

*Business of the House*

I sat quietly and listened to the hon. member when he was questioning. Perhaps he could do me the courtesy of doing the same.

The hon. member talks about the legislation dealing with the North American free trade agreement. We have been seeking for three weeks to have that legislation referred to committee so it could be looked at and compared with the agreement which has been in committee for several months.

I have been told by the New Democratic Party repeatedly, it has been asked twice in the House, under no circumstances ever will it agree. That is it. No way.

In order to get it to committee I have no other choice but to get second reading done. Debating second reading *ad nauseam* is a matter of principle. Is that going to change the principle of the New Democratic Party? Is there anybody in the country who knows what its position is or does not know what its position is?

The hon. member continues to talk from his seat. The hon. member cannot do me the courtesy I did him by listening to my response.

We have had dozens and dozens of witnesses. The bill is there. I see the hon. member for South West Nova, like the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona, cannot keep her mouth shut while others are talking.

I do not know for sure what an appropriate level of debate is at second reading but I do know that the British Parliament had six hours of debate on the resolution to sign the Maastricht treaty, something that is profound and important. It was able to do it in six hours.

Incidentally under British rules it is not allowed to be brought up in Question Period the way it is repeatedly brought up here, day after day after day.

**Mrs. Campbell (South West Nova):** It is time you got out of here.

**Mr. Andre:** I think it is time we completed that debate, sent the thing to committee and people could examine it in its detail. Then perhaps even the hon. member from Nova Scotia will have an opportunity to go there and she will be able to talk to the record where people will keep track of what she is saying if she thinks it is so important.

• (1525 )

**Mr. Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, the government House leader has brought up a good point. He cited the example of Westminster with respect to the passage of Maastricht.

I wonder then whether the government House leader would be willing to consider, seeing as he is such a fan of what happened at Westminster with respect to Maastricht, putting the North American free trade agreement in the House of Commons, on this floor, in Committee of the Whole for over 21 days, which is how long they have considered Maastricht now on the floor of the House of Commons. If he wants to cite Maastricht and Westminster in the House of Commons, he should keep in mind that that is what they have done there. They have considered it in Committee of the Whole—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I would like to say to the hon. member that he is getting into the substance of the bill which I think is more appropriate to debate when the bill is called. I will recognize him again if he has another request.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Mr. Speaker, I agree. I listened to the exchange of the government House leader, who is no longer here I guess. I understand and I perhaps trespassed too far, but frankly in view of what has happened here in the last two or three days I do not really think I have trespassed enough.

All I was going to ask the government House leader, knowing full well my point over two years of correspondence, knowing it is not in the bill, knowing it is not in the committee report and knowing full well in the answer to me that there is an oxymoron that obviously parties do not have any interest in independence, is there going to be a section in the bill to take care of the discrimination that the Lortie commission found about independence?

That will help facilitate my co-operation, what little it is worth, but it can be quite a bit depending on how I get energized as to the passage of the bill which I would hope in the first phase would be passed, but you cannot pass the things for Mr. Kingsley, the electoral officer, unless you help some members who happen to be independent who cannot write a tax receipt the same way that you can. That is discrimination of the worst order.