

ly in the House, with two exceptions. This means that this motion will not come to a vote and will die on the Order Paper at six o'clock. Am I correct that it was the Conservatives who made it impossible for us to continue this critical and important debate as it touches on environmental issues, native issues, fishery issues and economic issues generally?

**Mr. Dick:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**An Hon. Member:** What are you afraid of?

**Mr. Dick:** I am not afraid of anything, but I should like to tell the Hon. Member, if he does not realize it, that there was no vote taken. It was a matter of standing in our places; there was no question for the yeas—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** That is debate, not a point of order.

**Mr. Riis:** The Tories voted against it; the CN flacks voted against it.

**Mr. Dick:** Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out that the matter does not die but goes back on the Order Paper and may be called again.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** You have made your point. The Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior wishes to answer the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap.

**Mr. Penner:** Mr. Speaker, it occurred to me that if Canadians are watching parliamentarians at work, this is an issue to which they would want to pay close attention because it is not a simple issue. In fact, most decisions which are made are complex and have many aspects to them. It seemed to me that this was a good opportunity for all aspects to be expressed by Members who are concerned. Let them take only one aspect and say that it really bothers them. Let us hear more about the economic impact. We have not heard enough about that today. For goodness sake, why should such an important motion come, as the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) told us, at the eleventh hour, regretfully? Why should we stop at six o'clock and say that that is the end of it? Nothing has been given to the Government to arm it to raise its concerns with the railway and to respond legitimately to the testimony received by the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry. This is why I thought it was important for us to go beyond six o'clock, to continue the debate and hear everything.

**Mr. Riis:** We can't now, is that right?

**Mr. Penner:** We cannot now unless Hon. Members agree at three minutes to six that we will not say anything more and we will let the motion be concurred in. That would be the honourable thing to do.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Penner:** That is the way in which we could say to the Canadian people that the reform of Parliament is not some-

### *Fisheries and Forestry*

thing which will come about when the committee on parliamentary reform has reported. We could say to them that parliamentary reform has begun in this House today because this Parliament is being responsive to one of its committees.

**Mr. Thacker:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner) who has served many years in the House. Does he remember even one occasion upon which his Government permitted such a motion to come to a vote? He is an experienced Member and knows that the committee has done a lot of good work. At the same time he knows that the dynamics of the committee are somewhat different from the dynamics of Cabinet which has to make the final decision on all sort of bases that the committee might not have considered. He knows that that process is ongoing.

What did his Government do in terms of ever letting such a motion come to a vote? What did he do and what did the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) do when he was Minister of the Environment? It was their Government which spawned Crown corporations like fish.

**Mr. Penner:** The Hon. Member is really flattering me way beyond anything I deserve because he is asking me to repeat the first part of my speech. What I am telling him and other Hon. Members is: for goodness sake, let us not get ourselves stuck in the past when Governments did not respond to the work of committees. The Party opposite went to the Canadian people and said that it was time for a change. Who can deny that we want to see changes? But where are these changes supposed to be? Are they supposed to be in some far off place? Why not let those changes begin here? The change we could adopt very easily is that we could begin to listen to standing committees, special committees and task forces of the House.

I am not happy with the past. I said to all Hon. Members of the House that if the previous Government had listened more to its Members, it might still be around governing. If this Government listens more to its committees, it might last a lot longer than I would like it to last. I will put all that aside because I think it is more important to the country, not who governs which political Party, to have good government. We cannot have good government unless we have parliamentarians working along with the Government to give us the best kind of legislation possible.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Fraser:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I just want to clarify something. There was a suggestion made by an Hon. Member on the other side—I am sure it was not with any malice—that all Conservatives had risen—

**Mr. Riis:** Except two, I said.

**Mr. Fraser:** Except two. I just want it recorded, for some reasons which—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, please.