

## Supply

• (1515)

Balancing the books also means balancing the common market trade between provinces. We must give up this "what's in it for me" attitude which is prominent among politicians. We are at a crossroads here, a decision about the equality of members, not who can get the most from a country that has served us so well.

The old line political parties have a fossilized vision of Canada. Fiscal mismanagement has led to a significant regional difference between all provinces, not just one. It is time for a new theme. It is time we moved out of Jurassic Park and into the future.

**Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood):** Not clichés.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** Yes, it is a cliché but if you ever saw Jurassic Park, Madam Speaker, it is sitting across from me.

I appeal to the people of Saskatchewan, Newfoundland, Quebec, British Columbia, Alberta, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Ontario, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Yukon and the Northwest Territories to set aside regional differences and work toward a strong, financially secure nation.

Once again, a concern. Our generation of politicians are excluding the millions of young people under the voting age in this discussion. The future of these young Canadians is being decided upon and they will be the ones responsible for this decision and the mess we create. Does it sound familiar? That very kind of philosophy was embedded in Liberalism when they started increasing debt and borrowing year after year, as did the Conservative Party as well. If our young could vote they would not separate, they would build a stronger Canada.

We cannot make a strong nation by emphasizing the differences through multicultural policies, differences through bilingual policies, differences through special aboriginal policies, patronage and other political toys. We are a federation of 10 equal provinces. We are the true north strong and free. We are our home and native land and we will always be a united Canada.

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East):** Madam Speaker, I would like to say that as surprising as it is coming from the Reform Party, I am glad to hear this debate on national unity. For 20 years I have been trying to keep Canada together, doing what I could from the other side of the country, from British Columbia.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that we are a democratic party. Our party is a democratic party so we vote by consensus and majority rule.

During the Charlottetown hearings, and I attended several of these hearings, there were several answers that came out. We

heard what Canadians wanted. The referendum was an expensive one. Referenda are all expensive. I believe that an election is the time for us to vote on whether the work that the government has done is good or not.

I would also like to add that in all these discussions, and I have been listening all morning, I never heard where the Reform Party stands on inherent rights to aboriginal self-government. In fact, during the Charlottetown accord hearings one of the questions that came up constantly and one of the things that people seemed to be agreeing more on was in fact the inherent rights to self-government for the aboriginal people.

I would like to ask my hon. colleague where the Reform Party stands on the inherent right of aboriginal self-government?

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** Madam Speaker, I have just two comments. It is ironic that one hears in the House, as surprising as it is, the Reformers discussing national unity. I would suggest that Reformers are as nationalist as the government. The difference is how you run that government, how you run a country and how you deal with it. I certainly do not subscribe to its approach.

The inherent right of our aboriginal peoples has always been of concern to Reformers. We believe in their inherent right. The difference is that the government has yet to define what inherent right is, what kind of management style it is, how much is it going to cost, will the department of Indian affairs still exist and so on.

• (1520)

We believe in the inherent right of aboriginals to govern themselves, but there are a lot of questions that have to be answered before we would sign on the dotted line and that is understandable.

**Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Waterloo):** Madam Speaker, I have heard many motions on opposition days and I can say that this one is flim-flam. It is phoney. It is political opportunism.

We have a six to seven-part motion. There is absolutely no way I would support the leader of the Reform Party when he spoke this morning of their vision of what a new Canada is. There is absolutely no way.

I am going to refer to what the leader of the Reform Party said on January 20. There are all sorts of other quotes in *Hansard* that we can go to. This is the leader of the Reform Party speaking:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister has repeatedly said that he does not want to reopen constitutional issues at this time and that the priority of his government is jobs and economic growth. Yet yesterday he and other members were repeatedly drawn into heated exchanges with Bloc members on the constitutional future of Quebec.

There are millions of Canadians, including Quebecers, who want Parliament to focus on deficit reduction, jobs and preserving social services.