

being invoked. In fact, it was unanimous consent, as indicated in *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition*, whereby the House proceeded on its own to ignore its own rules and proceed with the introduction of the Bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) is rising, but there are other Members who have not yet spoken.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I just wanted to correct some of the points made by the last speaker. I do not disagree with his argument that we gave unanimous consent for the Bill to be presented on first reading. We never questioned that. What we did not give was unanimous consent to waive Standing Order 108. That is the debate. I am not disagreeing with his reading of *Hansard* of January 19, not at all. I am just telling him that the Bill is imperfect, it is not acceptable, it goes against Standing Order 108 and that is the whole argument.

**Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate this morning and this afternoon and I do not think there is much doubt that if it comes to making a decision you will have to rule that the Bill has been introduced in imperfect form and, therefore, the point of order raised by the Liberal House Leader will have to stand.

I think we should look at this from the point of view of what is best for the people of Canada. We oppose this Bill, but we were willing to co-operate on January 19, as the previous speaker mentioned, in introducing the Bill and waiving the time period between first reading and second reading and so on. We were prepared to have a reasonable debate beginning on January 19 without going through all the technicalities.

The concern of opposition Members is that the Government decided to play hardball on this whole question. Last night the Parliamentary Secretary moved that the question be put. He was interested in stifling debate. He wants to use the rules against us to prevent a full and proper debate of this Bill. We think that debate is necessary. We have issues that have to be raised. His motion means that that kind of debate cannot take place.

Perhaps there is a way out of this impasse. Perhaps you could call for a 15-minute recess and sit down with the House Leaders and see if some kind of deal can be made. Perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary might want to withdraw his motion.

● (1450)

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member. I will hear him out. However, I just point out that the Hon. Member in inviting all Hon. Members to work out a deal has created instant, mild disorder in the Chamber. That is a most extraordinary result of an Hon. Member making what seems to the Chair to be such an eminently sensible suggestion.

**Mr. Manly:** In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I submit that if an agreement cannot be reached among the three Parties, you

have no alternative but to rule that the Bill was introduced in an imperfect manner.

*Point of Order—Mr. H. Gray*

**Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any doubt in people's minds that there is an imperfection in the Bill before us which has been debated for the last several days. However, with regard to the suggestion that has been made that people do not have access to the information, on the afternoon of January 8 when I called upon various remanufacturers in my riding who were vitally interested in the contents of the memorandum of understanding, I found that they already had a copy. The information had gone out and had been widely disseminated. It is false to say that the people of Canada and Members of Parliament did not have that information.

I hope that common sense will prevail. As imperfect as we all are, our nation's business should proceed. We should deal with the Bill in its present form after making the necessary corrections. I do not think anyone noticed the imperfection in this Bill until yesterday afternoon. Everyone took part in the debates on the motion to alter this Bill and to delay it for six months. It would be an injustice to the Canadian public to wipe out all that has happened in the last several days.

**Mr. Axworthy:** Mr. Speaker, since my last intervention several points have been made, particularly by yourself, which I think require a response.

I can sympathize with the interest of the Chair in resolving the matter satisfactorily in order that debate can continue. As our House Leader pointed out in his first statement, there is a very important principle at stake here, that is, the sanctity of the Standing Orders. While we respect the suggestions to "fix a deal", as helpful as they may be, it is vital to resolve this problem correctly. Knowing the weakness of the Government in negotiating deals, knowing that it always gives in to any negotiations, the offer is tempting. However, the Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney) is not in the Chamber and we would certainly want her to be available for those negotiations. I would not like to suggest that perhaps she has left for Hawaii, but we do not know.

This is simply not a matter of trying to work out a minor clerical error. There is a fundamental principle involved, which I am sure Your Honour fully respects. If the last speaker reflected upon the matter more carefully, I am sure he would realize that this matter does not deal only with an export tax. It is a matter which will govern the proceedings of this House in this and future sessions. To compromise our Standing Orders would be to set a very dangerous and serious precedent.

The argument has been made by the Government House Leader and others that the unanimous consent of the Opposition to proceed with the debate on Monday was an acknowledgment that we were prepared to accept the Bill. One can see from reading *Hansard* that that is not accurate. We had moved a motion to have an emergency debate at that time. The Government House Leader said that they would instead introduce a Ways and Means Motion to debate the matter. As