

Constitution Amendment, 1987

pensions? Did the Prime Minister not say that during the election campaign? Is it not true that he did just the opposite? I answered the Minister of State for Youth regarding the commitment made during the campaign. All parties said that. The Liberal and Conservative Leaders expressed their views in Ontario; the NDP never said that they were against Quebec signing the Constitution. As to his second question about who worked to bring Quebec in the Canadian fold: it is Robert Bourassa. Who should we congratulate? The Premiers of the other provinces who understood Quebec when the time came. Regarding the amendments, could the Minister of State for Youth who is about to speak tell us who protected the cultural communities and what he has against his colleague for Dollard des Ormeaux? Why is he against protection for the Italians in the Constitution? Why is he against protection for the natives?

• (1300)

I campaigned for protection of cultural communities in Canada. I campaigned for protection of native rights. But you, who are the Minister of State for Youth, you are against natives, you are against cultural communities. Ask your colleague for Dollard (Mr. Weiner) whether he shares your views, whether or not he thinks they should be protected by the Constitution?

Mr. Charest: Mr. Speaker, it might be important to immediately recognize that the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) has probably lost his self-control and is quite ready to cast aspersions on all Members of this House, as he does regarding his colleagues in his own Party when he calls them anti-Quebecers. The Hon. Member for Saint-Henri—Westmount (Mr. Johnston) has been called a “Westmount Rhodesian” by the Hon. Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet). A Member of his own Party has accused the Hon. Member of behaving like a saleslady from Eaton’s. The Hon. Members of his own Party that they behave like Montreal “manglophones” of the 19th century.

To place things in perspective, I think no one will take very seriously the accusations brought against me because, in the final analysis, the Hon. Member had accusations to make against everybody. But if you want to be honest, you ought to say, as well namely to Mr. Bourassa for whom you seem to have great respect, that during the next elections, according to what your leader has publicly admitted on television, you intend to campaign against the Meech Lake Accord. During the next election campaign, you had better go and tell exactly that to Quebecers, to French-speaking Quebecers, because if you do not, there is one thing you can count on us, to let them know.

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, during the next negotiations on matters like the Senate reform and multiculturalism protection, phase II would destroy the Meech Lake Accord, just like the Meech Lake Accord destroyed what had been achieved in the 1982 Accord. Wake up, Mr. Minister, you are going the wrong way! There will always be constitutional negotiations. We must now proceed to the reform of institutions like the

Senate. Your Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said that he wanted to change the Senate. So, if in the next election campaign, he does not take position for Senate reform, it will prove that he misled the people of Canada. If protection of multiculturalism and sharing of jurisdictions between the federal and the provinces are not issues dealt with in the next election campaign, it will mean that the process has been stopped. But Canada will still be there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Minister of State (Youth) (Mr. Charest) on a point of order.

Mr. Charest: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that had the member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie made an effort and read the Meech Lake Accord, he would know that the Senate reform is on the agenda of each and every constitutional conference in the years to come. I would add for his guidance that if he read the Accord he could spare us this completely useless argumentation. Just stick to real questions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (M. Malépart) on a point of order.

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Does this mean that your party only wants to discuss Senate reform and refuses to protect the Canadian cultural communities? If the Hon. Member wants to run on that issue in Dollard, I am game. If he wants to come to the western part of Montreal, and tell the people in Saint-Léonard that his party never wants to go back to the bargaining table to protect cultural communities, to protect native people, it's his privilege, Mr. Speaker, not mine. As far as we are concerned, the Constitution remains a permanent concern.

I must also tell the Minister of State (Youth) that the Constitution is like a huge collective agreement. Year after year to meet the needs people will make changes to the Constitution with a view of improving it.

As to the protection of native people, even the Pope when he came here, asked the Canadian people to protect our aboriginal people and be generous towards them. Now the Minister of State (Youth) says no to this request made by the Pope. The people of Sherbrooke will remember.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Since there are two points of order, I shall entertain another question from the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville (M. Nystrom). Afterwards, debate will resume with the Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville (Mr. McCurdy).

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to ask a question. As an informed member I agree with the distinct society clause for Quebec and I have signed the special committee's report, and so on.

Something else I want to mention is the fact the province of Saskatchewan was the first English-speaking province to adopt the resolution, and I am proud of that.