

[English]

—to the effect that there has been a general understanding that no snap vote will be taken, is well understood. As far as I am concerned I agree with that principle, but that does not solve the difficulty. I agree with the principle that no snap vote should be called, and on that point I think the point of order raised by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) was well taken.

[Translation]

Although the hon. member for Témiscamingue mentioned earlier that the Chair had said to call in the members, this does not mean that a member cannot rise on a point of order. Thanks to this point of order, I was able to review the general principles set forth in the previous orders passed on June 29 and July 9.

I see no problem in deferring the vote on the amendment until next Wednesday, since the House cannot, according to all precedents, proceed with the debate on third reading without ruling on the amendment now before us. We must therefore look for a way out of this dead end.

[English]

I know the minister is trying to stand up, and I shall welcome his suggestion at the end of my remarks.

Now that the question has been put on the amendment, we are facing a dead-end difficulty for a different reason. Members who are not here and who have the right to participate in a vote, if my interpretation is correct, according to the order, cannot be blamed for not being here and would have the right to blame the House for any vote taken in their absence without notice. Any member who was planning to speak on third reading tomorrow might be prevented from speaking if we postpone the vote until next Wednesday.

The fact that the vote is postponed or would be postponed on the amendment, might prevent other hon. members from bringing in amendments to the third reading motion. To delay that vote until next Wednesday, and if at that time the House felt that a third reading vote should be taken immediately, because some members might have planned to go to their ridings or have other engagements, would also cause confusion. But at this time my immediate conclusion is that no vote can be taken immediately if I interpret the two orders correctly.

[Translation]

The vote cannot be held right now. Accordingly, it must be deferred until next Wednesday, unless the House unanimously decides to amend the previous orders.

● (1710)

[English]

The House is master of its own rules and of its own decisions. Unless hon. members after consultation can bring some definite proposal to the Chair which could be put to the members so that, with the unanimous consent of all hon. members, there might be some modification as to the set time of the vote on the amendment, we cannot proceed any longer and I would have to call it either six o'clock or ten o'clock. We could call it six o'clock so that the House leaders could discuss the question during supper time and, when we reconvene at eight o'clock, suggest a solution. I invite the minister to speak at this time.

Capital Punishment

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in the circumstances, in order to enable those further conversations to which you referred to take place, I move, seconded by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand):

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I know the motion is not debatable; therefore I rise on a point of order. I wonder, before Your Honour, puts the question, if there is not some possibility of our agreeing now, with unanimous consent, to adjourn until eight o'clock this evening to allow House leaders to meet. This motion could certainly be put at eight o'clock. I do not know if that would be contrary to what the minister had in mind. Frankly, I do not know what the minister had in mind, but I think there would be agreement for the suggestion I have made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) will agree that the rules are strict with regard to motions such as the one moved. They are not debatable. I must put the question immediately, unless the minister decides to withdraw the motion.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Its adoption will mean that the House will be called to sit at eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.
And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Macdonald (Rose-dale)) which was agreed to on the following division.

(Division No. 151)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand	Campagnolo (Mrs.)	Faulkner
Andras	Clermont	Firth
(Port Arthur)	Condon	Fleming
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Corriveau	Flynn
Baldwin	Cyr	Foster
Béchar	Daudlin	Fox
Bégin (Miss)	De Bané	Francis
Benjamin	Demers	Gauthier
Blais	Douglas	(Ottawa-Vanier)
Blouin	(Bruce-Grey)	Gillespie
Breau	Douglas	Goodale
Buchanan	(Nanaimo-Cowichan-	Guay
Caccia	The Islands)	(St. Boniface)
Cafik	Dupras	Herbert