

Peckford that Newfoundland should have control of its resources both onshore and offshore and free passage of its renewable resources to any markets to which they might deliver them. Every member of Newfoundland's legislature supports that, and the vote has to be interpreted as being against that. I say that because, although we have been pledged ownership of resources by some who have spoken on the government side of the House, the controls which will be imposed by the constitutional proposals, and the scurrilous agreement between the NDP and the Liberal party, put ownership of a resource in no substantial position of importance any longer because the control of the resource passes over from those independent entities to the Government of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCain: I just want you, members from Atlantic Canada, to understand what you are voting for and what interpretation can be put on this very innocuous-appearing document which carries within it powers of interpretation which go far beyond the understanding of the parliamentary secretary and of the President of the Privy Council.

Canada is in jeopardy, it cannot be otherwise described. I have assumed this position, not because of my party but because my party and I agree wholeheartedly. It is a position against which I have been advised by constituents because there is no understanding among the masses in Canada of the real consequence of the ultimate interpretation of the resolution, section by section. There is no understanding that Canada will now be governed by the courts instead of by the legislation of this land, that Canada may have its rights jeopardized in the courts and they will not be correctable by legislation in this land but will instead demand an amendment to the constitution.

How could any democratic-minded person, in all honesty, if he proclaims democracy as his base, vote without understanding the possible interpretations? I think the weakness of the case can be well pointed out by the fact that not a single Liberal member in the House has offered an argument in support of the document which we are at present considering and debating. They have shafted us with their barbs. They have had their tantrums, as did the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chrétien) yesterday, a perfectly planned theatrical tantrum which got him the publicity he wanted. It was a disgrace to the operation of Parliament from a minister of the Crown, particularly one holding his portfolio.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCain: I have listened with great care to many speeches, and have read others, and I have not found one supporting statement or argument for a clause, word or phrase, but merely a contention that it must be there.

The government now is afraid that the milk chocolate with which it has adorned this instrument will dissolve, and that the intelligent people of Canada will begin to spread the word that it is only used to encrust a bitter lemon. It has been a matter of camouflage and misleading information promoted both by

The Constitution

speakers in this House and a \$30 million propaganda program to advise the people, "We are working for you, God bless you, you are in safe hands." Little do they know what is happening. Now they are afraid of time because there is an obvious change of opinion and because I and others members of this House, with some danger to our own political future, recognizing that principles are more important than an individual political future, have taken this unpopular stand, as every poll in this country has proclaimed. But we have taken the logical stand, and logic and right will prevail, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCain: Why the rush? I want to know what is the importance of time in the discussion of this item. Why should discussion of an item of such consequence to the country be restricted in time when the consequence of the time spent and the decision reached will be timeless as it goes forward in the history of this country? What is the justification for the restriction of time and for closure? In the interests of a happy, prosperous and harmonious Canada co-operating together for prosperity in the future, I make a plea that sanity may prevail and emotion may subside so that reason can rule and we get what we need in a constitution. I support human rights, etc., and let no one have the unadulterated gall to deny that. So in order that we may have more time, I plead with the House that it may accept this motion which I make, seconded by the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker):

That the motion be amended by deleting the sixth paragraph and substituting therefor the following:

"That the committee submit its report not later than February 12, 1981; that the committee have power to adjourn from place to place within Canada; that the committee be empowered to retain the services of advisers to assist in its work; and that it also be empowered to retain such professional, clerical and stenographic help as may be required.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCain: I move that motion in recognition of the fact that there are people who have spent a lifetime studying the constitutional history, constitutional procedures, the constitutional possibilities, and the consequences of hasty adoption of constitutions in other domains, and that this constitution should not be arrived at under datelines and deadlines. Before it becomes law, or before it is submitted to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, it must have the pooling of the wisest men in this domain to phrase it so that it will last. It should not be the hasty phrases committed to paper as they were in the PM's office or in some other marble alley somewhere out of sight in this domain of ours, without proper understanding of the ultimate consequences.

● (1630)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. With respect to the motion moved by the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain), because this may occur again in the proceedings, I want to indicate that in view of the fact Standing Order 33 is in play at the moment, I think it is the