

Privilege

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, I apologize profusely to the member for accidentally answering one of his questions. It certainly was not my intention.

Seriously, I would be happy to have a look at the motions and his request for papers, as I have done in the past, and attempt to get complete answers.

I should say that by way of tabling I did that just now. If the House would request that I do it by reverting to Tabling of Documents, we could do that. However I did not think that with consent for the motion that it was necessary.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, before we give our consent, I have a question for my hon. friend.

Based on the unanimous motion of this House the matter of the crisis was referred to the aboriginal affairs committee for study. Yet, if I heard correctly when my hon. friend introduced his motion, the matter was referred to the justice and solicitor general committee.

It seems that it would be more appropriate to have it referred to the aboriginal affairs committee. After all, it has been given the responsibility of examining the whole issue.

I would like to seek clarification from my hon. friend on that issue.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, it is true that there has been consent to refer the issue of the Oka crisis over the summer to the Indian and aboriginal affairs committee. However, in this particular case we are dealing with a report from I believe the solicitor general of the province of Quebec. It was decided, in conversations with the other parties and with the members of the justice committee, that we would table this document with reference to them.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I think we are being asked for unanimous consent. Before we give unanimous consent, I want to make it perfectly clear that while it was discussed in the justice committee to do just that we in the New Democratic Party felt that since the Oka issue had been sent to the aboriginal affairs committee for examination it would be the appropriate place to send

this report. After all, if they are studying this issue in detail, this report will be an integral component of that evaluation.

• (1520)

Simply, I want to say that we will give our consent—

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Riis: Okay, Mr. Speaker, I guess we will not give our consent, then.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am really sorry to hear that. I certainly gave the New Democratic Party the motion at the beginning of Question Period. It was my understanding that this came from discussions within the justice committee of which their party is a member.

I am disappointed that we now find ourselves in a position where we have asked for the consent of the House, with the understanding that I had it before I did it. As hon. members know, it is not my practice to ask for consent on motions unless I am fairly certain that there is an agreement on it.

The other unanimous consent motion that I seek to put before the House—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Did the hon. member have consent to table the document?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Perhaps I could help a bit. I am the New Democratic Party member on the justice committee. We have not agreed that the justice committee, from our point of view, examine this matter. As our House leader said, we think it is part and parcel of the general examination by the other committee.

I gather this is the report of the attorney general of Quebec as to why the army was called in. It is under the National Defence Act of Canada. The government actually does not have to table anything under the act, but it is attempting to table something.

I personally would like to see the government table a report. However I wonder if it might be possible for us to give our consent. I certainly would consent to the government tabling the report, but not necessarily with reference to the justice committee.