

Government Orders

In the event that there is some concern among members as to just exactly how this rule ought to be interpreted, I will go away and give it some consideration. In the meantime, it may be that as the hon. member for Kamloops has suggested that I deem the applications to be in front of me, I can only do that, of course, with the consent of the House.

• (1150)

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, may I make a couple of points, the first one being that when I moved the motion yesterday, and I did move the motion that we move to Orders of the Day, it was not in any way my intention to cut off emergency debates. In all fairness, had the opposition advised me that they had made an application for such a debate, I am sure we would have been able to co-operate and to accommodate them in some fashion.

I want to say also, without in any way establishing a precedent, I have no problem and on our side we would be willing to accept the recommendation of my hon. friend from Kamloops, the House Leader of the NDP, in that those notices which were given yesterday, notice or notices, I am not sure what you are dealing with, being treated as though they were refiled again today, as long as that does not establish a precedent, and also does not in any way reflect on the government's opinion as to whether or not those particular issues in fact do represent an emergency.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell may have a point that I have omitted, and I will hear him.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I want to make just a brief point to add to something that has been said, to ask the Speaker to consider one other element when Mr. Speaker makes his definitive ruling on the interpretation of Standing Order 52 and it is the following.

My colleague, the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier, has described to Mr. Speaker why he believes that indeed today or at the immediate opportunity on the next day, there should be no need to refile and I accept that point. I wanted to make one further point. I wonder if the Speaker could consider as well whether it would have been appropriate yesterday, as a matter of fact

immediately after the vote to move to Orders of the Day, to deal with the issue.

I say this for the following reason, Mr. Speaker. I am not saying it was the motivation this time, but any government could in the future, if the Speaker's ruling today remains unchallenged, utilize the procedure of moving to Orders of the Day in order to stop the opposition from proposing to Mr. Speaker that pursuant to Standing Order 52, we have an adjournment debate. In fact, the government may have developed this tool now by accident. I am not saying it will use it, but the precedent would nevertheless be there.

If the Speaker could consider that immediately after such a vote were taken, if there were a similar vote taken in the future to move to Orders of the Day, that that vote not prevent the Speaker from ruling immediately after on the application under Section 52. That is the point that I wanted to make.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate the comments of hon. members. I think we have an arrangement in the House, at least at the moment, and I will deem that the applications are in front of me and I will deal with them at three o'clock this afternoon.

I want to say to hon. members that whatever remarks I have said or any remarks that anybody else has said here today do not stand as any kind of a precedent. I will consider the issue and come back to it. But I think it is fair to comment, and especially for the public watching, that if this were a skilful ploy, the House Leader has made it very clear today that he is not proceeding with that intent. I think the public should know that this matter at least for today has been resolved by agreement between the parties and I thank the hon. member for Kamloops for his suggestion.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

INCOME TAX ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Monday, January 22, consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C-52, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act and related Acts, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.