

the Government in power, acknowledged that a modicum of order was necessary and that we had to adopt procedures that would be fair and equitable to all . . .

**Ms. Copps:** . . . and reasonable.

**Mr. Gauthier:** . . . and reasonable, as the Hon. Member said, and that the House must be able to dispose of debate quickly. That, Madam Speaker, we can accept.

Today however, they would have us believe that after seven hours of debate . . . I am not making this up. If we look at the Order Paper, it indicates . . . I may remind Hon. Members that we normally have eight hours of debate on second reading, and after those eight hours of debate broken down into 20-minute speeches, we have 10-minute speeches.

Today, in the *Projected Order of Business*, we read: Bill C-129:

—20-minute maximum during the next hour of debate: speeches are subject to 10-minute question and comment period.

There was one hour of debate left before starting on the usual eight hours for considering this Bill.

The Government has used this procedure to cut off debate, which amounts to strong arm tactics, to prevent Members of this House from speaking to the important subject matter of Bill C-129, which is the privatization of Air Canada.

Madam Speaker, I have not had a chance to speak to the Bill yet, and only seven Liberal Members have spoken so far. I would, however, like to take part in the debate, and I would like to give the House the benefit of the views of my constituents, who feel that today's privatization of Air Canada is a bad thing, and I want to let the Government know that we are against privatization, but being against the Bill does not mean that I will consistently oppose and obstruct. Certainly not!

We have a Government that is making proposals with which we cannot agree. We have only sixteen days of debate left, and we are being asked to pass forty-one bills between now and the end of June!

Madam Speaker, let's stop playing games! The Government is playing games because it doesn't know how to manage its time. It never learned how in the three and half years it has been in power, and it never will. But asking Members, after seven hours of debate, to forget it, to say: "It's over, no more debate!" . . . and to vote on the Bill . . . They can say it, and they can do it, but I can't agree with this way of doing things, Madam Speaker. This is using the majority like a sledgehammer. This is a Government that doesn't know how to manage its affairs, that is incompetent in the way it administers the House, or should I say in the way that it administers the business of the House, because fortunately, running the House is not the Government's responsibility, but the Chair's. The Government, however, is responsible for the business of the House, and as the Government proposes, we, considering our small numbers, must try to dispose, through sensible debate.

### *Time Allocation*

Madam Speaker, I have an important speech to make about Air Canada. There are clauses in this Bill that upset me. There are a number of things that upset me a great deal. Like many Members, we are exposed to a certain amount of lobbying.

Air Canada is now lobbying me very seriously about clause 10 of the Bill. I wanted to mention this in the House because I think it is important for Members from Quebec and those who support the French fact to know that Air Canada does not agree with Bill C-129 and Clause 10. It wants to get rid of clause 10.

Never! I will never agree to any changes in Bill C-129 that would release Air Canada from its obligation to comply with the Official Languages Act.

I wanted to say this, and I will, if I have a chance, Madam Speaker. All Members of this House should realize there is a lot of scheming going on within the establishment of Air Canada. That doesn't sit well with the Government which may have bitten off more than it could chew, as it does, from time to time.

In any case, I don't agree with this business of being told after seven hours of debate that the debate is over with. There are many Members on this side of the House who don't agree either and who would like to speak and who will, Madam Speaker. If we have to, we will use the Standing Orders to show the Government we don't agree with its sledgehammer policy, with its constant pushing and shoving of Opposition Members, trying to get them to be . . .

**Mr. Rossi:** Accommodating.

**Mr. Gauthier:** . . . accommodating, as the Hon. Member for Bourassa (Mr. Rossi) just said. They are acting like dictators, Madam Speaker.

I repeat that last Friday, the Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board) (Mr. Lewis) tried to use a motion to extend the hours of debate on Friday in order to finish second reading. He said earlier that if the proposal was not acceptable on Friday, objections should have been raised right away.

Madam Speaker, I watched when the Minister came back a little later in the debate to move that the House limit the debate on Bill C-129 to one additional day. He did so at 1.35 p.m., only twenty-five minutes before the House adjourned. And he expects us to accept his argument that if we didn't agree, we should have asked the Chair for a ruling at the time, to find out whether the motion was in order.

Madam Speaker, I submit that this argument is as specious as his argument that there has already been enough debate at this stage. I suppose the Parliamentary Secretary, who has just entered the House, will try and rise again in this debate and will move, at one o'clock or even before then, that the House continue sitting during lunch time and that the additional time be used to debate the motion pursuant to Standing Order 117.