

### THE CONSTITUTION

LIBERAL CONVENTION, WINNIPEG—SPEECH OF PRIME MINISTER—ECONOMIC UNION

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa):** Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. On the weekend, in Winnipeg, the Prime Minister said, with regard to the provinces, they are creating a "garrison mentality" in Canada and they are "creating fences to keep" Canadians "apart".

Considering that right after the referendum, the vast majority of Canadian political leaders, including the premiers, indicated a co-operative attitude toward dealing quickly and seriously with constitutional reform, why is the Prime Minister now jeopardizing this very process by using such confrontationalist language?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, I was not at that point talking about the constitutional discussions; I was talking about the importance of preserving in Canada a strong economic union. The Leader of the New Democratic Party is certainly aware that there are certain practices in Canada which would not even be permitted in the European Common Market, in terms of mobility of labour and of capital. I would think I would have the support of at least his party on that subject.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Madam Speaker, the point at hand is not the substance of the matter of the negotiation—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Broadbent:** There is the arrogant shrug once again, Madam Speaker. Why we have a problem with the majority of the premiers who represent all parties—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I cannot allow a long preamble by the hon. member for Oshawa, no more than I can allow it by other hon. members.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Since we are agreed, along with the Prime Minister and many people in the country, to speedy change on the constitution, would the Prime Minister not agree that it is essential to obtain speedy change and to take an attitude toward the leaders of the provinces which is civilized, decent and assumes the same good will which he claims to provide for himself?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Madam Speaker, I would think that any member of this chamber would know that in the past several months and several years the rhetoric of many provincial politicians has been precisely of the kind for which the hon. member is reproaching this government. For months we have been witnessing the spectacle of provincial politicians saying that Ottawa was this or that Ottawa was that, that we were too centralized, that we were not giving enough powers to the provinces, and so on.

I said it in this chamber in the Speech from the Throne, and I repeat again, that the case must be made for preserving the Canadian economic union strong.

### Oral Questions

**Mr. Waddell:** With all the power in your hands.

**Mr. Trudeau:** I understand that on the substance the Leader of the New Democratic Party agrees with me. That is sufficient, and if he is offended at my rhetoric, then I apologize to him.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Madam Speaker, the point is—it is a serious point—not whether we happen to agree or disagree on rhetoric, but that a major first ministers' conference will take place for four days. I would like to ask the Prime Minister, in that context, since fully 80 per cent of the premiers—that is, eight of the ten premiers—since the referendum have had nothing but positive remarks to make about this process, does the Prime Minister not think that it would be appropriate for him to rise to their level, instead of descending to the level of the one or two premiers who have had confrontationalist things to say about the process?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Madam Speaker, I am always prepared to accept lessons in moderation from the Leader of the New Democratic Party and I accept the reproach.

\* \* \*

• (1430)

### HUMAN RIGHTS

EQUALITY OF INDIAN WOMEN UNDER LEGISLATION

**Hon. Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. He will be aware that within the next two weeks the United Nations Human Rights Committee will be ruling on a possible violation of human rights by Canada when the case of Sandra Lovelace, a status Indian woman seeking equality, is considered by the United Nations.

Given that this is the first time Canada's record of human rights has ever had to be questioned by the United Nations, and given that this matter will be considered by that body within the next few days, will the Prime Minister show his government's commitment to human rights by immediately taking steps to remove section 12(1)(b) from the Indian Act, thereby giving Indian women equality before the law, and at the same time removing any condemnation of Canada by the United Nations?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I am sure, Madam Speaker, that the hon. lady would want to put this question in context. She knows, of course, that for several years this government has been attempting to achieve that amendment. The subtlety is that we do not want to impose a solution on the Indian people. We all recognize Indians as having a culture of their own and having a right to preserve that culture. I think the attempt of my government back in 1969 to not only delete that section but, perhaps, to abolish the Indian Act in its entirety was a lesson, for me at any rate, that it was not wise even to go in a progressive direction over the heads of the Indian leaders themselves.

*Oral Questions*

Discussions have been going on for, I would say, a couple of years on that very subject with the Indian leaders. The present Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is in discussion with them. We indicated, I believe it was in the Speech from the Throne, that we would eventually have to act even if they were not all prepared to agree.

I am certainly in agreement with the indications of the hon. lady. Perhaps the case being decided at the United Nations will help persuade the Indian leaders themselves that they should be moving in this direction. But I am satisfied that our minister is trying to do it with their consent, rather than ride roughshod over some of their traditions.

**Miss MacDonald:** Madam Speaker, somewhere in the last few days I heard it stated that human rights are not negotiable. I presume that was with other people, other individuals, other organizations or with anyone in the whole Dominion of Canada. I presumed that was what the Prime Minister meant, that human rights are not negotiable, including the human rights of Indian women.

Since the Prime Minister is not prepared to move in this particular area of removing section 12(1)(b) from the Indian Act, as the Clark government had indicated to the Indian leadership it was prepared to do, I ask him what will the explanation be that he asks the Canadian delegation to take to the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women, which is taking place in Denmark next month, to explain the unwillingness of the Canadian government to come to grips with this issue.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Madam Speaker, I believe the preamble was very important to the question, because the hon. lady indicated a position which I believe is right in saying that human rights are not negotiable. Notwithstanding that, she knows that for at least ten years I have been trying to negotiate with the provinces their acceptance. At some point I suppose you have to act unilaterally. I am glad I would have the support of the party opposite in—

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

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** You are hoist by your own petard.

