

ployment, where I know there is poverty, where I know there are inequalities that are not present in any other part of Canada. I would challenge any member to come to those places with me, and I hope some members will take up that challenge. There are reserves in the ridings of some hon. members in which there are unequal opportunities for native people. I hope that these hon. members will take the time to state such cases, as I have done.

No one is happy with the present situation of the native population in Canada. The native people in particular want to see changes, and believe that recognition of their aboriginal rights would begin a new era of optimism and building for a secure future within confederation.

Why do I emphasize aboriginal rights, Mr. Speaker? One of the most crucial factors in preserving cultures, as everyone in this country is well aware, is language. I wish with all my heart and soul that I could make this speech in my own language. Since we are not allowed to do so, I will continue in the only other language that I know.

● (1610)

While everyone else is talking about preserving minority language rights, I want to remind members that in my constituency of Nunatsiak the language rights of the majority are not protected. In the proposed resolution there is no protection of Inuit rights to speak Inuktitut and no guarantee of their right to educate their children in their native tongue. This is further complicated by the fact there is not enough control over broadcasting in northern communities. The native language rights in the area of health, social services, and criminal justice are also missing from the pages of the proposed document, education being particularly important since it is the crucial element in the preservation of native culture.

Preservation of native lifestyles depend upon their source of livelihood and a sane development policy regarding renewable resources. Unlimited mobility rights would seriously threaten a process of careful and controlled development. Furthermore, native people must be fully involved in the resource development process on their lands, including access to revenue sharing as a means of establishing a stable economic base. In this case the territories are passed by.

Every party in this House has, at one time or another, called for the recognition of aboriginal rights. As recently as last July the Liberal party passed a resolution to:

Work toward the entrenching of original and native people's rights by:

(a) enacting legislation with the consent of the original and native peoples, that clearly provides for Canada's obligations by virtue of aboriginal and treaty rights,

(b) implementing a modern settlement policy that provides for orderly developments by enhancing, not extinguishing aboriginal, treaty and native people's rights and,

(c) include the original and native people's representatives at all levels of constitutional reform.

These people have not carried out any of the commitments of their party. These are all laudable sentiments. I am sure we in the House would express them at one time or another with varying degrees of truth. We on this side certainly express

them with truth. We have not seen anything from the other side yet to confirm that.

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

**Mr. Ittinuar:** If there is anything to be achieved, now is the time for members to act on their principles and good will.

On Friday before last the Prime Minister said that he would be willing to put the question of native rights on the agenda for discussions toward further constitutional change, after patriation. Last June the Prime Minister agreed to bring up the matter of representation of native people and territorial governments in constitutional talks with the provincial premiers.

In July the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Munro) told an all-chiefs' conference of the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood that native people across Canada may be invited to appear before the continuing committee of ministers to give their views on patriation and the constitution. Statements of good intent have so far lasted as long as one of our summers in the far north. We are looking for constitutional guarantees which are perennial as the permafrost in Grise Fiord, which I believe will last longer than this country.

The aim of the charter of rights and freedoms is to give individuals and minorities recourse to the courts if these rights and freedoms are violated. This I do not argue with. However, the proposed constitutional resolution omits any reference to the collective rights of aboriginal peoples. Canada's native peoples have a unique and historic relationship with the federal government, based on their aboriginal rights as the original inhabitants of Canada. Section 24 of the constitutional resolution provides that existing rights and freedoms of native people will not be affected by the rights and freedoms in the charter. I wonder what kind of guarantee this is when native people have been exerting considerable time and effort on the task of changing and improving the status quo. Are we now to be content with the same unsatisfactory status quo?

Section 24 protects native rights. There are no rights at present for native people. I wish to read the section and then re-read it in a manner which, had it been written that way, might have meant something to the native people. I quote section 24 of the resolution:

The guarantee in this charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed as denying the existence of any other rights or freedoms that exist in Canada, including any rights or freedoms that pertain to the native peoples of Canada.

What does that mean? I dare anyone on that side to interpret that for me so that it gives me a feeling of security. Had it been written in a manner such as this, it would have some meaning.

The guarantee in this charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed as denying the existence of any other rights or freedoms that exist in Canada, including the aboriginal rights and freedoms that pertain to the native people of Canada and which ensure their distinct cultural, economic and linguistic identities.

That would have had some meaning for us.