

*Supply*

people of the country must be consulted. Surely their leaders must be heard and their concerns must be recognized.

We have had situations which have even gone to violence in which the aboriginal people have a vital stake because it affects the economy of their communities. We have the salmon fishery on the B.C. coast. We have the salmon fishery in the Restigouche River in New Brunswick and Quebec. We have the situation in my own riding of Kenora—Rainy River where, because of the lack of attention to the definition of the rights of aboriginal people, there are grave concerns being raised and in many cases played upon by others for their own advantage. We have the situation at Rice Lake in southern Ontario.

I raise these examples not to say that the aboriginal position on all these questions or issues is correct, but to point out the depth and gravity of the concern which aboriginal people have for the regulation of both the freshwater and the salt-water fisheries in virtually all provinces and territories in Canada.

An entrenchment of the inherent rights of self-government for which the aboriginal leaders of the country sought and strove so valiantly at the First Ministers' Conference is, as I have said, something that cannot be included in the Meech Lake Accord. However, it seems that the First Ministers of the country met without considering the unfinished business, which was left before them as recently as some two months ago when they came together in the Langevin Block. Surely any conference, any consultative body, or any deliberative assembly, when meeting again, should be considering what was left undone from its most recent meetings. Surely that is something which was a grave omission from the Meech Lake Accord.

In the last couple of minutes which I have, I should like to turn to the situation regarding the Province of British Columbia and the way in which aboriginal rights and aboriginal aspirations are continually denied, derogated from, and devalued under a Government which I should not like to try to describe in analytical terms when related to the democratic system of Canada. We have a situation where the aboriginal people are essentially considered as not having a communal interest, not having communal aspirations, not possessing cultural heritage that they share among each other, and not being worthy of explicit recognition, even though everyone concedes that it is their ancestors who were here first and extended so much co-operation and welcome to the interlopers.

I should like to refer to a letter from the Assembly of First Nations to the Prime Minister which outlines the situation so clearly. It reads:

It appears that the federal Government has not been able to muster the political will necessary to deal with aboriginal and treaty issues in a way that would provide clarity and certainty.

As Mr. George Erasmus, the Grand Chief of the Assembly of First Nations, said, "the political will that was demonstrated over the last couple of days"—and he was referring to the first of June—"by the First Ministers was just not there in March".

"Consider the glaring inconsistencies of the double standard employed by the provincial delegates at the aboriginal rights conferences", says Tony Hall who is on the Faculty of Native Studies at the University of Sudbury.

The Meech Lake Accord requires revision and amendment if it is not to leave the aboriginal people of the country in the limbo which they have so long inhabited. As my Leader said, reconciliation of the people of Quebec with the Constitution is essential. My Party and I say that reconciliation of the aboriginal people of Canada with the Constitution is equally essential.

**Mr. McCurdy:** Mr. Speaker, my Party is inspired to hope that the Meech Lake Accord can produce an optimistic future for Canada based upon the inclusion, at long last, of Quebec in the constitutionalized family. However, there are some who share the concern, as reflected in the motion before us, that certain sins of omission leave the Accord flawed. I agree with that proposition.

I would ask the previous speaker whether there is not another area in which the Accord is flawed. Is there not the danger that the deliberations involved in leading up to the Accord have not seen so far too much debate between the two founding peoples? Is there not another sin of omission which should be addressed?

I call attention to the fact that Sections 7 to 15 are subject to Section 33, the *non obstante* or the notwithstanding clause. I am particularly concerned that there is a large portion of the Canadian population which sees in Section 15 guarantees of rights to those who are neither English nor French nor aboriginal.

Is it not another important omission which must be addressed that Quebec, shortly after the adoption of the Constitution Act, 1982, invoked Section 33 and applied it to all of its future legislation? Should we not be speaking on behalf of an increasingly significant portion of the Canadian population in ensuring that all provinces will be bound to respect in perpetuity the rights of those who are neither English nor French? Should we not ensure that rights accorded to people irrespective of race, colour, creed, and religion should not be subject to override?

**Mr. Parry:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for the question. He is a far more learned constitutional scholar than I am. I will do my modest best to respond to him.

I think it must be said that the multicultural and multi-ethnic dimension of Canada is as central as any other proposition or fact to an understanding of what makes the country live, move, breathe, talk, and co-operate; sometimes we struggle but we always finally get along together.

One of my initial fears in reviewing the Meech Lake Accord was the provision on immigration. I think its intent is something I would certainly want the Government to devote some time and effort to clarifying. I wonder—and others have expressed the same fear—if there is not some element in there