

committee meetings. I want to be quite clear that this is the basis upon which we put this matter forward. I say that, not suggesting there will be any such tactic, but sometimes enthusiasm takes over where logic should prevail, and occasionally—

**An hon. Member:** You should know.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** We want to get this business through and we put this forward on a serious basis in order to help expedite the business of the House and to get the government off a sticky wicket with respect to the \$10 billion. We put it forward in good faith in order to get the bill through in the minimum amount of time. It is essential that the Minister of Finance be at committee and that we be given the opportunity to examine and cross-examine him on the remaining provisions of the bill.

I believe it was the understanding given by the government House leader that, as far as he had any control over this matter, he would counsel his colleagues not to indulge in excessive debate or other tactics. The Minister of Finance is here and he will be able to confirm that he will be at those particular meetings.

● (1632)

Finally, as far as the understanding is concerned, we are agreeable to the five hours but that any votes that might arise by virtue of the discussion and amendments brought forward in the report stage will be taken at a time mutually convenient after discussion on this matter.

**Mr. Pinard:** The rules provide for that.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Maybe the parliamentary secretary, who was so good at undertakings, and who would not participate in this debate now, wants to make an interjection. But I am trying to recall publicly what was my understanding of the arrangement, that the votes would not be considered as part of the time involved in the five-hour debate. In other words, the five hours would be attributable and available for debate and not be included as far as—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I hope that all hon. members will recognize that if we are trying to come to some kind of agreement here, which I expect will be made the subject of a House order, the matter has now become so complicated that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to frame an order in extemporaneous language.

If the parties want to finalize the terms of an order, that perhaps ought to be done privately. But to attempt to do this as we move along from moment to moment, adding different paragraphs, conditions, and undertakings from the one side to the other, into the final product, I simply want to point out makes a practical procedural difficulty. If we were to attempt to phrase some sort of an order, there is a limit to how much we can incorporate in it extemporaneously.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Mr. Speaker, the reason I rose to explain my understanding of the undertaking of the government House leader was due to the fact that he inadvertently did not say it

### *Business of the House*

was his understanding the Minister of Finance would appear before the committee.

**Mr. MacEachen:** That is all right.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** The proposition that he makes is satisfactory to us. He is confirming that now, sir, and he did not make that clear when he made his proposal. I simply want to make that quite clear, that that was an essential and integral part of it, and I gave it some background. With those very few caveats and observations, we are prepared to go along with the suggestion and the recommendation put forward by the government House leader.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I often go to the press gallery and look at the notice board because it is a good way to find out what is going on around this place. It just so happens that I did not go last evening, so I have not seen the letter that was written to the government House leader by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). However, I was clued in a little before lunch time today as to what was happening, and although I have not had an opportunity to consult with all of my colleagues, I have consulted with enough of them to be able to state our position.

Our position, Mr. Speaker, is that we are prepared to agree to the proposal that has now been made by the government House leader.

May I state it as I understand it, hoping that it is the general proposition. It would be, first, that the debate on second reading of Bill C-7 be now regarded as concluded which, of course, would do away with that motion under 75(c), of which notice was given yesterday. It is also understood that any vote on second reading would come at 5.45. The bill would go to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs with the understanding that in that committee the government will move for the deletion of the clauses that relate to fiscal year 1979-1980.

The rest of the understanding is that when the bill comes back to the House, and it must come back by November 10, that the debate at report stage and third reading will not exceed five hours, and that any time required for recorded votes would be outside of the five hours.

I should like to say that I prefer that way of putting it, that is, five hours of debate, rather than saying one sitting day, because one sitting day can sometimes be messed up by a long debate on procedural points, references to Standing Order 43 and so on, and the first thing you know a sitting day can be an hour and a half or two hours.

So, Mr. Speaker, if you do not mind my having taken this time to say it, I have been trying to spell out what we understand to be the agreement, and we agree to it.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I think it is important enough that we do not have later misunderstandings as a result of our discussion. I do not believe the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) referred in his otherwise admirable summation to what would happen in the