

• (1620)

Earlier, my Leader talked about completing the circle. He said Quebec has now come into the constitutional family but that there are aboriginal people and people in the Territories who still do not feel part of that circle. It is time that this nation took that leap of faith and that the Prime Minister and his Cabinet showed a sense of leadership on behalf of the aboriginal people and the people of the Territories by calling that meeting.

While the Prime Minister can call a meeting without consultation, our motion suggests he go one step further and consult with the provinces and make sure there is a First Minister's meeting to resolve these problems and reassure the people of Yukon and the Northwest Territories that their concerns are being heard.

They are the ones who were left out of Meech Lake. They feel that their issues and concerns were ignored by the Prime Minister, the person who is constitutionally responsible for representing their interests. They must next be brought into the constitutional family. I urge Members of the House to pass this motion. It does not speak against Meech Lake, but urges the Government to take action for the aboriginal people of this land and for the people of Yukon and the Northwest Territories who believe they are part of the constitutional family of Canada.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ferland:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) who is talking about native rights. If I look at the wording of their motion, I find that the New Democrats always try to project the image of people who are concerned about problems that are, in fact, non-existent.

The first paragraph of their motion says: "That the Government should seek to restore existing rights of Canadians in Yukon . . .". How are we supposed to restore rights if the rights are already there in the Constitution? I mean, we are not going to reinvent the wheel.

The Meech Lake Accord does not say that the people of Yukon or the Northwest Territories have lost something. They were already included in the 1982 Constitution which you, the New Democratic Party and the Liberals, ratified while excluding Quebec, and you did not object to Quebec's not being included.

You were talking about native rights in Canada, but by excluding Quebec, by excluding 25 per cent of the Canadian population, by excluding a provincial Government which was able to negotiate an agreement with native peoples in Quebec . . . Remember the agreement signed by the Government of Quebec with the native peoples of James Bay? Those agreements were made by Quebec within that province, and on that province's territory, by the politicians who were there at the time. But the 1982 Agreement excluded Quebec from the Canadian constitutional accords and today, they are saying:

### *Supply*

Yes, but it wasn't important for the native peoples to have Quebec in the Constitution. That is what you did in 1982. And today, you are trying to reinvent the wheel.

What I want to say to my New Democratic Party colleague is that it was through our Party, independently from the Meech Lake constitutional agreement and well before it was concluded, that the Indians, the Sechelt band, gained self-determination. Thanks to whom? Thanks to the Government now in office. It had nothing to do with the Constitution. Nothing in the Meech Lake Accord says that native people will be forgotten, on the contrary.

This is why I should like to know on what grounds your motion calls on the Government to restore the rights of northern residents, considering that these rights were never removed from the Meech Lake Accord, and then explain to me why it was not important for Quebec to get aboard to help all native people of Canada.

[*English*]

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, first, I think I should correct some of the inaccuracies in the Conservative Member's statement. He said that the Liberals and the New Democratic Party endorsed the 1982 Agreement. Had he been here at the time he would have known that all three Parties, and again all three Leaders, endorsed the 1982 package. I do not think he can pretend that this was some Liberal and New Democratic Party attempt to ignore the reality of Quebec.

In fact, I know that my Leader, the Member for Oshawa, made some suggestions to make sure that Quebec was in the Constitution. One of the amendments we suggested is now part of the Meech Lake Accord. It would have allowed Quebec to be compensated for any shared-cost program in which it did not want to take part. That was a specific recommendation that we made at that time because we felt strongly that Quebec must be brought into the constitutional family.

The Hon. Member denies that existing rights are being changed. While I do not come from the Northwest Territories, my riding of Churchill is as close as one can get to the Northwest Territories. I spent some time in Yukon and the Northwest Territories. The 1982 constitutional Agreement requires seven provinces and the federal Government to agree to the creation of a new province. This has been a very difficult problem for people in Yukon and the Northwest Territories. Previously, the federal Government could create provinces by itself, as it did for Manitoba, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Newfoundland. After the 1982 constitutional Agreement, the opportunities of people from Yukon and the Northwest Territories were being restricted, but they accepted that.

As a result of the Meech Lake Accord and its successor, we now have a situation in which it takes the agreement of the federal Government and each of the 10 provinces for the creation of a new province. There have been times in our constitutional history when a province or provincial Premier may have had disagreements, sometimes justifiably, about a