

I emphasize the word "emergency".

—the government has no other items which it considers essential to be disposed of before the adjournment. The parties may, of course, be ready to agree on the approval of minor housekeeping matters such as motions 33 and 34 under government business.

As I recall, the last two motions mentioned were concurred in. Reference has been made to Bills C-68, C-81, C-84, C-87, C-88 and S-35. Bill S-35 has been disposed of, and Bill C-87 withdrawn from consideration before the adjournment pursuant to a subsequent agreement. Bill C-84 is now before the committee, and we have agreed to vote on Bill C-68. But nowhere on this list of bills does Bill C-61 appear.

I know the minister may be in some difficulty with respect to calling bills on the order paper. Bill C-83 is before the committee and I suppose could be called. The President of the Privy Council had indicated, quite properly, that it would be unfair to call Bill C-83, which deals with peace and security, when Bill C-84 was still before the committee. It would have been particularly unfair to call it since members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs are considering Bill C-84 and, therefore, could not attend the House of Commons. I am not quarrelling about that. The government has put the House in a difficult position. We are asked to debate a bill which we had understood we would not deal with until later this year, perhaps in the new session.

There is also the matter of hours to consider. It was always the intention, when the agreement was made for extended hours of sitting, that we should deal with the package of legislation which had been mentioned. That package was arrived at as a result of careful negotiation carried out in the best faith on the part of House leaders. Yet at present we are asked to debate a bill which was not included in that package. Perhaps the President of the Privy Council has something to say to the House about further extended hours.

I feel that I must raise a point of order about the calling of Bill C-61. I regret very much that it is necessary to do so. It was the impression of the hon. member for Halifax on Friday, as reported on page 14872 of *Hansard*:

—that a list of certain bills was to be considered, and that Bill C-61 was not one of those.

His recollection was exactly right. It therefore appears that the government should reconsider the matter of extended hours and the matter of reinstating private members' hours. I would not raise the matter if the government had forced extra hours on the House; but that is not the case. Exactly the opposite is true. Extended hours were arrived at by agreement on the part of all parties for the purpose of debating a particular package of legislation which did not include Bill C-61. Therefore, I wish to know what the government House leader proposes to do about the question of hours.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, some of the comments made by the House leader of the official opposition, and some comments made the other day by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), have a good deal of merit. When laying down the business for the remainder of this session, I admit, frankly, that I did not anticipate the sorts of difficulties which have

Maritime Code

arisen in the last few days. However, I do not believe that the calling of Bill C-61 is contrary to any undertakings I gave. Nevertheless, the members of the opposition may feel from what I said that I did not intend to call the bill again. At one stage, I think it is fair to say, I did not think I would have the opportunity to call it again.

What I said in the statement which has been read by the official opposition House leader is not inconsistent with calling Bill C-61, because I have no intention of pressing Bill C-61 through to completion unless that is the wish of all parties in the House. There is no other way in which that can be done. I want to make a couple of points of emphasis and clarification. I do not intend to call Bill C-61 after today because I foresee no occasion when it will be possible to do so.

It is our intention, if the necessary consent is not given, to call Bill C-83 tomorrow and Wednesday. After that we shall get to Bill C-84, which is the last remaining item on the government's list of business which must be concluded before we adjourn. It may be that consent will be given, in which case we would devote the time available to Bill C-84 and not to Bill C-83, because I do not think it will be possible to dispose of Bill C-83 before we adjourn unless we were to keep the House sitting, contrary to the undertaking I gave in order to dispose of it.

As to the extended hours, the House leader of the official opposition is quite right. The extended hours were agreed on for the purpose of considering certain business. Bill C-61 is not one of the items we intend to dispose of unless there is agreement on both sides. I do not intend to use any of the extended hours for the purpose of debating Bill C-61. Since on this day there are no extended hours, that question does not arise. I see no opportunity to call Bill C-61 again because the House will be considering Bill C-84, which must be disposed of, and Bill C-83 which can be called when, as expected, the justice committee reports tonight.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the minister speaks now, will he not close the debate?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He has just moved the motion.

Mr. Speaker: The minister will be making the first speech on third reading.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that I was opening the debate, rather than closing it, which I hope may be the case. I suggest that the exchanges between House leaders on the government and opposition sides challenge hon. members to see if they cannot pass Bill C-61 before the House rises for the summer. In the limited time available, I suggest it will be possible for hon. members to understand the purpose of the bill. Hon. members will recall that the bill had broad support on second reading. It was referred to committee without division, and apparently without dissent.

This bill is part of a large program for advancing and improving the law relating to seagoing vessels. Generally, it would institute a maritime code for Canada. It is but a