

Point of Order—Mr. Rodriguez

our views through the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, which we are already doing. I would say there is evidence of increasing international pressure to improve the situation and ameliorate the violence to human rights in Cambodia.

* * *

MR. RODRIGUEZ—RIGHT TO DEBATE**S.O. 43 MOTION CONDEMNING COMMUNIST ATROCITIES IN KAMPUCHEA**

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order regarding a matter which took place earlier this morning in respect of a Standing Order 43 motion placed before the House by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané). When the question was put I agreed with the principle contained in the motion and I said "yes", but I did not forswear my right to debate the motion. I believe the principles contained in that motion are worthy of debate.

Prior to the calling of question period I stood in my place to be recognized in order to participate in the debate for which the Standing Orders provide. Therefore I submit, Your Honour, the motion which was agreed to be put to the House superseded the question period in respect of debate. The precedent of this House is that in the past we had a vote on a bill put to the House for first reading, and when the vote went right into the question period, the question period was delayed until the vote had been taken. I am prepared to debate the principle involved in this particular motion. I agree with that principle, and I think it is worthy of consideration by this House in the fullest context.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Nickel-Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) has called the attention of the House to a problem relating to the whole operation of Standing Order 43. May I say at the outset, for the record, that what has happened on a technical basis is, whether it has been well done or not, that the question on the motion has been before the House, it has been carried, and it has been so entered as having been carried. The matter is, therefore, finalized. Whether that was a precipitous action by the Chair in the circumstances, remains open for discussion. The fact is that this action was taken and, therefore, it is concluded.

However, the hon. member raises two other aspects of applications made pursuant to Standing Order 43. The first is, of course, that there is a popular impression that what is being sought in every circumstance is not simply unanimous consent to introduce a motion, but unanimous consent for the passage of the motion. In fact, the hon. member has highlighted that what the House is being asked to do is put the motion before the House and then, of course, to enter into debate on it if that is the desire of members of the House.

The fact that debate occurs so rarely in these circumstances does not in any way diminish the correctness of the hon. member's point. In fact what was done was that consent was given, the motion was put, and at that moment the motion was

[Mr. MacEachen.]

debatable. If the Chair missed the intention of the hon. member for Nickel Belt to debate the motion I must accept responsibility for that. However, again I say it is extraordinary when these matters are debated.

The hon. member for Nickel-Belt raises another point that I do think we will have to consider, and that is that once a debate is launched during the period of time set aside for motions to be put pursuant to Standing Order 43, and this is a very important point, is that debate to be interrupted by the commencement of the question period? If it is not to be interrupted by the commencement of the question period can we, under our Standing Orders, in fact have a question period at all, since it is called for on this day from 11.15 a.m. until 12 noon and on other days from 2.15 until 3 o'clock in the afternoon?

These two questions are most important. Again I suggest that the matter has been resolved; whether satisfactorily or not, it has been finalized. I do thank the hon. member for raising again the two difficulties to which I think the Committee on Procedure and Organization, early in another parliament or at another session of this parliament, will certainly have to give its attention. That is my hope.

MR. HNATYSHYN—REPETITION OF MINISTERIAL SPEECH ON SECOND READING OF BILL C-29

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in respect of a debate which took place yesterday on the Farm Credit Corporation Bill, and a rather unusual and peculiar situation that occurred. I refer to the fact that during the course of debate yesterday, commencing at page 4227 of *Hansard*, the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald) rose to address this particular bill, and at that time stated to the House in the first sentence of his speech that he was addressing the House on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan).

● (1212)

I rose, during the course of the remarks just after that to point out to the House that the Minister of Agriculture had, in fact, addressed the House when commencing debate on second reading of this bill. The peculiar part is that when I look at the remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture, starting at page 3957 of *Hansard* on March 20, 1978, and the remarks made by the Minister of Veterans Affairs last night, the two speeches are identical. They are exactly the same speech made in connection with this one bill.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to us whether the time of the House can be usurped and wasted by this kind of contrivance whereby a minister repeats a speech that has already been made. I tried to bring this to the attention of the House and I was met with scorn, shouting, interjections on the part of the other side of the House, and the final indignity, which was that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Caron) stood in his place and categorically stated that the Minister of Agriculture had not spoken on this particular bill. I say that the parliamentary secretary and the