

The Address

say that Mr. Trudeau was right to patriate the Constitution just the same and to include a Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

I am sorry, but I disagree. When one of the major provinces of this Confederation doesn't want to sign, for whatever reason, you don't force the issue like Trudeau did in 1982, especially when you are talking about including the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. As the hon. member is aware, this was done to destroy Bill 101, because the Charter of Rights and Freedoms included language rights, although language is an exclusively provincial matter, and by putting this into the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, several sections of Bill 101 became *ultra vires*, so that the Government of Quebec passed Bill 178, thanks to the notwithstanding clause.

So the hon. member was in Sherbrooke, and she mentioned that her present leader had given us a set of guidelines. This is the same man who was there in 1982, and who said recently that he wanted a national referendum, but it didn't matter how Quebec voted, because he would settle the matter once and for all with all Canadians. Furthermore, the hon. member's new leader unreservedly supports the inclusion of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms because it intrudes on the Province of Quebec's jurisdiction over language.

So what does the hon. member have to say about this?

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with any of the remarks made by my colleague opposite.

I can only add that his leader at first supported what was done in 1982; secondly, his leader tried to force things through with the Meech Lake Accord and he failed. A Constitution is alive and can be changed along the way, but very carefully. So I do not feel that I need to go on answering, except that I would like to add some comments, some proposals on the motion that was tabled.

[English]

I continue about constitutional protection under which:

—the preservation of the proportionality existing regarding the representation of the Supreme Court judges coming from Quebec; the participation of the provinces in the appointment process of Supreme Court judges; the strengthening of Canada's economic integration which ensures: one, a free circulation of persons, goods,

services and capital, two, the creation of an efficient, intergovernmental mechanism of consultation and co-ordination of policies, programs and services, three, an effective regional representation within the Bank of Canada, while maintaining the present independence and authority of the latter; the preservation of the principles of equalization payments; the recognition, the respect and the guarantee of rights of our aboriginal peoples including the principle of self-government.

The members of the Liberal Party of Canada, along with the members from British Columbia have approved this document. We are all very pleased with the fact that our leader has given us a basic document. This government chose to use the words of our leader in its throne speech and in the undertakings that it took and it should accept further advice from him and use this as a basic document which can be amended, starting with public hearings in the beginning of September, rather than going to February of next year.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): A point of order, the hon. member for York—Simcoe.

Mr. Cole: Mr. Speaker, I believe in the spirit of co-operation that we have been talking about today that you will find there is unanimous consent to pass the throne speech on division.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The House has heard the motion moved by the deputy government whip.

[English]

Is the House agreed to the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to.

• (1730)

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify that it was not our intention to cut anybody off from debate but to allow the debate to go to 5.45 p.m. The agreement was that at 5.45 p.m. the throne speech would pass on division. I think that is clear now.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Your attention, please. It seems that there was a misunderstanding. I therefore suggest that the debate continue as agreed until 5.45 p.m. and at that time the motion moved by the