**Mr. Trudeau:**—acting unilaterally to impose human rights in a constitution if we cannot get agreement with the provinces. The process with the Indians is the same. The human right is as the lady stated, but we would prefer to do it with the Indians, as with the provinces, through persuasion and negotiation. That is what we have been attempting. But I accept the hon. lady's enjoiner to do it unilaterally at some point.

**Miss MacDonald:** Madam Speaker, just a very simple supplementary to the Prime Minister. How long is he prepared to make Indian women wait?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Madam Speaker, in the case of unilateral action on constitutional matters we have been waiting for 53

years. I think it is time to get along with the subject. I hope we will have the support of the hon. lady for that.

**Miss MacDonald:** You won't answer the question.

**Mr. Trudeau:** In the case of the Indians, the former minister responsible tells me we have been discussing it with them for seven years. I would say perhaps one or two years more should be the limit.

\* \* \*

**SPORTS****INJURIES SUFFERED IN BOXING—MEASURES TO REGULATE SPORT**

**Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour as the minister responsible for sport. The death of Cleveland Denny in Montreal today raises the death total to 330 boxers who have died since 1945 from injuries suffered in the boxing ring. The Denny death is reported to have followed the use of a type of blood doping.

My question to the minister—and I noted his reaction to the motion put under Standing Order 43 earlier today—is that if boxing is to be continued as a sport in Canada, what action does he propose to take in regulating the promotion of boxing with the view to eliminating fatalities such as this, and particularly the injuries suffered in the ring?

**Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of Labour):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for what I consider to be a very important question. In doing so, I want to compliment the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain for the resolution that he put before the House today.

There is the difficult question of jurisdiction, not only on an interdepartmental basis but in relation to the division of jurisdiction in such a matter between the federal and provincial governments. I spoke to the distinguished Minister of National Health and Welfare on this matter before coming into the House today. We are certainly going to investigate with the Department of Justice and, if necessary, with provincial authorities, exactly where the jurisdiction lies.

In view of the tragic death of Mr. Denny, which is the latest in a series of unfortunate events in the ring, I think it is most appropriate that those authorities who have jurisdiction carry out, medically and in other ways, a careful review of the practices and the precautions that presently exist to see if they can in one way or in many ways be improved. If they cannot, then I think we must give very serious consideration, as Canadians, to how long we can allow this toll of human life in the ring to continue.

## HEALTH AND WELFARE

## ALLEGED USE OF DOPE BY BOXERS—EFFECT ON USERS

**Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines):** Madam Speaker, since the blood doping seems to be an unfortunate factor in this matter, I will address my supplementary question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Will the minister assure this House and the Canadian people that the type of blood doping alleged to have been used in this instance is not harmful to the user and that no harm can follow the combat that follows such a situation in the boxing ring?

[Translation]

**Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Madam Speaker, as just mentioned by my colleague the minister of amateur sport, we both consulted this morning our respective officials concerning the tragic death of Mr. Denny. The specific question on the quantity of dope in the blood of boxers is part of the problem we would like to have looked into. If I understand current procedures correctly, a medical examination on the eve of a fight is the only requirement at this time. We are not sure that is enough, which explains the unanimous consent of the House, including the government, to having a task force look into procedures in the future.

\* \* \*

[English]

## THE CONSTITUTION

## CONFERENCE IN NOVA SCOTIA—REASON GOVERNMENT DID NOT ATTEND

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the right hon. Prime Minister, who is aware that an important conference on the constitution was held in Wolfville, Nova Scotia, last week. He is also aware that the leader of this party, two former ministers of the Conservative party and three premiers of the four Atlantic provinces were there.

The Prime Minister was invited and three ministers of his government were invited but did not attend. I should like to ask the Prime Minister why no one from the Government of Canada attended this important conference in the Atlantic provinces, which was an insult to the premiers of those provinces.

■ (1440)

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, I am afraid I do not have an answer to that question. I understand the conference was some time last week—

**Mr. Broadbent:** It was Wednesday, Thursday and Friday.

**Mr. Trudeau:** —at a time when most ministers were either working here in the House or preparing for the convention on

## Oral Questions

the weekend. The hon. member knows that the House has not been sitting very much the past two weeks because of the holidays, and I imagine that no minister was able to find himself free to be there. I realize it was an important conference, and I have a briefing note on it. I understand very important subjects were discussed, and in spite of the laughter from the NDP I will attempt—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Trudeau:** Well, the NDP sure needs some publicity in the Atlantic provinces.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

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

**An hon. Member:** You got too much on the weekend.

**Mr. Nystrom:** Madam Speaker, it is the Prime Minister and his party who got the adverse publicity in the Atlantic provinces. Since three premiers were there, and several politicians from the opposition parties, I wonder whether the Prime Minister is now ready to apologize to the organizers of the conference and to the three premiers for not being there or having someone go on his behalf.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Madam Speaker, that seems like a repetition of the same question. Maybe we have the same reason as Premier Peckford had for not being there. But I will find out.

\* \* \*

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

## PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF SPEAKER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, STATE OF VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA

**Madam Speaker:** I would like at this point to draw the attention of the House to the presence in our gallery of the Hon. S. J. Plowman, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Victoria, Australia.

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

\* \* \*

## AGRICULTURE

## DROUGHT IN WEST—ASSISTANCE FOR GRAIN PRODUCERS

**Mr. Jim Schroder (Guelph):** Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the program announced in Yorkton last Thursday for cattle producers to help them cover the drought period, what does the federal government intend to do for the grain producers?

**Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture):** Madam Speaker, the plans that the government has announced will not have anything extra over and above what crop insurance already allows for. Under the programs that we have for crop insurance, any crops that are insurable which farmers have not