

my House leader, and I each asked questions of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), if at least he would not be prepared to allow the committee proceedings to be opened to the people of Canada, so that they could see it on nationwide television and hear it on radio. We asked for the support of the Prime Minister of Canada.

If Parliament was to be denied the opportunity to speak further on second reading, if it was to be sidetracked into a committee, could the committee proceedings at least be televised and opened to the people of Canada? The Prime Minister of Canada refused. He said that he would not take a position in favour of opening up the committee proceedings to the people of Canada. Why not? I think Canadians are entitled to know why the Prime Minister, who has not bothered to be in the House this afternoon while this debate was taking place after he invoked closure, felt he was not prepared to put his support behind opening up the proceedings of the committee so that Canadian could see it.

Perhaps one indication comes from the infamous August 30 Privy Council office memo marked, "For Ministers' Eyes Only". I refer to page 49 which reads in part as follows:

A highly contentious measure may be best contained in a committee where it is more readily managed by the House leader and his officers, and where easier and more effective relations can be maintained with the press gallery, since relatively few reporters will follow the proceedings.

Why? It wants to manage the news and to manipulate public opinion.

Members on this side of the House would be interested in seeing which government members will be on the committee when it is finally struck. The next page of the memo of the Privy Council office deals with the makeup of the committee. It would be useful for Liberal members in the House tonight who voted to gag Parliament earlier today to know what their leadership is expecting of them on this committee. Page 50 reads as follows:

In committee the government's position is likely to suffer. Attackers would be louder and more numerous than defenders. Careful choice of government members would be essential, and careful orchestration of hearings would be needed to ensure effective presentation of the government's position.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre indicated earlier that he expected the committee to act in good faith, without a spirit of acrimony. He asked us to trust the government. On what basis does the government present itself as worthy of our trust? On what basis does the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and the silent members sitting behind him, agree to go along with this denigration of Parliament and with this measure which attacks the basic rights of members of Parliament and inflicts damage upon the country? What was it worth? What did they receive in the exchange to agree to vote with the government on the basis of the assurance that the provinces would have what they have today, or perhaps less in the case of resources? What was it worth to the government?

Why was the government so anxious when it has a majority in the House of Commons and can get its way any day it wants? Why was it essential that members of the NDP support them? It is a fair question. It is because the govern-

ment has no base of support in western Canada, the New Democratic Party has largely been reduced to its western base, and according to government spokesmen quoted in the press, it would be useful to have western spokesmen defending what the government is doing to western Canada in this package.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said that he was proud of his leader for the deal he struck. Will he be proud next week? Will the constituents of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre be proud next Tuesday when the government unveils the second aspect of its proposals, its energy proposal? Energy is inextricably linked in the context of today's Canada with the whole constitutional debate. What can we expect? Can we expect the good will, compromise, and good spirit requested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, or can we expect to see more of the same—more attacks, more attempts by the government to pit region against region, Canadian against Canadian to divide us?

Again the document of the Privy Council office gives us some idea of what to expect next Tuesday night when the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) unveils his energy package? It explained why it was essential the government rush this package through the House and what impediments could be put in the way of speedy passage. Page 43 reads in part as follows:

The political climate in Canada is likely to be poisoned by a major energy conflict throughout the fall of this year and at least the early months of next year.

How will members of the NDP explain their support to their constituents after next Tuesday?

I listened as the hon. Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) said on radio that he was deeply disturbed by what the government had done in invoking closure. He thought it was wrong. It is not credible to effect a pose of injured innocence when one has been living in a condition of public promiscuity.

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

**Mr. Beatty:** No one will believe it. So, we stand alone. Later this evening members of the NDP will vote with their friends in the government to move this matter into committee, notwithstanding the deep-felt concerns of many of them and the concerns of their constituents. I am prepared to stand alone. Let it be recorded when the history of these events is written that the Progressive Conservative Party was prepared to stand for the conception of Canada we inherited, that we must be a federal system, that this country must be built on more than one man's vision, that it belongs to 22 million Canadians. We have a tradition and a heritage we inherited from our forefathers and hold in trust for our children. Grievous damage is done to our country when one man, with his acquiescent majority, chooses to impose his will on the rest of Canada. We stand alone but we stand proudly alone and we are not ashamed of it.

The government argues it is essential that action be taken precipitately and immediately because, according to the Prime Minister, it is a national disgrace that our constitution resides