

Supply

[English]

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, my friend from Chambly has raised a number of questions, some of which are even connected to each other.

[Translation]

When I consider the culture and history of Newfoundland and Quebec, I find some similarity in their history. I know it is not a good choice of words. But in spite of the all-pervasive presence of the Church, the dependence on natural resources such as the fishing industry in Newfoundland and farming in Quebec, their cultures were also very different.

[English]

Newfoundlanders are as different from other Canadians as Quebecers are in many ways and I do not want to equate the distinct society thing.

If you end up at a party with Canadians from every province, you end up with the Newfoundlanders and the Quebecers fighting over the rum bottle in the kitchen.

Mr. Langlois: Screech.

Mr. Reid: We end up in construction camps in northern Canada together. We have large families, or we used to have large families together. I think, Mr. Speaker, we have viewed the world very much the same way. We got forgotten a little bit. Perhaps sometimes by nature we got forgotten, left out there, in my case on a cliff and in Quebec on a large field on which it is difficult to grow things.

But that is something that should draw us together, something that demands that we look at the world very much in the same sort of way. I use the example of Newfoundland.

• (1730)

The shared values that my friend from Chambly talks about are shared values that we can have between any of the provinces in Canada, if only we take the time to look, and stop throwing barriers up in front of ourselves, providing excuses for us not to go ahead and find some solutions. We are allowing ourselves to be angered by things that normally would really not anger us if we thought about it.

Sometimes in some parts of Canada it is kind of cool to walk on flags, where it is accepted to be against one group or another. Unfortunately, it is far too easy. It is

too easy to be anti-somebody, and it is too easy to insult a particular group, or exclude a particular group, because perhaps sometimes to accept that we may not be as tolerant as we like to think demands that we not only look at ourselves as we are today, but demands that we do things in the future a little bit differently.

I think if we are willing to take some of those steps, some of the things that my friend from Chambly talks about, perhaps that may see us through all of this.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, I listened very closely to the speech by the hon. member for St. John's East. The remarks and the arguments that he made seem to me to be strongly supportive of the motion before us by the hon. member for Yukon. His remarks strongly supported a broadly based process. He supported consultation with many groups, including aboriginal peoples, minority groups and so on.

When I look at the motion, that is what the motion says. It says that the process must be broadened, that it must include not only governments but parliaments, including the various parties in parliaments. The motion also says it must include discussions with the aboriginal peoples, with women's groups, cultural communities, language minorities and that the process must be open and transparent.

Consequently, I want to ask my hon. friend what parts of this motion he is opposed to. I cannot seem to understand that he is opposed to any of the parts. I know he is with the joint standing committee and it is studying the amendment formula and consulting broadly, but it is not studying all the different aspects of the Constitution. Therefore, I put the question to him, listening to his remarks, how can he be opposed to this motion? If he is opposed to the motion, what parts of the motion is he opposed to?

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, my friend from Notre-Dame-De-Grâce knows that I try to be positive and I try to be supportive. However, as I said before I started, I also try and be sure of where I am going. The essence of the individual points of this motion I obviously have very little concern with. Yes, I could enter into a debate on some of the specifics.

I think, though, the time is not right in that, as I said earlier, we have the process of Bélanger-Campeau, we have the process that has been undertaken by Ontario, by Quebec, obviously, and by Manitoba. I think there is a