

Adjournment Debate

the House. That is the Standing Order under which the motion was filed. It would indeed be a travesty of the rules of the House if Members were denied the opportunity to consider a motion filed under that part of the rules. They were put in there for good reason. The Government is using the rule and I do not know how much longer a procedural debate of this kind should go on until we get ourselves into the area of wasting further time in the House, having less time to get to legislation to help the handicapped and others.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I think the Parliamentary Secretary is reflecting improperly not only on this House but on yourself, Sir, in questioning whether this procedural debate should go on longer and, to use his exact words, characterizing it as a waste of time. I say that this is barely disguised contempt for this House, and for you, Sir, and I call upon the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to withdraw those words and accept that procedural debates are the foundation of what this House is all about.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, if I have offended the House or the Member opposite in any way, I would be very happy to withdraw. I think a precise reading of my words, and I did try to say it precisely, would be that I wonder how much longer we can go on on this particular procedural item, which may certainly have aspects of clarity to it that may not always be present, how much longer we can go on without bringing the House into some kind of negative position.

Mr. Speaker: I think the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary has made it clear that he was not trying to abuse any Hon. Member or the Chair.

I have some announcements I have to give because they are important. Before I do that, I just want to say something arising out of the exchange we have just had. I think Hon. Members realize that when Members of all Parties came together and set a calendar, it was done as a consequence of discussions, extensive discussion, and it was done, of course, in the better interests of this place and in the duties and responsibilities that Hon. Members have to perform. It does not seem to me to that to take a little while to listen to these arguments is untoward or any kind of abuse of the ordinary function of this House. I just want to assure Hon. Members that I am listening carefully, and I think I indicated that in my intervention a few minutes ago.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for

Winnipeg Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie)—Canadian National Railways—Transcona Shops—request for assurance work will remain in Winnipeg/request for Ministerial assurance; the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell)—Health—AIDS disease—public education/Funding of federal centre for AIDS;

[*Translation*]

the Hon. Member for Kenora—Rainy River (Mr. Parry)—External Affairs—Sale of explosives to farmers by Expro Company—Request for results of Minister's inquiry/ Expro Company—Federal advance.

• (1630)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MOTION TO EXTEND HOURS OF SITTING

The House resumed consideration of Order No. 26 for the motion of Mr. Lewis

to extend the sittings of the House.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, I might just offer a tentative—and I stress tentative—comment on your request for comment on Section 49 of the BNA Act with respect to questions and the role of the Speaker in relation thereto. Unless I completely misunderstand what Your Honour read to us from that, it would seem that the questions that are referred to in that Section are questions on motions which are before the House which are about to be put to a vote referring, I believe, to the situation in which there may be a tie vote.

What we are trying to determine here is whether or not the motion that the Government intends should ever reach that stage, that is to say whether it is in order in the first place. I think the questions that are referred to by the word "questions" in the Section that Your Honour read to us are the questions which arise out of motions which have been deemed to be in order. What we are debating here is whether or not in fact the Government ought to be allowed to proceed with the motion. However, like everyone else, I would want to reserve the right to study the question more.

With respect to what is being debated here this afternoon, the Parliamentary Secretary, the Hon. Member from Calgary, went on at great length—

Mr. Lewis: Eloquence!

Mr. Blaikie: —and with a great deal of—

Mr. Lewis: Eloquence!

Mr. Blaikie: —self-righteous eloquence.

Mr. Lewis: Delete "self-righteous".