

proposes unlimited debate without time limits inherent, and I think it would be wise if hon. members would accord me the dinner hour to seek consultation with the Table officers in order to determine whether that is quite right on.

That being the case, and if it is deemed suitable by hon. members, debate may continue on the motion.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm)—Metric conversion—Request for parliamentary debate before system put into full effect; the hon. member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie)—Canadian Pacific Railway—Winnipeg—Rail relocation—Suggested reversal of government policy.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A), 1980-81

REPORTING FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Pinard:

That, notwithstanding any standing order, the Supplementary Estimates (A), 1980-1981, shall be reported or be deemed to have been reported from the several standing committees no later than May 9, 1980;

That, no later than fifteen minutes before the ordinary time of adjournment on May 15, 1980 the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings then in progress and put, forthwith and successively, without amendment or debate, every question that may be necessary to dispose of any item of business relating to interim supply, the said Supplementary Estimates, the restoration or reinstatement of any item in the said Supplementary Estimates or any opposed item in the said Supplementary Estimates and, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 72, for the passage at all stages of any bill or bills based thereon, providing that the ordinary time of adjournment shall remain suspended until all such questions have been decided; and

That, for the year 1980, Standing Order 58 shall be amended as follows:

- (i) by replacing in section (5) thereof the word "five" with the word "eighteen" and by deleting the words "Thirteen additional days shall be allotted to the business of supply in the period ending not later than June 30.";
- (ii) by replacing in section (9) thereof the word "two" with the word "four";
- (iii) by replacing in section (14) thereof the words "March 1 of the then expiring fiscal year" with the words "April 30"; and
- (iv) by replacing in section (14) thereof the words "May 31 in the then current fiscal year" with the words "November 10".

**Hon. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, we all enjoyed the meandering speech of the hon.

### *Supplementary Estimates (A)*

member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). I am a little disappointed that he did not make it for at least two full hours. He fell nine minutes short. Maybe next time he is in that spot he will surpass his own record.

However, I have to say, despite my criticism of his wandering and so on, that when it was all over he did produce something that to me, at least, is negotiable. I suspect that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) would find it difficult to accept the amendment in its entirety as it has been moved, but there are certain principles in it that I believe are sound, and I hope that there might be some consultations that could lead to a compromise or a negotiated settlement.

As a matter of fact, I think it is unfortunate that we are having this debate on the floor of the House. There is an awful lot of business with which this Parliament must deal, and it seems to me that one of the reasons for having meetings of House leaders is to try to sort out the process so that on the floor of the House we can deal with matters of substance. Indeed, I think it is unfortunate that the terms of this proposal as set out in the amendment were not presented at a meeting of House leaders where, perchance, we might have come to some understanding.

I have been a bit critical, perhaps, of my friends to the right. I am addressing myself now to the President of the Privy Council. As he knows, I was prepared to buy the motion that he put down the other day. In fact I was prepared to buy an even shorter one that he presented to us at a meeting of House leaders, but I ask him not to reject out of hand the suggestions which have been made by the hon. member for St. John's West in an amendment which he says was drafted by the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker).

Before I comment on what this amendment does as I see it, may I back up a bit and describe what I think would be the result of the motion as put by the President of the Privy Council. The hon. member for St. John's West rang the changes on the proposition that we were being denied the right to debate the estimates back on the floor of the House. Well, that happens to be the way the rules are set up. I do not like them but that is the way they are. The motion of the President of the Privy Council does not do that. All the motion of the President of the Privy Council does is to take cognizance of the fact that we have had a couple of elections, that we met only two months out of 13 between March, 1979, and April, 1980, and that somehow we have to catch up with the backlog. So, his motion proposed that since in the semester we are now in and in the one at the end of this year there is a total of 18 days, he puts down 18 opposition days. Since the rules provide for two non-confidence days in each of those, he adds two and two together and gets four. He is a smart man; he can do his arithmetic.

**An hon. Member:** He should be the Minister of Finance.

**Mr. Knowles:** As for the business of the estimates being sent to committee and then being brought back to the House