

Routine Proceedings

gives other members of the House the same right. It is all or nothing.

Mr. Speaker: I think the situation is clear. With consent of the House, the government, the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party apparently agreed there would be a statement by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, by the hon. member for York Centre and by another member for the New Democratic Party, but that's all. According to the Standing Orders, statements are not appropriate, except by the member tabling the committee report, unless there is consent. There is no consent for debate, only for a statement by the three parties in the House.

[*English*]

Very reluctantly, I have had to suggest that the commentary in response to the hon. member for Sherbrooke should be confined to the committee report and its contents and the activities of the committee.

I felt that it was not appropriate on this occasion. I have some sense that there may not be even consent for a wide-ranging debate that goes back into matters that led up to the matter.

The hon. member for York Centre has said that he wishes to defer his statements to another time because he feels he has a position to put forward. I think that that is where we should leave it.

The hon. member for Mégantic—Compton—Stansstead wants an opportunity to comment on the report. That opportunity is available by taking steps to put a motion for concurrence on the Order Paper and within 48 hours that matter can be called in the House. If the hon. member wishes to do that, he would be able to start off by having a full 20-minute debate, and other members, of course, could join in. So there is the opportunity to make representations, if the hon. member wishes to avail himself of those procedures.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérin: Mr. Speaker, thank you for this clarification. You will realize that I refuse to give unanimous consent. I refuse to consent to a debate, even by representatives of the three parties. And if as I see it, the consent of members of this House must be unanimous, it

should be obvious to the Chair that consent has not been given.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I think the difficulty is that consent was obtained. I have taken it upon myself to limit the tone of the debate and received co-operation. I will now hear the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, I join with pride the chairman of our committee and the representative of the Liberal party, and on behalf of the member for Burnaby—Kingsway, by saying that today is an historic day in this country.

What we have done with our report is to set the table for what is the constitutional accommodation that will bring Quebec into the constitutional family of Canada, which is extremely important. At the same time I believe that we have addressed the concerns and the suggestions of other people to make one united Canada, which is the most important thing.

• (1120)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I believe and I hope that we have found national accommodation for national reconciliation. We have respected the conditions set by the Province of Quebec, and we have also considered the concerns of other Canadians across this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is up to the Prime Minister of Canada and the provincial Premiers to act. It is time to act now, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition today, signed by numerous residents of Sarnia, Ontario and some from Vancouver as well, who are opposed to the goods and services tax.

These petitioners indicate that the government has imposed something like 31 tax increases since it took office in 1984. They object to the imposition of further taxes in the form of the goods and services tax and they call upon Parliament to reject this tax.