

Introduction of Bills

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: May I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Mr. Rodriguez: No.

Mr. Blaikie: No.

Mr. Speaker: I do not have consent to dispense with the bells and, as a consequence, I will have to make the usual statement and say, call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

● (1200)

(Division No. 379)

YEAS

Members

Benjamin	Henderson	Nystrom
Blaikie	Hicks	Oberle
Cadieux	Hockin	O'Neil
Clark	Hopkins	Orlikow
(Brandon—Souris)	Isabelle	Ouellet
Clifford	Jacques	Parry
Comeau	James	Peterson
Copps	Jelinek	Pietz
Cossitt	Jepson	Reid
Crofton	Jewett	Riis
Darling	Keeper	Robichaud
Daubney	Kempling	Rodriguez
Epp	Killens	Siddon
(Provencher)	Landry	Stevens
Ferland	Lawrence	Taylor
Forrestall	Layton	Thacker
Friesen	Lesick	Towers
Gauthier	Lewis	Turner
Gray	Lopez	(Ottawa—Carleton)
(Windsor West)	Manly	Van De Walle
Grondin	Martin	Vankoughnet
Guilbault	McCurdy	Vincent
(Saint-Jacques)	McKenzie	Witer
Guilbault	McKinnon	Young—76
(Drummond)	McLaughlin	
Gustafson	Mitchell	
Hamilton	Moore	
Hardey	Murphy	
Heap	Nowlan	

NAYS

Members

nil/none

● (1230)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion adopted.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, but perhaps not everyone was able to hear what was said by the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme). Perhaps he could now proceed.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I went all over the place, to the Senate, to my office and to the House of Commons, and the fact is that on December 9, 1985, there was a big debate in the House during Private Members' Business. There was a bill and a motion by two Members, Mr. Ricard and Mr. de Corneille.

The two were merged, there was a debate, and at about 5.40 p.m., before the 6.00 p.m. deadline, we decided we would ask to have Raoul Wallenberg made an honorary citizen. The next day, on December 10, the Senate was sitting, and it received a message from the House of Commons, asking that Raoul Wallenberg be made an honorary citizen of Canada.

It seems that at the time, on December 10, 1985, one senator refused his consent, so they decided to postpone the debate on Raoul Wallenberg, and the Senate adjourned.

[*English*]

The Senate adjourned on December 10, 1985, as shown in Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate No. 98. I do not know what happened that day, but later on that afternoon, the Speaker of the Senate was convinced that there was an urgent matter and he recalled the Senate, and that is shown in Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate No. 99. It is known as the second distinct sitting. It is unique in the sitting of the Senate.

● (1240)

What did they discuss? A message from the House of Commons humbly requesting the Senate to proclaim Raoul Wallenberg an honorary citizen, on a motion of the Hon. Senator Nurgitz, seconded by the Hon. Senator Marsden, that the Senate do agree with the House of Commons in the said resolution by filling in the blank space, et cetera, and that the message be sent to the House of Commons to acquaint that House accordingly. Ever since then, Raoul Wallenberg, a Swedish diplomat who helped to save so many thousands of Hungarian Jews, was proclaimed an honorary citizen of this country.

I spoke on that Bill while others were trying to rush it through the House because I thought Canadians should know who Raoul Wallenberg was. If I made a mistake, it was only one. I said there are two honorary Canadian citizens. That is not true. I made a mistake. In the U.S. there are two honorary citizens, Sir Winston Churchill and Raoul Wallenberg. Why