me a very direct question. I will ask for the unanimous consent of this House to reply immediately to the hon. member or at least to use his speaking time to respond to the comment he just made.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There is not unanimous consent.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I am nearly done. In closing, I will ask the hon. member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead again and those like him who seem prepared to listen to their own speeches but not that of others.

If his constituents can express their views on the future of Canada, why is he denying that same right to mine, in Glengarry—Prescott—Russell? Why would the people of my riding be entitled to less than the people the hon. member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead and others are representing?

I for one, believe that all Canadians have the right to express their views on the future of this country. Of course, I would like certain amendments to be made to improve the bill. But the main question remains: Do Canadians have the right, and should they have the right, to ratify the Constitution once an agreement has been reached, hopefully, between all governments in Canada? and I hope there will be such an agreement—

The hon. member for Shefford is asking: Has one not been reached?

Mr. Speaker, I think that, to most people watching this debate on TV, including members of this House, the answer to that question should be pretty obvious. In the absence of an agreement, how could we vote on a non-existent agreement? You do not need to be too clever to figure that out. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that most people understand that.

That being said, I will now let other hon. members have the floor seeing that there are a few minutes left. I want to thank the House for allowing me to make this brief comment and to conclude I would say that the

voters in my riding definitely have the right to express their views on the future of this country. That is why I intend to vote for granting them that privilege which I believe they should have in that day and age, today, on this 3rd day of June, 1992.

[*English*]

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I realize there are very few minutes left in this debate. I would like to say a few words about some of the issues that have been dealt with and some of the ones we are not going to have the chance to deal with because of the time allocation motion.

As the previous member from the Liberal caucus mentioned, some members of this House did put forward amendments. Others chose not to put forward amendments on this legislation. I would like to indicate on behalf of our caucus, the New Democratic Party caucus, that the critic, the member for Yorkton—Melville, and myself, looked through the amendments that were proposed by Conservative members, by Liberals, and by some of the independent members of this House. We found that we could support a lot of those amendments. Regardless of what part of the House those amendments came from, we considered them on their merit.

On this issue where the government has been talking about a non-partisan approach, I wish it had taken the same attitude. I talked to members of the government caucus who put forward motions. I am told that the word has gone out among the government benches not to vote for those motions. That is what I hear. We will see what happens later on.

The concern I have is that the government felt throughout this process once we, that is the three parties in this House, voted to allow this to go to second reading, we went to committee stage and entered report stage with the idea that the government would be open to amendment. We were told that by the government House leader.

We indicated at the outset that we had some concerns with the legislation, not with the principle of a referendum, and I reject some of the comments made by other members of this House, especially among the Liberals, that we are against a referendum.

Our caucus has voted—