

Motions for Papers

There is another aspect which cannot be overlooked, and that is that negotiations are still continuing concerning this particular matter, so I must say I cannot accede to the request of the hon. member because Standing Order 26(16)(a) provides that a matter proposed for discussion must relate to a genuine emergency. Previous Speakers and I have considered this necessary to justify setting aside the business of the House.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Of course, it could also be pointed out that this is the subject matter of our opposition day tomorrow, as has already been filed and tabled.

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, on the same point of order raised by the House leader for the official opposition, it has to be pointed out that until five o'clock today tomorrow's subject matter is not necessarily the subject matter put down by the Conservative Party.

Mr. Nielsen: That is a pretty fine hair.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 87 in the name of the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski)?

[Text]

Motion No. 87—**Mr. Korchinski:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence and communications, including telephone submissions, regarding the application by Cargill Grain Limited for a grant from DREE towards construction of an Oil Seed Crushing Plant at Melfort, Saskatchewan.

[English]

Madam Speaker: Shall the notice of motion stand?

Some hon. Members: Stand.

Motion stands.

Mr. Smith: I ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motions for the production of papers stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. WADDELL—DEBATE ON ENERGY BILLS

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order in relation to the tabling and debate of the energy bills. I wonder if I might raise this point now. This morning Bill C-103 was printed—

Mr. Smith: On the point of order, Madam Speaker, I request—

Madam Speaker: I have one point of order. I cannot hear two at the same time.

Mr. Smith: Can the hon. member wait until the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) gets here?

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell).

Mr. Waddell: Madam Speaker, this is a serious matter because of what has happened around here in the last few weeks. The point concerns the timing of the energy bills and the debate. A draft bill with respect to energy security was tabled about a year ago. Seventy-five changes were incorporated in that bill, which became a new bill, Bill C-94, with which Your Honour is familiar. Then there was the bell-ringing episode in the House. The bill is now divided as a result of an all-party agreement. One would have thought that Bill C-94 would have been split into eight bills and that we would have known what would be in them and then would simply debate them. But that is not the case. There have been changes in the bills as they are split.

• (1530)

This morning we received a bill, so we have had it for about three hours. It is a most complicated tax bill containing about eight different tax changes. There are discrepancies not only between that bill and Bill C-94 but between it and the previous budget bills. When we have had an opportunity to examine it we may find that there are also discrepancies between it and the Ways and Means motion which was tabled a couple of days ago. Without going into detail, already I have picked up discrepancies in the area of the Canadian ownership charge, the transportation and fuel compensation recovery charge and the Canadian ownership account.

It is very difficult for the opposition to prepare for second reading debate properly when the bills are dropped upon us just about two hours ahead of the debate. We will debate this bill just after the vote this afternoon, at about 4:15 or 4:30 p.m. That does not give us enough time to prepare properly for debate on the bill.

In the interests of fairness and procedure, I would ask the minister to consider the wisdom of dropping these bills on the House without giving adequate time for members to consider them. The committee is meeting at the moment and through this afternoon will continue to meet. How can the energy critics of the various parties attend the meeting of the special