

I will conclude to give another member a chance before we vote at five o'clock by saying it is easy to criticize. It is much harder to be constructive. It is easy, as some members have already stated in the House, to demolish. It is a lot more difficult to build.

It is much easier to criticize, but it takes a lot of the leadership and courage for the Prime Minister to deliver on his commitment to Canadians of October 27.

• (1650)

We could have consulted all the premiers of the provinces but we have seen what consulting the premiers does. The Mike Harris and the Ralph Kleins of the world who loved Quebecers prior to the referendum will fall into the trap that the future premier of the province of Quebec will set for us. The Reform Party is falling hook, line and sinker into that trap. I appeal to all the premiers of the provinces to work hand in hand with the Prime Minister who has only taken the first very important step.

The Chinese have a saying: the journey of a thousand miles starts with the first step. We have to take the first step. The Prime Minister has shown leadership today. I ask the future premier of the province of Quebec to respect his commitment and the democratic will expressed by all Quebecers, not only the 51 per cent that voted not but also the 15 or 30 per cent of those who voted yes, expecting to remain a province of Canada and work with us to build a better and stronger Canada.

I appeal to the premiers of the provinces to work with the Prime Minister over the next 18 months or whatever time is allotted to respect the will and desire expressed by Canadians on October 27. I appeal to the premiers of all provinces not to let that tremendous show of affection go to waste. That is what will happen if we cannot come together and work hand in hand. Whether Reformers, members of the Bloc Quebecois or NDPers, all of us owe it to Canada to work hand in hand to make sure our country remains united and strong.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I thought the member for Vaudreuil had a lot of nerve when he indicated that somehow Reformers should be castigated because they were not involved enough in the referendum campaign, when he and his colleagues in the House and outside the House told us we should not get involved at all, that we should stay out of the referendum.

It so happens that we got involved as much as the legislation would allow us to become involved. In fact many pollsters indicate that the Reform played a positive role in the outcome of the vote, in determining a no vote.

### *Government Orders*

Then the member and his colleagues have the nerve to say afterward that we should have been more involved. That is not right. It is beneath the dignity of this place to play those types of political games.

I was expecting to ask the member a question. I hope he will be in his seat to respond during this question and comment period. I noticed in Doug Fisher's column in the Ottawa *Sun* today that he commented on the Liberal caucus meeting where the whole issue of peace, order and good government was raised. He said it sent shock waves through the Liberal caucus meeting on December 5.

He mentioned a couple of members' names and of course I cannot do that. Canadians can guess who these members are. He wrote:

A senior member of the cabinet, so far successful as a minister and neither given to public philosophizing nor a publicity hound—stunned the gathering with the argument that the time had come for the government to unveil Plan B.

Of course the plan has to do with the peace, order and good government proposal. He went on to write that it would be a dose of tough love for the province of Quebec and that a lot of the proposals put forward in the Liberal caucus were similar to the proposals put forward by the leader of the Reform Party in the answers to the 20 questions.

Then he wrote that a jock would call this playing hardball. He continued: "The first doubt about such hardball begins in appraising" the Prime Minister as he seems.

And that is "bushed". Tired out after 32 years of hustling and partisan hassling. As an example, take one his lines on Monday: "I have a very good cabinet". Tripe!

This pretty accurately reflects what a lot of Canadians are thinking about the Prime Minister's approach on these constitutional issues: ram Bill C-110 through the House as though it is a national emergency, ram the distinct society concept through the House even though it has been rejected in the past by Canadians in a referendum. They have no regard for Canadians, the provinces or the failed concepts of the past.

• (1655)

Given the lack of support for the Prime Minister's proposals and given his suggestion that he would ensure a fairly worded question in a future Quebec referendum through the powers afforded him under peace, order and good government, how will the Prime Minister use the powers under his jurisdiction with regard to peace, order and good government to ensure the next referendum question, should there be one, will be fair and not subject to the criticism of the last question?

**Mr. Discepolo:** Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member I respond to a comment he made before about our invoking closure and this not being a national emergency.