

could look after our problems. As a member of the House I am asking myself what do the people I represent here want me to do. Do they want me to build a new country or to try to initiate a power struggle throughout Canada so that English- and French-speaking Canadians will be for ever arguing with one another? That is not what the people want.

I come from a 100 per cent francophone constituency, where the people are proud of what they are, proud of this individuality, proud of their language and of their property, proud of their culture. However, above everything else, they love their country. What they love most of all is to be able to get along with those with whom they live. What they love most of all is the peace that they can offer their children. What they love most of all is the peace they have enjoyed all their lives. Mr. Speaker, it is not with such speeches that we can provide this security for Canadians. Since the beginning of this debate, the positions of each party have become quite clear. The New Democratic Party said: Fine, we agree to patriate the Constitution and we agree with the charter of rights—indeed, they worked quite hard to have this charter amended—ans we also agree on the amending formula. However, there are certain things that we would like to see and that we feel are important for those we represent. We would like certain things in the area of energy, and so on.

I respect such a position as it is based on the wishes of the population. However, I am having serious doubts about the position of the Progressive Conservative Party. First of all, we have been told that the Conservatives were against unilateral patriation. Then, we were told that they wanted patriation, but without the charter of rights and without the proposed amending formula. We were told that they wanted to amend the charter of rights and were opposed to patriation. They also proposed amendments to the status of women and many other provisions. Then, they asked which formula was the right one. They said it was the Vancouver formula. Last weekend, it proved to be the wrong one, since a two thirds majority is sufficient to have an amendment passed. This formula includes the two third majority rule as well as opting-out and opting-in provisions, and we saw at the last Tory convention the results of a two third majority with opting-in and opting-out provisions. It is clear that their party is out of whack. But let us be serious. In this context, I must conclude that everything the Conservatives now put forward as their position is simply aimed at obstructing our work.

An hon. Member: They are divided!

Mr. Gimaïel: On a point as serious and as basic to our country as language and the bilingualism policy, I am asking one thing, and it is simply this: If the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Simcoe South does not reflect that of the Progressive Conservative Party—

An hon. Member: Shame!

The Constitution

Mr. Gimaïel:—I ask the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) to do what his predecessor, the Hon. Bob Stanfield did in the case of the then hon. member for Moncton, and to expel the hon. member for Simcoe South from his party!

● (1700)

[*English*]

I would like to say this to hon. members in English. I would like to ask the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition to do what is necessary, as the former leader of the opposition, Bob Stanfield, did when he expelled the member for Moncton because he did not support the view of the party with respect to the bilingual policy in Canada. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to do the same thing with the member for Simcoe South, if he was not expressing the view of his party. I ask him to do no less than that. Then we will know the truth.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gimaïel: If he does not do so, this means the member for Simcoe South expresses the view of his party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gimaïel: I am pretty sure, however, that he will not do that, and I should like to explain why. First of all, is not the hon. Leader of the Opposition the man who, during a visit to Chicoutimi, signed the famous petition which the Quebec separatist government had been circulating throughout Quebec for the past six months?

[*English*]

Is he not the man who signed the petition the Quebec government made and circulated throughout the province for the last six months? Yes, they did it in Chicoutimi. The Leader of the Opposition did that.

[*Translation*]

Is it possible for us to say at this time that this party indeed has a policy promoting a bilingual and united Canada? No! In this respect, I should like now to direct my remarks especially to my own constituents. As residents of the Lac-Saint-Jean riding, you have certainly heard Quebec Premier René Lévesque make the following statement: "We are indeed lucky to have the Progressive Conservative Party fighting for our interests in the House of Commons." If that is what you mean when you talk about fighting for the interests of Quebecers in the House of Commons, Mr. Lévesque, just keep on babbling and try to convince everybody that you yourself are fighting for Quebecers.

I, for one, can tell you that I am proud to be here to represent my constituents and to help build our country instead of trying to break it up as you are doing, Mr. Lévesque. Let me tell you that I need not associate with people who make speeches such as this one to convince the people of