

Assume somehow you can practically take care of that situation. Given what we have seen trying to reach agreements around this House when we have three or four different parties in a relatively small committee and how long it takes, imagine trying to bring together that group.

Then you tell that group to raise an allocated limited amount of money.

“You shall raise and allocate a limited amount of money.” The native groups would want money to fight this Meech Lake accord because there is nothing in there for Indians and aboriginals and they think it should be defeated.

The National Action Committee would say it wants some money to spend on fighting it because there is nothing in there for women. Then you are going to have the REAL Women organization saying it wants money to fight this because it thinks it has already gone too far in terms of the feminist agenda. Then the CLC is going to have its claim. How would those things be adjudicated?

Suppose the committee decided that REAL Women has a cause and it should be allocated a certain amount of money and air time to fight its cause. Is NAC not going to say: “Okay, that is fine with us”? Of course not. It is going to object strenuously and it will certainly go to a court. What judge is going to say: “Too bad, you cannot participate”?

Common sense indicates that is the wrong thing to do. For example, suppose the question had many parts where you were asking about a package that included Senate reform, aboriginal self-government and all the other items now under discussion.

You may want to campaign against aboriginal self-government and for Senate reform, or *vice versa*. Does that mean you have to be simultaneously on both the yes and no committees or do we have a multiplicity of committees? If you have a multiplicity of committees, do you have one yes committee and several no committees because each group has a different reason for wanting to say no?

Just common sense dictates that would be a foolish thing to do. It is for that practical reason that out of the 600 referenda held in the western world that were

looked at by the Hansard Society in the U.K. at a conference in co-operation with American Enterprise Institute, only one had succeeded in having umbrella groups with limited expenditures and everybody else excluded from campaigning, and that was in Quebec. What happened in Quebec? It was a very unique situation. The question was very simple, basically. You were for sovereignty or you were against it.

In the National Assembly there were two parties. One was for sovereignty and one was against. The legislation provided that committees be set up. The organization would be undertaken by the Parti Quebecois or the Liberal Party of Quebec and anybody who wanted to participate had to do so under one of those committees.

There were no subtleties. People were not asked whether they were for sovereignty with an upper house, sovereignty with native self-government, et cetera. It was a very simple question amenable to that kind of structure. It worked out fine. Everybody found that a reasonable way to participate, and it proceeded.

To impose that model on legislation that is enabling only, in which there could be multiple questions and which could be complex with many parts is to fly in the face of common sense. That is why we had to oppose it.

I thought common sense would dictate. It has been a considerable source of frustration that the common sense argument was either not understood or simply dismissed in the pursuit of the political objective of saying: “Ah, but for fairness you have to have umbrellas and limits”, even while recognizing that kind of ideal is simply impractical, impossible, and there is no way in which it could be done.

**Mr. Edmonston:** Show us the legal opinion.

**Mr. Andre:** The hon. member for Chambly walks in making comments. Typical.

Common sense indicates the charter is very clear in this regard.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Andre:** I hear heckles from the New Democratic Party, and I have never attributed common sense to the New Democratic Party. Do not worry, I am not talking about you. It is important the legislation be as fair, as reasonable and as workable as possible. I believe this bill meets this test.