

The Constitution

Broadbent). That is a sham and it will come back to haunt them.

An hon. Member: That is democracy.

Mr. Nielsen: That is democratic? Hon. members over there would not know what democratic is or what it means.

The motion I wish to move for your consideration, Mr. Speaker—and you may want to take it under advisement until tomorrow—is:

That the motion now before the House be amended by adding thereto after the sixth paragraph the following:

Notwithstanding any Standing Orders or practices of either House, the committee shall have the power to table a minority report with its main report, and any such report shall be tabled by the committee if signed by three or more members of the committee.

Quite apart from the numerical qualifications in that motion, that used to be our practice in this place. But a few years ago, under the changes in the rules—would the gentleman bring back the copy of my speech please? It is caught under the copy of the amendment.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Table your speech.

● (2050)

Mr. Nielsen: Notwithstanding that the present Prime Minister had those rules changed, the fact remains that it used to be the practice in this place that a dissenting voice in committee could be heard. However, under the changes he brought about, they cannot be heard at all, a matter of such importance as this is an occasion when, if there is a minority voice to be heard, it should be heard, and that is the purpose of the resolution.

If they are not out to gag us and if they are not out to preclude another point of view being heard, there will be no difficulty over there and certainly no difficulty on my left. I see that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is in his seat now. He remembers this procedure very well.

Mr. Knowles: No, I have never heard of it.

Mr. Nielsen: You have never heard of a minority report?

Mr. Knowles: Never heard of it.

Mr. Nielsen: Well, I am surprised.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nielsen: Certainly. That used to be a custom which seems to have been forgotten in this place, but we always permit questions.

Mr. Knowles: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nielsen: Certainly.

Mr. Knowles: Is he not confusing the fact that minority members in committee have made statements outside the House and reports to the press, with what he is now proposing? I do not recall a committee ever having a minority report tabled in the House.

Mr. Nielsen: The committee itself never had the power to file a minority report, but members on the committee had the opportunity to file a minority report.

Mr. Chénier: Now you are confused.

Mr. Nielsen: I am not the one who is confused. It is that hon. member over there who keeps hopping from seat to seat and interjecting and never taking part in debates who I always hear.

In the instrument that is now before Parliament the Prime Minister and his Liberal government are attempting to do something which has never been attempted in this country before and perhaps not in any country at all with a constitutional and parliamentary democracy.

They are attempting unilaterally to rewrite and revise the constitution in a manner decided upon by the Prime Minister and his advisers in the bowels of the Langevin Block in areas—and there certainly can be no argument on the opposite side or to my left—which are definitely as well under provincial jurisdiction as they are under federal. They are attempting not simply to patriate but unilaterally to rewrite and deeply revise the constitution in a manner decided upon by the Prime Minister and his advisers. They are attempting to impose upon all Canadians, regardless of their political belief, a Liberal party constitution created in the smoke-filled backrooms in the bowels of *l'Édifice Langevin*. I know. I have been there, and I know how they operate over there.

An hon. Member: For how long?

Mr. Nielsen: I know where all this nonsense came from.

Mr. Harquail: How long were you there?

Mr. Nielsen: We may not have been there long, and perhaps the people of this country will very soon have cause to regret that we were not there a little bit longer. However, that is where this kind of leaked cabinet document for-ministers'-eyes-only comes from.

When I read this document and studied it, I went back to my copy of "Machiavelli the Prince". I read it and re-read it and compared it. I had two copies of "Machiavelli the Prince". I burned my other one because this cabinet document is the update. "Machiavelli the Prince" is now irrelevant. It has no more meaning because this cabinet document is the update on how to manoeuvre, manipulate and shape public opinion to conform with Liberal policy while it is being made. This is a very, very dangerous direction for the political life of this country to be taking.

Knowing that what they are doing cannot be done constitutionally in Canada, they are going over to ask the British