

*Government Orders***POINT OF ORDER**

REQUESTS FOR EMERGENCY DEBATES

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to serve notice to the Chair and to the Table with regard to the whole concept of emergency debates. I will not pursue it today but give notice to the Chair I would like to have an opportunity on the floor of the House of Commons to intervene in the whole concept of emergency debates and the procedure which we follow in this House.

Certain acts have taken place over the last 12 months which I think would change, if you will, some of the restrictions which are tied in with the concept of emergency debates. On a future day this week I would like to give my views to the Chair in order that the Chair could have a full understanding as to where the Official Opposition is on this particular subject matter.

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued by my hon. friend's intervention. I think it is a fascinating one and I assume what he is talking about are some of the reforms or changes to the rules.

I suggest to him we have a couple of options. First, we could pursue it through the management committee, whose mandate this falls under or second, he could indicate to me whether he intends to use an opposition day for such a discussion.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I would like to lend my support to my hon. friend's suggestion. Certainly I think we are all interested in reforms of the Standing Orders to allow more flexibility.

We saw a good example—I see my friend nodding in approval—earlier today when the hon. member for Skeena rose on the matter of the astonishing news of the depletion of the ozone over Canada. Obviously it is something we should be dealing with as quickly as possible. I want to lend my support to these great ideas as well, Mr. Speaker. The sooner we get on with it, the better.

Mr. Mills: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I put through you to the government side yesterday a proposal for an emergency debate led by the government to have unlimited hours in order to figure out ways by the end of

the week that we could put Canadians back to work. I wonder if the government could respond to that request.

[*Translation*]

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Considering the nature of our Standing Orders as they relate to emergency debates, I must inform the hon. member for Mackenzie that his motion does not meet the requirements set forth in our present Standing Orders.

However, the Chair is the servant of the House, and if hon. members would prefer to see a little more flexibility, the Chair will of course be glad to accept any changes the House may decide to make.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA ASSISTANCE PLAN

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Monday, February 3, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mazankowski that Bill C-32, an act to amend the Canada Assistance Plan, be read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): At the adjournment of the House yesterday the hon. member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon had four minutes remaining for debate.

Mr. Joe Comuzzi (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, I certainly will not comment on the four minutes. I thought it was longer but I will abide by the request to maintain my remarks to four minutes.

As the debate closed last night I was trying to illustrate those areas of the economies of Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia that would be affected by the capping process in this legislation that is presently before the House. Homes for the aged would be affected, as would nursing homes, hostels for transients, child care institutions, homes for unmarried mothers, residences for physically and mentally disabled persons, residents for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, and rehabilitation services for substance abusers.