

of the National Assembly in Quebec in terms of achieving this distinctiveness. It refers, in addition, to legislatures outside of Quebec and the Parliament of Canada.

I would also remind my friend, the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grace—Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) of Section 23 of the Canada Act which talks about minority languages and education rights within those minority languages. It says that all provinces must provide education in the minority language where numbers warrant. Therefore, I think we are covered pretty well in terms of protecting minority language rights.

As more of an opinion than a fact I would say that one way of protecting the French language from coast-to-coast is to ensure that there is very strong protection of it in Quebec. The French language is a minority language in this country and an even smaller minority in North America. We can protect the French language across Canada by protecting it very solidly in Quebec, ensuring that it is not eroded there. If it is solidly protected there, that can help it flourish right across the country.

The English language is very well protected because it is the most important language in the world today. It is the majority language in North America as it is in this country. One way to protect minority rights is to ensure that we have two secure linguistic bases. If people do not feel insecure about that, both can flourish on each other's turf, so to speak.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville (Mr. Nystrom) as well as to those who preceded him, particularly his Leader and the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner). I was very impressed by the clear indication of support which both Leaders have offered with respect to the resolution currently before the House.

With that in mind, would the Hon. Member, on behalf of his Party, be agreeable, in light of the unanimity which seems to prevail, to have this motion deemed adopted, as was the case when we dealt with the Manitoba French-language resolution a few years ago which was sponsored by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy)? I think it is in the interest of all Members of the House to have a clear indication from the House. I sense that there is unanimity and ask whether we might consider, before concluding the debate at six o'clock, to agree to have the motion deemed as adopted by the House.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I understand what the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) wants, and I think it is fair from his point of view. However, those of us who were not direct participants in the constitutional debate at Meech Lake would first want to see the final details of the Accord. I, along with others, have raised some questions about the spending power, whether or not there is a possibility of more Indian rights in the Constitution, and the amending formula as it pertains to the creation of new provinces. Therefore, we would like to see more details.

The Constitution

Second, I know that there are some other Members of Parliament who would not want to vote unless they had a chance to speak. Therefore, a one-day debate with a vote at six o'clock is not really fair.

The third and final point that I will make is with regard to the Manitoba case of a few years ago which the Deputy Prime Minister mentioned. I was here and supported that resolution. I remind the Deputy Prime Minister that in the Manitoba case we had details about what was being debated because there was legislation in Manitoba. There were also court decisions on the Manitoba case and we, therefore, had a lot of information to look at. In other words, the i's were dotted and the t's were crossed. In this case we are debating a question in principle and want to see more details before we will be prepared to vote.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kempling): The time for questions having expired, I will recognize the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Hamelin) for debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles Hamelin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, usually there is a 10-minute period for questions and comments after each speech. It is my understanding that the 10 minute period would not end before 5.57 p.m.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kempling): The Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) is correct that there is a 10-minute period provided for. The 10 minutes have expired according to my clock.

● (1750)

I saw no other Members rising. I immediately proceeded to debate. The Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Hamelin).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles Hamelin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, Canada is a country of tolerance which is in the process of becoming united again with full respect for its differences.

Mr. Speaker, in the early 1980s I joined the team of the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) because I believed he could manage to create a new climate of harmony in Canada and make Canadians regain their aspirations for genuine federalism. I believed he would be able to put an end to the sterile squabbles among the various regions of the country.

[*English*]

I believe that such a change could create a new relationship between Canadians, a more creative, tolerant and generous relationship between Canadians.