

*Byelections*

agree and I said so, but nevertheless I do not think we do justice to this piece of legislation if there are others who want to speak to it.

We ought not to apply a guillotine and deprive members of this chamber of the opportunity of addressing themselves to Bill C-209. I would therefore invite my colleagues on all sides to vote against this guillotine motion and allow other members of the chamber to be heard on the subject. There are three or four members on this side who wish to speak, and I am sure there are others on the other side who would like to address themselves to the resolution.

I invite members of the chamber to vote against the motion now before us that the question be put, in order that we may hear our colleagues.

● (1810)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ray Chénier (Timmins-Chapleau):** Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that private members' hour is an opportunity for us to present suggestions and to move private bills and that it allows members who want to take part in the discussion to do so. That is why today, because I am in favour of the bill before us, I spent long hours preparing what I would say. But if at every debate during private members' hour there is a proposal like the one made tonight I think it will become quite dangerous because whenever a member wants his bill to be passed all he will have to do is to propose it.

That will end the debate and will force a vote. But I think that limits the freedom of members of this House to take part in an extremely important and legitimate debate. It is our role to participate in debates. I think that the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) indeed tried to impose on us a system which, to my mind, is not democratic because it is precisely our role to consider bills and to try to weigh all the pros and cons. Today, we find out that we cannot speak in this House which is supposed to be a place for debates. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I find I must reject the proposal put forth by the hon. member for Crowfoot.

[*English*]

**Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi):** Mr. Speaker, I am one of those other members who wish to speak on the bill, but now I will have to address myself to the motion. The first thing I must say about this motion is that it strikes me as being one of the most hypocritical acts I have seen in this House in a long time. As the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader said, we agreed to extend the sitting hours this evening in order that the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone), who introduced a very worth-while bill, would have the full hour to discuss this bill. Then we had a stunt pulled on us, a swift.

On various occasions between 1974 and 1979 when the government brought in rule 75 to limit the time of debate, I recall the howls of outrage, the wringing of hands, the crocodile tears, the screaming of "guillotine" from the other side of

the House, were something that would bring tears to the eyes of a blind sow. But now we have the very same people, or at least one of them, doing what they condemned over and over again when we were in power for doing it in a legitimate fashion after many hours of debate in every case. Yet in the last parliament we saw the government of that day bring in the guillotine rule, or limitation of debate, at the very moment of introducing a bill.

There is just no consistency in the way that party behaves. Not only is their interim leader inconsistent, but it seems that many of their members are inconsistent as well. This is an outrage against this House after the House agreed to an extension of time.

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

**Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi):** It is a discourtesy to the members of this House. This should not go unchallenged, and I will now have to vote against this motion even though I had intended to speak briefly on the bill and to support the principle in the bill presented by the hon. member for Crowfoot.

**Mr. Yurko:** Mr. Speaker, I think it should be made very clear that the motion is perfectly in order. The motion was put after two members—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member cannot speak again on the motion that he has placed before the House.

**An hon. Member:** Learn the rules.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The House has a motion before it. The House is debating the motion, as is its right to do. I will now recognize another speaker. In this case I am recognizing the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Laniel).

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérald Laniel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up the remarks just made by the hon. member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne). Having been here for 18 years I have heard the Tory opposition and even sometimes the NDP complain about the arrogance of this government which on a few occasions, to run the business of the country, had to resort to Standing Order 75C or what the other side used to call closure to make progress in the government's business. Here they are now, unexpectedly, at the last minute, without any warning, calling for the question early in a debate interesting all members.

I would like to point out to the hon. member that even in the case of Standing Order 75C, the rules call for notice to be given, and if the hon. member wants to refer to Standing Order 33 and read it carefully, even then, a minister must rise to give notice of closure, and I want to quote Standing Order 33, at page 26, which reads as follows: