Government Orders

• (1200)

FORESTRY

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions. The first is from residents of the spruce capital, Prince George, in northern B.C., who have signed the petition urging the government to move quickly to ensure that the Forest Resource Development Agreement between the federal Government of Canada and the Province of British Columbia is signed to ensure that the replanting of our harvested lands takes place.

PROPOSED GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Mr. Speaker, I also have a petition signed by residents of British Columbia in communities like Lone Butte, Powell River, Coquitlam and Sechelt, who are expressing concern about a disappointment, as the member from Kamloops said, over this government's plans to introduce a goods and services tax. These petitioners call upon the government to bring in effective income tax measures that are fair and equitable to all Canadians.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all questions on the Order Paper be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall all questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I wish to inform the House that, because of the ministerial statement, Government Orders will be extended by 21 minutes beginning at one o'clock.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada) moved that Bill C-43, an Act

respecting abortion, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On a point of order, the hon. member for Kamloops.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, before we hear the Minister of Justice make his presentation on this very critical area, I would suggest that we give some thought to the following. Normally when the government introduces legislation, as it is doing today, the tradition has always been that the government would make its presentation, followed by a member of the opposition, then back to the government, and back and forth across the aisle with members speaking in favour of or against the legislation.

Recognizing that this is a special piece of legislation where there may be people speaking both in support or against from all sides of the House, I wonder whether the House would give some consideration to not following the usual course of having a speaker from the government and then from one of the opposition parties, but that we simply look at it in terms of speakers who are speaking for the legislation or against the legislation. In that manner a much more balanced debate would take place over the next few days. Perhaps we could even do it on a gender basis, with an effort being made to have men and women speaking on this in the first hours of the debate.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, we cannot agree to that proposal, basically because it would have to be well known prior to debate what the position of the individual speakers are, and I think that would be prejudicial to the debate.

I would like to just make one point. Is it possible for the House of Commons to provide some of us with additional copies of this bill because it is in great demand by the population? The House is only giving out up to one hundred copies of the bill per member. I wondered if we could resolve that by asking the House of Commons to make available reasonable amounts of copies to those members who request additional copies.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, may I first react to the comments of the official opposition whip. We too would favour publication of more of the bill simply because of the nature of the debate and the interest across the country in it.

If I may respond to my friend, the House leader for the NDP, let me say that we would have some concerns with that because, as has been mentioned, one does not