

*Privilege*

convened meeting when discussions of this nature must take place.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, with all seriousness that for Standing Order 78(3) to be used by the minister responsible for privatization and quoted in this House yesterday, where it says that an agreement could not be reached, and when we have determined today, without any question, that there was no discussion regarding an agreement at least between the government and the Official Opposition, I submit that if we are going to follow rules that are written for this House, we must do just that, follow the rules. If the rules are not followed, Mr. Speaker, I beg of you to recognize that at this point we have seen a breach of those particular rules, as they were intended to be followed. It would be appropriate for us not to proceed at this point with a time allocation motion and subsequent discussion and debate.

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I would just like very quickly to correct the record in terms of what the hon. member for Kamloops said about the use of closure. I have here all of the time allocations. The rule, which is now 78(1), (2) and (3), was imposed in 1971 by the Trudeau government. Between 1980 and 1984 inclusive, it was used 29 times in that four-year period. In the six-year period since then, it has been used 27 times. So, we have used it fewer times in six years than the Liberals used it in four years.

That is to answer the atrocious distortion by the hon. member for Kamloops that this government has used it more often than any government in history. We have a long way to go to catch up to the Trudeau government.

**Mr. Arseneault:** That's debate.

**Mr. Allmand:** Nobody believes you Harvie.

**Mr. Andre:** Mr. Speaker, apparently the facts are unacceptable to the Liberal opposition.

On March 29, 1990, the hon. member for Kamloops raised a complaint about the use of time allocation. Mr. Speaker said at that time, and I quote from page 9917 of *Hansard*:

The hon. member for Kamloops has raised a complaint. At the same time, he has indicated that at least in his mind there was a possibility of obtaining a workable understanding.

—on time allocation. Mr. Speaker went on to say, and I quote:

The hon. minister has said that in his view that was not possible.

I have had to deal with this matter before, as hon. members know. I refer all hon. members to a ruling made on August 16, 1988, as reported on page 18380 of *Hansard*. In the very last paragraph I had to say this:

Standing Order 117—

Which is now Standing Order 73:

—provides for a Minister to act if there is no agreement and as I stated on June 6, 1988, the Chair must take a Minister's declaration at face value and cannot judge the quality of negotiations or of any proposals that may have been made.

I think that is the position that the Chair has to take.

I think that clears it up and we can get on to the business, Mr. Speaker. We have now taken up 45 minutes.

At the House leaders' meeting on Tuesday, I asked whether there would be agreement on some sort of reasonable period on this bill. There was no such agreement and it was obvious. I, indeed, asked, "Are you suggesting I will have to move to time allocation?" The acknowledgement was that I probably would have to do that. You have heard my parliamentary secretary state his efforts to reach some sort of agreement under 78(1) or 78(2).

I would repeat my offer now: if we can reach an agreement, under 78(1) or 78(2), I am prepared to reach such an agreement. I am prepared to do that now, right now, if there is such an agreement from the Opposition. I was not able to get it at the House leaders' meeting, which is the reason we have those meetings—in order to have those discussions.

My parliamentary secretary followed up yesterday, in the afternoon, with an attempt to reach an agreement, thinking that, after their caucuses, perhaps there was some inclination maybe to reach an agreement. There was not. On that basis, we are moving with 78(3) which, Mr. Speaker, but for the time we waste today, would have provided for three days at second reading on this legislation, which is quite a considerable amount of time, given the other processes that have to go through.