

[English]

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 30

AWARD OF ADVERTISING CONTRACT

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an application under Standing Order 30 from the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray).

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 30 I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault), that the House adjourn for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the advertising contract awarded without tender to a company headed by a relative of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson), and the failure of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) to enforce conflict of interest guidelines in the aforementioned matter and other circumstances related to this case.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) gave me notice of his intention to request an emergency debate under Standing Order 30. As Members know, there are a number of tests which the Chair is required to apply to an application under Standing Order 30.

First, the matter proposed to be discussed must be a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration. As our precedents confirm, not only must the matter be a genuine emergency, there must be an urgent need to debate it with a minimum of delay in the national interest. The Chair must also take into account whether an early opportunity to debate the issue is likely to occur. We are now into the third Supply period and only three of the allotted days have so far been used. The Opposition has the option of choosing this subject as their subject of debate for the next allotted day.

Let me make it clear to the Hon. Member that it is clear to me that the matter is important which is, in my view, why it has loomed so large during the Question Period for the past few days. However, I am not persuaded that it is related to a genuine emergency as contemplated by Standing Order 30. I am therefore unable to find that the request fulfils the requirements of Standing Order 30.

* * *

[Translation]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Paul Dick (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall all Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1985

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1985

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-18, an Act to amend the Criminal Code, to amend on Act to amend the Criminal Code and to amend the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Act, the Excise Act, the Food and Drugs Act, the Narcotic Control Act, the Parole Act and the Weights and Measures Act, to repeal certain other Acts and to make other consequential amendments, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There are two items I would like to raise in terms of the business of the House this afternoon dealing with the particular Bill which has now been called for consideration by the House. First, there have been consultations between the Parties and I believe there will be a disposition to deal with report stage and third reading of this Bill today by unanimous consent.

The second point is to address the question of admissibility, if I might, with respect to some of the motions put forward at report stage.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member is not the only Member with that interest. There are 16 motions on the Notice Paper at the report stage in amendment to Bill C-18, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1985. I intend to hear procedural arguments in a minute.

Motions Nos. 1 to 4 are identical. These motions present some procedural difficulty to the Chair in that they seem to go beyond the scope of the Bill and appear to amend the parent Act.

Motions Nos. 5 to 8 are also identical. These motions will be debated together and a vote on any one of these motions will dispose of the other three.

Motions Nos. 9 to 12 are identical and again give the Chair some procedural difficulty in that they also appear to go beyond the scope of the Bill and attempt to amend other statutes not included in Bill C-18.

Motions Nos. 13 to 16 are identical and should be debated together. Again, a vote on any of these motions will dispose of the other three motions.

I am prepared to hear procedural arguments from Hon. Members on the acceptability of Motions Nos. 1 to 4 and 9 to 12, should they wish to do so. Perhaps, for the sake of convenience, I could hear them in the order in which I was given notice of their intention to proceed. I will therefore start with the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan).