

Speaker, that certainly in the North, the Tory "trust me" is just not good enough.

I have spoken briefly about the provincehood issue. There is another area that remains unchanged, and that is, the clause regarding boundary extension. Do the First Ministers actually envisage that the Yukon will become part of British Columbia, that the Western Arctic will become part of Alberta? Do they really harbour such fantasies of a land grab in this day and age? Can any Canadian take such an idea seriously? Would Albertans, for example, stand by while Manitoba took over Calgary and Edmonton? It is ludicrous. Therefore, why is it there?

I would like to say a few words now about the people of the North. As the Hon. Minister said yesterday, Constitutions are the peoples. I would like to talk about the peoples of the North who, like everyone else in Canada, live, work and raise families. We must first remember that the North is an important part of Canadian history, not just a history of gold rushes, whalers, missionaries and fur traders, but it has a rich heritage of aboriginal people whose ancestors have lived in the North for at least 30,000 years.

These people are not exotic supplements to *National Geographic*. They are politicians, scientists, business people, trappers, hunters, storekeepers, linguists and archeologists. As an example, in Old Crow, Yukon, there is a man who does not read or write but who, without the aid of any of our culture's science, classified 200 species of birds, not in Latin but in Loucheu, not written on paper but remembered and recited orally. He is a scientist. He is a northerner. He is a Canadian.

There are those who came to the Yukon as fur traders, adventurers, seeking gold, seeking jobs, building the highway. They stayed to build a country, your country, Madam Speaker, and mine. I know a woman whose father carried a piano on his back over the Chilkoot Pass on his way to the gold rush. Today that woman, her children and her children's children are building a society in the Yukon. They are Canadians.

I know a miner, a refugee, who works at a difficult and dirty job but who is proud "she" and her family are Canadians. She can work here and build her community in her Canada and our Canada.

I know farmers—yes, Madam Speaker, there are farmers in the North—raising cattle and growing crops under very difficult environmental conditions. They are working to ensure the self-sufficiency of the North. They are Canadians.

There are many more. There are fishermen, business people, gourmet cooks. There are theatres and cinemas. There are singers and song writers. From Watson Lake to Old Crow, from Dawson to Haines Junction, from Mayo to Faro, in Teslin, Tagish, Carmacks, Carcross, Elsa, Snag, Burwash, Swift River, Beaver Creek, Moose Creek and Whitehorse, and in the 13 Indian bands of the Yukon, there are Canadians who elect governments territorially, elect Members of Parliament,

Constitution Amendment, 1987

who raise their families, run their businesses, drink a beer now and then, and understand themselves to be full-fledged Canadians. As an aside, Madam Speaker, Revenue Canada certainly appears to agree with them.

Unless amendments are made to this Accord, northern Canada will be saying it is only half Canadian, that our voice does not count.

At one time when people from the south asked me what I did for a living, I would say somewhat facetiously: "I am paid to occupy the North". We see increasing instances of our sovereignty under dispute, but it will not be through further militarization that we assert our sovereignty. It will be through pointing to Yukoners, to residents of the Northwest Territory, to the Inuit, to the Dene, the Loucheuc and other aboriginal and non-aboriginal groups, saying: "This is our land. These are Canadians. This is Canada".

With respect to our specific concerns which are addressed in these amendments, such as appointment to the Supreme Court, why would members of the Bar, many of whom belong to several provincial Bars but reside in the Territories, be excluded? It defies logic. There is the need for a resolution of aboriginal rights, further aboriginal rights conferences. As aboriginal groups have so eloquently said, the circle of Confederation will not be closed until Canada's first peoples are recognized.

● (1640)

Finally, provincehood, not now but for the future. Surely this is a logical extension of our history to date. The Government of Canada has a fiduciary duty to protect the interests of the North and aboriginal people. Can the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) truly say that he has fulfilled this duty?

In an article in *The Toronto Star* on September 20, 1987, Richard Gwynn stated, "The Arctic matters deeply in itself to Canadians. It matters in terms of sovereignty; and of the environment. It matters most perhaps, psychologically. It rounds us out as a nation; giving us depth and form". I could not agree more.

Representing that part of Canada which has no vote and no voice, I must vote against this Accord as it stands, unless amended. I urge Members to listen to the amendments which will be put forward by our Party which will add to making this Accord acceptable to a much broader range of people.

As I mentioned earlier, we were not part of the consultation process. This is the only formal forum in which we can speak and say no. I urge Members of the House to support the amendments of the NDP.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Madam Speaker, I feel that this debate is about Canada, about ourselves, about the way we perceive ourselves and it is also a debate on the division of powers to enable us to do the things which we have to do as citizens, in our country.