

sibilities. I have always felt that this is a healthy situation, but it has to be kept within limits. Often it has exceeded those limits, and I think it would be wise for those who have a responsibility for writing editorials and making speeches in this House to avoid using phrases like "knuckle under" and "capitulation" because this does no good at all.

I understand there was some \$470 million paid under Governor General's warrants finally approved by Appropriation Act No. 3 in 1974 which covered compensation through September to October 30, 1974. That might have been the first amount, but I am not sure whether there was anything else paid. In addition to that, also in Appropriation Act No. 3 by Vote 52A there was a further sum of \$330 million to provide for payment to and after November 1, 1974. The first appropriation was Vote 11A for \$476 million.

There was no termination date in respect of the \$330 million, except that the government assumed in its calculations that this would cover the amount required for compensation to importers to the benefit of the consumers in eastern Canada to the end of the year. I now understand that the \$330 million will probably carry over until sometime in January, and I am fortified in that belief by the fact that this bill calls for the approval of a supplementary amount of \$365 million whereas Bill C-32 provided for \$430 million. It may well be that the experience of the government so far would indicate that the amount originally estimated will not match what is anticipated.

I do not blame the government as it is very difficult to anticipate what will be required in respect of consumption in eastern Canada so there will be a general equalization of price. This is a principle that has been acceptable to most Canadians, and certainly to most members of this House. Because of that difficulty, and pursuant to Vote No. 52A in Appropriation Act No. 3, 1974, we have a fairly complicated and complex set of regulations. I will not attempt to debate them, but there are some six or seven pages which I think the minister attempted to sum up in his response to the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.

I would suggest that at the appropriate time in the new year there might be an opportunity for consideration of those regulations by the committee. I know that in due course they will come before the Public Accounts Committee, but that is after the event, and it might be that because of the difficulties and problems which arise from the government's attempt to meet this difficult and complex situation, it would be a good idea for this House, as the ultimate approver of expenditures, to consider these regulations and other problems that may have arisen. Perhaps this can be arranged between the House leaders.

I do not suggest there is any rush, but I think it is essential in the discharge of our duties that we arrange for such consideration. I am glad to see there is now a breathing space for the government of Canada and the governments of the provinces, through their first ministers, to get together. There is no doubt that in world development there will be some rather consequential changes in respect of oil prices and supplies. The meeting of the President of the United States and the President of France would indicate that they have proposals to make that may have

Adjournment Motion

some impact. I suspect it will not be enough to hold one meeting of the first ministers' as there are many problems to be put on the table for discussion.

I notice it is now five o'clock, and I wonder if there is a feeling in the committee to continue in order to get this bill through. I will not be more than five minutes.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would be much obliged if we could, as I will be away at a meeting this evening.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We have at least two members who wish to ask some questions, so I think it is more than a five-minute operation.

Mr. Towers: I would agree to have the committee go ahead to finish this.

The Deputy Chairman: I appreciate what hon. members are seeking to do, but I do not think this is a decision we can make in committee. Ordinarily the committee consideration would now be interrupted so that we can deal with private members' business. I think the decision will have to be made by the House. If the committee will allow me, I will leave the chair and the point of order can then be discussed and an agreement perhaps reached.

Progress reported.

● (1700)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. 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 Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall)—External Affairs—Cyprus—Possible removal of Canadian contingent; the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert)—Industry—Textiles—Request for government aid to industry; the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—Allegation of bias in reporting news event in Middle East—Government action.

[Translation]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, as the mover of that bill, I would ask leave of the House to carry on the consideration of the bill in committee so that all those who want to ask questions may do so, to complete immediately, as agreed, its consideration.

[English]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, if it can be done in five or ten minutes we would not mind, but we have at least two members who wish to ask questions and we do not think they should be under that kind of pressure.