

Government Orders

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Richelieu, on a point of order.

Mr. Plamondon: These motions were presented to the House at the report stage and they therefore belong to the House. To withdraw them would require unanimous consent. We have had a similar situation already.

Madam Deputy Speaker: No, these motions were not presented to the House. Notice was given that these motions would be presented, but the notice may be withdrawn, which is what happened. As a result, the motions cannot be presented in the House again.

Mr. Plamondon: On the second point raised by my leader, can someone else—

[English]

Madam Deputy Speaker: Just a moment. Order, please. It is impossible for the Chair to hear a member talking from the floor.

[Translation]

Mr. Plamondon: Madam Speaker, my question concerns the second point raised by our leader, which was whether another member can present them, since they are already on the Order Paper.

Madam Deputy Speaker: For another member to present motions that were withdrawn would require the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. Plamondon: Mindful of the great democratic virtues of the people around us, I wish to seek unanimous consent for a vote on these motions.

Madam Deputy Speaker: You would first need the consent of the hon. member for Churchill.

• (1650)

[English]

Mr. Murphy: No, Madam Speaker. I introduced 25 amendments in the time period that was allocated. After looking at the entire package of amendments, comparing them with the motions of the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville and looking at what the government itself has presented, I thought that these six particular motions were not necessary. I still have a number of motions on the floor which we will be forcing votes on.

I think the hon. members of the Bloc will have all the opportunity they wish to vote later on tonight.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Madam Speaker, I was reluctant to get up to debate this particular set of motions because there was not much that I needed to say on them, but I felt in light of the proceedings in the House yesterday it was incumbent on me to get up and explain to the public what has been going on in this place in relation to the proceedings on this bill.

[Translation]

What we saw yesterday, Madam Speaker, was an attempt by members of the Bloc Québécois to kill this bill. They brought in all their members to make ten-minute speeches on every amendment moved in the House by the other members. It's a big change to see all these members here, and I am delighted to see them I must say. But yesterday they were here for the sole purpose to kill this bill and to obstruct the proceedings of this House and I think that should be said, Madam Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I have a point of order. The hon. member for Shefford.

Mr. Lapierre: Madam Speaker, the hon. member is interpreting the perfectly democratic approach taken by our members as an attempt to obstruct the proceedings of this House. I know you will not accept this inference when members are merely exercising their rights which it is your duty to protect.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. member knows perfectly well this is not a point of order. However, perhaps I should remind the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands—

[English]

—he may have been impugning motives. I would be grateful if he would come back to the substance of the motions in front of the House.

[Translation]

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, I was trying to explain my reasons for taking part in this debate, and I made it clear that I would not have done so if we had not had all these speeches yesterday by members of the Bloc Québécois. I did not make good speeches, Madam Speaker, but I spoke just the same.

It is clear that this party, the Bloc Québécois, is out to destroy this country as it is today, to divide it. The referendum proposed under this bill runs contrary to