

In light of this simplistic proposal circulated for discussion, does the Minister have plans that he can now announce for amending the proposals put forward, and has he had discussions with the Secretary of State about a more suitable response to the voluntary sector in Canada?

[Translation]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, a departmental working paper was published precisely so that all interested parties could express their views, give us their suggestions, and guarantee, on the one hand that there would be no abuses of the fiscal system by the foundations, and on the other, that true charitable organizations would receive all the fiscal benefits provided by the Act. We have had many meetings with representatives from these organizations. We have received many suggestions. We are now examining these proposals and I shall be able to announce in due time certain decisions or conclusions. For the moment, we are still considering the comments and suggestions made to us.

[English]

ROLE SUGGESTED FOR COMMITTEE

Mr. Walter McLean (Waterloo): Madam Speaker, while the Minister has had individual representations, there has been no opportunity for these groups to appear before a committee of this House, or in any other public forum. Is the Minister now prepared to put the findings he has received before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs in the same way as the subject of the general support of the voluntary sector has been referred to that committee for discussion?

[Translation]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, the suggestion of the Hon. Member is certainly surprising. I have to tell him once again that I made public a working paper which is neither official nor governmental, but simply a departmental working paper, so that the organizations concerned can express their views. I repeat that we have had many meetings. The submissions made by these organizations are in the public domain if these organizations so wish it. When I decide to make a specific legislative proposal to Parliament, this proposal will obviously be considered by Parliament at that time. Until then, I believe that such an initiative would be at the very least premature, and I would invite instead the Parliamentary Committee to concentrate on issues dealing with specific bills.

Time Allocation

● (1500)

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

NOTICE OF ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER REPORT AND THIRD READING STAGES OF BILL C-155

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I would like to rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deans: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Axworthy: I wish to inform the House that there have been consultations among the representatives of the Parties.

Mr. Deans: Point of order!

Mr. Axworthy: It has not been possible to reach an agreement pursuant to Standing Order 80 and Standing Order 81 with regard to the allocation of time on the report stage and third reading stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Shame on you!

Mr. Deans: Point of order.

Mr. Axworthy: Therefore, at the next sitting of the House I shall propose a motion, pursuant to Standing Order 82, to allocate two sitting days to the report stage and one sitting day to the third reading stage of the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, I contend that the statement made by the Minister is certainly not a point of order. It may well be a statement by a Minister for which authority has been granted, but there is no point of order that allows a Minister to rise and make a statement.

While I am on my feet, I move:

That we proceed to Orders of the Day.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member is quite wrong. Such motions have been moved before under points of order. I have a list of them here. Therefore, that notice of motion by the Hon. Minister is quite valid in the House.

If the Hon. Member now wants to move another motion, he may do so. But that particular motion was perfectly valid. Furthermore, the Hon. Member should know that he may not move the adjournment of the House on a point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I would have expected the courtesy, by the traditional usages and customs of this place, of being heard on the point of order raised before the Chair made a ruling, for I did have submissions to make. I would like to make them now while the Minister is in his seat. You have made your ruling, and I will not question that.

The way that the Minister functioned here was very sneaky and totally unnecessary.