Government Orders

[*Translation*]

The hon. member asks if there is unanimous consent to allow him to present a motion.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, because I hope that those or two or three minutes, since time is running out, will not be substracted from the 10 minutes allowed for questions.

I know that the hon. member took the floor at 3.52 p.m., which means that he talked for three minutes. I respectfully submit that there are seven minutes left for an answer from my colleague and for a comment that I would like to make, unless you recognize someone else.

[*English*]

Mr. Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question and comments. Certainly I support in essence any preamble that fully describes the spirit and the soul of the country that we together, irrespective of cultures, irrespective of differences, not only tolerate but respect each other. In that spirit I support the principle of the preamble.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint–Denis): Mr. Speaker, I know that the debate is coming to an end. At this point, I would like, for obvious and very political motives, to be on the record today.

I want to make something clear, and I do this partly because of the speech made by my hon. colleague from Winnipeg who said "the will of the people is supreme". I, Marcel Prud'homme, member for Montreal—Saint-Denis, member representing Quebec in Ottawa, want to be clearly understood.

Regardless of the.past, if there had been a referendum in years gone by, my attitude would have been the same. I do not know, at this point, if I will abstain from voting or if I will support this legislation, but one thing is certain: I want to be clearly understood. My position is unequivocal: Never, and I mean never, will I recognize a referendum through which a majority from outside Quebec would impose its views on that province. This

means that I would have hoped to see in the bill this issue of regional veto.

I am speaking on behalf of my province. I know that Quebec is a region. I leave it up to Canadians to define their regions. I remember an hon. member who wished that Canada would be divided into five regions. This reminds me of our history class in school when we were taught that there were five regions in Canada. Today, others see four regions. I do not have to get involved in this debate. I will talk on behalf of my region.

I want the record to state clearly that, personally, I will never accept that the rest of Canada dictate its views to Quebec. I will go even farther by saying that I would fight anybody from any political party, including mine, who would believe or who would want people to believe that we can, through a Canadian majority, impose something on my province that it does not want.

Mr. Speaker, there is no point in making a long speech. This is a well–thought comment that I wanted to make in the House.

● (1600)

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary–North–East): Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to the remarks made by the member for Saint–Denis. He knows all the admiration I have for him. I agree with what he said. I feel that, as a confederation, we should not, by a pan–Canadian vote, impose a pan–Canadian decision on any province.

I go even further than the member for Saint–Denis. I feel that Alberta surely has the right to be heard. It presently has before its legislature a referendum bill. I really feel that, while we form a confederation, an over–all view should not be imposed on any region or province.

That was by way of a comment.

[*English*]

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I suspect there is not that much time left for questions and comments.

The member who recently got up and to whom we are supposed to be directing our questions and comments through the Chair, of course, said that he was going to support this legislation. Then he went on to list a number of the major areas that the Liberals had said must be in the bill.