

for once with the Hon. Member for Saint-Henri—Westmount. This looks very much like a conversion and smacks of political expediency. I hope such is not the case, because it would be very sad that a man should have all the right principles for the wrong reasons.

I would like to ask him two questions.

Here is my first question. He was saying a while ago that the new spending powers under the Accord would not weaken Canada. Is he planning to encourage Mr. Pawley to keep his mouth shut when the time comes to deal with this aspect, since the NDP leader in Manitoba was apparently the one who created problems and almost caused the Meech Lake Accord to fail?

Here is my second question. He mentioned the amendment aimed at protecting the multicultural dimension of Canada. He said that we are a mosaic and not a melting pot, like the United States. The Quebec federal NDP leader, Mr. Harney, seems determined to create division and conflict again, saying that the linguistic rights—

• (1250)

[English]

What is going to happen to the minorities in Quebec if Mr. Harney, the federal leader of the NDP in Quebec at the moment—

**Mr. Benjamin:** You have everything wrong.

**Mrs. Mailly:** His approach is that he does not care about the rights of minorities because he wants language matters strictly under provincial jurisdiction. What are you going to do about that?

These are two questions that I think have to be answered if you are going to make yourselves the defenders of a distinct and proud Quebec society.

**Mr. Nystrom:** First, Mr. Harney speaks for himself, I am sure, like the Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley—Hants (Mr. Nowlan) will speak for himself.

The Hon. Member asked about spending power. Mr. Pawley signed the agreement, and partly because of his insistence the wording was strengthened with respect to the federal objectives. He made a very useful contribution towards strengthening the federal objectives, making sure they were compatible with the federal Government. We can all be proud of his contribution. I certainly am. I am also surprised that the Hon. Member would make that rather partisan remark.

As to Quebec, this is not a new-found interest in that province. I and the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) can give the Hon. Member our policy books and she will find that, with Robert Cliche and Tommy Douglas back in the sixties, there was a recognition that Quebec was a unique and distinct society.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Go back to the 1940s and Thérèse Casgrain.

### *Constitutional Accord*

**Mr. Nystrom:** My colleague refers to the 1940s. I was not around the conventions in those days, but Madam Casgrain, a respected woman in Quebec, talked about the uniqueness and difference of Quebec. It is not a sudden discovery by the NDP that Quebec is different.

**Mrs. Mailly:** You supported the Liberals who were against all these principles.

**Mr. Nystrom:** Just a last comment, Madam Speaker, please?

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** The time for questions and comments is over. The Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley—Hants (Mr. Nowlan) has the floor.

[English]

Resuming debate.

**Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants):** Madam Speaker, I know other Members want to speak and our time is limited, so I will do something I usually do not do, stay fairly close to my notes.

I listened with a great deal of interest to my friend, the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville (Mr. Nystrom) who always speaks with eloquence and passion. I agree with much of what he said. I am not going to touch on some of the things I fully agree with, especially what he said about the North. However, I want to deal with some of the other items that he mentioned.

This is either the beauty, the challenge or the curse of this debate. In listening to his logic in interpreting the Meech Lake Accord I am almost reaffirmed in my concern about some of the very things he sees so positively, but which I think create real problems. He talks quite rightly about the Machiavellian politics going on in the other Chamber by that muse from Lake Ainslie in Nova Scotia, MacEachen Incorporated. He has come out of his cave of hibernation and is trying to impose himself in the parliamentary process by playing monopoly with the concerns of the citizens of this country.

I said, along with Stanley Knowles, many years ago that I am for abolition of the Senate. One of my first essays in political science dealt with the reform of the Senate. However, what I cannot accept from my hon. friend who just spoke so well is that he laments the hacks, flacks, and all the political patronage in that Chamber down the hall, yet does not raise any questions about how the new method works. There is still going to be appointments of hacks, flacks, and good people, but instead of being appointed only by a Prime Minister after consultation, the appointments will now come from a list provided by the provinces. The form has not been changed.

If my hon. friend, who has been around here for a few years, along with some Premiers who are a little newer to the political game, really believes, given the unanimity rule for amending federal institutions, that there is a snowball's chance in that place down below of making any fundamental reform to the Senate, he is wrong. Triple E goes out the window. Instead of