

Government Orders

I ask the Speaker to make a simple ruling, not to quash anything, but simply to give the members an opportunity to look at the amendments which some members have already seen to see what the Speaker has already seen. As an ordinary member of the House I have not had the opportunity. My last chance to get that opportunity lies in your hands and I simply ask you, sir, not to stop the process, not to set it aside, but to give me the opportunity that some members have had. I believe that it is basically unfair and the House should not proceed with amendments to legislation when some members have seen it and other members have not. Sir, you are my last chance.

Mr. Speaker: Members may have a grievance.

Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I am the critic for my party and financial institutions. I find it totally unacceptable what is happening here this morning.

We have been at this process for over a year. It has been a very long and complicated process. We arrive this morning and we find dozens of amendments, I believe 95 in all, that we have never seen before. Several days ago, we in the Opposition had our amendments in. You would think that the government would try to have the amendments in.

Its only common courtesy that it should. We should have copies of these amendments before we arrive in the House to debate them. It certainly indicates to me that this government is really disorganized. I always knew that before but here is an extreme example. We are debating today the biggest reform of financial institutions ever to take place in the history of Canada.

The government comes in this morning and presents us with dozens of amendments that we are supposed to discuss.

As I said, this is legislation that is complex. We have been at it for over a year. We have to study each of these amendments and know how one affects the other, and so on.

I find it unacceptable that it would come in with these amendments and not give us time to look at them. I even heard this morning that one section was left out of an amendment.

If you do not call that total disorganization, I do not know what you call it. I think it certainly points out that the government is being arrogant, insensitive, discourteous and disorganized. As I said, I am the critic for my party for financial institutions and I find this situation totally unacceptable.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out the role that we have played in the committee.

I have been the critic for our party for financial institutions. I took that responsibility very, very seriously. All through the hearings on the bills in committee, I tried to annotate whatever changes we agreed to in the committee.

As subsequent bills came, I tried to match those amendments with the following bills because they were all interconnected. In fact, we have been very co-operative on this side of the House.

In the previous Parliament, we did Bill C-83. That was Bill C-4's previous name in another Parliament. We agreed unanimously to resurrect Bill C-83 in the form it had when the committee finished with it. We resurrected it as Bill C-4.

We agreed unanimously in this House. The co-operation of my party was given to extend the Bank Act for a year so that the Bank Act would not have run out in April 1990.

We agreed unanimously to second reading debate of three bills. We did three bills, Bills C-19, C-28 and C-34, in one shot. When last have you ever heard of three bills being debated at second reading in one shot? In one shot?

We did that, and we agreed that Bill C-4 would wait until we were finished with these other three bills. We then went to report stage. We went to committee stage and we dealt with those three bills very, very expeditiously.

All during the process, the chairman of the committee, the member for Mississauga South is going to lead the government, he is going to be *in loco ministerio*. While he cannot be a minister, he is going to act as a minister today with these bills.