

*Government Orders*

Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)	Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Laporte	LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacAulay	MacDonald (Dartmouth)
MacLaren	Maheu
Manley	Marleau
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)	McCurdy
McGuire	Milliken
Nault	Nowlan
Nunziata	Nystrom
Ouellet	Pagtakhan
Parent	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard
Prud'homme	Rideout
Riis	Rodriguez
Simmons	Speller
Stewart	Stupich
Taylor	Tobin
Vanclief	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Whittaker	Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—90

• (1600)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

When debate ended, the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier had 10 minutes remaining.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

### REINSTATEMENT OF BILLS

The House resumed from Tuesday, May 28, consideration of the motion of Mr. Andre (p. 655).

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, I must tell you that we are very disappointed with the ruling on Motion No. 1. We had serious reservations about this proposal, but we will put up with it because we have no intention of appealing your decision. We accept, somewhat reluctantly shall we say, that this government be once again allowed to disregard the principles of parliamentary democracy with yet another special measure. We consider it special because they used a motion to reintroduce or reinstate five controversial bills which were found wanting last session.

Mr. Speaker, as I already explained, every item on the Order Paper at the time of prorogation is supposed to die on it. However, since the government has introduced a motion to reinstate these bills, we have to consider them now.

[English]

Since I began my remarks on the government's heavy-handed motion to reinstate certain bills, for which it

could not receive unanimous consent because they are indeed not very good bills, a new element has been introduced into the debate—closure. It is now using its majority, the tyranny of the majority, to impose upon the rest of us its will.

That is far from being democratic. Here we have an abuse of power by the majority because the government happens to have the numbers and it can impose upon the minority a process which, to say the least, is objectionable.

Obviously the Conservative government in power has become an old hand at closure. The media do not pay attention to it any more. The government uses closure, abuses it, anytime for anything.

It should be noted that in the five years, and I have the statistics to give the House, the Conservative government has used time allocation 31 times to limit debate, compared to previous federal Liberal governments which used time allocation 29 times in 19 years. Between December 1986 and December 1990 the Conservative government used closure 18 times. In the 77 years before 1984 governments, all governments, used closure 19 times.

Most recent, this government used closure to terminate debate on changes to our Standing Orders, many of which placed greater limits on the opposition, limiting debate and our ability to better oppose the measures the government puts forth.

• (1610)

Now the Tories want to re-introduce certain bills at the stage these bills were abandoned like hot potatoes. When they prorogued the House, they abandoned those bills. They knew what they were doing and yet they proceeded because they said: "We have the numbers." Again, that is a tyranny of the majority.

There were good reasons why these bills were abandoned. They were abandoned because they were flawed. They were controversial. They were publicly opposed by many. They were obviously not a priority for this government, since it let them stand not for months or weeks but for years. Some of those bills have been standing on the Order Paper of this House for years; they cannot be a priority. What is the hurry all of a sudden? Why could the government not go back, take the comments made on the debate on these bills, readjust the proposals and come back with an amended proposal?