

The Constitution

part of the bargaining instrument because that is the position of our party. We believe that the offshore provinces should be put on the same basis as the inshore provinces. That is our belief, but we were not in a position to do anything, and I state it frankly because it is no secret. We have our strength in western Canada and the Liberal party is weak in western Canada.

One can see these moves within the political process in two ways. One can look at it and say, "Ah, somehow that is cynical wheeling and dealing". That is the essence of democratic politics that it be conducted openly. If we believe in the consensual approach to constitutional change, and if there are in a proposal many things in which we believe, as my party saw in the constitutional proposal, such as fundamental rights, language rights and equalization, and you also saw something which was missing in terms of resource control which was important to western Canadians as well as others, and you saw the means of negotiating because of your strength, then I think it is appropriate in a democratic system to negotiate toughly and get it, and we got it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: You sold out.

Mr. Broadbent: Someone has said that we sold out. I would say to the Conservatives, "What have you obtained for the people of Canada?" Not a thing. The people of Newfoundland should pay attention with some care to what Mr. Peckford is saying because, as a result of constitutional entrenchment which will amount to two full pages of constitutional text, over resources all the provinces will have substantial power. As a result of its inclusion in the constitution, Mr. Peckford, if he is still premier at the time, will have the clear authority to manage and control the right of, for example, development of hydroelectric power in Labrador and Newfoundland itself. No longer will private corporations be able to challenge the right in the courts or his participation in interprovincial trade, as is the case today. The victory which we have won in this debate is for the people of Newfoundland not just the people of the prairies. Similarly,—

[*Translation*]

—in Quebec, Mr. Lévesque wants control over asbestos. With those rights entrenched in the constitution, the Quebec government, presently that of Mr. Lévesque or perhaps in the future that of Mr. Ryan or someone else, could also have control over those natural resources. It could decide what it wants as far as asbestos is concerned. It would be its right, which is not the case at present, because the Supreme Court has made certain decisions in the past which have changed the present constitutional reality of Canada.

● (1550)

[*English*]

So I say to our friend in the Conservative party, not only for Newfoundland but for the people of the province of Quebec, this constitutional amendment, giving them a right to control

the management of their resources, is of profound importance, and I am proud to play a role in that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: In Alberta and Saskatchewan the same right holds for the development of taxing powers over their gas, over their oil and, indeed, over their potash.

I should like a member of the Conservative party to put on record, sometime, how many millions of dollars the right to indirect taxation on oil and gas is going to mean to Mr. Lougheed. We have done some preliminary calculations and even for Alberta, Mr. Speaker, "it ain't hay". So the prairie provinces are going to benefit as well.

British Columbia, a province that has gas, a province that has lumber resources but which wants to set up planning mechanisms and that wants to set up a pro-rationing method of development, under the constitutional change that we have proposed and that the government has accepted, the government of British Columbia—whether led by Mr. Bennett, or before long, we anticipate, Mr. Barrett—will be able to do so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: The point is that the resource amendment that the government has decided to accept is not without significance; it is something of real importance to every region and province in our land.

Mr. Clark: Ask Allen Blakeney.

Mr. Broadbent: The Leader of the Opposition tells me to ask Allen Blakeney. Mr. Blakeney spoke for himself a couple of hours ago and said the same thing.

Mr. Clark: Check the record.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I say that if we moved in the Conservative party's direction today, if we supported the motion before the House, then language rights, fundamental rights, equalization and provincial control of resources would all go out the window.

Mr. Clark: That is not true.

Mr. Broadbent: The Leader of the Opposition says that is not true. But they would go out the window in the precise sense that if the motion presented by the government and so amended in the future is accepted, we would have those things; under the Conservative proposal we would have nothing but a constitution back here.

In this context, I want to ask about our native people.

Mr. Crombie: They are not protected here.

Mr. Broadbent: A former minister says the native people are not protected here. I correct his in one minor respect only: there is a clause referring to existing rights. I say to the House that this party intends to work very hard to improve what is in the existing resolution presented by the government, and to