

payments and international trade in the country, is only to be given one hour of debate.

● (1640)

Mr. Nystrom: Closure in advance.

Mr. Anguish: The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) calls it closure in advance, and that is exactly what it is. The Liberal Government and the Conservative Official Opposition know that when people in the agricultural industry find out the implications of this legislation they will be very angry regardless of which Party forms the Government of the country. This is a regressive piece of legislation. We want unlimited debate when it comes back before Parliament. If the Government does not like what we have to say and what the people of Canada have to say, then it can bring in closure. At least we will get two hours of debate under that system.

I see that my time has expired, Mr. Speaker, and that you are rising to your feet. I should like to ask for unanimous consent to continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

[Translation]

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, I see the Members of the New Democratic Party are glad to hear their Liberal colleagues. I may remind my honourable colleagues opposite that if we had not had this avalanche of motions during the last few weeks, the mood of this debate might have been a little more serene, which would have benefited all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I am supposed to speak today to motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 to amend Bill C-155. The content of these motions, and the speeches we have heard today and on previous days, give the impression that Opposition Members are extremely touchy about their democratic rights, to say the least. I said today in a motion under Standing Order 21 that Bill C-155 had been the subject of frequent discussion, had been debated in public, in the House and in Committee, and probably for the first time in the Parliament of Canada—nor is it usual in our Provincial legislatures,—proposed regulations may be laid before Parliament. I think that in their comments, Opposition Members have neglected to mention that proposed regulations to implement Clause 21(1) of Bill C-155 will be laid before each House of Parliament. In fact, the procedure is that proposed regulations are presented in this House. As soon as they have been presented, they may or may not be referred to Committee. I may refer the Members of the Opposition to Clauses 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 of Bill C-155.

Western Grain Transportation Act

Therefore, as indicated in Clause 22, proposed regulations are laid before each House of Parliament. That is what the Clause says. Second, fifteen Senators or thirty Members of the House of Commons may decide that the proposed regulations be referred to Committee. I must agree with what the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council said earlier, when he said: All right, I realize that to the New Democratic Party, thirty Members may be a bit much if they happen to be the only ones to want a debate on the issue, especially since they cannot be certain about their Party's future. However, thirty Members is still less than 10 per cent of the full membership of the House. I repeat, to say that the Government is taking too big a slice of the pie is taking a rather exaggerated view of one's democratic rights.

Therefore, fifteen Senators or thirty Members of the House of Commons may refer to Committee—

[English]

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the Hon. Member would be kind enough to entertain a question at this time?

[Translation]

Mr. Gourde: Mr. Speaker, I do not think we have yet reached questions, and I would therefore like to finish what I have to say, and perhaps later I could answer one of the Hon. Member's questions.

I myself, although unfortunately I have not had occasion to do so, have a number of questions to put to the Members of the New Democratic Party, because when we went to British Columbia, we heard comments by mayors of municipalities of British Columbia who said they failed to understand how throughout the debate on the Crow, the New Democratic Party Members, and they were very clear about this, had neglected to defend the interests of the people of British Columbia just so they could read a series of petitions. Mr. Speaker, we would have to look at the text of the comments made by the mayors of four municipalities. I do not remember their names, when we sat in Vancouver in August, and then we could see, or possibly hear, but in any case we could see exactly what was said, and I am sure that all Members of this House would find it very useful to know the views of British Columbia taxpayers on the performance of the Members of the New Democratic Party.

In any case, what is also important in this Bill is that a committee to which a proposed regulation—

Here I am reading Clause 22(3) of the Bill:

A committee to which a proposed regulation is referred under subsection (2) shall forthwith consider the proposed regulation and report thereon to the Senate or House of Commons, as the case may be, within thirty sitting days after the referral is made.

Now, since this afternoon—I realize I may have missed some of the debate—all I heard Members discussing was this one hour of debate in the House of Commons. However, the