

that they are the result, either directly or indirectly, of the free trade agreement.

An Hon. Member: The campaign is over, Ed.

Mr. Broadbent: Also, we have now had the reimposition, by the President of the United States, of an unfair tariff on Canadian shakes and shingles going into the U.S.—a tariff which, when originally imposed, resulted in a loss of jobs in Canada, and which, if continued, will result in further job losses.

In saying that there is a case for an emergency debate, Mr. Speaker, I have in mind that, since then, we have had a Throne Speech which specifically excluded the establishment of legislation that would provide for an adjustment program in the case of lay-offs and which specifically excluded the possibility of the establishment of a committee to monitor the impact of the free trade agreement, and all of this in the context of the Government saying that once we complete consideration of the free trade implementing legislation, Parliament will embark upon an extended recess, a recess extending, perhaps, into March of next year.

I say that the workers who are laid off now, Mr. Speaker, cannot afford to wait. We have an emergency that has to be addressed now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for Oshawa for having given me extensive notice of his application. The formal application, in its written form, is much more extensive in detail than the oral summary provided by the Hon. Member, and certainly I have read it very carefully.

While the matters raised by the Hon. Member in his application for an emergency debate are serious matters, it is, I feel, premature for the Speaker to order an emergency debate at this time. Again, I am always ready to reconsider these matters should circumstances change.

There is the potential for some opportunity for Hon. Members to discuss the matters raised in the application.

To reiterate, while I consider the matters raised to be serious, I do not consider it appropriate to order an emergency debate at this time.

Orders of the day.

House of Commons

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PROPOSED HOURS OF SITTING

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): A point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Mazankowski, moves—the Hon. Member for Kamloops on a point of order.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I think that it is appropriate if I recognize the Hon. Member for Windsor West. I think it was quite clear that he was rising on the same point of order.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

An Hon. Member: Free trade is good for Windsor, Herb.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, the Government has given notice of a motion which proposes to suspend, and in fact drastically suspend, the rules of this House—

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): To summarize the motion, it appears to say that the House will sit continuously for an indefinite period, exclusive of December 26, 1988, and in fact will not adjourn on December 21 to resume in January, as is provided for by the Standing Orders. The motion also states that the House will not adjourn at 6 p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays but will sit, without a break, until midnight on those days.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the wording of the motion does not state that the House shall sit for these hours only for consideration of the legislation to implement the Government's trade deal with the U.S.; rather, it states that the House will sit "for Government Orders". In other words, for any business that the Government puts on the Order Paper. The Government, therefore, could put anything it wishes on the Order Paper and use this motion to get it through.

Looking at the third paragraph of the motion, it goes on to state that for the duration of this session or until otherwise ordered, the provisions of Standing Order 73(1) and (2) respecting committee stage of Public Bills