

*S.O. 75c*

Standing Orders is to limit our own speeches. Having said this, Mr. Speaker, we shall have the opportunity perhaps in the next debate to apply S.O. 75A and to agree on time allocation in the House. Mr. Speaker, I hope I shall not have to make another speech on S.O. 75C in the forthcoming debate next week.

[English]

**Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster):** Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to those on the government side speak about Standing Order 75c. Without the advice of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), I went back to see how 75c came about. I can only say that I agree with my colleagues 100 per cent.

Members opposite say it is a parliamentary law, one of the rules of Parliament, so they should use it. It is a law that was brought in by closure. The laws of Parliament must be built by consensus. We, the elected Members of Parliament representing our constituents want to have this House work effectively and we strive to that end. We cannot have the tyranny of a majority. This law was put on the books by a Grit majority. It was brought in by closure. The government member who just spoke said they want an efficient government, an efficient operation of this House. By continuing to use 75c, they indicate that they want to be efficient but do not want opposition. They do not want any member of this party or the party to my left to oppose them. They want to run roughshod over the people of Canada, continuing in their wild and woolly spending ways.

Government tells us not to debate in this House, not to bring up those things they have done. We are told not to get involved. The government says it wants to run Canada and that it should be allowed to dominate it. If we oppose, they bring in 75c. That is what this government has done, is continuing to do and will do in the future when people in Canada try to express a legitimate concern on behalf of their constituents.

We are here to express concerns on behalf of those we represent. We are expressing concern on behalf of those who contribute the money about the spending by this government. We are debating Bill C-59 because we have a debt. It is not the government that has the debt, but the people of Canada. It is not Liberal members opposite who owe this money, but all Canadians. As far as the use of 75c is concerned, which stifles and stops debate and the democratic process, I find it repugnant both as a Canadian and a parliamentarian.

May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen)—Federal lands—Yukon—Disposition of certain lots without tender; the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert)—Petro-Canada—Inquiry whether offer made to purchase Petrofina; the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen)—Fisheries—Regulation of herring fishing on west coast.

● (1700)

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, private bills, notices of motions (papers), public bills. There being no items on the Order Paper under the heading of private bills, the House will proceed to the notices of motions (papers).

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

Items Nos. 1, 22, 5, 28 allowed to stand by unanimous consent.

\* \* \*

## FOREIGN INVESTMENT REVIEW AGENCY

REDUCTION OF SHAREHOLDINGS BY TATE & LYLE HOLDINGS LTD. IN REDPATH SUGAR LIMITED

**Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil)** moved:

That an order of the House do issue for copies of all agreements, correspondence, notes and other communications relating to the requirement by the Foreign Investment Review Agency that Tate & Lyle Holdings Limited reduce its shareholdings in Redpath Sugar Limited.

He said: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is not the first time I have stood in the House to discuss this particular subject. May I say at the outset and repeat what I have said before, though I will be mentioning Redpath Sugar, I am not criticizing any of their actions. Though I will be mentioning the Export Development Corporation, I will not be attacking them. Even though I will be talking about the Foreign Investment Review Agency, it is only because of some concerns about the operation of the agency which I hope to explain in my remarks.

The interest in the subject of sugar goes back several years to my concern about developing countries in the Caribbean. It seemed to me it did not make sense that we in Canada were