

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, just to add one additional point to the debate. A member who spoke indicated, in directing a comment to you, Mr. Speaker, that the chair of the finance committee referred to the Lichens precedent and that the Speaker in this House indicated in his ruling the other day that the Lachance circumstance would not be considered a precedent.

He said nothing about the Blenkarn incident. I just want to make that clear that he was referring to the Lachance justice committee circumstance when he said this must not be considered a precedent. The hon. member for Mississauga South indicated that he considered it to be a precedent but the Chair indicated that it ought not be and he certainly said nothing about the Blenkarn incident. That is the point we are trying to make. We do not want that to become a precedent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I am not going to argue with the hon. member but I think that when he referred to the Lachance committee he knew who the chairman was in the committee. I would suggest to the hon. member—I may be wrong—that he might have referred to Blenkarn.

In any event, was the hon. member for Chambly rising on this point or was he going to ask the hon. minister a question or comment?

Mr. Edmonston: Mr. Speaker, I was going to make a comment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): A comment in regard to this point of order?

Mr. Edmonston: Addressed to one of the principles that were raised by the parliamentary secretary.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I think I have heard enough arguments today in regard to the matter here today. I think we should carry on. I will listen to the hon. member's point of order. The hon. member for Chambly.

Mr. Phillip Edmonston (Chambly): I will be very brief. I have also been very patient listening to the arguments raised on both sides of the House but I find that one of the principles that has been overlooked is the principle of *audi alteram partem*. I would appreciate if you take a look at that principle, Mr. Speaker, which means that all parties should be heard.

The opposition, whichever party we are talking about in opposition, argues that this principle of *audi alteram partem* has to be respected. If we take away the tools of the opposition so that the parties be heard, we cannot be in opposition. It is a farce.

We hear the argument that might makes right, that we have to govern, but one of the principal ingredients of governing correctly is listening to all parties. One of the reasons for this situation is that the parties were not listened to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will now conclude by thanking hon. members: the hon. member for Kamloops, the hon. Whip, the hon. parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Edmonton East, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, all the hon. gentleman who have contributed. I appreciate all the arguments that have taken place here today and I will take everything under advisement and come back as soon as possible to make a ruling.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

STRIKING—THIRTY-FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the thirty-fifth report of the Striking Committee and if the House will give its consent, later this day I intend to move concurrence in that report.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*Translation*]

STRIKING COMMITTEE

THIRTY-FIFTH REPORT CONCURRED IN

M. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier.

That the Thirty-fifth report of the Striking Committee, tabled earlier today, be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.