

*Capital Punishment*

—which goes against the arguments of the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette)—

... shall be held at a time to be fixed by the House leaders, provided that that time shall be not more than one week after the request for the division.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see anything in last Friday's motion which cancels the motion of June 29. Therefore, I do not see how it can now be decided to hold a vote. The House leaders should meet and hold discussions. If they agree and if the vote is held within 10 minutes, that is fine, but I still think we should go by the June 29 resolution which has not been cancelled. This House actually passed it, and I do not really see the purpose of the present discussion.

[English]

**Mr. Condon:** Mr. Speaker, I seem to have caused a little consternation with the motion which I put, which was seconded by the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles), this morning. I assure the House that it was not my intention to embarrass either the House leaders or any hon. member of this House. My motion was prompted by the way I feel, and I felt it was necessary because of the concern I have for the constituency of Middlesex-London-Lambton. It was my assumption that the vote would be taken on Wednesday as outlined in a previous order. I am in your hands, Mr. Speaker, but I wanted to present this position. When the vote comes, I would prefer—and I am sure the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand would agree—to have all hon. members in the House to express their opinions.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Horner:** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak because I cautioned the House about the question of postponing all votes until a specified day. I thought it was wrong then, and the hon. member, whether his intentions were correctly received by the House or not, pointed out clearly how wrong it is. This House has to debate and its members have to stand and be counted at the end of a debate.

● (1700)

As I understand it, the end of the debate on the amendment has come but not the end of the debate on the bill. The debate on third reading can continue. I have not spoken on third reading and I am sure there are other members who intend to speak, but the order laid down on July 9 suggests if—and "if" is a big word—the debate is not concluded the vote will be taken on Wednesday. I suggest to you, Sir, that you have three options: to call it six o'clock and allow the House leaders to meet; to have a vote on the amendment on Wednesday; and the third option is to have the vote on the amendment taken right now.

**Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand):** As the seconder of the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I should like it perfectly understood that there was no trickery in our minds when it was moved. We felt Bill C-84 should be postponed until after the Olympics—that the capital punishment legislation should be in force during that time, and that point was stressed during the debate many, many times.

Having said that, and without having listened to all the argument just now, I assumed that the vote would be

[Mr. Lachance.]

taken on Wednesday afternoon as set forth in the order before the House now. I just want to make myself clear. I have no strong feelings one way or the other as to when it is taken, but in fairness to everybody I think it should be Wednesday.

[Translation]

**Mr. Beaudoin:** Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, all we need to know is whether the last motion moved last Friday can change anything to the motion moved by the government House leader on June 29. If that motion, which reflected the views of the House leaders, is still valid, we must wait until Wednesday to hold the vote. But if the June 29 motion drafted by the House leaders is no longer valid because it is cancelled, so to speak, by last Friday's motion, it is up to you, Mr. Speaker, to rule on this matter and decide whether the vote shall take place Wednesday or today. If that motion is valid, because each motion to amend has to be voted on and the date of the vote agreed upon by the House leaders, then, it is up to you, Mr. Speaker, to make a ruling.

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I think I have received some very valuable contributions from hon. members, although I must say that did not help solve the problem. The House is in a difficult situation at this time. The motion of the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon), which was seconded by the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles), has come to a vote, and although both members declared it was not their intention to bring about this complication, the Chair cannot rule on their intention, and I have to consider the situation the motion is putting the House in at this time.

[Translation]

As far as I am concerned, in answer to the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), I, for one, have no difficulty with the two orders that were passed by this House on June 29 and July 9.

My interpretation of the order of July 9 deals with a specific matter and is merely a notice given to those hon. members who were to return to their respective ridings, so that they would know when the vote would be taken. It could have simply been announced in the House that an agreement had been reached between the House leaders, but it was decided to introduce a supplementary order. Initially, it was decided as a general principle that all the votes on the report and third reading stages of Bill C-84 would be taken only after an agreement was reached and the time decided upon by all the House leaders.

The order was put last Friday by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) in order to make it quite clear, the report stage having been disposed of, that the vote or votes on third reading would be taken on Wednesday, July 14, immediately after the prayers. There is no inconsistency whatsoever in that.

The only difficulty lies in the fact that an amendment was moved by the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon) and that the debate was concluded on the amendment which proposed that third reading of the bill be deferred for three months. Therefore, the House now finds itself in a dead end. I think that the point made by the Solicitor General—