is French, but because it has become more and more European. We know that the Greeks in Quebec have taught us about the restaurant business. Many Italians are engaged in construction and have brought us new ideas. Quebec has progressed, it has changed with the French majority, with the English minority, but to those were added—an important feature that must be protected—cultural communities.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that even if the Prime Minister does not take his responsibilities and the amendments moved by the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party are defeated, I will vote for the Meech Lake Accord.

Hon. Jean C. Charest (Minister of State (Youth)): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) on his truly splendid intellectual tour de force. He actually managed to rise in the House and say all of the following: First of all, I support the amendments my party is proposing which would, for all practical purposes, make the Meech Lake Accord null and void, but on the other hand, I am going to vote for the Meech Lake Accord. He says: It is your Government's fault and your Prime Minister's fault if Quebec enters the Federation. We want it to enter Confederation, but it will be your fault if it does. That takes some doing, Mr. Speaker. I think he managed to criticize just about everyone except, of course, you yourself, Mr. Speaker. He did not criticize Robert Bourassa, but he will later on because he mentionned free trade. Mr. Bourassa supports free trade, and the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) is against free trade. Since our Government's position is that of Mr. Bourassa, who has praised our Prime Minister's position, the Hon. Member will have a chance to criticize him later on.

Personally, I would like to remind the Hon. Member of a few historical facts. He feels Mr. Bourassa has a great deal of merit. I can't say I disagree. In fact, I think he has quite considerable merit. Does the Hon. Member remember that during the 1984 election campaign . . . Funny, I remember a speech made in Sept-Îles by the then Leader of the Opposition, today the Prime Minister of Canada, in which it was made quite clear that bringing Quebec into the Constitution was part of our election platform. Funny, I remember a visit by the Hon. Member's present Leader or his tentative or interim Leader, a visit to Quebec in the riding of Rimouski, where he criticized people who voted yes in the referendum. He said they had no right to run for office. I did not hear any criticism from the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) at the time. And that is the team that today is going to vote yes, no and maybe on whatever issue is tabled. I would like him to respond, I have a few questions to ask him. First, does he support his Party's abstentions concerning the report of the Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons—indeed the position of his Party until now with respect to the Meech Lake Accord is abstention. Unless I am mistaken you are now defending and representing the position of abstentions, probably those who are absent because you are also the people whose absence in Quebec right now is most obvious.

As a matter of fact, not only will 13 of your colleagues not endorse the Party position, which is to abstain, because that is the official position, but now they will vote against, 13 out of 40, yet he refers to the fact that we have two in our Party, two out of 200, including one who also comes from northern Canada and who, for the same reason as the present Member for Yukon, has chosen to vote against the Meech Lake Accord. So I am curious to know whether he too is abstaining. I am also curious to know whether, during the next election campaign, he intends to advocate the Meech Lake Accord amendments now proposed by his Party and which will obviously be defeated. So the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie should tell us right now, yes or no, if he intends to be, if he can be frank during the next election campaign. His answer will now give us an idea of his frankness. If he does not respond we will know exactly where he stands, particularly if his answer is evasive. Yes or no, during the next election campaign will the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie speak in favour of the Meech Lake Accord amendments he is proposing today?

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Minister of State (Youth) (Mr. Charest) has reminded me about the promises of his leader during the electoral campaign. He lied to the population and misled senior citizens and families. All the parties said about the commitment to a Constitutional Accord that Quebec had to rejoin the constitutional family. Have you ever heard a Canadian stupid enough to say that he did not want Quebec in the Constitution, except for the Hon. Member for Sherbrooke? Mr. Speaker, this clearly shows his stupidity. The Prime Minister lied to the population during the electoral campaign. Senior citizens have said so. Moreover, 71 p. cent of the population disagree with him.

Mrs. Mailly: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Mailly) on a point of order.

Mrs. Mailly: I think that it is obvious, Mr. Speaker. I am asking myself certain questions. The Hon. Member speaks about liars and so on. He did not reply to the question. He acccuses everyone of lying, including the Prime Minister. I therefore ask for your guidance, Mr. Speaker. Is it proper in this House to use such language in a debate of this importance on the Constitution and the rights of Quebec?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is not unparliamentary language. I do not believe that the Hon. Member for Montréal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) meant that the Prime Minister had lied deliberately. I shall therefore give him the benefit of the doubt. The Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie.

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, can the Hon. Member who just rose on a question of privilege deny that her Prime Minister had said he would restore full indexation of Old Age Security