

Government Orders

When the Special Economic Measures Act was introduced as Bill C-53, it envisaged motions to revoke sanctions orders and regulations tabled in Parliament.

In committee, the member for Winnipeg South Centre proposed changes to the bill to allow motions to amend orders and regulations. He spoke eloquently of the "constructive" role that his proposal would give to Parliament in developing broad-based support for sanctions orders and regulations. His appeal to high-minded principles carried the day in committee. The motion we debate today is a flagrant abuse of the fruit of appeal to the principle by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. All evidence suggests that this—

• (1720)

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order the member for Surrey—White Rock—Delta is now arguing that the motion before the House is effectively out of order and that it is beyond the scope of the Special Economic Measures Act. He states that the motion in question is not made pursuant to section 4 of the Special Economic Measures Act.

I have a copy of the background statement with respect to this particular regulation. It states that the Canadian government approves the special economic measures Haiti ships regulations pursuant to subsections 4(1) and (3) of the Special Economic Measures Act.

Earlier today a colleague of the member for Surrey—White Rock—Delta attempted to argue that this motion was out of order. The Speaker stated it was in order. I suggest this is just another attempt to do an end run around the Speaker's earlier ruling.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I think it is a matter of debate. I give the floor again to the hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Friesen: I would point out that the riding is Surrey—White Rock—South Langley. The member is a few years out of date and maybe that is indicative of his point of order too.

I would agree with you, Mr. Speaker, that it was a point of debate and not a point of order. I will conclude with the following remarks and I point out to the member for Burnaby that I have just said that the motion

deals in effect with urging other countries to adopt the orders that we have and that goes beyond the scope of the legislation.

I conclude by saying that the member from Winnipeg and his appeal to high-minded principles carried the day in the committee. The motion we debate today is a flagrant abuse of the fruit of the appeal to the principle by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. All evidence suggests that this motion is nothing more than a dilatory exercise far removed from anything to do with Haiti.

I move that we bring this debate to a close.

[*Translation*]

Hon. André Ouellet (Papineau—Saint-Michel): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in this debate and to support the motion presented this afternoon by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

I am glad to see that the parliamentary secretary at the very least had the courage to come to this House. If his minister does not have the same respect for Haiti, at least the parliamentary secretary is here to remind us of the speeches the minister has already made and also the speeches of the Canadian Ambassador to the United Nations.

He seems surprised that my colleague presented this motion that is supported not only by all members of the Liberal Party but also, I think, by members of the New Democratic Party.

As my colleague said very clearly, the reason we are presenting this motion is that we think the government spares no effort to make fine speeches, but when the time comes to really take radical, tough measures to restore democracy in Haiti, it seems that the Canadian government has no more energy and forgets the minister's or the ambassador's fine words.

The purpose of our amendment is to urge the government to go beyond rhetoric and to shake things up so that democracy is restored to this country that has suffered so much for too long.

Let me remind you of what the minister said last May to the Organization of American States: