

I say in a federal state that both the provincial and federal Governments should co-appoint the Justices of the Supreme Court, and that is what is being done in the Meech Lake Accord. That is co-operative federalism. That is the kind of thing we want in our province. I suggest that the overwhelming majority of Canadians want it as well.

With respect to the Senate, we saw what happened yesterday in that House. In defiance of the Leader of the Liberal Party, it passed a motion to have a study of the constitutional Accord. If we are not going to abolish the other place, if we are not going to have an elected Senate, the least we can do is to ensure that the provinces have some input into the selection of Senators so that the Senators are not obedient to an old master like Pierre Trudeau but will have some responsibility to represent their provinces and their regions in a truly federal state.

I also want to mention the north. There is perhaps one glaring omission in the Constitutional Accord, and that is that northern Canadians become, in a constitutional sense, second-class citizens. Other residents of other provinces have an input through their legislature and in the nomination of judges and Senators. However, citizens of Yukon and the Northwest Territories do not have the same right. I do not think that is fair. I know an important case is being launched, but I think we are going to have to look very hard to find some kind of amendments so we do not create second-class citizens in a constitutional sense in northern Canada.

I am also concerned that the amending formula for the creation of new provinces has been changed requiring unanimous consent. I think we can hopefully all unite in this House to build up some kind of public feeling among the provinces to agree to revert back to the existing amending formula, which is seven provinces out of 10. Because of this glaring oversight, I want to move an amendment which I hope is acceptable to all Members of this House.

I move, seconded by my friend, the Hon. Member for Regina West, (Mr. Benjamin), who has been pushing for the idea:

That the motion be amended by striking the word 'and' at the end of paragraph 9 and substituting the following therefore,

That the Committee, or a sub-Committee, have power to travel to, and hold at least one public hearing in, each of the two Territories;

That the Committee be empowered to retain the services of advisors to assist in its work, and that it also be empowered to retain the professional, clerical and stenographic help as may be required;

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting that House to unite with this House for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deems it advisable, five Members to act on the proposed Special Joint Committee.

In closing, I appeal to the Deputy Prime Minister and to the Liberal Party to seriously look at the possibility of giving this committee the right to travel in northern Canada. I think this is a really special case because they do not have provincial Governments. They were not part of the Meech Lake Agreement. They did not have a Premier sitting down at the table for them. The federal Government represented them, I know,

but citizens of other provinces had both the federal Government and their premier, and there is a difference. With the amended formula, they do not get a chance to help select the judges of the Supreme Court or the Senators. There is a guarantee for a Senator, but the federal Government would appoint the Senator from the Yukon or the Northwest Territories. So in that sense I think there is a constitutional double standard.

● (1240)

The other point I want to make is that they may never become provinces if unanimous consent is required. There is a difference when it comes to the north. I think the committee should have the power to travel to the North or to send a subcommittee to the north. If the committee, through consultation, deems it unnecessary, then the committee does not have to travel. We do not say that it has to travel. We are saying that if it wishes to travel then it should have the funds available to do so.

I am sorry that my time is running out. I would like to have made one or two more comments.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Hon. Members have heard the terms of the Hon. Member's amendment. Are there questions or comments?

Mr. Johnston: Madam Speaker, this is a sad time for Canada, not necessarily because of differences of opinion, on this constitutional Accord, but when we see a Party once regarded as a Party of principle become purely a Party of political opportunism—

Mr. Mazankowski: Exactly right.

Mr. Johnston:—we all know that power corrupts. The NDP has now proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that even the fleeting sniff of power corrupts.

That being said, I wish to ask the NDP spokesperson, the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville (Mr. Nystrom), a question with regard to process. He mentioned the constraint on the spending power that is found in the proposed new section 106A(1) of the Accord, which he views very favourably. He says that to withdraw, provinces would have to meet national objectives in carrying on their own programs. At the present time we know that the spending power as it is generally used requires the delivery of funds to the provinces for them to spend in accordance with certain national criteria, otherwise the funds are not forthcoming. I suggest that this section clearly creates a new situation and the term "national objectives" must mean something. It is a very important consideration, what it means. That is a legal issue. Who establishes those national objectives is another legal issue. We have already heard a number of interpretations.

I would like to advise my friend from Yorkton—Melville and the House that I have written a letter to the Prime