

closure rule on the resolution dealing with the constitution violates my personal privilege as a member of this House to attend here and to speak for my constituents. My claim is that I am restricted to the narrow point of the constitution.

As you know, Madam Speaker, if this resolution comes into force, the whole social fabric of our country will be changed. As the hon. member for Cambridge (Mr. Speyer) has pointed out, we do have a social contract. I submit that there will be many changes in the future, and I would like your advice. I believe that it is a violation of our privileges as members to be able to speak because we are limited to the narrow point of amending our Canadian constitution.

When I came here as a new member I read Beauchesne, particularly the section in the fifth edition dealing with "Principles of Parliamentary Law", which states:

To protect a minority and restrain the improvidence of a tyranny of a majority: . . . to give abundant opportunity for the consideration of every measure, and to prevent any legislative action being taken upon sudden impulse.

I clearly feel that I have the right to speak. I am sure that you are aware, Madam Speaker, of the section in the BNA Act which gives to my constituents the privilege to elect a person to come here and represent their views. I have referred you to Beauchesne and the long-standing customs and traditions of this House.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) claimed to Canadians that their member would be able to speak, and therefore I claim that privilege because of the law and because I represent a minority region, and because the government is acting on sudden impulse. This resolution reduces my constituents, the province of Alberta and the other provinces, from a position of equality on constitutional amendment to a position of perpetual second-class status.

The resolution imposes rights over our long-standing common law tradition. For example, section 42 in the resolution has the potential to destroy the protection which heretofore was inherent in my provincial government, and section 44 interferes with the protection which my constituents have heretofore had through the Senate. I have studied the resolution, listened to the speeches, and consulted with my constituents by letter, telephone, and personally, and I have prepared very carefully a speech of some 21 pages in which I attempt to point out to hon. members opposite the very deep feelings we have in the west about this resolution and the potential downside for us.

We are dealing with the constitution. It is a document which will go on forever. I believe that I have a privilege and that my constituents have the right to have their views put before this House so that my children and grandchildren will remember, 100 years and 200 years down the road, that their member at least had an input. I believe that closure has blocked that privilege. I submit that there is a prima facie case of privilege and I therefore move:

That the whole question of closure related to the narrow point of the constitution be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Business of the House

We look to you personally, Madam Speaker, because this matter will go on for many, many decades, to create some new law with respect to constitutional amendments.

Madam Speaker: At the outset, I would remind the hon. member that Standing Order 33 does not make any exception as to the subject which may come under closure. I believe that part of his argumentation was based on the fact that we are dealing with a particular subject and that he would have liked to have had a chance to express himself at length on that particular subject. Of course, that is the right of all members of Parliament, and our rules are devised in order to allow members to express themselves. Those rules have been voluntarily imposed on the House by the members and they are accepted by all the members.

At some point, and at certain times, members feel that these rules are restrictive and, indeed, they are. But if they are restrictive to some, these restrictions are designed to protect others so that they too can express themselves. A very simple example is the 20-minute, 30-minute, and 40-minute rule which is applied to various speeches. One member might find that 40 minutes is restrictive and, indeed, it is as far as he is concerned. But that rule is designed to allow other members to express themselves because that also is a right of this House.

The matter to which the hon. member is referring has been voted upon in this House. I have merely executed a decision of this House. Closure had been voted into this House. Once that is done the procedure follows, and I try to apply it as best as I can interpret it. My feelings, and I have been very careful throughout this last day, yesterday, to be as fair as possible, because I know how important it is when such a measure is proposed to the House, are that everything should be done in order and in conformity with our Standing Orders.

I have applied my efforts and my best attention to see that everything was just so in the course of yesterday. I must tell the hon. member that my feeling is very strong, that everything which went on, which members might or might not like, was done strictly according to our Standing Orders. Therefore, I am very sorry to say that I cannot find a question of privilege in the hon. member's question.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PRESENTATION OF BUDGET

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, pursuant to Standing Order 60, I request that you designate an order of the day to permit the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) to present his budget at 8 p.m. on Tuesday, October 28, 1980.