

the federal government on the amending formula, why deny us the time? Some members opposite say it is not a question of time, but that it is about time. Watch them all applaud. Silence. I caught them in their own act. Why can we not have a little more time?

I said earlier that it was wrong for the provinces to go to the courts, but the Prime Minister has forced them to do that. I wish they would have said: let us have patriation with an agreed-upon amending formula. Then we could have had a debate we could all understand instead of muddying the waters with detail.

We are asking the British Parliament to deal with matters we will not deal with ourselves. That is wrong and I object to it. As an Atlantic Canadian and as a Nova Scotian, I say the government is going about this the wrong way. They are sowing the seeds which will tear this country apart. Do you not know Newfoundland? If you did not listen to the premier of that province last night, I suggest you obtain a transcript and read it, because he was serious. The premier of the province of Alberta did not just put through the matter of a referendum just willy-nilly, and if you think you can fight that, you are wrong. You are addressing yourselves to a break-up of this country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Forrestall: What would you know about it? Why do you not go there and find out? What the hell would you know about it? Go out there and find out. Go out to Fort McMurray and into Tyvan, Saskatchewan and ask the wheat growers. Go to *Ecum Secum*. Stand on the wharf and see what the people think of what you are doing. Go to Lloydminster. Go to Vegreville. Go into the valleys of British Columbia. Go into those magnificent mountains. Go and find out. Hon. members over there are supporting a leader who is sowing the seeds of destruction of a way of life in this country. The British Crown that you fellows so deride has not served us badly for 200 years—not 53 years, but 200 years.

● (2040)

Let us get agreement and let us proceed by way of agreement, not by way of confrontation or fighting or argument. Why divide and conquer a country that wants to get on with living and working, providing for its families and providing for national and international security?

This matter before us is important. It is important to all of us. Our blind following of the dictates of a man who wants to be prime minister of a unitary state, a man who wants to be president of his own republic, will lead only to dissension and division. As I mentioned earlier—and this is especially for the Minister of Transport, the distinguished co-chairman from our committee—to suggest to those who know him that he has decided, to support this measure because it is politically prudent, is a position that is not acceptable to me. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the longer this debate goes on, the more often and the more frequent hon. members opposite will hear

their constituents voicing their objections to the unilateral action they are so blindly supporting.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I could say, along with most members who have participated in this debate, that I am happy to be taking part in it. But I am not going to say that. I am not going to say that for much the same reasons as the hon. member for Nunatsiak (Mr. Ittinuar) expressed earlier this evening.

I come from a region which has been denied a voice, denied a voice at the table and, until now, denied a voice in the debate. The spokesman for our party, the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) when opening this debate was the first to speak of Canadians above the 60th parallel. I want to add that voice to this debate in addition to the hon. member for Nunatsiak.

It has been the intention of our party to approach the issue of constitutional change in a comprehensive and open-minded manner. That has always been our intention. It has been rendered extremely difficult by the Prime Minister's arbitrary and capricious method of imposing change through the medium of the British Parliament against the strongly voiced opposition of the majority of the premiers of this country. It has been rendered difficult also by his refusal to accept the fact that the premiers have exactly the same rights and privileges in matters under their jurisdiction as he, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), has in federal matters. They have the same right and responsibility to put forward their views on matters affecting their provinces. It has been rendered difficult, too, by his insistence upon regarding the constitutional issue as a very personal one, one that he is peculiarly qualified to solve—so he thinks—to the point where all those who dare disagree are stigmatized as anti-Canadian. And that has been the tack over there. It has been rendered difficult, too, by the Prime Minister's insistence on creating straw men—putting the premiers in a false position, by setting out the issues in his terms, and in his terms only. It has been rendered difficult, too, by the deliberate attempt of the Liberal government party to mould, to shape and to manipulate public opinion in this country under the guise of legitimate advertising, and embarking on a new era of mind control, the Orwellian 1984 concept.

Since it is my intention to move an amendment this evening, rather than run out of time before doing so, I intend to put it to the House now and then carry on with my remarks. I put this amendment to the House in the hope that it will be accepted in the sense of parliamentary fair play, in keeping with the rules as they used to be before they were altered by the present Prime Minister thus rendering less effective the meaningfulness of this place. I hope it will gain the support of those to my left who appear not to be listening. They might as well be across the aisle for all it matters. From what I hear on the news tonight, they believe they are there. I think, Mr. Speaker, the fix is in and that there will be some kind of perception, some attempt to create the kind of conciliatory process which will allow the public to come away with the belief that the Prime Minister has graciously conceded to the adjurations of the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr.