

The irony of Meech Lake is that we are left with the 1982 Constitution with a Charter of Rights about which there are many questions, and a Supreme Court which will in effect legislate as it works its way through that Pandora's box.

On the other side we have annualized constitutional conferences where everyone will end up fatigued or the public will be turned off because those conferences will fail from time to time. All they will amount to is a showboat photo opportunity. Those are built in to the Constitution. At the same time Parliament will in effect be mute in so far as contributing anything to the processes concerned before the First Ministers sign on the dotted line. I am saddened by that. I want Quebec in but, quite frankly, I am looking at it in the same way that Premier Bourassa did in 1971. He was not anti-Quebec when he walked away from the Quebec formula. He was pro-Quebec. I want Quebec in but I want it in a new Confederation that will be able to meet the challenges of this world, not a federation emasculated by all these other things in the Meech Lake Accord, some of which I have not touched upon.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Questions or comments.

Mr. Waddell: Madam Speaker, I congratulate the Hon. Member on his speech. He and I share opposition to this Accord and we are in a small minority.

If Canadians really understood this debate, does the Hon. Member think they would favour a Senate controlled by the provinces, one which will be able to veto the laws of this House? Do Canadians favour a Supreme Court chosen by the provinces when it will be the referee between the federal Government and the provinces? Does he think Canadians favour this veto power which puts us in a constitutional strait-jacket? Does he think Canadians favour the notion that future federal spending programs may be limited, as witnesses such as Professor Jack London of the Law School of Western Ontario said in committee? We may not have a national day-care program but a series of checkerboard programs or none at all. Does he think Canadians favour an immigration policy checkerboarded across the country with the provinces controlling it? Does he think Canadians favour leaving native people out, or women, who fought so hard for their rights in 1982? Does he think they favour leaving the multicultural reality out? I do not think so.

When Canada was playing the Soviet Union, it was not Team Alberta with Gretzky or Team Quebec with Mario Lemieux. It was Team Canada. Does he not think Canadians share a greater vision of Canada where the central Government plays a greater role, not just one of 11 equal Governments? That is the true vision of Canada that Sir John A. Macdonald, Laurier, Mackenzie King, Diefenbaker, Pearson and Trudeau had. That view is the view of the majority. That is why we have a country, not a bunch of provincial dictators trying to run the country through these conferences, which amount to another level of Government. How do we get that message out? I think they are on our side.

Constitution Amendment, 1987

I agree with the Hon. Member, we want Quebec in. I am prepared to recognize the distinct society. I would go further than he and accept the five suggestions of Premier Bourassa. However, this goes way beyond that. Add that to free trade and you have a double whammy.

I think we are losing this country and I would like to know how we are going to get the message out to Canadians.

Mr. Nowlan: Madam Speaker, I will be very brief because I obviously agree with almost everything the Hon. Member said. I could go along with the five conditions as well, more or less the way one Party did. Former Prime Minister Trudeau gave evidence before a committee and he was asked about who in Quebec really cares. He said other than some professors and politicians about 95 per cent of the people really are not aware or do not care. Quite frankly, as a Tory wondering about our standing in Quebec, because we are all so conscious of polls, I am amazed that if this great concern has filtered down to the people why is it not reflected in our position in that province?

I am afraid that the Canadian public, anglophone and francophone, are bored to tears with the Constitution. The message has not gone out. I do not think they really appreciate the way this process has come about. It has happened so quickly without public debate. Yes, it went to committee but that was in the summer. Our summers are so short that no one really pays attention to politics then.

• (1640)

The Member spoke out. I saw a little blurb in the paper while I was flying back to Ottawa on Sunday. I did not know that he was going to do what he did. I have received responses on the very strong position that I have taken. I think that people do not yet care because the message has not got out.

The Editor of *The Globe and Mail* who appears on *The National* every so often is such a pontificator as to make the infallibility of the Pope pale by comparison. Yet that paper has not led the debate. If I was from Quebec I would be all for this. If I was a francophone outside of Quebec I would be very concerned. I am concerned for Canada.

Mr. Berger: Madam Speaker, I want to compliment the Member on his magnificent speech. I hope other Members of Parliament will take the opportunity to read his speech or, even better, watch a videotape of it. You will agree with me, Madam Speaker, that very few were present for the Member's speech.

With regard to the interest of Canadians, Jean Marchand, who used to represent a riding in Quebec City, used to tell the story about the marine worker in his constituency who came home at the end of the day. When his wife asked him what kind of day he had he said that he had had an awful day, that he had a headache and could not concentrate on his work all day because he was worrying. When she asked what he was worrying about, he said he was worrying about the Constitution.