

What are the consequences of this particular ruling and this particular procedure that is taking place? As I have indicated, there is no precedent. There is no tradition. There is no convention. What this government is doing is in effect trampling on the rights of the minority. Those of us in opposition have a responsibility under parliamentary tradition. We are Her Majesty's Loyal and Official Opposition. It is our role to oppose, to hold this government accountable, to provide alternatives to the government of the day.

By allowing government members to do what they are doing, we are being denied our rights in the opposition. What are those rights? Those rights include debating certain pieces of legislation. We have no opportunity to debate six or seven or eight pieces of legislation, if this motion carries.

Members opposite wake up and say: "Well, they have already been debated". They have not been debated in the Third Session of the Thirty-Fourth Parliament. They may have been debated in a previous session, but they have not been debated fully and completely. The parliamentary process will not be followed with respect to these eight pieces of legislation.

• (2000 )

In effect, we are being denied the right to debate and we are being denied the right to vote on certain pieces of legislation. What kind of precedent will be set as a result of this? Today they want these five bills. What is to stop those characters opposite tomorrow from saying: "Well, when Joe Clark was Prime Minister, he had a good idea. When the present minister of constitutional affairs introduced this bill, it had reached second reading back in 1979, we thought it was a good idea. Why do we not revive that bill?" It may have gone to third reading, it may have gone to the Senate, but it died when the government died.

Well, it can effectively say, and the precedent will be set: "We like that piece of legislation so by a vote in the House," as we are about to do in a few short minutes, "let us revive that piece of legislation at the stage it was at in 1979." That is the precedent that is being set. In fact, this government, as a result of the precedent you set, Mr. Speaker, and because of what the government is trying to do, will be able to revive, resuscitate any piece

of legislation that died over the last 124 years of Canadian parliamentary history.

Now is that due process? Is that in keeping with the Canadian parliamentary tradition? I submit it is not. You yourself, Mr. Speaker, are playing host today, yesterday and tomorrow to a group of parliamentarians from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. You invited them to visit our country so they could see how the parliamentary process works.

They are watching from the gallery and they are probably wondering what the heck is going on in the Canadian Parliament. This may have been possible under previous Communist regimes in the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia or Czechoslovakia, but not in Canada, not under Canadian parliamentary tradition. The power of the majority is being used in a summary and callous fashion to walk all over and destroy the rights of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, you were called upon to assist this government in trying to extricate itself from its own incompetence and mismanagement. It mismanaged the Second Session of the 34th Parliament. It was not able to adequately and appropriately govern. It made mistakes. If these bills were so important to this government, why did it prorogue the last session of this Parliament? The Conservatives should have completed their agenda and then come forward to the people of Canada with a new throne speech and a new vision for Canada.

We are now being asked to deal with the mismanagement of this government. I have seen a lot of mismanagement and incompetence over the last seven years from this Conservative government. I have seen, time and time again, the Conservative government trample on the rights of the opposition. I have seen closure motion after closure motion after closure motion. We objected on this side of the House and we objected. This is far worse than any closure motion that has ever been allowed in this House, in terms of the terrible and horrible precedent that this particular government motion will set. It ought not to have been allowed, but somehow the government was able to convince the Chair without citing a precedent. If we do not abide by the law of *stare decisis*, the law of precedent, then I do not know what is going on in terms of due process. You know as well as I do, Mr. Speaker, that in this place precedents play an extremely important role in the governing of the