

the man who was to become the prime minister of this country five years later. He said, and I quote:

The men of the 1867 constitution must have feared the paralysis that such a state of affairs inevitably leads to. Today, they would have to reconcile many more things than Upper and Lower Canada, the maritimes and the provinces that followed. As a result, to take over power in Ottawa, political parties naturally had to strive increasingly to reconcile very different regional interests, which usually meant reducing the ideological content to its bare minimum.

And Mr. Trudeau concluded, at that time, and I quote:

But what may have been overlooked is the degree of intellectual decay that process finally led us to.

So, what constitutes, in the eyes of other Canadians, the main value of the political men in this country, whether they work at the federal or provincial levels, is the faculty to compromise and adjust themselves to the political facts and situations, of Canadian life, that admirable philosophy that has enabled Canada to go through, without too much danger, the severest crisis in its history, the need to love, understand, tolerate and accept one another, and get along together, which is the main characteristic of Canadian political life, all that is not the greatest Canadian virtue; in the eyes of the present Prime Minister, all that has become an offensive vice that leads to the "decay of Canadian political thought".

Those who had a chance to watch the debates of the September conference on television were unanimous in praising and admiring the quality of the interventions of the ten provincial premiers, including that of my province. They were in a position to see that if there is any decay in the Canadian political thought, it is not at the provincial level. The decay, Mr. Speaker, is found in the Pitfield and Kirby documents, in the "bulldozer" tactics of the Minister of Justice, and in the art of expertly presenting facts in a wrong light of the Prime Minister of Canada himself.

The Prime Minister brags about having the support of his caucus, as if the latter represented the Canadian people, but I doubt that Canadians, especially Canadian Liberals, see themselves in the people the voters sent to sit in Parliament. For all practical purposes, the Liberal caucus actually represents only two provinces: Quebec, with more than half the caucus members, and Ontario, which provides the other half, more or less. The Atlantic provinces are poorly represented and the west is totally missing, except for two members. In these circumstances, how can the Prime Minister emphasize the representativeness of the Canadian nation rather than that of the Liberal caucus? One would not argue if the Prime Minister had received a clear mandate from delegates representing the whole of his party in a policy convention. But he never had such a mandate, even at the last election, because he deliberately and knowingly kept silent on the matter of constitutional reform, arguing that the provinces were fed up with this subject matter which, one has to admit, had become the pet project of the leader of the Liberal Party of Canada.

But in fact, is the Liberal party worth more than its caucus? On this point, let us refer to the statement made by the Prime

### *The Constitution*

Minister himself in the article published in the April, 1963, issue of *Cité Libre*. I apologize to my friends from the other side if I go back to *Cité Libre*. However, the Prime Minister—

**An hon. Member:** It is not a shared feeling!

**Mr. La Salle:** It is.

I referred a moment ago to an article published in *Cité Libre*. In fact, knowing how ambitious the government head is, one cannot help but wonder whether it is not precisely what he calls the decay of the political thinking within the Liberal Party which has drawn him into this formation, thus repudiating his past links.

For that matter, did he not confess it publicly by running under the Liberal banner in 1965? Isn't it well known that despairing ever to see the New Democratic Party take power he needed a more flexible tool to realize his plans and that this tool, always available to autocrats, he would have found in the Liberal party? In spite of the deep contempt that he feels toward his own party, isn't it precisely that proverbial spinelessness of its members which prompted him to run for the leadership?

Let us read again, Mr. Speaker, excerpts from *Cité Libre*, a text of 1963, 17 years old but which still conveys a vivid sense of present-day reality. It said, and I quote:

"Since I have been watching politics, I do not recall having witnessed a more degrading spectacle than that of all these Liberals who have acted as turncoats along with their boss."

Also, criticizing what he calls—

—the autocratism of the Liberal structures and the extraordinary cowardice of its members—

—The present Prime Minister, but back in those days, with *Cité Libre*, he would add, and I quote:

The philosophy of the Liberal party is quite simple—

—That is interesting, Mr. Speaker.

Just say anything, think about anything; or even better, do not think at all; but get yourself into power because we are those who can best govern you—

—and Mr. Trudeau to conclude:

Suckers, all of them.

He wrote that. Say anything, this is what the Prime Minister of Canada has just done in his most recent statement to the Canadian people when he stated that the repatriation is urgent because of the commitments which were made to Quebecers during the May 22 referendum.

**An hon. Member:** You were not there on May 22.

**Mr. La Salle:** No, Mr. Speaker. I was not there on May 22. Those who worried about the fact that I did not take part in the referendum will understand today—

**An hon. Member:** You have never been there for Quebec.