

*Business of the House*

on Monday. On Tuesday, we shall consider the report stage of Bill C-143, which is to be reported back to the House in a few moments, and which concerns the borrowing authority requested by the Government. Wednesday, as usual, will be reserved for Private Members' Business. Thursday, we shall resume debate on Bill C-139 concerning the Income Tax Act, to consider the third reading stage, and if we do not finish on Thursday, I hope we shall be able to do so on Friday of next week. All of this is of course subject to change on reasonable notice.

[English]

**Mr. Lewis:** Madam Speaker, I should like to thank the Government House Leader for listening to our objections with respect to allotted days.

With respect to the reports of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, has the Government sought legal advice on the suggestion that all three reports be considered at one time? On this side we feel that the Government may be in violation of the letter of the law, if not the spirit of the law, in not allowing full debate to take place under Section 20 of the Act.

We suggest the purpose of the deadline set out in the Act is that the House and Members may consider the report and the objection and then they may be dealt with by way of a motion and sent back to the Electoral Boundaries Commission. Then they can be dealt with in each Province finally, and at a time when views on the Electoral Boundaries Commission are current, and there can be a final disposition made of the boundaries in each Province. Has the Minister sought that legal advice?

**Mr. Pinard:** Madam Speaker, my understanding of Section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act is that we have to start debate on the objections within 15 days following the 30 days in which notice of the objection must be given. There is nothing in Section 20 that says that debate has to be completed within 15 days, however; that is not clear at all. That is why in 1976 the House Leaders thought it wise to come to an agreement. We were not able to come to such an agreement this time and so we have at least to start debate during the 15 days. Tomorrow is the first day within the 15 days following the 30 days in which the four objections have been made. That is why tomorrow can be used to start debate on the four objections.

What I am saying is not that we will limit debate to one hour on four objections; I am saying we will start debate and we will want to resume debate, if necessary, at a later time that we will agree to together later on.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Madam Speaker, on House business I would like to indicate to the Government House Leader that the Minister of National Health and Welfare, in a press interview and in Question Period today, signalled the fact that the Government no longer intends to bring in a Canada Health Act in a big hurry. Does that indicate that the Government is prepared to refer the subject matter to the standing committee so that we might call witnesses and engage Canadians in the

dialogue about health care before the Act is actually written? If it has not yet been written and circulated, is it the Government's intention to use the parliamentary committee in that fashion?

**Mr. Pinard:** Madam Speaker, I will consider the request of the Hon. Member and most likely raise it with the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

**Mr. Murphy:** Madam Speaker, my question is also directed to the Government House Leader. Yesterday the Prime Minister, along with nine Premiers and the Leaders of the Aboriginal People, signed an Accord. Will the Government House Leader be setting aside time for the Prime Minister to make a statement in the House? It is my understanding that a number of Premiers will be returning to their provincial legislatures to explain what happened in the last two days and the positions of their provincial Governments. Will the Government of Canada make a statement in the House explaining its position and its future plans?

**Mr. Pinard:** Madam Speaker, I intend to table in a few minutes the documents and the Accord to which the Hon. Member refers. Following that tabling and after he has read them, if there is something he does not understand, I am sure we will be pleased to try to explain it to him.

\* \* \*

#### PRIVILEGE

MR. MACKASEY—PAID LOBBYIST ALLEGATION IN MONTREAL  
"GAZETTE"

**Hon. Erik Nielsen (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, yesterday the Hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Mackasey) raised a question of privilege. At that time I said I wanted 24 hours to consider the matter and to respond.

We started from the basic premise that when a Member raises a question of privilege based upon what that Member considers to be an infringement of his personal privileges, he should be given every opportunity to obtain redress through the House or its Committees in a proper and normal fashion. I have considered this and obtained advice with respect to the three areas of concern that I expressed yesterday. I must say at the outset the Hon. Member for Lincoln has been kind enough to assist me in obtaining the facts and I have also received other advice.

I think the Chair has some problems here. In one area there are the civil proceedings that may be taken and there are certain limitations in the Province of Quebec that may affect the commencement of those proceedings, and consequently the life of any work that the Standing Committee may undertake, should the Chair find a question of privilege present and should the motion be accepted by the House, may be affected.

The second area of concern is the ongoing bankruptcy proceedings. My advice, which the Hon. Member for Lincoln has co-operated in obtaining for me, is that these proceedings