

Tabling of Documents

Third, let me come to the procedural aspect and your ruling made on November 24, 1986. The individual who so willingly today refers to usurping and subverting was told he was out of order by yourself for trying to do something that he is attempting to weasel in today.

Finally, on the substance of the motion, the Deputy Prime Minister took great pains to tell Members of the House that we have had four days of debate at report stage. But the Deputy Prime Minister very conveniently, for his own purposes, for his own political agenda, to suit the multinational corporations which have written the provisions of Bill C-22, has forgotten to tell Members of this House that there are 47 amendments. The Deputy Prime Minister just brushes that aside. He also fails, on the substance of the motion we are obviously going to get to at some point in time, to indicate that the committee which studied this Bill was prohibited from calling certain witnesses. The committee was limited in the amount of time it had to deal with the witnesses and the committee was limited in its duration by the Government. Now the Deputy Prime Minister has the unmitigated gall to say on the floor of the House that the opposition Members are usurping—

Mr. Mazankowski: Subverting is the word.

Mr. Dingwall: —are subverting. Shame on the Deputy Prime Minister, with 47 amendments which Members of this Party and Members of the New Democratic Party have put forward and with four days of debate. Yet somehow on a major piece of legislation we are to accept the buffoonery of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Mr. Mazankowski: We have had 82 hours.

Mr. Dingwall: Let me come to petitions. The Deputy Prime Minister says that you can table them with the Clerk. I want to inform the Deputy Prime Minister through you, Mr. Speaker, that there are a great number of Canadians who want to have their Member of Parliament and other members address the issue of Bill C-22.

I say through you to the Deputy Prime Minister that the motion of his Parliamentary Secretary is flawed in three procedural areas. On the substance of the motion, it does not make any sense whatsoever. In view of the precedent which you laid down in the House on November 24, 1986, Mr. Speaker, I suggest respectfully that you have no other alternative but to rule out of order a motion put forward by the Parliamentary Secretary, the intent of which is to choke off meaningful debate on a very important piece of legislation affecting Canadians.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my intervention will be very brief and simple. I am not a lawyer. I do not want to talk about the procedures in that sense. I consider that your duty in this, Mr. Speaker, is to give all members equal treatment. My wishes are just as important in this House as the wishes of any member of the Government.

The Government cannot, therefore, take any route which will force through this House of Parliament any of its wishes against those of any other Member in this House, particularly if they go against traditions and precedent and if they are against routines which, for hundreds of years, have been built up as being necessary for the good and the fair operation of this House. I think that is possibly the basis of my intervention.

What is good and fair as far as the operation of this House is concerned? This motion, if allowed to go through, eliminates part of the democratic process of which we are so proud. It is a denigration of the process of the House. Is that really what we want? Is that what you want, Sir? Is that what Members of this House want? Do we want a process that throws away hundreds of years of procedures just because the Government has a Bill which we in the Opposition and which many Canadians think is offensive and which we think requires much more debate than it has had in this House? What I wish, and what many people wish, is to go on debating the amendments that have been proposed to Bill C-22. We do not want to go into a closure procedure which will not allow us to be fully heard.

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, I find myself surprised and shocked that the Parliamentary Secretary would show such little regard or respect for Parliament as has been demonstrated today. I want to begin by saying quite clearly that what has been done today cannot be directly connected to Bill C-22. If you argue that somehow a particular Bill justifies what the Parliamentary Secretary has done, I would have to say that that in no way relates to the Routine Proceedings of the day, regardless of how the Government feels about the way in which the Opposition has dealt with a particular—

• (1210)

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Cochrane—Superior (Mr. Penner) has raised a point which is of interest. He is saying that the procedural point that is being debated ought to have nothing to do with the fact that there is behind it Bill C-22. I happen to agree with the Hon. Member for Cochrane—Superior, and I want it made very clear that, so far as the Chair is concerned, the Chair is not the least bit interested in what Bill is behind it. The Chair is interested in the point that is being argued, and that is whether or not it is appropriate for the Government, under these circumstances, to skip matters of Routine Proceedings.

I want that to be understood very clearly by all Hon. Members and the public. It is not the place of the Chair to move government business through the House, nor is it the place of the Chair to take into account the relative merits of any proposal of the Government.

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for that intervention. That was the point I wished to make and I will say no more about it. Very simply, my argument is that Bill C-