

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, December 7, 1989

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the three House leaders with respect to the terrible tragedy that took place in Montreal yesterday.

There was a feeling among the House leaders that the House should comment on this particular tragedy. We have agreed that at 2.15 p.m., after the usual Statements by Members and immediately prior to Question Period commencing, a representative from each of the three Parties would be recognized in the House for a brief statement of condolence to the victims and their families, those who were injured, and those who witnessed the tragedy.

I do not think we need a House order to do that, but I did want to advise the House that this agreement had been reached among the parties.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, we agree with this procedure. At 2.15, we will have an opportunity to express our sympathy for the relatives, friends and witnesses of this terrible incident, for the victims of a madman.

[*English*]

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked at the news yesterday of the terrible tragedy in Montreal. Our hearts went out to the victims and all of those who were part one way or another of the terrible incident.

We would certainly like to join with the House in making appropriate comments at 2.15 today.

POINT OF ORDER

SUPPLY DAY MOTIONS—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: I am going to ask the indulgence of the House. Before Routine Proceedings I have two rulings to make. The first is on a point of order raised by the hon. parliamentary secretary. I will be dealing immediately thereafter with the question of privilege or perhaps more properly a question of contempt raised by the hon. member for Victoria.

On Monday, October 30, 1989, the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader raised as a point of order several questions regarding the conduct of business on a supply day.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands and several others offered comments on these questions. I want to thank members for their contributions to this debate on an interesting procedural matter. I have considered the matter carefully and am now prepared to respond.

[*Translation*]

The first question asked by the parliamentary secretary was whether it was necessary for the government to designate a supply day before the opposition can give notice of a motion they want debated. The parliamentary Secretary maintained that it was a necessary precondition. The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands suggested that in this specific case it was not necessary and that, in any case, it had been done in anticipation of Friday being a votable supply day.

[*English*]

According to our rules and practice, the purpose of notice is to give warning to the House of an item of business that might be raised for debate. The notice does not necessarily mean that the item will actually be debated or that it will be debated any time soon.