

Government Orders

clause it spotted a flaw and simply corrected it. I say thank you to the Senate. The Senate changed from a board to go back to its committee and that is a mistake. I think the Senate will be back to this Chamber some day in the next two or three years asking for a board, because I think it has created for itself an administrative structure that is unwieldy and makes it very difficult to activate the responsibilities inherent in this bill.

This bill came about and was examined by all sides of this Chamber for a purpose. We are not today, without the passage of this bill, treated like ordinary Canadians when it comes to the justice system. The securing of information from this Chamber about the behaviour of members and their utilization of the budget today, without this piece of legislation, requires a judicial process, usually a search warrant, before any information can be obtained. The Speaker has to grant permission for the warrant to be executed.

I think it is fair to say that we found that situation intolerable, that the public nature of search warrants and the fact that they are full of allegations and not proof, created difficulties for members, and in particular, members' families.

This piece of legislation is an obligation on the part of the board to provide the police and courts with information that they cannot get today. It is additional information. It is saying to the police and the courts, we will give you accurate information if you would simply come and ask.

If there is an allegation out there about the behaviour of a member, it can be dealt with quickly and expeditiously. If there is truth, or some element of truth to the allegation, it will go through an investigation and a process. If it is simply an allegation without a foundation in truth, that can be discovered and all members, all sides of the Chamber can avoid the public nature of allegations. Allegations do enormous damage. This day started at 11 a.m. with an NDP allegation about an unnamed person in the Prime Minister's office. That tars all of the members of the Prime Minister's office with a brush. It is not fair. It is simply not fair.

I would like to indicate to the colleague who spoke ahead of me, that both as board members and certainly on behalf of all the board members of my party, we would be quite willing to pass a bylaw that would require the board to give to the police officers or to the courts an opinion which is relevant to the case.

It says in the bill itself, under the bylaw section, the board of governors must make bylaws respecting all such things as are necessary or incidental to the exercise of its powers and carrying out of its functions.

Those early bylaws must deal with the way the board itself intends them to function. It can deal with the issues that are contained in these two amendments, without turning over the control to the Senate.

Abolish the Senate, says the former premier of the province of British Columbia. I did not see his legislature when he was in charge pass a motion to that effect, to abolish the Senate. It is awfully easy to sit on the side lines and snipe, but when you have the responsibility of governing, surely you have to act responsibly.

I suggest to this House there really needs to be no more time on this particular piece of legislation, that we should move to the agriculture bill. If we want more time on the agriculture bill or more time on this, I would move:

That the House continue to sit beyond the ordinary hour of daily adjournment for the purpose of continuing consideration of the second reading of government Bill C-79, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act.

• (1250)

If we do not need it then we can adjourn at one o'clock or we could actually agree to consider the agricultural bill after one o'clock. At this point, I simply would ask you to put that motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): A point of order, the hon. member for Churchill.

Mr. Murphy: I believe, Mr. Speaker, if you check the records or your memory, you will realize that the government Whip got up on questions and comments. Therefore, he cannot move that particular motion. It should also be noted that he has taken almost all the time for questions and comments and, therefore, not allowing other members to speak.

I am sure, with regard to this specific point of order, because he asked a number of questions which we obviously do not have a chance to reply to since he has taken up most of the time, the motion he put is out of order.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I will consult before ruling on the Government Whip's motion. Since we have two and a half minutes left, I will recognize the