Business of the House

[English]

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, I have a point I should like to put to the government House leader. For two Fridays in a row we have been making an effort to clean up some so-called non-controversial bills. As a result of Thursday meetings, in both instances I have made arrangements for members to be present to deal with them. I would ask that we make our minds up one way or another: Are we going to deal with them on a Friday, and which Friday? Then I can ask my members to be here and not have to ask them to change their plans every week.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I think the concern of my hon. colleague is legitimate. For two weeks we have tried to deal with some uncontroversial business; he has agreed to some of it and the Conservative Party has agreed to some items. It was difficult, however, to get the agreement of the three parties on the three pieces of legislation concerned. Since only one of the three bills we have discussed could be proceeded with tomorrow, I thought it was preferable, as I had a commitment from the Tory House leader, to deal with the other one on the following Friday and tomorrow not go on wasting our time but try to terminate debate on report stage of Bill C-48, on which we have already spent a lot of time. Subject to circumstances the following Friday we could try to agree on at least three bills that we could approve, using one speaker per party.

I appreciate the concern expressed by my colleague which is valid, but he must understand that in our caucus, after a House leaders' meeting, I have to have consultations and it is only on Thursday at three o'clock that according to practice I am in a position to confirm if we can go along with the discussion that we had in the previous House leaders' meeting.

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, is it not possible for us to decide today that a week Friday, subject only to matters which may arise in the interval, we will deal with certain pieces of legislation, rather than wait until the day before the Friday that we are supposed to be dealing with it?

Mr. Pinard: I think this is a constructive suggestion, Madam Speaker; nevertheless, it is always difficult for a government to agree one week in advance, not knowing how debate will evolve in the House. We have spent many, many days on report stage of Bill C-48. If debate were to continue to next Thursday and not terminate, it will be difficult for the government to agree to switch to other legislation, when it would become more and more urgent. It is impossible one week in advance to make a commitment. On the other hand, it is surely possible to plan and try to come to some agreement. I will take note of the suggestion made by the hon. member.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, as the government House leader knows, we have offered to deal with Bill C-45, the pest control legislation, tomorrow and let it go with one speaker. We have also agreed to deal with Bill C-25, the radiation emission legislation, with one speaker. Those are bills that he

could have. I do not think that there would be any difficulty for the NDP in dealing with those matters tomorrow.

I have suggested that if we were to change the date of our House leaders' meeting to Tuesday, followed by caucus, we could have decisions for him which I am sure would streamline and make the government's conduct of the business of the House more efficient. By Thursday he would have full knowledge of any agreement that could be reached and legislation that could be dealt with.

Mr. Pinard: First of all, Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague mentioned Bill C-45 and Bill C-25. We discussed dealing with those two bills tomorrow in our discussion this morning. We also mentioned Bill C-84, to amend the Small Business Loans Act. This bill is urgent, for technical reasons, as it will increase the amount of loans to small business in this country. He knows very well that this party is not in a position this afternoon to confirm that we could get Bill C-84 tomorrow. When he mentions Bill C-25, it is the NDP that cannot guarantee that we will get that bill tomorrow because they have more than one speaker and they have asked us to deal with it as the third item. Therefore, I end up, with just Bill C-45. This is not sufficient.

(1510)

The reason I think it would be more useful not to deal with those three bills is that I do not have agreement to deal with the three of them. We end up with only one bill. I prefer to use tomorrow to deal with Bill C-48 for the reasons I have mentioned.

The hon. member talks about House leaders' meetings. This is very useful sometimes, but it has also demonstrated that it is not always necessary when we do not end debate on major pieces of legislation. In the past, it was not necessary to meet on a Tuesday to determine the business of a Friday. Since I have been House leader, we have always had our meetings on Thursdays, and so far we have been successful in approving 65 bills in this House in this session. Therefore, I think if we have good will on both sides, we can still meet on Thursday and get some legislation passed by this House.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Madam Speaker, I have a point of order on House business. Last week at this time I asked a question of the President of the Privy Council concerning a bill which Canadian women, in particular, have been awaiting a long time, Bill C-53, the sexual offences legislation. At that time, the President of the Privy Council informed me that he was prepared to bring this bill forward on Friday of this week, namely, tomorrow. If he could reach an agreement with the two opposition House leaders, and that following one speech each by the opposition parties this bill would be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

I want to say that we have agreed in the past, and we will certainly continue to agree, that this bill should be referred to the justice committee quickly. We are prepared to put up one further speaker on the bill and see it go forward, as not only have many individual Canadian women demanded, but also all