

*Government Orders*

Again, he did not produce the precedent. The Speaker rooted through what the parliamentary secretary referred him to and his guess is as good as mine on this point. I do not know what he is talking about. He never produced any authority, and yet he makes these blanket statements designed to hoodwink the Canadian people into thinking that this is somehow normal and regular.

It is not normal or regular. If this was so usual or common, the parliamentary secretary surely would have cited a precedent from the British Parliament. There are 400 years of records he could have dug through to find some precedent that might have supported this.

He is always telling us how much we should emulate the British Parliament, what a great institution it is, and how if we only followed British practice we would be way ahead. Yet he is not following British practice in this case. If he is, he has no authority for saying so. He has not produced a single tittle of evidence to support this gross breach of our practice and I suggest that it is totally inappropriate.

Then we go to his other suggestion. The first point was that what we were doing was unprecedented and therefore out of order:

If we were to take argument that any time a decision, action, or process is new it is therefore out of order, or because it is different it is unprecedented, and therefore cannot be done, the judges, lawyers, the Speaker of the House, I, in my role as parliamentary secretary to the House leader, the House leaders of the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party, would not be able to proceed because all we could do if we were to rely on precedents would be to simply follow what our predecessors have done.

Well, our predecessors have done quite a lot. There is lots of room within the sphere of parliamentary practice and precedent for the parliamentary secretary to work. What he does not want to do is allow this House to debate bad bills that this government in its incompetence, bungling, and fumbling wants to introduce into this place.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Milliken:** He is ashamed—and he should be—to produce these bills in this House and allow them to be discussed because he knows that if we have a full debate on them the Canadian people will, as they have so often with this government, rise up and say: “Let us get rid of this bunch. How long can we stand to see our country torn apart by this Conservative mob? They are no good”.

They are at 14 per cent in the polls. That is the evidence of their incompetence and the distrust and dislike they have sown across this country from one coast to the other and to the other. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, they have had enough.

If the parliamentary secretary had any courage he would be in here allowing debate on these bills and introducing them in the proper course. Instead, he brings in a motion and says we want to deem all these bills virtually passed. “We will limit debate on that motion. We will put closure on it and shut off debate so Canadians cannot hear how badly we are performing. They are going to hear how awful we are as a government. We do not want our faults exposed in this House”. That is what they are doing by this.

Let us look at the things they have left out. Let us think of the bills they did not put in this motion that were on the Order Paper. What about the conflict of interest bill? Where is that? I think it was introduced in November 1989, and we have never seen it. It has never been called for debate. The Prime Minister in the last election said we will have special conflict of interest legislation so that members of Parliament are not found in conflict. We want to run an honest administration. Yet no administration has ever had as many members charged with criminal offences as this one has.

That is the kind of thing that should have been dealt with in this legislation. The government introduces it and then does not call it. It sits on the Order Paper. Why did it not bring that back in and deem it to have had first reading in this motion? I know why. The government's own backbenchers, the ones who are having trouble, the former members who have been convicted are saying they cannot have that kind of bill. That is why we do not have it.

Yet the government should be introducing this kind of legislation and proceeding with it. We have asked it to move on it for two years and nothing has happened. It is afraid to proceed with that legislation and it should be ashamed of itself.

It will move with other taxation measures that impose taxes and charges on the people of Canada, and take away their benefits. It will proceed with its weak-kneed environmental legislation. We have just heard from the hon. member for Lasalle-Émard in a very capable speech about what it will do on this issue. We heard from