

tyranny of the majority opposite. They are going to tyrannize the rest of us. They plan to tyrannize the country because they have this majority and they are going to shape Canada, they think, in the view that they have of it. They are going to find it cannot be done, Mr. Speaker.

What is a confederation, Mr. Speaker? Webster's dictionary gives the following definition:

A body of confederates especially of states more or less permanently united for common purposes.

Canada is given as an example. But we are not going to be that kind of state any longer if this goes through. The Prime Minister does not even mention the states that were there originally before they joined; just people.

What did Sir Wilfrid Laurier say in 1889? He said:

The only means of maintaining confederation is to recognize that, within its sphere assigned to it by the constitution, each province is as independent of control by the federal Parliament as the latter is from control by the provincial legislatures.

That is what the grand old man of Liberalism said. The only means of maintaining confederation is, as he put it, not this kind of imposition on the legislatures by the federal Parliament. That is why we fear the termination of our system if this attempt is successful.

In the course of his lectures on April 10 and 11, 1980, Mr. Michael Kirby, who is now secretary to the cabinet for federal-provincial relations, said:

But for anyone who believes—as I do—that the process of decision-making in our kind of society is as important as the decision itself—that is, that means are in fact as important as ends to our society—then this was an important and imaginative experiment.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker: "that means are in fact as important as ends". That is what hon. members opposite forget. They are going ahead as though their ends justify everything and as if the means do not count. In his advice, Mr. Kirby forgets what he said in his own lectures.

An editorial in the *Toronto Globe* of July 3, 1869, stated as follows:

The danger most to be feared is that men who really do not believe in confederation at all should so seek to extend and consolidate the federal legislative and executive power that the local governments and legislatures shall be in danger of becoming mere shadows and shams, and that the evil from such a danger may lead to the opposite extreme of ignoring national unity, and in zeal for mere local interests and specialities, the breaking up of confederation altogether.

That is what they feared in those days, and that is what is happening today. It is what we fear.

The Prime Minister apparently wants to have his place in history. I should like to make one brief reference to the book "Newfoundland—Dawn Without Light", in which the author, Dr. Herbert L. Pottle, deals with the question of leaders who want their place in history. The relevant abstract reads as follows:

A political leader's preoccupation with his place in history is not a good omen for his enduring contribution to history. For a leader so engrossed has his attention constantly diverted from the basic business of governing—which can have historical significance—to the petty distractions of forever reckoning up his personal triumphs and setbacks—which is not history but diary.

The Constitution

That is what the Prime Minister is doing.

Let me deal with the Newfoundland situation now. There is nothing in this great resource concept of the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Broadbent) and the Prime Minister that deals with offshore mineral resources at all. As a matter of fact, in his letter of October 20, the Leader of the New Democratic Party did not even mention the offshore resource question. He did not make that a condition because he does not care about eastern Canada. He does not care a bit.

What does the government leader in the Senate say about this? Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from the proceedings of the other place of yesterday, at page 909. When asked about this arrangement between the Leader of the NDP and the Prime Minister, the government leader in the Senate had this to say:

There is no deviation from the BNA Act. This statement in the letter from the Prime Minister flows from the BNA Act itself. It is a reconfirmation. It is a restatement of a right which is already enjoyed by the provinces.

So the Leader of the NDP has negotiated mightily and all he got was a reaffirmation of the BNA Act, which is being disregarded in this House in any event.

There is nothing for offshore resources and there is nothing for interprovincial movement of electricity. And the hon. minister opposite even had the gall to mention that. There is no action by this government to free Newfoundland from the tyranny and usurpation of their electricity by Quebec which refuses to let it flow through that province to other customers. There is nothing about that. You could drive a truck through the equalization clause in the so-called charter of human rights. There is no obligation on the government whatsoever with respect to equalization. This is the government—

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) on a point of order.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) entertain a very short question? It will not take much of his time. I realize he has a lot to say.

Mr. Crosbie: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Tobin: Would the hon. member tell me what he and his government were doing for seven months about solving all these problems that he is accusing this government of not having solved? What were you doing for seven months, John? Writing that budget?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. Order, please. The hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!