

Government Orders

While we are talking about the people I do admire on this debate, I must tell you some of the interventions I have not admired because I do not think they were very appropriate.

My friends from the Bloc Quebecois are hon. colleagues. One has been elected here as a member of the Bloc, but I consider them to be more or less the Hari Krishnas of the independent movement. They come out and give very fatuous and not very intellectual arguments. It is almost like what we hear in Quebec. There is a fellow by the name of Charbonneau who sells Vitagro. He used to say: "*Parole de Charbonneau, c'est Vitagro qu'il vous faut*", or by the word of Charbonneau Vitagro, it is what you need for your plants.

It is like the independence movement in Quebec. If the *Independantistes* want to convince us, they have to give us more arguments than telling us: "Well, listen this referendum is no good. It is terrible. It is treasonous. It is against the rest of the country", because that is not true. There is nothing treasonous about this. A bad law is a bad law. It is as simple as that and \$108 million is something the Liberals understand because they are used to spending big bucks.

I have a letter here, dated May 26, 1992, issued by the Liberal Party and it is a fund-raising letter. It is about the referendum. You know what the Liberal Party says? It is signed by the Leader of the Opposition who says: "For many months, I have maintained that the so-called constitutional crisis was caused and fuelled by politicians". He is right. He is one of them. Do you know what he says at the end? "If you agree with me, please help us fight for your democratic rights. Please send us \$100, \$500, \$200, \$50—there is nothing less than \$50 here—or a special gift". I guess this is the referendum lotto. I do not know but this is a special gift. He is saying: "Help us fight the referendum".

Members on the other side got these fund-raising letters. The point I am trying to make here is when the Liberals were sending off this fund-raising letter asking for \$50 or more that would make Tammy Baker proud, they were at the same time getting tossed out by the government on every one of the amendments my good friend the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel and others considered crucial to this debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows:

[*Translation*]

the hon. member for St. Boniface—Youth employment; the hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre—Job creation; the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie—Trade; the hon. member for York West—Employment; the hon. member for Prince George—Buckley Valley—Softwood lumber industry.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bill to which the concurrence of this House is desired:

Bill S-10, an act to incorporate the Green Shield Canada Prepaid Services Association.

Pursuant to Standing Order 135(2), the bill is deemed read the first time and is placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading at the next sitting of the House.

* * *

[*English*]

REFERENDUM ACT**MEASURE TO ENACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Andre that Bill C-81, an act to provide for referendums on the Constitution of Canada, be read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): It being 4.45 o'clock p.m., pursuant to order made Wednesday, June 3, 1992 in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of third reading of the bill now before the House.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.