

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lapierre: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to draw one thing to your attention. The motion adopted on December 18 does state: “—at 5.00 o’clock p.m. at the latest.”

It is now 5.20 p.m. Unless you go by Pacific time, I suggest it is even too late to table the said motions. We said “at 5 o’clock p.m. at the latest” and, as far as I know, unanimous consent was not given to ignore the clock either.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: It may be the reason the hon. member has, but I am satisfied we are proceeding on a proper procedural basis. The hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, I move that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word “Monday” and substituting the following:

“January 14, 1991, provided that any time before that said date the Speaker may fix a time at which the House shall meet either in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 28(3) if public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time, or after consultations with the government for the sole purpose of granting Royal Assent for any bill or bills after which the House shall stand further adjourned in accordance with this Order”.

Mr. Speaker: The House can do anything it wishes if there is consent. There was not consent to accept the amendment. I have listened to the intriguing argument of the Official Opposition. My difficulty is that when looking at the motion, the exact words are “provided that each opposition party has had an opportunity to move an amendment or subamendment”. I think I am pressed back into the position that my colleagues in the Official Opposition have had that opportunity. I have had to rule the amendment out of order despite how serious the issue is, but I do not see any way that the Chair can get around these words, “provided that each opposition party has had an opportunity to move an amendment or subamendment”.

If the House wants to proceed in another way, I certainly am prepared to listen to comments if there was consent, but without that, I think I have to proceed.

Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats would have been very pleased to support the Liberal amendments, so I am sorry it was not found to be procedurally correct.

However, I wish to address one provision of the motion and move an amendment which enables the government to pass into law those bills that are currently in the Senate without the House sitting.

We reluctantly support this provision with the exception of Bill C-43. As you know, Mr. Speaker, Bill C-43 is not like the other bills in the House.

An hon. member: Order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will have to put her amendment. As I had to point out, the placing of an amendment at this time under the motion that was accepted by the House is not a time for debate.

I ask the hon. member to put her motion.

Ms. Black: Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting the words “granting Royal Assent for any bill or bills”, and replacing that with “granting Royal Assent for bill or bills other than Bill C-43.”

Mr. Speaker: I find the motion in order. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1750)

Before the taking of the vote:

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark’s Crossing): On a brief point of order, Mr. Speaker. On the vote on the amendment, we will remember that Bill C-43 was a free vote. I wonder if we could not—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: That is not an appropriate point of order at all. The question is on the amendment.

The House divided on the amendment, which was negated on the following division: