

Routine Proceedings

I will also recognize the hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca and the hon. member for Essex—Windsor if they have other arguments to present. I would think that the hon. member for Kamloops has brought forward a very documented argument in regard to what it is we are discussing here today.

I think if we left it at that, I would take it under advisement, and then at the same time, let us review what the hon. member for Kamloops has brought forward today in this Chamber and continue the argument again on Monday, at a more opportune time so we could allow the opposition day to go forward. Is that agreed?

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me to be a fairly straightforward point of order, and to have the whole issue set aside for the weekend would seem to me to put in jeopardy the process that the House has launched upon where we have gone through a process of first reading, second reading, committee stage. The committee has now reported to the House.

This is one more example of the NDP and their jackboot tactics, their tyranny of the minority, coming up with a situation whereby they will not let the House continue on with the normal stages of the bill, that is, the stages that are to come, the report and the third stage.

That would be my reason for saying that I think that members can make their arguments today if they choose. The Speaker should hear which arguments it wants to, and then the Speaker can ponder on it and rule over the weekend. But to set the whole thing aside, to me would be just another example of using the tactics that we have seen in the last few weeks in this House to derail this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, if you choose to hear the arguments today, I would like to make a few comments.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think it is very evident that the government does not want to hear the very long points of order that we are going to have on this particular issue.

It is a very complicated matter. Most of us have not been in a situation actually to have the report from the standing committee. It was just made a few minutes ago,

and I would submit that there is ample precedent for hearing arguments again or later, when notice is given.

On many occasions the Speaker has allowed arguments to be made one day later as long as notice is given. I would suggest that, under the circumstances since the Liberal party has asked for that, since there are a number of our people who would like to actually look at the report and because I am sure the Speaker would like to have a chance to examine the report himself, this would be very logical and helpful.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I think there is ample time to go ahead and present the arguments today.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I think you just made a great suggestion to the House that indeed it is an opposition day. We do not get many in a year. This is a very important opposition day dealing with environmental matters, dealing with a document that was tabled outside the House yesterday by the minister but, nevertheless one that touches every Canadian.

We would like to ask members of the government to concur with us. Indeed, the argument before the House touches on a report tabled by a committee which studied Bill C-62, the goods and services tax. We have asked, reasonably, that the debate on the procedural matters be put off until Monday so that we can proceed with our opposition day. I think this is a reasonable request to make since the report has just been tabled and none of us have had a chance to read it, as yet. I think it would be reasonable for us to read it. It would be good, logical procedure to have the arguments by the members for Kamloops and Kingston and the Islands put forward to the House. I would accept and we would agree with you, Mr. Speaker, that this debate should be put off until Monday.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I have a very short intervention to make.

I thought that it was important that some remarks on this one issue be made today. What we are asking you to rule on, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not the procedure that occurred in the finance committee is now a precedent and can be used to allow chairs, forever in the future, to use similar procedures.