

Point of Order—Mr. Paproski

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. First, let me thank the minister for telephoning yesterday to advise me of his inadvertent misleading of the House. His answer leaves open questions as to whether there is a danger that, as a result of the energy policy introduced by this government, the United States, or any other country, will invoke action under GATT; will invoke action under the U.S. mines, minerals and lands act; will invoke action of the OECD; and whether there is going to be any impediment or deterioration of the Canadian position in relation to the fisheries treaty; our representations on Garrison, our representations on the "Buy American" program, and whether there will be any other dangerous impact to Canada which will cost us more in terms of jobs or in terms of investment than the government's energy policy has already cost Canada. We want to hear from the minister in some detail as to just how much this policy will cost Canada. We know about the jobs which are being lost in western Canada, Ontario, and Quebec, but we want to know what new dangers loom as a result of international objections to an energy policy which was framed without the participation of the Department of External Affairs.

MR. PAPROSKI—PROCEDURE RESPECTING S.O. 43 MOTION

Hon. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton North): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It concerns the same point of order raised by the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. McMillan). Madam Speaker, when you heard the noes, did you hear them from your right hand side or from your left hand side? On this side of the House we agreed to the motion, so the disagreement must have been from the other side.

I would like to add that there is no place in either May's or Beauchesne which says that the hon. member who said no should not stand up and be recognized. I have tried to find something in the rule books. If it is the hon. member for York East (Mr. Collenette) who keeps saying no, I wish he would get up so the people of this country can see who it is who is saying no to all our motions under Standing Order 43.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: No!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. D. M. Collenette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, I simply rise to underline the answer which you gave to the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. McMillan). A little earlier today a motion was put by my colleague, the hon. member for Don Valley East (Mr. Smith), concerning the Wallenberg case. This same motion was moved a couple of weeks ago and passed this House, and no one on this side of the House said no. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. No matter on which

side of the House members sit, hon. members should rely on your judgment and your hearing ability.

Mr. Paproski: Madam Speaker, I just want to apologize—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I have already heard the hon. member for Edmonton North (Mr. Paproski). I must reiterate that I heard hon. members saying no. When I hear noes, the Standing Order does not obligate me, or the members, to identify who said no, or from which side of the House they came. I can only tell the House that I heard noes, and they did not come from heaven!

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, may I ask the government House leader to confirm the business which we will be dealing with when we get to orders of the day today and his expectation for tomorrow? Since the adjournment motion has been passed and we will be returning on January 12, could the House leader indicate now, as specifically as possible, the legislation we will be dealing with when we return? I understand we will be beginning a new cycle with respect to allotted days. Perhaps he may wish to designate the first allotted day upon our return.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, this morning we met and agreed to deal with Bill C-34 this afternoon. It is most likely that we will vote on the amendment on second reading of that bill before five o'clock. The bill will then be sent to committee for further study. Tonight, if possible, we will be dealing with second reading stage of Bill C-50. I understand we have an agreement to put up only one speaker per party and to send that bill to a standing committee rather than to Committee of the Whole House. This will be followed by resuming debate on Bill C-48.

● (1510)

[*Translation*]

If we complete study of Bill C-50 this evening, tomorrow we will resume the debate on second reading of Bill C-48 entitled an act to regulate oil and gas interests in Canada lands and to amend the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act, in the hope of completing it tomorrow and referring the bill to the standing committee of the House. Should a vote become indicated tomorrow, as we have agreed, it would be put off till after the Christmas break at whatever time we then agree upon, that is, till after January 12.

Should we manage to complete study of Bill C-48 tomorrow, then we could resume the debate on second reading of the bill on January 12, when we come back and during that week.