

*The Constitution*

CN and its subsidiaries, such as Canadian National Express, which provide services in this country that are inferior to the services which they provided 40 years ago. How will the regions of Canada outside the major metropolitan areas be protected in their expectation of better services from such a company unless it is put in the constitution as a right? Obviously, the right does not exist at the present time. With regard to regional disparity, almost every region of this country at one time or another has been or can expect to be economically inferior to another region. Prosperity is a very fleeting thing. It will not remain in any one area indefinitely.

I do not say that prosperous areas should not look to and work for the time when they will be less prosperous. I have no objection to the fact that some areas of this country are more prosperous than others. All I am saying is that this prosperity should not interfere with the attaining of regional economic sufficiency by other regions of this country. It is very important to me, as a member from Atlantic Canada, that this matter be foremost in the thinking of any constitution by any government. No region, least of all Atlantic Canada, is looking for a handout. All any area is looking for, I am sure, is an investment in its future. That is certainly the position of Atlantic Canada.

Areas which are not as fortunate economically as others can experience difficult times, not only the infrastructure of the community, but the individuals of these communities. In a community which has fallen upon economic hardship and which is declining, it is the people who suffer. These people have worked all their lives through the depression and the wars up to the present, and they are not able to work any more due to the fact that they are aged, they suffer from ill health, or the area in which they live is economically depressed.

Many of these people do not have the wherewithal to recoup the savings which they lost and to regain their self-sufficiency. They may have spent most of their lives paying the mortgages on their houses, building up a small savings account, and collecting a few other things. In times of economic stress their homes are worth considerably less. I think it is important that we be mindful of this situation. When we talk about the building up of monetary reserves, personal fortunes, and developing economic potential, we must not forget the people who have already worked and who have attained savings. They have not accumulated fortunes, but it is that money upon which they have come to rely.

When talking about the fortunes and money that will be accumulated in the future in this country, let us not forget the money and the fortunes which have already been accumulated and upon which many people in this country depend.

**Mr. MacKay:** Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member accept a question?

**Mr. MacLellan:** Yes.

**Mr. MacKay:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member whether he is going on record at this time as a member from Atlantic Canada as saying that the proposal that

we are debating tonight will really improve the economic prosperity, the freedom of the Atlantic region, its resource base, and its hope for the future? Is that what the hon. member is telling the House?

**Mr. MacLellan:** Yes I am.

● (2100)

**Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, the entrenchment of a charter of human rights and freedoms in the Canadian constitution is, in my view, and in the view of the New Democratic Party, essential. I also applaud the initiative taken by my leader to have the provincial ownership and control of natural resources entrenched in the constitution.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** They are already there.

**Miss Jewett:** I am so glad the hon. member intervened, Mr. Speaker, because the Premier of British Columbia, Bill Bennett, has been saying for the last several years that the New Democratic Party, federally and provincially, intended to take away such protections as now exist of provincial ownership of resources. He went all over the province saying that the NDP was going to take away such protection as existed of provincial control of resources. But now, when the New Democratic Party will not only not take away what has been there but has taken the initiative to ensure that provincial ownership and control of these resources is entrenched, and therefore fundamentally safeguarded, the Premier of British Columbia does not know what to say. Indeed, on this score the Premier of British Columbia passes all understanding.

**An hon. Member:** Like the NDP.

**Miss Jewett:** Furthermore, the suggestion made earlier tonight by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Miss Carney) that somehow or other a particular amending formula, the Victoria formula, and not any other such as the Vancouver consensus, might damage British Columbia is, it seems to me, entirely erroneous.

In the first place, for the first two years after the constitution is patriated, there must be unanimity for any amendment to take place, and unanimity includes British Columbia.

In the second place, the Vancouver formula that the Conservative party seems so fond of, would not necessarily favour and, indeed, could abolish, some of British Columbia's most important or cherished interests if pursued by other provinces in a direction that B.C. did not find desirable.

I gather that the premier is now slowing down a bit and realizes that what is before this House, so far as it concerns British Columbia, is of benefit.

As we all know, however, and as has been spoken of many times, there are deficiencies in this proposed resolution one of which affects a group comprising 52 per cent of the population right across this country. The most alarming deficiency in the resolution and the one I want to talk about tonight and make