

his position, I hope we can talk with him at the time our legislation will be brought forward, and get his support.

● (1730)

**Mr. Kaplan:** Mr. Speaker, in making his remarks, the hon. member opposite referred to me and said that he was sure I would agree that the matter was a difficult one and that it should be given more consideration. I want to assure the House that I do not agree with that assertion. As I proposed the bill, it is totally a matter of civil liberties within Canada. That is all it touches. I cannot understand why consultation should be necessary to determine whether we should protect the civil liberties of Canadians.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCain):** Order, please. I think the hon. member is participating in debate.

[Translation]

**Mr. David Kilgour (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I shall be brief. At the beginning of this debate, we asked if it was acceptable to proceed with Bill C-203, but I think you also said that such was the government's request. It seems this is not completely accurate because the government did not request such a decision from you, sir. I would suggest that Bills C-201 and C-202 are not ready for discussion at this point, and ask whether hon. members would be agreeable to discuss the bill put forward by the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan), with unanimous consent, pursuant to Standing Orders 18, 19 and 49, and the finding by Mr. Deputy Speaker of December 5, 1977.

[English]

In a word, Your Honour, I think it was a misunderstanding that we proceeded with this bill at the request of the government. As members know, the government can do this but twice in a session; that is my understanding. Therefore I would ask Your Honour to ask hon. members to agree unanimously that we proceed with this bill now, rather than at the request of the government.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCain):** The hon. member has asked for unanimous consent.

**Mr. Lachance:** On the same point, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Knowles:** This is a nice way to take up time.

**Mr. Thomas H. Lefebvre (Pontiac-Gatineau-Labelle):** Mr. Speaker, we all realize why the parliamentary secretary has been asked to do this. He mentioned it in his request, so that the postponement is not put under the request of the government. Under the rules, if these bills are asked for twice in the name of the government, they cannot come back.

We will agree with this, provided the Chair and members of the House realize that from time to time there may be members on this side of the House who will have bills in the order which come up for discussion when those members are away for very valid reasons. I should remind the House that

### *Foreign Economic Boycotts*

we would expect the same courtesy from the parliamentary secretary, who cannot divorce himself from his duties in representing the government. Therefore, we would agree, but I hope the Chair and the House remembers that it could happen to members of the official opposition or of the other parties as well.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCain):** Is there unanimous consent that the record shall show Bill C-201 and Bill C-202 have been stood by unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCain):** The record shall be changed to record the two changes as requested and approved.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan) I did not know whether to laugh or cry, because his recounting of the history of this bill was very selective, to say the least.

It is true that Bill C-203 is exactly the same as Bill C-32 which was introduced in the last session of the last Parliament by the then minister of industry, trade and commerce, Mr. Horner. Also it is true that at one point there was agreement on the part of opposition parties to let the bill go through. I will not thrash old straw as to why it did not go through, but the only reason there was agreement to let that bill go through, without extensive debate on the part of a number of opposition members, was that we knew very well the then government had no real desire to get anti-boycott legislation on the books.

The bill introduced by the government of the day was the most to which that government would agree. What that bill did in the last Parliament, and what the bill now before us does, is simply to require individuals or companies, which co-operate with countries involved in boycott operations against Canadian citizens or Canadian companies, to report it to the government, and the government would make it public. There would be no penalty, there would be no censor except publicity.

In the last session we agreed to let that bill through quickly because it was the best we could get. I know the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) was unhappy with the meagreness of that bill, and I assume the hon. member for York Centre was unhappy. Now that he is no longer a member on the government side, I would have thought he would have brought forward a bill which would really do the job. The bill before the House does not really do anything.

I recognize that we are dealing with a very difficult situation. One cannot live in the late 1970s and not realize the tremendous power which oil-producing countries have in our modern industrialized world. One just has to look at the difficulties in which the Prime Minister (Mr. Clark) and his government have become involved as a result of the Prime Minister's pledge, when he was leader of the official opposition, to move the Canadian embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. We recognize the difficulties. It might sound like hindsight, but I say to the government whip who has spoken on this