

**Mr. Whelan:** They want shoes on the baby and bread on the table. They want a form of security. That means some kind of job so that they can earn their own way in Canada. They can do that by sharing, not by saying "greed" or "We want more than the rest of you." They cannot do that by saying, "We do not want to share the way we build Canada" or "We do not want to be in a position where perhaps we are better off and share with someone who is not so well off." For instance, what good is the heritage fund piled high?

**Mr. Andre:** You are piling it high right now.

**Mr. Whelan:** On the farm we have piles, and we know that if we do not spread it around, it does not do a bit of good.

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

**Mr. Whelan:** The same is true in our society with money. You cannot corral it in one part of the country and not distribute it properly in the rest of the country. That is not the way Canada was built. We shared these things to build a country which is—and I know I am repeating myself—the envy of the world. Our way of life is the envy of the world. We are the best housed and the best educated. We have the best of the whole world. Some talk of another Utopia. If there is a better part of the world, I want to go and see it some day. I could describe Canada, as a new Canadian in my area described it the other day. He was watching television and listening to his children talk about the debates they read, young educated people who are more fortunate than their dads. He was an immigrant from Italy, and he said to me, "Gino, I would like to make a comparison. The world is one great big roast beef, and Canada is the best slice of that roast beef". I have heard no one here describe it any better than Biase Di Pasquale, a neighbour of mine who is proud of his accomplishments in this country. He is so proud that he trusts the people who have been in power longer than the other party in Canada. He trusts his Gino because he knows his Gino.

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

**Mr. Kilgour:** Mr. Speaker, the minister has a moment or two left. I wonder if he would permit a question.

**An hon. Member:** Let him finish. You have been interfering all night.

**Mr. Whelan:** Mr. Speaker, I understand that I have about three or four minutes left. I go as Minister of Agriculture to World Food Council meetings, the FAO and the OECD in Paris. At any world food meeting respect is paid to Canada. I know it is not paid to me because of who I am. It is because of what I represent. I represent that country called Canada which is looked on not as a huge military power or a huge power which is trying to impose some political philosophy on anybody else but as a country which enjoys the most freedom of any country in the world.

Ours is the country which is much envied. People want to come here and be part of this country called Canada. Yes, I am proud to be a Canadian, and I will do everything I can to

make the people of Canada understand what this debate is about. It is about bringing our constitution to its rightful resting place. I will do my best to explain in the humblest of language because I do not think anyone uses more humble language than I do. I do not know how to use any other language. About 95 per cent or 90 per cent of the people of Canada are something like your Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. They have had rough lives. They have had tough lives. They do not have that much education, but they do appreciate Canada, and they want it to stay as it is.

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

**Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to take part in the debate on the constitution, especially since many of my colleagues who would wish to speak have had that right denied them by the imposition of closure. I object to the government's refusal to hear what my colleagues have to say and to the unjust limitation of debate on an issue of such basic importance as the constitution.

Along with other New Democrats I agree with the need to bring our constitution home. I would be happy to see a charter of rights and the principle of equalization enshrined in our constitution. Coming from British Columbia, I am glad that New Democrats were able to get the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to agree to provincial control of resources. Six years ago I saw how the federal government prevented that right and how it hampered the economy of British Columbia under Premier Barrett because it refused to grant that right. Provinces need these rights so that they can develop their own economies without being hobbled by Ottawa.

However, while I support many of the features in the constitutional package, I join with my colleagues in deploring the inadequacies in the charter of rights and its failure to recognize the rights of women and natives.

I wish to direct my remarks particularly to the charter's failure to recognize and enshrine the rights of Canada's Indian, Inuit and Metis people. If we look at the charter we see that it lists in great detail the rights the government considers important. We have inherited many of these rights from centuries-old traditions. They are so deeply interwoven in the fabric of our society that perhaps they do not need to be enshrined, but they are enshrined, and they are spelled out.

Other rights, such as those relating to language, are new and not yet universally accepted. Again, these rights are spelled out in detail.

However, when we come to native rights, what do we find? We have a fuzzy non-statement about non-rights. Section 24 of the charter of rights says, and I quote:

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.

That is all there is, "any rights or freedoms that pertain to the native peoples of Canada". George III did better than that. In the proclamation of 1763 he said, and I quote: