

Mr. Speaker, I am squarely against such a measure because it violates the rights of members of parliament and because in the future it will allow the passage of other pieces of legislation in the same fashion. The rights of members of parliament are violated in such a way that Canada can no longer be called a democracy but rather a dictatorship. And as we are against dictatorship, and as we really are democrats, not the kind who abuse their liberty but the kind who know how to use it in an intelligent way, I would like the minister, whom I appreciate a lot, to hear me. He may have been forced to introduce this motion today. We have to understand that we are going through a very difficult period, that unemployment is a cruel situation and that we have to expect the state to take action to offset this lack of jobs in the private sector.

Therefore I would like to mention again that it is a good thing to launch programs such as Canada Works and Young Canada Works but that sufficient funding should be available to make these projects real and to implement them to create jobs, to lower the unemployment level and to restore the hope that the population as a whole will be able to get work one day among the Canadian people. A country where many people work is bound to be peaceful and secure. There is no other formula, Mr. Speaker.

● (1530)

[English]

**Mr. Herb Breau (Gloucester):** Mr. Speaker, very briefly I wish to make two points regarding what the opposition has said on this motion under Standing Order 75C. First of all, they have referred to it as a motion of closure. It is not closure at all. One cannot see the word "closure" in Standing Order 75C. The motion does not close off debate; it allocates time for debate. The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), and particularly the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), should know that closure procedures come under Standing Order 33, not 75C. So it is not a motion to close off debate; it is a motion to allocate time for debate so the House of Commons can pronounce itself as to how much time should be devoted in the future to second reading of Bill C-27.

**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Not so. It is closure.

**Mr. Breau:** I ask the hon. member to refer to the Standing Orders and to show me the word "closure" in Standing Order 75C. If he can do that, I will concede that he is correct. The hon. member should spend a little more time reading the rules, and less time trying to make political points.

The second point is that the opposition have said that the government is bringing forward a motion under Standing Order 75C to muzzle its backbenchers and to stifle debate on the Liberal side of the House. That is not true. In fact, the contrary is true: if there is a group that muzzles backbenchers from the government side, it is the opposition by their frustration of debate.

● (1540)

**Mr. Alexander:** Four days?

*Motion under S.O. 75C*

**Mr. Breau:** The hon. member asks "Four days?" as he is walking out of the House.

**Mr. Alexander:** I have a committee meeting.

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

**Mr. Breau:** I would like to remind the hon. member that in the "mother of parliament" in Great Britain on second reading it is very rare that a debate goes over one day. Second reading on debate in this House should be the place where there are philosophical clashes, political clashes and where points are effectively made by spokesmen of the opposition and by the minister proposing legislation or supply. That is why we have clashes. Then one studies the effects and the details of legislation elsewhere. One does not necessarily have to take the time of the whole House of Commons to discuss for hours and hours, extending to days, second reading of a bill, report stage or third reading.

It is the opposition that really frustrates the backbenchers of this House and muzzles them from debate, because they know, in the modern society in which we live, there is a lot of legislation that has to go through this House. The government has to have a legislative plan. The only thing that stops backbenchers participating more in debate is that it is not possible to know exactly when debates will end. It is impossible to know exactly when the opposition will want to stop speaking. They just want to go on and on and on. They have the notion of the last century, when the only way to bring something to the attention of the public was to have a filibuster in the House and to frustrate the legislative plan of the government until the public found out about it and, hopefully, pressured the government into changing its mind. They should know that we do not live in that kind of society any more. They should know that it is possible very quickly to muster public opinion support of legislation. It is possible for backbenchers, for members of the opposition and even for groups outside this House very quickly to muster public support and bring pressure to bear on the government to change its mind.

Only one Liberal Atlantic member of parliament has spoken on this bill. Already there have been indications, after hearing speech after speech from the opposition for four days, that the Liberal members on this side of the House have been more effective and more efficient in getting the government to change its mind. There already has been indication that the government has looked at some of the provisions of Bill C-27. I wish the Conservatives, particularly those from the Atlantic provinces, had been more clear when speaking in this debate.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Breau:** I have read the speeches very carefully.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** That does not mean you understand them.

**Mr. Breau:** I do not think hon. members understand the implications of Bill C-27 in terms of the benefit structure changes for people on unemployment insurance. Very little has