member since 1903, which is before many of the provinces became provinces. We thought that perhaps a solution to assist in our economic ills, our lack of development and our lack of progress—since the Marshall Aid Plan was still in force at that time—was to declare war on the state of Alaska, lose it, and then apply for Marshall aid. This gives you some idea of the view which we in the north held with respect to the manner in which southern Canadians viewed themselves—their mentality reached to the sixtieth parallel and no further.

The other event that I wish to draw to the attention of hon. members, in order to put things in proper perspective for tomorrow, is with respect to a great deal of reading I did before I came here. To my shock and dismay I found that of the three districts in the Northwest Territories, the Mackenzie, Keewatin, and Franklin districts, there is only one which was represented in Parliament, namely, the Mackenzie District. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who is entering the chamber now, was not here at the time I introduced my private bill. But I am sure he is aware of the fact that the Franklin and Keewatin districts of the Northwest Territories were not represented in Parliament. The Mackenzie District was. The member for Nunatsiag (Mr. Ittinuar) now represents that area; but in 1957 there was no representation there.

At that time, I introduced a private member's bill which would have given the franchise, the vote, to those Canadians