

The Constitution

western ethnic minorities are clamouring for a charter of rights for their protection. First, I want to ask the minister what is the name of that Alberta social scientist? What is the evidence adduced that minorities in western Canada feel they need this charter of rights for their protection? Second, does the minister recognize that the reason for the growth of alienation in western Canada, growing into such organizations as the western federation, is precisely because of the intransigence and unilateralism of the federal government, as shown precisely in this resolution?

An hon. Member: That is a speech.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to provide the hon. member or any other member, with a copy of the article which appeared in a journal called "Race" about two years ago.

As for the hon. member's second question, I think his assumptions are somewhat specious. I think the reasons many of the ethnic groups feel the need for a bill of rights is because they feel discriminated against. That discrimination can be solved by the bill of rights we are proposing.

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister who has just finished speaking would not want to deliberately leave the House, and although he is from Winnipeg and the Wheat Board is centred there, I am sure if he does some research and checks into it he will find that the Wheat Board was not set up as a result of the federal government using declaratory powers.

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister a very straightforward question.

Mr. Collenette: Go into committee and ask these questions.

Mr. Roche: He used the phrase "Alberta social scientist." He built his argument around it. I am simply asking him the name of the Alberta social scientist.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. As the hon. member will recognize, the practice on occasion of asking questions at the end of another member's speech is tolerated, if I can put it that way. It is, of course, done at the option of the hon. member, in this case the minister, who has the floor. Normally the Chair will allow a question once, perhaps twice. That seems to be a courtesy which is extended both to the person who had the floor and the questioner. But I think the point has been made and perhaps we might go ahead.

Is there another hon. member who is seeking the floor on a point of order?

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I represent The Battlefords-Meadow Lake constituency. I would like clarification from the minister about something which arose from a comment in a speech he just made. He mentioned that part of the commitment to western Canada would be the extent of dollars that would be spent on the railway system. I would like to bring to the minister's attention a situation that happened in our constituency—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I have just attempted to explain to hon. members that in a situation where a minister or a member is finishing his speech there are times when with the agreement of the hon. member who wants to raise a question and the agreement of a member who has been speaking, the Chair has permitted that kind of an exchange. It should also be noted that it has never been done beyond the time limit of the individual member who had the floor. I did not make that point clear earlier with respect to the hon. member for Edmonton South (Mr. Roche) when he rose. However, I must point out that in accordance with the rules of the House the time given to the minister for his speech has now expired, and it is appropriate to move on to the next hon. member who seeks the floor.

The hon. member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake on a point of order.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House. I have a question that is very pressing and urgent arising from the minister's presentation.

Some hon. Members: Order!

An hon. Member: Ask it in question period tomorrow.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. It is simply irrelevant whether the hon. member thinks his question is the most important since creation. I cannot allow it under the Standing Orders of the House of Commons.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I must admit that this debate is of great interest and significance. I wish to contribute to the discussion and I would like to refer immediately to the previous speaker, the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy), who told us about the co-operation shown by the federal government and the role that it must play within Canada. We do not object to the federal government taking part in the development of economic projects in the west and in the other provinces. There is no problem about that. However, he seemed to forget one most basic fact which is to speak about the provinces. Of course, this proposed resolution could lead to very interesting discussions about principles, rights, and so on. And in addition, there is another issue of which we are all aware, that of the patriation of the constitution. We have nothing against patriation as such except to the extent that we want to respect the federal structure and the two levels of government and that we shall never allow this government to go over the head of the provinces. This is very clear in our minds.

An hon. Member: Speak louder.

An hon. Member: What did you do in Quebec for 40 years?

Mr. La Salle: This afternoon, I heard the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. De Bané) play a very different tune since the time he signed the minority report on