

I submit that both arguments made by my hon colleagues opposite fail. The first argument fails because Beauchesne's sets out the notice and we are within the terms of that wording. The second argument fails because the exact wording of Standing Order 116 refers to a majority of the representatives and my hon. colleagues opposite have misread it, though I am sure the misreading of it was well intentioned. I submit that we have met the notice requirements and that the motion is in order to be presented and proceeded with at this time.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a small point of clarification. In dealing with the matter of whether or not the notice he gave yesterday for a motion under Standing Order 117 was in order, my hon. friend made reference to Beauchesne's. I would like to draw to your attention that the edition of Beauchesne's that we use predates by a number of years the adoption of the Standing Orders on time allocation. I respectfully submit that whatever Beauchesne's said about a notice or the form of a notice, it could not possibly apply by way of a precedent to these Standing Orders because they were not in effect at the time this edition of Beauchesne's was prepared.

Second, I am informed that in every case to date since the Standing Orders went into effect, the notice required under Standing Order 117 did include the details of the time allocation to be sought in the motion for which the notice was a foundation. I wanted to make that small point of clarification.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate very much the Hon. Member for Windsor West's continuing assistance to the Chair on these sometimes difficult issues. I will look at Beauchesne's, but it seems to me that the latest edition of Beauchesne's may have come out after the change in the rules. I think I am right on that, but I will have a look at that and I will take into account the other point the Hon. Member made.

I have listened very carefully as well to the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) who is always of assistance to the Chair in these matters. I will give his remarks considerable consideration.

I think the Hon. Minister of State has divined my sense of this and has indicated that the Government will not be surprised if I reserve for a few hours to give this the consideration it needs. I want Hon. Members to know that I have done some considerable work on this, but I will return at three o'clock to make a ruling. In the meantime, we will proceed with the Orders of the Day.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have just checked the date of publication of the Fifth Edition of Beauchesne's. I think you are right. It did come out after the Standing Orders, but again, I am told that all the precedents involving the use of Standing Order 117 did give the details of

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

the motion to be sought. I had wanted to say immediately that you are quite right in what you said about the edition of Beauchesne's and its timing.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for Windsor West. The question of when the edition came out takes nothing away from the argument, and I want the Hon. Member to know that I will give it the consideration that I ought to give it as I will give to all of the arguments that have been made.

Resuming debate.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton—Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, the arguments which have been placed before the public of Canada in respect to free trade do not really conform with reality. I think they should be referred to more as scare tactics with political motivations. They involve the pursuit of power rather than the pursuit of truth and the pursuit of what is in the best interests of Canada.

I am in particular disagreement with the concept that in any way, shape, or form the culture of Canada will be altered by virtue of a free trade agreement. Culture is something which government cannot legislate. We have tried on occasion to legislate morality in conformity with the faith the majority of the House has supported. We have tried to create legal structures which would implement our belief in the morality we would like to see sustained in this nation, and we have failed. We cannot, no matter how hard we try, legislate culture. That is something which is always in a state of transition and always in a state of change.

While historians may depict a reason why there has been a change in the culture of any particular area of the world, I do not think they have ever pinned it down to a particular piece of legislation, particularly as it relates to trade.

● (1220)

Culture is something which prospers in prosperity. It never advances in a period of recession. This Bill is intended to create prosperity in this land and I believe that it will. Any argument, political or otherwise, to the contrary certainly will be negated by the study of history as to when culture thrived, be it art or whatever, and when it failed to develop. It needed money and sponsors, which is what I hope a prosperous Canada will generate, in order that culture may indeed thrive.

We have heard representations that our entertainment industry may not thrive. I say, as I have said before, that at such point in time as the entertainment industry of Canada chooses to present the entertainment which Canadians enjoy, it shall then prosper. As long as there is an alternative to what is produced in Canada it shall be in competition with the listening audience, the viewing audience, or the reading audience in this land as it is elsewhere.