

ensure that the rights of native people are not only as stated in the bill but are extended well beyond that to include treaty obligations as well. So we will be fighting for that.

In the Tory position—and I do not say this pejoratively as I am trying to understand it—if we got the constitution back, all it would mean is we would have it back without any reference to a clause at all—without any understanding that there would be anything in it for our Indian and Inuit population or any of our other native people. At least in the present resolution there is something that we can amend and improve.

The same point could be made with reference to women's rights. There is an affirmative action clause that we like but that can be improved. There is also, in our judgment, a need to deal with the constitution in such a way that it would reverse a number of Supreme Court decisions made in the past decade the effect of which has not been to establish equality between men and women, but just the opposite. In the resolution that the government has offered, we have grounds on which to make improvements on the matter of women's rights, and we intend to do that.

I want to come now, Mr. Speaker, to what in our view is basically wrong with the Vancouver formula. The former prime minister, the Leader of the Opposition, says that in his proposal we would have a "work" something—I do not have the precise words from his press release of this morning but the gist of it was that it would be a formula that would enable us to get speedy and concrete change right away. With all due respect, I say to him that in my judgment he is wrong, and I want to tell the House why I think so.

The essence of the Vancouver formula is that all the provinces would participate in the decision but that any province would have the right to veto its application to its own province. That is what is in the Vancouver formula. Of course, the provinces agreed to that; why would they not? They would each retain a veto over things that affect them; they would have everything to gain and nothing to lose, but I say to the Leader of the Opposition, we are a federal party and we have national responsibilities that go beyond provincial premiers.

**An hon. Member:** Right on.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Broadbent:** If we accepted a formula like that, would we have medicare in Canada?

**Some hon. Members:** No!

**Mr. Broadbent:** Would we have hospitalization in Canada?

**Some hon. Members:** No!

**An hon. Member:** No thanks to the Tories.

**Mr. Broadbent:** I say, Mr. Speaker, if we had accepted a formula such as that proposed in the Vancouver amendment we would not have a Canada with a common set of rights—of fundamental deficiencies, if you like—from coast to coast. We would have a hodge-podge Canada with a highly differentiated

### *The Constitution*

set of rights and principles. We will have nothing to do with that kind of Canada.

**Mr. Malone:** The option is no Canada.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Not only is that a fundamental flaw, it is a serious flaw, and I am disturbed that the Conservative party, as a federal party, could put that forward as a serious option at this time. I mean that, because I think it could lead to the dismemberment—it could lead to a highly differentiated set of rights in every region of our land. There could be family law of one kind in Manitoba, for example, and an entirely different kind in another province. Some provinces would have medicare and others would not. What we stand for in this party is a common sense of Canadian citizenship. That is fundamentally important, Mr. Speaker.

The other point I want to make is less significant but surely must cause the Leader of the Opposition some concern. Some amendments simply cannot be subject to an opting-out formula. I ask the Leader of the Opposition what he would do with proposed amendments that would change the Senate of Canada? What would he do with amendments that would change the Supreme Court of Canada? Will some provinces be able to opt out? In other words, Mr. Speaker, it would be inoperative to take the formula with that kind of requirement—an opting-out process for each of the provinces—in dealing with an idea that we favour, for example, such as provincial participation in the Supreme Court. That would be completely inoperative in a federal state.

**Mr. Clark:** That is not true.

**Mr. Broadbent:** I stand to be corrected by the Leader of the Opposition later on, but that is certainly my understanding of the way it would work.

I understand that my time is just about up, Mr. Speaker, but I wanted to say to the House that there are many things in the government bill that we profoundly believe in because they have been established New Democratic Party policies. Of course, there are other areas of very serious concern, as my colleagues have expressed. In committee we will deal with the amending formula, women's rights, and native rights. We plan to fight for improvements in those areas.

As a Canadian, I want the deadlock broken; as a Canadian I want a reasonable package that has something that is favourable to Atlantic Canadians, to people in Ontario and in Quebec. We have that in equalization and we have it in language rights, and now we have it in resources. I want action now so that, to use the phrase of the Leader of the Opposition, we do not need to continue to be colonials.

If we bring the constitution home along the lines indicated, we will indeed have a constitution in Canada, and we will have embedded in it a number of just principles that all Canadians could defend.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!