Friday we would expect to complete third reading on Bill C–35 and upon its completion the government would call Bill S–2, the Tax Convention Act, for second reading.

On Monday it would be my intention to call for second reading Bill C–26, Public Service 2000, and on Tuesday to continue second reading hopefully to completion of Bill C–26.

Next Wednesday I would intend to call an allotted day or an opposition day.

In terms of the general question, as I have said to the hon. member on many occasions, I feel that we could probably use our time in a more fitting way on many occasions around here to discuss subjects of interest and of some import if we could find some way to accommodate it within the constraints of time in terms of getting the legislation through, in terms of recognizing that we have opposition days on which the opposition can choose the subject matter and in fact from time to time schedule debates in the evening for special subjects as we have done, for example, with regard to the constitutional question tonight, next Monday, Tuesday and Thursday.

I would hope that we could get together and discuss to see whether it really is necessary to have three full days, for example, on Bill C–32 at third reading, which is a long way through the process. Perhaps we could cut that down to two days and have the third day allocated to subject matter of interest, or we could do that on similar bills.

I am always available for that kind of accommodation, but it is very difficult for me to agree to a process that says the government will continue in essence, figuratively, to get down on its knees and say: "Please allow us to pass this legislation", then in addition open up extra time for special debates of the opposition's choosing. There is just not enough time on the calendar. I would love to co–operate. I think we can co–operate. If we agree, there has to be a little give and take on both sides.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the House that there has been a good deal of co–operation among all parties with regard to the debate which will be taking place this evening on constitutional renewal to give members an opportunity to put their concerns before the House and thereafter table documents with the committee. I want to thank the government House leader, who has been very co–operative in that process.

I also want to say to the hon. member that my question was not intended to interfere or delay the activities of the government which has the sole right in setting the agenda in terms of legislation for this House. We are not suggesting that. In view of the comments, and he might want to take some time to discuss with his Parliamentary Secretary, under the provisions of either Standing Order 52 or some other arrangements, debates could take place later in the evening on subjects that a good majority of members of Parliament find to be important, ones which affect their constituents and are important for the country.

This is not to mean this in a partisan way. I just point out to the government House leader that, as he knows, we are in a difficult economic situation and there are issues that all Canadians would like to see us debating on the floor of this House of Commons. On the other hand, we would avail ourselves as opposition parties to select some of those subjects which can be debated under provisions of allotted days, opposition days. I suggest quite sincerely to the government House leader that there is a menu of economic issues out there which will require the special attention and co–operation of the government in order to debate it in what I believe is a very sincere way to try to find some solutions in order to put Canadians back to work.

That is the spirit in which I ask the question. Perhaps later this day or perhaps next week we might be able to pursue those discussions with the government House leader and his parliamentary secretary to arrive at some sort of accommodation for the government in its dealings here.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short comment regarding the points raised by my hon. friend, the opposition House leader, and ask the minister a question.

First of all, I want to say to the minister that it is appropriate that we take some days to debate important legislation. I think that Bill C–32 is one of those pieces. As a result we could move expeditiously on other pieces of legislation like C–35 and S–2. I think we can come to an accommodation without any difficulty.