

*Oral Questions*

enhanced. I commend the Hon. Member for his perception in that regard.

I want to say that in terms of the whole process of constitutional change with regard to the aboriginal peoples of Canada, I have already had an opportunity of meeting with representatives of the groups, with the exception of the AFN, and my colleague, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, has in fact been in constant contact with that important representative group.

It is our intention to carry on and find the best way possible to deal with the question of constitutional changes of aboriginal self-government. We will continue our liaison and discussion. I am going to consult with my cabinet colleagues and develop a strategy to deal with that matter to ensure that the priority for that development is in fact maintained.

## CREATION OF NEW PROVINCES

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear that the Minister of Justice and the Government are open to having that added as a third component to the First Ministers' Conference for next year. In relation to Yukon and N.W.T., I have searched the record myself from 1981 until now and have been unable to find a position put forward by any province or any federal Party suggesting that an over-all veto be provided to each province for the creation of new provinces north of 60°. Prior to 1982 it was bilateral. Since 1982 it has been seven provinces with 50 per cent of the population. Is the Minister of Justice prepared to be sensitive to the aspirations of northerners and be similarly prepared to leave the door open to northerners for the creation of new provinces?

**Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I am trying to recall any Member who gave any greater attention in leadership to that matter than the Member who represented Yukon for so many years in this Parliament, the Hon. Erik Nielsen. We have maintained that commitment in our Party to northern Canada.

● (1430)

I want to say that there is—and it has been pointed out by the Deputy Prime Minister—the reality that legal proceedings are in fact before the courts at the present time which limit my ability to speak on the particular matter.

The fact of the matter is that we as a Party and as a Government are committed to the enhancement of the northern part of the country. I think our policies in that regard are worthy of commendation and will be seen to be the right way to go in years ahead.

## REQUIREMENT FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT OF PROVINCES

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Justice to address his mind for a moment to the point I made a moment ago. Nowhere on the public record in Canada are the positions of the provinces or of the Parties represented

in the House of Commons endorsing the requirement for the support of all 10 provinces for the creation of new provinces.

Would the Minister of Justice tell the House why the federal Government took the initiative to include subclauses (e) and (f) of the old Clause 42 and roll them into the new Clause 41 when there were no provinces or no Parties in the House of Commons on the public record? On what grounds did it take that action?

**Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, that is quite untrue. I do not recall any particular participant in the First Ministers' meeting not agreeing to the particular proposition. In fact, all Parties were represented at the table. All Parties in the country had representatives at the table in the sense that there are Governments from four different political Parties.

The Hon. Member is just speaking through his hat when he makes that allegation. I remember the leadership which the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs has given over the years in respect of the devolution of provincial status for northern Canada.

Our commitment is maintained there, and we will continue to work to that end.

[Translation]

PROMOTION OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH LINGUISTIC DUALITY—  
POSITION OF GOVERNMENT AND PROVINCES

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. The 1987 Constitutional Accord makes it an obligation for Canada and the provincial legislatures, including Quebec's, to protect the basic characteristic of this country, namely the French and English linguistic duality. If this duality is accepted, does it not deserve to be enhanced, and why were the provincial legislatures as well as the Parliament of Canada not asked to promote it?

[English]

**Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting to note that the Hon. Member has had a long interest in and support for the principles of bilingualism in Canada. Indeed the Accord has addressed in a very new and progressive way the undertaking of all provinces and the federal Government regarding the principles of a fair and equitable system of bilingualism in Canada.

This is an historic document, an historic agreement. I think the First Ministers showed the spirit of co-operation in our country in respect of this important topic. We should all commend those participants in this regard.

[Translation]

INCLUSION OF SPECIAL PROVISIONS IN CONSTITUTION—PRIME  
MINISTER'S POSITION

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that, as far as duality is concerned, the