

Business of the House

which would benefit Canadians instead of the bankers and a very exclusive level of society. The banks have been allowed a free hand to play the Canadian economy and to assist in the selling out of the Canadian economy. Under the present Conservative Government, I believe that the pace of the sell-out will accelerate, especially under this legislation.

Another disgusting institution in Canada is an offshoot of the banking system which is called the Federal Business Development Bank. The Conservatives want to shut down that institution for all the wrong reasons. I suppose Conservatives want the Bank of Tokyo and other foreign banks in Canada that they supported in the last Parliament to begin the process of lending. But the FBDB could be reshaped to become a valuable organization in encouraging and enhancing entrepreneurial capability in Canada. However, it seems that the federal Government, for a philosophical reason, will put a torpedo into that organization instead of cleaning it up.

Finally, we should revamp the tax system to ensure that penalties are given to the companies which come into Canada strictly to control and exploit the economy rather than to make a contribution. There should be benefits for appropriate investment which will enhance the economy and create further jobs. Our tax system should favour Canadians, rather than those who would take over.

* * *

● (1730)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that just a few moments ago the Government House Leader designated Friday next as an Opposition Day. I have had an opportunity to discuss the matter with him and the Deputy House Leader for the Official Opposition. You will know, Sir, that Standing Order 62(4)(b) says:

If an opposition motion pursuant to section (9) of this Standing Order is to be proposed on a Friday, forty-eight hours' written notice shall be given that the recorded division on the motion, if demanded, is not to be deferred.

I have no knowledge at this point as to whether or not a division might be demanded and I do not want to raise problems with regard to what may happen on Friday. But I wonder if, for the purposes of allowing that such a thing could occur, the House might give unanimous consent to consider that the requirements of Standing Order 62(4)(b) would be met if notice were given by 2 p.m. tomorrow, Thursday.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, it is one of those situations where I think there is a misunderstanding between the Hon. Member and myself. I had not understood the Hon. Member to say that he wanted to leave the option open for a vote on Friday. I understood he wanted to leave the option open, if he could have a vote, which I understood would be deferred until Monday.

Mr. Deans: No.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: So I think under the circumstances it might be convenient for us to have a further discussion about this matter. I have no objection to a vote being called and being taken on Monday, but I had not understood he wanted to leave the option open to have a vote on Friday at the end of the debate. Maybe we can sit down and have a discussion with respect to what agreement we can reach. I am prepared now to agree that if a vote is attached to the motion, we would have the debate on Friday and there could be a vote at the end of the day, pursuant to the rules. That is satisfactory. But I do not necessarily want at this point in time to agree to the possibility of a vote on Friday on short notice.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I would of course be quite willing to sit down with the Government House Leader and discuss the matter. The problem arises out of the Standing Orders because of the fact that we do not have a lot of notice for this Opposition Day. I think the Government House Leader has in the past attempted to give notice in sufficient time to allow for adequate preparation. But by giving notice at 5.20, on what I think might have been a Wednesday afternoon, this effectively precludes the Opposition from being able to utilize Section 62(4)(b), which of course is a Standing Order but is supposed to be able to be utilized.

I just want you to understand that the dilemma is that although the Opposition Day has been designated in time, and I concede that, there is of course the necessity for negotiation, or discussion at least, between the two Opposition Parties before a decision can be arrived at as to which of the two Parties will utilize the Opposition Day. It would be my hope, for example, because it might appear to be our turn, that we would have it. Nevertheless, that is not always the case.

The only reason I am asking for the opportunity to utilize Standing Order 62(4)(b) is that unless I ask for that now, and agree, therefore, to Friday right now, we would have to file a motion right now, which does not give us adequate time to discuss it, prepare it or decide upon it. We are caught in a very serious dilemma because it would then be possible for the Government at any time to announce Opposition days for Fridays and not give adequate time and, in so doing, preclude the opportunity for the utilization of Standing Order 62(4)(b). I am not suggesting that happened, but it could happen.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The point is, Mr. Speaker, that what the Hon. Member is really asking for is the option to call a vote on a Friday, which is not the normal process. It is available to the Hon. Member and the Opposition Parties if they want to force a vote at the end of the day on Friday. I am saying that he can have a vote on any motion but we will have that vote deferred to Monday for the convenience of Members. I am not speaking only on behalf of my colleagues or myself, but on behalf of all Members. I think that is appropriate.

The second point I should make is that I gave the Hon. Member verbal notice, the usual courtesy, at the end of Question Period. He asked me to announce it on the floor of the House, which I was quite happy to do. Both Parties received notice from me shortly after Question Period. If all