

of the whole rather than referred to another committee of this House. It is a matter of great importance to Canadians generally and we think the whole House should deal with it in committee.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, as a result of the discussions we had with the hon. President of the Privy Council, we still agree to support his motion and further agree with the suggestion the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) of the New Democratic Party has just made that, when the time comes, instead of referring the bill to the standing committee, perhaps we should rather discuss it in committee of the whole, so that considering the importance of the bill, we can pass it as speedily as possible.

[*English*]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I suppose we can hardly anticipate now what the House will decide on Monday with regard to where the bill goes. It may be a question for argument, but I feel it would be most improper not to have the opportunity of examining the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) at least with regard to what has happened and with relation to the details of the bill. That cannot be done effectively in the House. The bill would come back to the House for third reading and there would be an opportunity then for members to make further decisions. We will facilitate the committee proceedings. For our part, there cannot be any agreement to dispense with the normal course which is that the bill go to a standing committee, unless the House should make an order otherwise. We are not prepared to consent to that order.

There is one other point. With regard to the proposal made by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), we are willing to suggest that after the original speeches there be a limitation of 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: There is no motion before the House at this time; simply a statement on motions by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp). However, this is a matter which will be dealt with on Monday. If there are further consultations and an agreement that an order of the House be made later this day, so be it. In any case we have no proposal for an order, simply an announcement. In any event, that will be the business of the day on Monday. Have I misunderstood the nature of the remarks?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be desirable that an order of the House do issue today so that preparation can be made for the debate on Monday. Like the spokesmen for the NDP and the Social Credit party, the government would prefer that the bill be referred to the committee of the whole. However, the Progressive Conservative party House leader will not give consent to that procedure. It would expedite consideration of this very important measure if, notwithstanding our particular reservations about the committee to which it might be referred, we could agree today to an order that it follow the ordinary rules of the House.

As hon. members know, it is part of our rules that bills of this kind are referred to a standing committee and that

Business of the House

consent is required for them to be referred to a Committee of the Whole. I would hope that later this day an order might be made which would be acceptable to all members.

Mr. Speaker: Is the President of the Privy Council seeking an order now that the bill should be dealt with on Monday in any case, with an order later as to how and when, or does he consider it better to leave it until a full order is put forward later in the day?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any question about the importance of dealing with this bill immediately—

Mr. Diefenbaker: After five weeks of delay!

Mr. Sharp: I think an order should be made now. I would prefer it if the House leader for the Official Opposition could frame an order now, and then, perhaps, we could dispose of the matter immediately.

Mr. Baldwin: If the hon. members speaking for the New Democratic Party and the Creditiste Party, despite their very reasonable reservations, would agree at this time to the course I have mentioned, we could dispose of the matter now and make the one order.

Mr. Brewin: I have consulted with the other members of my party and they are agreeable.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, this proposal is also agreeable to us.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Shall it be ordered, then, that the bill be introduced and stand for second reading on Monday?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Baldwin: And could we not add the items with which I believe we have already agreed in principle—that the ordinary rule as to adjournment be suspended and that the—

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Baldwin: Well, I gathered this was the understanding on the basis of which I made my suggestion.

Mr. Speaker: I would respectfully suggest we have gone as far as we can go at this moment. If there are other consultations which might result in an order later in the day, so be it. But, for the moment, enough is enough.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I should like to take this occasion to remind hon. members that since this arrangement varies the order of business for Monday we shall not be debating the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne on Monday, with the result that the House will not sit at eleven in the morning but rather at two o'clock in the afternoon.