

referendum campaign. But these scare tactics did not work in Quebec and they will not work in Newfoundland.

The Newfoundland Liberal MPs on this side of the House are determined to fight, with all the strength we can muster, the demagoguery which we have witnessed in our own province. Once our people know the facts they will see the sham for what it is. The constitutional resolution which we are debating here explicitly guarantees the Labrador border and our denominational schools. Section 43 and section 47 of the resolution are our protection.

Section 43 provides a special rule whereby amendments that do not apply to all provinces, such as the terms of union, would be made only with the consent of Parliament and the province concerned. Mr. Peckford conveniently forgot to point this out in his province-wide broadcast. Furthermore, section 47 is even more explicit. It says that no amending formula as outlined in the resolution would apply where the constitution contains another procedure for making an amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. As I often do when in the chair, I try to signal hon. members or ministers who are speaking that they have a moment or two left to wrap up. There is some pressure on all hon. members because of the 20-minute time limit. Because I allowed an interruption, I will give the hon. minister 30 seconds.

Mr. Rompkey: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to point out the facts on this important issue in our province, as they exist at the present time. We on this side of the House stand firm on the matter. I wanted to point out one particular matter which came up in the recent amendment that deals with the transfer of resources from one province to another and indirect and direct taxation. The Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) dealt with this subject very well yesterday.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Rompkey: I want to say to my friends across the way that it will be an asset to our people, not a liability.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my point of order to the acting government House leader. It would be my view, as well as the view of members of my party that, considering the events today, it would be inappropriate to have a private members' hour. We would rather have the hour used for the debating of this resolution. I have spoken to the House leader of the New Democratic Party, and I believe that they are in agreement. I would ask that the government accede to this request as well.

Mr. Dick: Make it unanimous.

Mr. Collenette: Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that the hon. member could have given me prior notice of this suggestion. We have six minutes left before we call it private members' hour. I will give my decision at one minute to five.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. There is a small technical problem, and the Chair has difficulty hearing

at times. I do not know whether the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) put a motion or whether there was an implicit agreement to give further consideration to the suggestion.

Mr. Epp: I asked for unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair can interpret the remarks of the hon. parliamentary secretary that there is not unanimous consent, but nonetheless I think it is in order to put the question.

Mr. Dick: No, he said that he would wait for five minutes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Then there is agreement to delay discussion on this matter?

Mr. Dick: Yes.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, in due course I will deal with the remarks of the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Rompkey) where it is necessary. In my opening remarks I would like to say with regard to my leader that as I was reading my Roman history recently I came across the philosopher Seneca, who said:

Whereas fire is the test of gold, adversity is the test of a strong man.

Our leader has been tested in adversity and I think that he is showing himself well in these times of adversity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: I am not talking about brown, I said gold. I have only 20 minutes allotted to me, so I cannot make the full presentation that I wanted to make. I did not expect that closure would be introduced in this debate. After only 24 hours of debate, after only 46 members out of 279 in this House have spoken, after 22 out of 145 Liberals have spoken—123 have not spoken—after 19 out of 102 Progressive Conservatives have spoken, 83 have not; and after only five out of 32 NDP members have spoken, leaving 25 who have not spoken—

Mr. Knowles: Twenty-seven. Can't you count?

Mr. Crosbie:—231 members of this House, give or take a few, have not had a chance to speak in this debate. It took God six days to make the world. It takes the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) only 24 hours of debate to remake Canada.

The Prime Minister has tried to deceive the Canadian people. He said in his opening statement several weeks ago on television that the Canadian people have to find a way of breaking out of 53 years of constitutional paralysis. To say the best about that statement, it is an untruth. We have had many constitutional changes in the last 53 years. There has been no constitutional paralysis.

For example, in 1940, unemployment insurance was added to the federal jurisdiction, and in 1951 section 94(a) was added to the old age pension to clarify federal powers. There has been no impasse. Even if there has been debate on the constitution over the last 20 years or 30 years, it has not been