

*Business of the House*

within a reasonable time so that members will have some time in their constituencies before returning in August.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** That is fine, Mr. Speaker. I have noted my hon. friend's remarks and I, too, observed the faces across the House. In his remarks concerning the debate on the inquiry, the minister injected a new element, according to my recollection, and that is that the debate on the pipeline inquiry might be conducted in a series. In other words, there might be one now on the National Energy Board report and one later on the Lysyk report and the second volume of the Berger report. That is something new; it has not been dealt with before.

Does the House leader intend to deal with this matter in a series of debates? If that is the government's intention, would the government not reconsider? It seems to me—I say this with respect—that until all the reports are in it would not be fruitful for the House to consider the matter. The purpose of the debate is to consider all the evidence.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly one debate is mandatory in light of the commitment that has been made. I have always had in mind that it would be possible, when the National Energy Board reported, to call the motion on the pipeline which is on the order paper, and this would give the House an opportunity to discuss it for a day. If that were done, it would not relieve the necessity of having a final debate in August. On that first point I am rather relaxed; it might be desirable to have a debate on the National Energy Board report, or it might not. We could consider that after we receive the report. My own view is that it might be useful to have the views at that time, but I would withhold my final judgment.

**Mr. Clark:** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the government is suggesting that it has extra government time to have an extra debate before the adjournment of the House, an extra two-day debate on the pipeline, I hope the government might reconsider the government House leader's suggestion that there is not enough time to extend the debate on national unity.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Clark:** If we have the time, before adjourning, to begin a debate *seriatim* on the pipeline, surely we have time in the House on government days to take more than eight hours' debating time to discuss the urgent problem of national unity which is facing this country.

**Mr. Coates:** Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I raised a question of privilege on which Your Honour reserved your decision. I was just wondering when that decision might be rendered by the Chair.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The only question of privilege I can recall the hon. member raising was concerning the actions of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson).

**Mr. Coates:** I refer to the festivities here on Parliament Hill on July 1, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I can perhaps give the matter further consideration and give the House an accurate description of the way I see my responsibilities. I attempted, however, to describe to the hon. member and to the House in a preliminary way the way I saw my responsibilities in this regard; that is to say, that I did not see it as the responsibility of the Chair to be able to intervene in the individual and specific agenda of every event which takes place in these buildings; but, rather, I would attempt to persuade all those who hold events inside and outside these buildings—and there is some difference in jurisdiction—that the best motivations ought to be used in the true parliamentary sense. In that regard, I indicated to the House that I would express that sentiment to the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts), which I have done. However, I will attempt to formulate more precise language as to whether or not an exact question of privilege is involved.

● (1520)

**Mr. Coates:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that no action has been taken, to my knowledge, since I raised my question of privilege, to alter the events as they have been planned and indicated to the government, I wish to move, seconded by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway)—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I should remind the hon. member we are in routine proceedings and we are not able, at this time, to receive that motion. However, we will be on motions shortly.

**Mr. Goodale:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. While there is some discussion in the House with respect to our plans for House business, I wonder if I could raise with hon. members a point which I mentioned last week regarding private members' business this week. As events have unfolded, the only time available for private members' business this week would be Thursday afternoon between the hours of five and six. In the normal course of events, that time would be designated for the "B" schedule of private members' business, namely, the calling of private bills, notices of motions for papers, and public bills.

As I indicated last week, discussions have taken place and I think there is agreement to proceed with a series of bills standing in the name of various hon. members, instead of the normal course of business within that hour. These bills effect certain changes in the names of constituencies. For the information of hon. members, the bills are as follows: C-283, C-392, C-393, C-394, C-405, C-406, C-418, C-422, C-427, C-428 and C-429. There are 11 of them in total. There has been agreement to call those items in order beginning at five o'clock on Thursday, and to proceed with them through all stages without debate in order to accommodate the changes which members deem to be desirable. In the remaining time left to us in that hour on Thursday, there is agreement to take the report stage of Bill C-256.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, that sounds agreeable, subject to one question. Does that list exclude the