

Supply

possible to impress with House Leaders that this legislation ought to be expedited.

I can assure him that as far as New Democrats are concerned we will do everything we can to co-operate.

We also recognize that it is important legislation because there are divergent views represented in the House of Commons as to the appropriateness of certain clauses. I know there are Members on all sides who have very important questions they want to pose, presumably at the appropriate stage of the debate, particularly at committee. I encourage the Hon. Minister to approach his House Leader to see if we cannot proceed with this expeditiously.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, I appreciate that offer on the part of the New Democratic Party. I am very interested in having this matter dealt with because I think it is a fair Bill. It is a Bill that addresses this matter in a fair and consultative way. It certainly bears scrutiny, but when I hear—not from the Hon. Member's Party—that we are going to spend a very long period of time, by the Liberal Party in filibustering this Bill at second reading—

Mr. Gauthier: You are being dishonest when you say that and you know it.

Mr. Hnatyshyn:—when we are dealing with the principle of the legislation, I agree that—

Mr. Prud'homme: A point of order, Madam Speaker. I usually do not disagree fundamentally with the Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn), but unless the Hon. Minister can prove that the Liberal Party intends to filibuster, because he said that the Liberal Party intends to filibuster, unless he can prove—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Order, please.

Mr. Prud'homme: This is a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Order. I think the Hon. Member knows very well that it is not really a point of order but more a point of debate.

Mr. Prud'homme: Certainly not. Therefore it is a question of privilege.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, I will try to address it. I do not want to alarm the Chairman of the Liberal Caucus—

Mr. Prud'homme: Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I would hope that we can discuss the language issue in this country without being passionate, because that is always the danger.

Mr. Charest: Why the motion, then?

Mr. Prud'homme: You will see later on. I will participate in the debate. I am a Member of this Party. I do not intend to filibuster. If the Minister of Justice can prove that we said that

we would filibuster, I would disagree with my Party because I do not intend to filibuster.

Mr. Charest: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prud'homme: The Hon. Minister of State for Youth (Mr. Charest), is very enthusiastic. As Minister of Youth, I hope he is more enthusiastic when looking at the projects for youth next summer.

Mr. Rossi: You know what filibuster means, Ray.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It seems obvious that the Hon. Minister is making a general statement.

Mr. Rossi: She does not know what filibuster is, but you do.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I am sure the Hon. Member for Bourassa (Mr. Rossi) may want to participate in the debate right now, but it is becoming very difficult to answer the query by the Member for Saint Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) when the Speaker can hardly hear herself speak in the House.

[Translation]

I think the Hon. Member knows very well that so far at least his privileges as Member have not been questioned, that the Minister made a general remark which, as he said himself, he will undoubtedly want to qualify at the earliest opportunity. The Hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn).

[English]

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, before I was interrupted I was saying to my distinguished friend, who is Chairman of the Liberal Caucus and speaks on behalf of the Liberal Caucus on all matters, that what I am talking about in terms of filibuster is that I think the most appropriate place for us to look at this legislation is in committee where we can go through it clause by clause and have the people who are involved in this examine these matters. There is no provision on the floor of the House for us to look at the matter clause by clause. We are constrained by the rules to deal with principles.

The Liberal Party has spoken by its *porte-parole*. They have already spoken with respect to the fact that they think this is the best Bill they have ever seen in terms of official languages. Why would they suggest to me that they will have practically three-quarters of their caucus rising to spend an inordinate period of time on the Bill if they are really interested in making progress?

Mr. Penner: It is called democracy. That is what we do. We debate the Bill in the House of Commons.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I do not want to patronize the Hon. Member, but the fact is that we have an agenda in the House. If the Opposition is really interested in passing the Bill, it will get together with the House Leader and propose a reasonable amount of time that will allow it to put forward the cogent argument on the principle of the matter but will also allow a