

Government Orders

Mr. Gauthier: Are they good?

Mr. Hawkes: Those principles may be right or they may be wrong. Certainly members from all three parties are on both sides of that issue. Some believe the principles are correct. Some believe the principles are flawed.

Mr. Gauthier: Put it to a vote.

Mr. Hawkes: The only way, Madam Speaker, for this House to be satisfied about a good, solid recommendation for the future for gun control of this country is to have a committee with the powers of a standing committee, rather than a legislative committee so that the entire situation can be assessed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I think I have heard all that is needed to be heard at this time.

Mr. Waddell: A point of order, Madam Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. member on a point of order. Is it on the same point of order? I think we have heard all sides on this one. The government has called for Motion No. 23. The government has the right to do so. The only thing that the Chair can do right now is put the motion to the House and let us debate it.

Mr. Waddell: Madam Speaker, it is a further point of order.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On a further point of order. The hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

• (1150)

Mr. Waddell: Madam Speaker, I understand what you are saying, but I want further clarification to end the point. The hon. member for Calgary West is now saying that the government wants to propose the motion to send the subject matter of gun control to the committee so there will be a broader look at the whole subject matter, rather than just the narrow look that he claims is contained in Bill C-80. This is the first time the hon. member has said this, so that is his position now.

My question then, and further to this point of order, is what then will happen to Bill C-80?

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. member may want to answer, but my feeling is that the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam is really now debating the motion which I am about to put to the House.

Mr. MacLellan: Madam Speaker, what I find completely unacceptable is that the hon. member for Calgary West stood up and said that this bill had to go to a special committee and not a legislative committee. Under the rules of the House, when a bill passes second reading, it goes to a legislative committee. The hon. member is saying that a legislative committee is not suitable to deal with the government's own legislation which the government has brought before the House.

What the hon. member is doing is condemning his own proposed legislation, yet leaving the proposed legislation on the Order Paper. It is a complete mish-mash. This government is a disgrace. This government does not know what it is doing; it is against its own legislation.

Madam Deputy Speaker: If we are to be into debate, I will recognize the minister. On a point of order, the hon. member for Kamloops.

Mr. Riis: Madam Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt my hon. friend leading off the debate on this motion. I wonder if I could put a question, through you, to the Minister of Justice. Since we are going to start on this rather creative course to deal with a very important matter, normally the government's first speaker would receive an immunity in terms of questions and comments. I want to ask my good friend, the Minister of Justice, whether she would agree to at least a 10-minute question and comment period at the end of her presentation.

Mr. Hawkes: Madam Speaker, let us proceed with the normal course of events, unless we have unanimity in the Chamber to accept this motion. You have not asked whether there is unanimous consent to simply accept the motion and then move to second reading debate.

Mr. Gauthier: Madam Speaker, may I plead with the minister to give us an occasion to ask her a few questions in this House. We have had a bill, before committee, pertaining to young offenders on which she has refused to appear to answer questions of members of Parliament. We are just asking her now: will she please answer questions dealing with this important proposed legislation on this very important subject matter? Ten minutes is not much.

Mr. Crosby: Madam Speaker, as I understand it, to depart from the normal rules of procedure would require the unanimous consent of the House. What the member for Kamloops should have asked for was the unanimous consent of the House to have a question period following the minister's speech. Had he asked for unanimous consent, I would have denied it.