

ought not to have been asked by someone who respects the traditions of this House.

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, I know you have made your ruling and I accept your ruling. You were going to reflect, check the "blues", examine *Hansard*, perhaps check the tape.

I just want to clarify for the Chair that the Leader of the Opposition did not ask for the resignation of any minister involved in the process. In fact the Leader of the Opposition asked as to whether or not the Deputy Prime Minister would assume responsibility on behalf of the Government of Canada, which I suggest to the Chair is quite a distinction in terms of what the government House leader has just said to my colleague for York South—Weston. There is a major distinction.

I do not think it inappropriate that colleagues on this side of the House, when ruled out of order by the Chair, rightly or wrongly, however one wishes to perceive that, should have an opportunity to ask questions of the Chair so that they can clarify any misunderstandings or interpretations that they may have of the rules of this House in order to preclude another opportunity in the very near future to ask a question which might be out of order.

That is the intent of the hon. member. I find it rather disconcerting that the government House leader would stand in his place and try to dictate the policy which the Chair should follow and indeed what this House should follow.

**Mr. Speaker:** Let everybody back up for a few moments. Much of this Question Period has been taken up with what amounts to a national tragedy. As a consequence, some very tough questions have been asked. Some answers have been given. We have had a bit of a procedural disagreement as to whether or not some questions should have been allowed or should not have been allowed.

I do not think it is in keeping with the gravity and sadness of the issue to carry on now and get into a long procedural debate about what the "blues" may or may not show.

I am trying to co-operate with all sides on this matter. I will look at and consider it. The hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond does accept my ruling and does realize that once having made the ruling, that is where we are.

### *Point of Order*

I have not been adverse to hearing members from time to time if it is helpful in asking for some clarification. Perhaps I can do that. I think we should let this go for now and accept the fact that I will look at it and discuss it further with members.

I am concerned about one other matter. Several perhaps. One, there was an argument about noon with respect to an amendment. I would not ordinarily do this because the argument was pretty well closed off. If the hon. opposition House leader wishes to address me shortly on it, I will hear it. Then I will have to go and make up my mind. I have already done some consideration. If the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond wishes to do that, I will hear him briefly.

\* \* \*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if I might just pose a business question and then give you a brief intervention with regard to the admissibility of the amendment. Perhaps the hon. government House leader could indicate to the House the business for tomorrow, Monday, Tuesday and the remaining part of the week.

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the government will call Bill C-21, debt servicing and reduction, for debate at report stage. On Monday, we hopefully will be able to complete the debate on Bill C-21.

On Tuesday, it is my intention at this point in time to call an allotted day. I will confirm that on Monday. In terms of business for the rest of the week, I would like to use the usual channels and discuss with the opposition House leaders the business for the remainder of next week.

\* \* \*

## POINT OF ORDER

### ADMISSIBILITY OF AMENDMENT

**Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, briefly, there was some discussion earlier this day with regard to the admissibility of the amendment which was put forward by my colleague which reads in part: