

Business of the House

Let us not suggest this is going to be a theatrical event for the television cameras. Remember what is at issue, remember what is at stake, and let us deal with it in a businesslike fashion rather than for the benefit of our audience.

Mr. Lyle Kristiansen (Kootney West—Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, during Question Period I referred to a document, an interoffice memorandum for Westray Coal entitled *Security Procedures* and I would be pleased to table that document for the House and I now so do.

Further to the question of tabling—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): A private member cannot table a document unless he has unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants): Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise two points on House business. I have refrained from speaking on the referendum issue.

There is a suggestion from the member for Kamloops which I understand, although I do not necessarily agree with the urgency and the dispatch that the government House leader mentions. We have all the government members around here under the Whip and I understand that because I have had nine requests to pair just today.

Why does the government House leader not have Committee of the Whole tomorrow on the bill and if there is a problem with voting in terms of second, third, or fourth reading, at least get rid of the bill and then have the final bill when we come back.

I do not see the problem with votes tomorrow. If we are really going to send it to a committee, forget about television. If you are really going to bludgeon it through the committee, which I sort of think is the intent in view of the allocation order today, let us have the fight tomorrow on the clauses. Quite frankly I am a member that will vote for the bill but I have a real problem with several of the clauses and the government is eventually going to have its say.

I throw that out in terms of House business as far as the referendum bill is concerned. Everything used to be

done in Committee of the Whole with fair dispatch when I came here many years ago.

My second question is the perennial one concerning the merchant marine. I know the government House leader has been trying. I am suggesting that if he cannot get a little more finite in the answer today with this week coming up, I will be on the government House leader with all the other little problems he has as a bird dog in heat.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, that is a terrifying proposal.

In view of that threat, the bill will get beyond the Notice Paper the first week of June when we are back. The Department of Justice indicates it should have completed its drafting and I will be putting it on the Notice Paper June 1 and treating it will depend on agreements in the House. As I have indicated, we are anxious to proceed with it and I hope we can do that very quickly.

In terms of the Committee of the Whole, indeed that suggestion has been made and discussed. Unfortunately it requires a special order of this House. We were not able to secure agreement in that regard so we cannot proceed that way. I agree with the hon. member it would have been a better way to proceed.

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I want to have the attention of the House leader who may be busy looking somewhere else in his impatience.

That is exactly the problem that we are going through at the moment. He is impatient. I, along with many colleagues, the member for Kingston and the Islands, the member for Churchill and many Conservative members, his own colleagues, work very dutifully on the committee of electoral reform. We have done so because we thought that we should work that way with patience with each other. He is so impatient that we are not sure—I am still on the same point—if it is worth at all sitting on any committee.

Many amendments are already ready. I want to be on record because I will not to be a member of the referendum but I certainly will attend. Many amendments are ready. Why do it behind the curtains? They are ready and they have been accepted at the committee on electoral reform. They would be ready immediately to be acceptable. Could we have the assurance of the House leader that at least a lot of freedom would be left to the members to accept very good amendments which