

Government Orders

Is there a private conversation going on while I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, or were you talking to me?

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I was telling the hon. member that you have another two or three minutes left as far as your debate is concerned. I regret if I have disturbed the hon. member's train of thought.

[Translation]

Mr. Gérin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You have a rich experience here, you have been a member of this House of Commons for more than 15 years. As for me, I have only been here since 1984. I don't know if you remember but when I first came to this House as a young member, I was told by my English-speaking Tory colleagues—because Quebec did not have any Tory members before—“Here, my friend—

[English]

—you are in the House of Commons. You will see fair play”.

[Translation]

Where is this fair play? Is that what the House of Commons is all about? In French, the word *communes* or *commun* does not have quite the same meaning.

Were they telling me that the fair play of democracy, the fair play of the British, the fair play of English Canada, the fair play of English Canadian members, would mean gagging a group of members who had faith enough in their ideas and beliefs to the point of leaving this puppet government? Is that fair play? Is that what the House of Commons is all about? Is that democracy? Do you have the right to prevent me from speaking on 62 out of 64 amendments? Is that fair? Is that correct? I am asking you, Mr. Speaker. Answer me, is that correct?

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I intend to take a few minutes only. I know other hon. members would want to speak too and I do intend to co-operate in seeing that others have also the opportunity to express their feelings.

• (1920)

I must say that I listened to what the hon. member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead had to say, but there is something I do not get. If I understand him correctly, he does not intend to vote for the bill, nor to propose any amendment. He does not want to improve the bill in any way, and he certainly does not want to do anything that would give this bill the credibility it is so lacking, according to him.

If this hon. member and others do not wish to propose amendments, do not wish to vote for the bill, when this legislation is passed later on today, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering—

Mr. Lapierre: Mr. Speaker, I know that you are as familiar with the rules of this House as if you had written them yourself. Tell me, Mr. Speaker: is a member of Parliament allowed to presume how another member will be voting later in the evening? That is what the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell just did, and I know that we are—

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I am not a magician and I do not think that we presume anything. Honourable members are honourable members. I would like to listen to his debate. The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.

[Translation]

Mr. Boudria: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, of course, listened to what the speaker before me had to say, even if I was not in total agreement with him. Perhaps he and his colleagues could have reciprocated, especially on this memorable evening in the history of the House of Commons. The point I want to get across to the hon. member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, is this:

What do they care whether we are dealing with section 3, 14 or 33? How can they object since they do not want to change a thing in this bill to improve it and have a better bill? I find it extremely difficult to understand the thinking of the hon. member who spoke before me—

Mr. Gérin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have a problem. In his speech, the hon. member, referring to me, maybe not by name, but in no uncertain terms, asked