

raised by civil libertarians and the urgent need for comprehensive reforms to ensure that women and children are not exploited in pornographic literature.

• (1550)

In conclusion, the impression is that Bill C-111 is going to provide considerable assistance to our friends in the Caribbean. This is simply not the case. It also assumes that we will reduce tariffs on semi-conductor parts and computers. We know from the actions of the Government and comments of the Minister of Finance recently that we will be increasing tariffs on semi-conductor parts and other items. There seems to be confusion there.

Finally, the extension of the phase-out date on the prohibition of the import of obscene material to December 31, 1987, in order to allow legislation to be brought in, seems to us to be excessive. We do not need more than a year to deal with this very critical problem. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we will be submitting appropriate amendments to Bill C-111 in committee in the hope that we can bring some sense to Bill C-111 and make it something which will help the Caribbean countries and enable us to move with more haste in dealing with the importation of pornography.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The question is on the motion in the name of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL FISCAL ARRANGEMENTS AND FEDERAL POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND HEALTH CONTRIBUTIONS ACT, 1977

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-96, an Act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal-Post Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977, as reported (without amendment) from a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The Bill comes before the House at report stage at this time. However, the Chair is not yet ready to rule on the motions which have been moved to the Bill. I therefore propose to Members that we proceed with debate on Motion No. 1, without prejudice to whatever ruling may be brought down at a later time.

Federal-Provincial fiscal arrangements

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know what the disposition of other Members in the House would be. However, the House is ready to deal with Bill C-75 and I was in the middle of my speech on that Bill. The Government has called Bill C-96, notwithstanding the fact that the Speaker is not ready or able at this time to rule on amendments which have been moved to this Bill. We have the absolutely unprecedented position of the Speaker, through no fault of the Speaker, being forced to say that—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, order.

Mr. Tobin: The Government is playing games on C-75.

Mr. McKnight: Who is playing games on C-75?

Mr. Tobin: The Government.

Mr. McKnight: Who is making commitments and breaking them?

Mr. Tobin: No commitments were made.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order! I think we can deal with this matter quite rapidly by reminding Hon. Members that the Speaker has already dealt with the issue brought to the attention of the Chair by the Hon. Member for Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe. Before the point of order was raised I proposed to the House that we proceed on Motion No. 1. I would like to draw to the attention of the House, and especially to the attention of the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau), that if we do proceed at this time it is without prejudice to any ruling the Chair may render in a very short time.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order. Frankly, I am concerned about proceeding with debate on a technical amendment—and that is what this is, it is substantive but technical—without knowing whether the amendment is indeed in order. I am not normally opposed to proceeding with amendments when the amendments are of a less important nature than the amendment before us.

I am speaking slowly, as I often do, while trying to get a sense from the Chair as to how long the Chair thinks it might be before a ruling on the acceptance or nonacceptance of Motion No. 1 might be given. As the Chair will recognize, this amendment is very crucial. I submit that it would be unfortunate to have an extended debate on this crucial amendment only to discover in the final analysis that the debate was for nothing.

The House is sitting longer hours in order to facilitate the passage of government business. I suggest that it makes a bit of a mockery of the process if we end up debating things which we do not know will be accepted by the Chair. Perhaps we could get a preliminary ruling on any one of the amendments. It does not necessarily need to be on Motion No. 1. For example, we could debate Motion No. 4 which deals with the date of proclamation. We could have a reasonable debate on