

to the matter being debated, and Your Honour has so decided under paragraph (8) of Standing Order 26. Under paragraph (9) of the same Standing Order, Your Honour has discretion as to when the debate should take place, whether tonight or tomorrow night or any other time.

Some hon. Members: Starting now.

Mr. Huntington: Tonight.

Mr. Pinard: The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde), as Your Honour well knows, is outside of this country in the exercise of his duties and will be back tomorrow. Therefore, I would humbly suggest that this debate be held tomorrow night at eight o'clock.

Madam Speaker: Under that discretionary power, I have just said that the debate should take place this evening at eight o'clock.

Mr. Nielsen: It is urgent.

Madam Speaker: I understand that the hon. minister will not be present at that time. However, I asked leave for this debate to take place because I felt that the matter—

Mr. Nielsen: Is urgent.

Madam Speaker: —should be discussed in an urgent way. I am in the hands of the House. If the House wants to delay the debate until three o'clock tomorrow—

Some hon. Members: No, no!

Madam Speaker: —I could follow the disposition of the House.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, the Chair has already found that the subject matter is of such urgency that it requires immediate attention. That was the purpose of designing the rule in the first place. I would point out that it would be impossible to debate the matter under Standing Order 26(9) tomorrow, because it specifically refers to the time of eight o'clock. Of course, tomorrow the House rises well before eight o'clock. By acceding to the suggestion of the government House leader, we would be giving implied consent to sit tomorrow night at eight o'clock. We believe that the matter is of such urgency that it requires debate today. I am sure the minister is not that far away that he cannot get the next plane back.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Send a jet.

Mr. Nielsen: Send a government jet.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, clearly, the Official Opposition is refusing to agree to have you change your ruling, because, in fact, you made the ruling before I could make my suggestion, and I cannot hold that against you. However, you are aware that under Standing Order 26(9), the Chair has the discretion to order the debate to be held the next day. With

Taxation

unanimous consent, there is no reason why the debate should not be held at eight o'clock tomorrow evening, even if it is Wednesday, although to the members on this side of the House it seems clear that the Official Opposition would rather not see the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) take part in the debate.

Madam Speaker: Well, I used my discretion to determine the time of the debate, and the reason I ruled in favour of a debate was that I felt it was warranted owing to the important nature of the subject. Consequently, I thought the debate should take place at the earliest convenience of the House, which seems to be eight o'clock this evening. I agree that the House can, by unanimous consent, proceed with its business as it sees fit, but, since there is no unanimous consent, I maintain that the debate will start this evening at eight o'clock.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

AN ACT TO AMEND THE STATUTE LAW RELATING TO CERTAIN TAXES AND TO PROVIDE OTHER AUTHORITY FOR THE RAISING OF FUNDS

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed, from Wednesday, April 28, consideration of the motion of Mr. Bussi eres that Bill C-93, to amend the statute law relating to certain taxes and to provide other authority for the raising of funds, be read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Madam Speaker, I am continuing the debate today on the borrowing bill put forth by the government. I would like to refer to the petroleum and gas revenue tax where we saw, along with the national energy policy and the budget, two instruments which required a strong, healthy and viable industry. I refer to the oil industry which was operating in western Canada, seeking stability, security and energy self-sufficiency for this country. We heard from the so-called New Democratic Party, "Liberal West", the hypocrites, when the national energy policy was introduced. What did we hear from the "Liberal Party West", the New Democratic Party? We heard: "Good, let us have more. Get those multinationals. Get those Yankees. Send them home. We will take over the oil companies in western Canada." That is what we heard from the western members of the "Liberal Party West".

We saw the present government go out into the world market to borrow money to purchase Petrofina. It did not borrow money to go out and start up Petro-Canada so that company could do its own exploring for oil in order to contribute to the security of our country, to the energy survival, the