

budgets, opposition days, discussion papers, draft legislation, committee hearings and Question Period.

I think the citation is clear. We are not moving on any legislative action taken upon sudden impulse. We are moving after a great deal of consideration.

Because it is at issue politically when one gets outside the walls of this House whether or not there is a basis for moving closure, I want to review for the record not only debate but delay over the past few days.

The issue was brought forward by a notice of Ways and Means tabled in the House on Monday, January 22. The Ways and Means motion was concurred in on January 23.

On January 24, prior to the introduction of the GST, the House leader of the New Democratic Party raised a point of order on the scope of the Ways and Means and Ways and Means reference to documents not tabled in the House asking that the introduction of the bill await the Speaker's ruling. The Speaker declined and agreed not to let the goods and services tax bill go to second reading until he had ruled.

The bill was introduced and read the first time with two votes. This was on a New Democratic Party allotted day. It required two votes to get it introduced.

Then, what did members of the New Democratic Party do to their own opposition day? They forced votes on the introduction of two private members' bills calling for three votes altogether.

On Thursday, January 25, the government on that day was forced to move to Orders of the Day to avoid a filibuster.

On Friday, January 26, we called other business awaiting the Speaker's ruling. The members of the NDP filibustered Government Orders. They did it this way. This is the time of the taxpayers and the time of the House.

There was one vote on concurrence in a committee report, and another vote on a motion that another member be heard. There was another recorded vote to move to Orders of the Day. Then there was a motion that the House do now adjourn. That is delay—

**Mr. Speaker:** I wonder if the hon. minister could assist the Chair.

### *Speaker's Ruling*

The Chair is extremely aware of the facts which the hon. Minister of Justice is relating. We have a careful argument put before the Chair. If it would suit the hon. minister, I want to deal with it now. I propose to let the House recess for five minutes while I consider the argument put to me by the hon. member for Kamloops.

### SITTING SUSPENDED

The sitting of the House was suspended at 4.47 p.m.

### SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 4.57 p.m.

### SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Kamloops has raised a point of order in which he says it would be improper to accept the government's motion for closure. He makes four points in this argument.

First, to paraphrase his own effective use of language and his own eloquence—and I do not mean to do a disservice to him by boiling it down into one point—his first point really is that under all the circumstances it is not fair that debate be curtailed.

He makes reference to comments that I made at another time, pointing out that in this Chamber there are many methods used by both sides in a dispute to make their point. With respect to that ruling, nothing that I say today should be considered to be any detraction from it.

Second, the hon. member for Kamloops argued that the government ought not to be moving closure at this time. He also argued that closure was being used for a purpose for which it was never really intended and that the effect of this is to limit freedom of speech in the chamber.

Third, he argued that closure contravenes the Constitution of the country.

Last, and I think I have it straight, he argued that the use of closure here is inconsistent with the practice in the United Kingdom House. He refers to constitutional sections which indicate that the rights of members here ought not be any the less than the rights of members under the Constitution of the United Kingdom. I am going to deal with each of these. Before I do, I want to say that the hon. member for Kamloops presented his