

*Supply*

heard day after day, "If Meech is rejected, you are rejecting Quebec", but he sent a second stringer out to try to explain the importance of the deal in the rest of Canada. He did not have the courage of his convictions in English in the same way as he did in French.

I will tell you that I, as one who defended and supported in the House through trials and tribulations of my own party, am prepared to throw my lot in with whatever movement can save this country. But I will also tell you that we have to learn from the message of Meech.

• (1520)

The message of Meech is that if we take constitutional reform as a seamless web, if we prevent public input, if we prevent real parliamentary discussion, then we are dooming the results to failure. We do not want failure on this side of the House. We want success. We want to work with whatever political parties are capable of achieving that, but we want to do it with the full participation of the Canadian people so that we can truly have a Canada round of constitutional discussions.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Richelieu has the floor. He has only 30 seconds.

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu):** I just want to remind the leader of the Liberal Party that the only reason Mr. Chrétien appeared at all before the Commission was because he had not been elected yet as a member of Parliament when he made his request. We all know that hon. members were not allowed to appear before that Commission. There is nothing heroic about that, specially with all the rubbish he said then. In any case, Mr. Chrétien, as you know, personifies everything that can possibly be harmful and treacherous to the Quebec nation.

Therefore, would the hon. member be prepared to recognize, as Acting Leader of her party, that during the next referendum in Quebec, the federal government should respect the limit of 2,2 million dollars each for the "yes" committee and the "no" committee and not be allowed to spend 25 million dollars as it did during the last referendum to launch a crushing assault on democracy in Quebec?

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** First, I would like to reply to some falsehood expressed by the hon. member. I assumed, coming from a person who has based his whole career on Quebec separation from Canada, that he would admit the truth about the Bélanger-Campeau Commission, because, in fact, hon. members appeared in front of the Commission, including the hon. member for Chambly who made a submission. There was also his seat mate, the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer. I don't see why he argues that members did not have the right to appear.

The hon. member for Hull—Aylmer made a submission, which proves the falsehood of what he was saying. If they want to speak about the Bélanger-Campeau Commission, they should tell the facts as they are, because when they tell Canadians that the Prime Minister and other people were not permitted to appear, this is absolutely false. Anyone who wanted to could appear. Many things can be blamed on the Liberals, but not that, because we appeared and our leader made a submission which provided the basis for the amendment we are proposing today. If the Bloc Québécois was even so slightly opened to constitutional reality, they would realize that other people—outside the Bloc Québécois—have ideas about renewing the system for the good of Quebec and the rest of Canada. If you want to play chess with the situation, whether it is on the federal side or on the separatist side, I can tell you I am not here to let federalism be checkmated.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Resuming debate. The hon. member for Sherbrooke.

**Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke):** Mr. Speaker, I don't want to spend too much time on the case made by my colleague from Hamilton East. I just want to say that I am pretty satisfied with the answers she gave me a few minutes ago. Although very passionate, I think she is much closer to the kind of non-partisan approach we should be looking for in the future in a constitutional debate. And in concluding, as far as the hon. member is concerned and Mr. Chrétien's testimony before the Bélanger-Campeau Commission, I think it is pretty clear, Mr. Speaker, and I might as well call a spade a spade, that if Mr. Chrétien, the leader of his party, had taken the trouble to say what he thought about the June 9 accord, without pulling any punches, perhaps there