3945

Mr. Chrétien: No, I do not say that. They were not perfect, neither are we. Nor is the Leader of the Opposition perfect.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: I am telling hon. members that those rights have not been protected in the constitution as they should have been. This is an historical debate—a once in a lifetime chance and we shall not miss it. But it will be impossible with the amending formula which the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting today.

I dealt with ministers all summer. We came close. There was a lot of good will, but certainly the old problem of trying to bargain the patriation against something else again was the flaw which prevented an agreement.

Mr. Clark: It is a shame to have a federation, is it not?

Mr. Chrétien: I say that we want to have the mobility rights and the non-discriminatory rights protected. What is wrong with that?

The freedoms we have in Canada have been gained over the years. This land has known discrimination in the past, but we are mature enough to have overcome a lot of it. The progress that we have made has to be protected forever in the constitution.

Mr. Clark: Tell us about the War Measures Act.

Mr. Chrétien: This is just like what John Diefenbaker wanted to have. I tell hon. members to read the records of 1960 when he was debating the Canadian Bill of Rights. Mr. Diefenbaker was complaining about the provinces which would not agree at that time to have rights protected in the Canadian constitution. We are just finishing the work for Mr. Diefenbaker today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: I am appalled to know that the Leader of the Opposition who comes from western Canada does not feel strongly about the rights of Canadians.

There are many people in this land who do things and whose rights seem to be well protected in normal society, but these rights can disappear very rapidly. Just take a look at other countries around the world. Some of the most stable societies have seen the ugly head of racism rising to the surface. That shall not happen in Canada because rights will be protected in the constitution.

It is very easy for the majority to have views of minorities. It is the role of this Parliament to make sure that this land of ours, it is a land of minorities of all kinds, will see the rights they have acquired over the last 113 years protected forever in the Canadian constitution. This is the Canada we are going to have. The Constitution

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1610)

[Translation]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I think that today the right hon. Leader of the Opposition is trying to find his way out of the mess he got himself into.

An hon. Member: As usual.

Mr. Chrétien: Today he is proposing the unilateral patriation of the constitution. We did not get any agreement on the Vancouver formula. There was no such agreement. Show me the agreement if it does exist. The fact is it does not exist. We have talked about it and it was always under the condition that such and such a thing be accepted. They were not accepted. There was no agreement. Several premiers, several ministers who attended the conference constantly expressed reservations regarding this formula. This is why, Mr. Speaker, we prepared this resolution.

Mr. La Salle: Have there been any agreements on your resolutions?

Mr. Chrétien: I am pleased the member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) raises this issue because we are being accused of not having gone far enough, of not having forced Ontario, for instance, to accept section 133, of not having forced the provinces to accept it. We are being criticized for refraining from systematically invading the provincial jurisdiction concerning bilingualism in the legislatures and as concerns provincial statutes. Some would have liked us to impose—

An hon. Member: Courts of justice!

Mr. Chrétien: —certain things to the provinces. We would have liked to do so, but we have respected the rights of provinces.

Mr. Clark: This is what we are asking you to continue doing!

Mr. Chrétien: And that is what we are doing. However, I do not like people who have a double standard, such as the hon. member for Joliette, who says: "Impose what I want, but do not touch what I do not want." Either we have neutral patriation—and in the patriation formula that we are now proposing, we have basically tried not to effect the balance of powers between the federal government and the provinces. We have respected this balance of power and the only change we have suggested in this regard is the one we accepted today at the request of the Leader of the New Democratic Party, we have agreed to change the powers of the provinces so as to guarantee their control, which is already granted by the constitution, over their own resources by giving them the right to tax resources indirectly and to legislate in the area of interprovin-