

pursue its options. I agree with the hon. member for Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker, but I regret that I have not heard him speak on this very important matter in the House. I would like to think that he will continue to represent the wishes of his constituents.

The hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) stood in his place in this House and in a fine and eloquent manner spoke of the pitfalls and inequities that he saw in the resolution. As to sections 42 and 46 concerning the amending formula he said it was not proper that under this resolution the right could be given through an amending formula and taken away through a manipulative referendum which denied the basic partnership and essence of federalism. That is what he said in this House. I hope members of his party continue to talk that way because I believe they truly represent their constituents. That is what we hear. That is what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was saying when he said we should set aside our differences. I agree with those two members of the NDP but I should like to ask whether there are other members who feel that way and who may not have spoken in the House. Only one member from that party spoke on the resolution today. As I understood the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, he was speaking on an amendment or a point of order.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Does the hon. member not realize, with respect to our stand on closure, that we voted against it today solidly? Does he not realize that I did make a full 20-minute speech today, including our attack on closure? The hon. member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) made a full 20-minute speech and we have another one to come. Would the hon. member not like to get his facts straight?

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, I certainly retract my remarks about the matter on which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was speaking, but sometimes we hear 20-minute speeches from the hon. gentleman on other matters. I do apologize to the hon. gentleman.

The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Kristiansen) spoke as well, and I referred to his speech earlier today. In effect he was saying, "My leader said that we support in principle most, if not all, of the items in the resolution," but then he went on to say, "with regard to resources taxation." He then quoted the former premier of the province of British Columbia, Mr. Barrett, as saying:

British Columbia is prepared to share all the oil and natural gas rights granted to it by the constitution if the Government of Canada would put under public control all of the oil and gas in the country.

That is very nice, for the people of British Columbia. Then he added the comment that it appears the NDP are willing and want the province to maintain jurisdiction over natural resources, that is, unless the federal government would promise to nationalize all the natural resources—then they would give it all to them. I am sure the people of British Columbia would be very interested in that proposition.

The Constitution

This Liberal-democrat coalition will be bringing in a supposed amendment which is not acceptable to any but the Prime Minister and the leader of the New Democratic Party. It is not acceptable to the premier of Saskatchewan who was quoted today as saying that this move has made it more difficult for the provinces to bargain. There was a big hullabaloo about the right to indirect taxation. But most of the resources from Saskatchewan are not exported to other parts of Canada, Mr. Speaker, they are exported outside the borders of Canada. So indirect taxation does nothing in those circumstances.

Mr. Blakeney has already found a way to get around indirect taxation by imposing an income tax at the wellhead which has diminished, and will continue to diminish, the search for oil in our province. In that way, the potential of this country to become self-sufficient in oil will be jeopardized.

We speak of Canada as being more than just a federal government. Several members—and not just members of my party—have spoken about this resolution. One province accepts it; two are not sure and seven are considering action in the courts. Senator Manning has spoken out in the other place against the resolution and the political minister for Alberta in the other place, the Minister of State for Economic Development (Mr. Olson) is reported in the *Vancouver Sun* of October 11 as follows:

Economic development Minister Bud Olson, the lone Albertan in the federal cabinet, said Friday he does not favour Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau's constitutional amending formula.

The senator told student Liberals at the University of Alberta that his "personal preference" is for the Alberta amending formula.

So it is not just members of this party who oppose the motion, Mr. Speaker. We want to know why we have to change the system under which we have been governed. We want to know by what right the only acceptable viewpoint is that of the Liberals. More than that one viewpoint must be represented.

Let us examine what that Liberal viewpoint represents in Canada, Mr. Speaker. There is a total of 282 seats in this House and at the present time there are a number of vacancies. The government has 143 members and a majority of 33 seats. The province of Quebec has sent 72 members to the government benches—

An hon. Member: Seventy-four.

Mr. McKnight: —and over 86 per cent of Liberal members are from the central provinces, Quebec and Ontario. Only 20 Liberal members come from the eight other provinces combined, two of them west of the Ontario-Manitoba border. So what about rural Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories?

An hon. Member: There are NDP members.

Mr. McKnight: I hear a member on the government side saying it is all right because the NDP supports them. I should like to tell hon. members opposite that from the information I have and the speeches I have read in this House, I gather that