

Business of the House

not lose their new jobs because he will pre-empt this source of revenue?

● (1500)

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, I am sure that in whatever arrangement we arrive at with the producing provinces there will be ample revenues to ensure that British Columbia will prosper with the help of the British Columbia government and the national government of this country. I can assure the hon. member that she has no reason to fear.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, by way of a point of order, I wonder if I might direct a question to the government House leader. Could he tell us the business of the House this day, tomorrow and into next week as far as he can see?

Also there is the matter of the designation of an allotted day. If one has not been designated, perhaps he might look into that.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, today we will continue debate on second reading stage—and hopefully reach the conclusion of that debate—of Bill C-3, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971. In the following order we will be looking at Bill C-35, Bill C-5 and Bill C-22. The first day the House will be sitting next week is Wednesday.

[Translation]

Wednesday of next week will be a day allotted, I think, to the New Democratic Party. Then we will try to complete the debate at Committee of the Whole stage as well, I hope, as on third reading of Bill C-19, to amend the Employment Tax Credit Act, and Bill S-6, to amend the Two-Price Wheat Act. If tomorrow we do not complete the debate on Bill C-22, to adjust the Accounts of Canada, we hope to be able to do so sometime next week. That is the work for next week, subject to the return to the House from the committees of priority bills which the government might decide to consider ahead of those I have just listed.

[English]

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, there have been some reports of statements being made by the leader of the government respecting proposed reforms in the Standing Orders and practices of the House of Commons. The most recent report I have seen appeared in the current edition of *The Legion* magazine. Prior to the adjournment of Parliament for the summer, is the government House leader planning to table a document in the House of Commons respecting his precise proposals for reform of the House? If he is doing that, would he consider quickly a reference to the Standing Com-

mittee on Procedure and Organization in order to give that committee an opportunity to organize itself and to look at certain firm proposals, on the understanding that we would have some proposals to make as well? The reports seem to indicate that perhaps it is time, rather than talking about parliamentary reform, that Parliament start to take a look at it. What are the plans of the minister respecting that?

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I have not read the article to which my learned colleague has just referred concerning a time frame for the proposed reform of our Standing Orders in order to streamline them and make them more efficient and probably more human. I am prepared to entertain his suggestion. I should like to remind him, however, that in 1974 and 1975 our Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization had the opportunity to deal in depth with this. Three reports were published following these committee meetings, and we have also benefited from the opinions expressed by both sides of the House on these proposed reforms. Some of them are even favoured by the former government House leader and we have found them interesting. The study stage is not necessarily over, but it is well advanced, so that we might now consider quicker ways to make this Parliament more efficient, but always after consultations with both sides of the House.

If my hon. colleague will help me set the tone, I am willing to repeat the same suggestion I made to him last week to set a 20-minute time limit on speeches until the summer recess. If he can agree to that today on behalf of his party, and if the Leader of the New Democratic Party can do likewise, I undertake to limit the time allotted for speeches to 20 minutes until the summer recess. This could be a step in the right direction and help make Parliament more efficient and more equitable. I would point out to my colleague that it would not penalize the opposition. If speeches were shortened to 20 minutes it would not take time away from the Progressive Conservative or the New Democratic Party. It would give more members and particularly members from western Canada an opportunity to get involved in the debate. That would only be fair in a House that now has 282 members.

Finally, to answer the question of my colleague on parliamentary reform, I would say we are open to reform and the methods to be used. We want them to be the most expeditive and the fairest. We want to make changes in the spirit of Parliament and in consultation with all members of this House.

[English]

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, the problem with parliamentary reform in this House is that it has not been parliamentary reform in the real sense; it has been little piecemeal bits such as shortening the length of time of speeches. I am prepared to discuss proposals with respect to limiting debate regarding the length of speeches, but this Parliament wants to discuss much more than that in terms of