

foundland has proposed in recent months. We have a government in Newfoundland—I pray there are no others in Canada, but I fear there may be others—which proposes to pass laws saying the first qualification to work in Newfoundland on certain developments is that the person be born in that province. If that first requirement is not met, the individual would be told he or she is not qualified to work in Newfoundland.

In this charter of rights we have mobility clauses. These will guarantee Canadians the right to live, work, pursue happiness and to raise their families anywhere in this country. But if Premier Peckford has his way, that right will not be extended to Canadians as far as Newfoundland is concerned.

I have a younger brother who could not find work in Newfoundland. He is now working in Edmonton. I have another younger brother who will complete a course in the college of trades this spring. He may not find a job in Newfoundland. We are glad that my younger brother can pursue a job anywhere else in this country. He, too, may end up out west. The fact that I have two brothers who have to go out west is the kind of shortsighted argument that Premier Peckford would use to justify saying that no one but Newfoundlanders shall work in the offshore industries of Newfoundland. That may appeal to people, perhaps even my brother, the day he boards a plane to leave home. But that kind of shortsighted vision, if allowed to grow, will destroy and balkanize this country and will turn us into ten banana republics.

I find Premier Peckford's position hard to swallow. I cannot accept it, especially in light of what he himself said in his paper "Toward the Twenty-First Century—Together", dated August 18, 1980. In that paper, we read that:

The entrenchment of democratic rights and fundamental freedoms is a means of giving explicit constitutional recognition to values which have served Canada well.

He continued:

Newfoundland, therefore, supports a charter of rights which will entrench the democratic rights and fundamental freedoms of Canadians.

Only mobility rights entrenched in a Canadian constitution can put an end to the kind of threat with respect to mobility which Premier Peckford and his government represent.

● (1650)

What did some of the people who appeared before the constitutional committee have to say about mobility? Mr. Gordon Fairweather, the chairman of the Human Rights Commission said:

I am absolutely delighted to see that mobility rights are to be enshrined... If the maritime provinces, from where I come, had been restricted in mobility, there would have been social revolution in this country and I think it is time that people remembered that... We are totally committed to this principle and I think 99 per cent of the people of Canada are.

Mr. Edward Hearn, a Newfoundlander representing the Newfoundland branch of the Canadian Bar Association, said this:

One of the... legitimate objectives of the Constitution of Canada is the integration of the Canadian economy. The free circulation of goods, services,

capital and workers has not always been adequately protected under the BNA Act. We are strongly in favour of improving and protecting the Canadian economic union.

The Task Force on Canadian Unity said:

In a federal union, the regions can expect their economies to perform better as a result of the free movement of labour, capital, goods and services.

I only regret that the mobility clause at this time does not include capital, goods and services. As a start we have guaranteed the mobility of individual Canadians to move about this country.

The premier of the province of Newfoundland was quoted while speaking at the National Press Club just across the street here in Ottawa some time ago as saying that the central government has only that life and authority delegated to it by the ten provinces. I do not know that if there are other premiers who share Mr. Peckford's view, but that kind of vision for Canada, if it were universally accepted, would not result in a community of communities but in ten balkanized little states, each to the detriment of the whole, protecting what they see to be their own self-interests.

When I see that kind of a statement by a provincial premier, especially the premier of my province, then if we were to accept that concept, I wonder who Premier Peckford would have arbitrate what he perceives, and indeed what I perceive, to be the difficulties and the differences he has with the province of Quebec on the question of hydro development. With that kind of perception, I wonder who Premier Peckford would have arbitrate the fisheries conflicts which arise from time to time, not between Canada and the United States, but between the maritime provinces.

There is one other matter I want to speak on, namely the referendum provision. There are those who oppose the resolution because they do not like the process and do not want to offend the premiers and provincial politicians. There are those who are upset about the referendum procedure.

There was a referendum not too long ago in my province. Let us review what is in the referendum procedure. The government has already stated it does not intend to impose an amending procedure of its own devising immediately, but rather a two-stage approach to the adopting of an amending formula as proposed which will provide opportunity for all governments in this country to work out an amending formula together.

During the first two years following proclamation of the Constitution Act, 1981, the general amending formula will require the unanimous consent of Parliament and the ten provinces. First ministers will meet at least once a year during that interim period in a constitutional conference. A key item on the agenda of the conference will be a search for a general amending formula.

If unanimous consent on an amending formula is secured, Part V of the act as amended by Parliament and the provinces will come into force and we will have reached agreement for the first time after 53 years of deadlock. If agreement is not possible during the interim period and seven or more provinces representing at least 80 per cent of the population can agree on