

*Business of the House*

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to negotiate on the floor of the House, but I do want to indicate to the government House leader, as it is my responsibility to report back to him, that with regard to amendments to the Canada Elections Act there are some difficulties with that particular piece of legislation. I understand that negotiations among the political parties are still continuing.

With regard to the conflict of interest legislation, since it is a subject matter that affects all members and all members have had an opportunity to participate in drafting that particular piece of legislation we would be prepared to move on it, perhaps not this week but if negotiations could be completed we would be prepared to proceed next week.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, I might begin by saying that the government House leader indicated that he had made a proposal with respect to passing Bill C-114 and Bill C-116. We do not make any apologies for not agreeing to pass bills concerning electoral reform and conflict of interest, two very broad topics that Canadians would like to hear more about, all in the course of a Friday afternoon, which is what the government House leader proposed.

The one thing the government House leader did not mention as he gave us the government business up until Tuesday of next week, which does not exactly carry us through until next Thursday when we get to ask this question again, is whether he intends to proceed with Bill C-115, the legislation concerning the North American free trade agreement, next Wednesday.

When he is answering that question I wonder whether he would indicate the government's intention with respect to time allocation. He will know of the concern we and others have expressed that this particular piece of legislation should in all parliamentary fairness and tradition receive more than a day and a half of debate, which is so far what the government has proposed.

Could the government House leader put these fears to rest? We are not interested in debating it forever, but we think that a day and a half is certainly not adequate. Would he put these fears to rest and would he have some

confidence that once a decent debate has been held we will be willing to send it into committee? Would he withdraw the threat of time allocation and indicate to us just what he intends for the rest of next week after Tuesday?

• (1515 )

**Mr. Andre:** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the hon. member talking about traditions and fairness in the way of operating. The way we have always operated is by reaching agreement on issues for which there is no great partisan dispute, conflict of interest, election reform act, so that we can treat them in an expeditious manner. It is not a matter of not having them exposed or trying to pull anything sneaky.

It is a matter of getting them into committee so that they can be looked at. The conflict of interest act came out of a committee study. As for the Canada Elections Act, for goodness' sake, there have been months and months of study after a \$20 million royal commission. How much longer is it necessary to carry this on before the hon. members will be satisfied?

I did indicate in my answer to the House leader of the Liberal Party that in terms of beyond next Tuesday I would have the usual discussions with the opposition.

I have asked the NDP repeatedly how much time it wants. There has been a flat refusal from the New Democratic Party to agree to any reasonable time limitations on any piece of legislation at any time. How do I negotiate in the face of that kind of flat refusal, which is all I have received from the New Democratic Party up until the promise made just a while ago for the first time?

**Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants):** Mr. Speaker, this is right on the House business and what the government House leader said. I was very interested in that last comment. I am not going to get into the other elements that interest me.

I would like to ask something in terms of the Canada Elections Act and the \$20 million spent by the Lortie commission and the recognition that there was a discrimination on tax receipts for people who were not involved in registered parties.