

*Government Orders*

John Diefenbaker would be rolling over in his grave to know we are going to discuss the potential referendum to try and resolve impasse on constitutional discussions. We have not had a national leader participate in this debate. We have had two allocation orders already, one on second reading and now one on report stage.

There are fundamental things. I have listened to the hon. minister for intergovernmental affairs this afternoon and I give him credit. He has brought civility, calm, and patience, patience that frankly is starting to be a yoke around his neck in these delicate discussions as they have had them from coast to coast for months.

We all know the reality and there is now an impasse there and some are blaming it on the Senate, some are blaming it on something else. It is easy to blame the Senate.

Even the NDP spokesman yesterday talked about the mechanics of a bill. All we are talking about is mechanics. Shall it be money here, or committees there, or registered agents there, time allocation here? There has been no discussion at all from of the three national parties as to what they want in terms of a future in this country that a referendum may help to find.

As I say, that is corroborated by the absence of the three national leaders unless they intervene in this debate sometime between now and 7.30 p.m. and I think they darn well should.

They should tell Canadians. We know what the Parti Québécois stands for. As I say, I am totally against what it stands for but I can understand it to a point. Frankly, unless we become more realistic, compatible, and tolerant, as the hon. minister of intergovernmental affairs said today, we are going to have problems.

It did not help things today not to give the Parti Québécois a chance to give its view, which we know. You know what is going to happen with the Bloc Québécois. You know what is going to happen in the Quebec papers tomorrow. Its members are going to be martyrs. They have been cut off at the pass. They could not speak.

Here you are going to have the minister of intergovernmental affairs speak. You could have the spokesperson who happens to be from Quebec, the member for

Papineau speak. You had the member from the NDP speak.

• (1710)

They could speak on something that is fundamental and that we all call the Canada round. What do we do? We shut out those who are dedicated to a Quebec, admittedly by itself. They are in this House but we cut them off at the pass. Wait until we see in the Quebec papers how they become pseudo-martyrs.

Tonight we are going to go through the hocus-pocus and hypocrisy in many ways of voting on 30, 40 or 50 amendments when we usually have agreement. I can understand their interest from a straight political point of view. They have been very definite in their interest and we are going to be here for hours.

That will be a nice story, not you or I, not to the political elite that have been trying to get a consensus, and other political elites that have been trying to break up the country, but to the average Québécois or the average Canadian. Speaking of the Québécois, they are going to say: "Hey, our boys did not have a chance. Those dirty anglophones across the country cut them off at the pass". We did that today.

There are so many things to say. I do not know how many minutes I have left.

I want to come back to the minister of intergovernmental affairs because there are so many things one could say and perhaps I may have a chance later on or at third reading. I agree with the majority of what the government House leader said. I really want to put this out in the public domain and I hope that someone from the government side answers it. Yesterday, we saw a set-up question from the member for Fredericton—York—Sunbury to the minister of Indian affairs about Indian self-government.

I want someone from the government side, either the Minister of Justice who certainly knows about it, the minister of Indian affairs and certainly the minister of intergovernmental affairs to try and get through. What happened to Meech? People thought we were actually dishonest. We cannot let the same intellectual dishonesty that affected Meech affect the very sensitive progress now. One of the most sensitive things is the whole question of the inherent right of the aboriginals to