

*Summer Recess***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[Translation]

HOUSE OF COMMONS**MOTION RESPECTING SUMMER RECESS**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Pinard:

That, when the House adjourns on the day this order is adopted, it shall stand adjourned until Wednesday, October 14, 1981, provided that at any time prior to that date, if it appears to the satisfaction of Madam Speaker, after consultation with the government, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time, Madam Speaker may give notice that she is so satisfied, and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its "business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time; and

That, in the event of Madam Speaker's being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker, the Deputy Chairman of Committees or the Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees shall act in her stead for all the purposes of this order.

Madam Speaker: Order. Before I recognize the first speaker, I should like to point out to the House that normally, when such a debate is held, the Standing Orders provide that we recess for dinner from six o'clock to eight o'clock. Nothing is provided for Friday. The Standing Orders mention Monday, Tuesday and Thursday, but not Friday. I suppose you may decide that we should recess from six o'clock to eight o'clock, as if it were a regular week day.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[English]

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, if that was put as a question to the House, then we would say no to the question.

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I understand that you did not put a motion to that effect. You merely said that on a regular weekday, the House takes recess in the evening from six o'clock to eight o'clock. However, since it is Friday when usually the House adjourns at five o'clock, you conclude that we should normally recess for dinner from six o'clock to eight o'clock. That is what you said and we agree with your interpretation.

[English]

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, we can talk about this all the time, but you were asking the opinion of the House. This government, which has for the first time in the British Commonwealth moved closure to shut down the House of Commons, is now suggesting that we take two hours of very valuable time enabling us to lambaste the bounders for what they are. The answer is no; they deserve the two hours of lashing they are going to get.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles: Madam Speaker, I regard what is now being discussed as quite unimportant; the damage has been done. Since there is not unanimous consent to adjourn for supper hour from six o'clock to eight o'clock, I take it we will sit through until one o'clock in the morning. As I say, the damage has been done.

Madam Speaker: Quite obviously, since the Standing Orders are not clear, I suggested an interpretation which could be taken. However, I would naturally need the unanimous consent of the House to determine we would adjourn from six to eight. Since we do not have unanimous consent and the Standing Orders are silent on this matter, I have to rule on the side of allowing Parliament to debate as long as possible. Therefore, there will be no adjournment from six until eight.

I believe I have two members rising on a point of order. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

● (1440)

Mr. Knowles: Madam Speaker, just to be clear, although I regard it as unimportant too, perhaps there should be an understanding as to whether we will have private members' hour between four and five o'clock or spend the time on this adjournment motion. It does not matter, but it should be clear.

Madam Speaker: It is quite clear in the Standing Orders that private members' hour must commence at four o'clock.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I see that the Postmaster General is seeking the floor. I notice in the record of last night's proceedings in the House that the hon. Postmaster General spoke. He announced his intention to move a motion, and he has now moved a motion. I think it could be argued, and I do argue, that we should consider that he has lost his right to participate further in the debate. He was not contributing very much, anyway.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Perhaps for the benefit of the House this should be done.

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I find the attitude taken by the opposition House leader somewhat inconsistent. He complains that we are trying to muzzle them, and yet he now wants to muzzle the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Postmaster General (Mr. Ouellet). Yesterday, the Postmaster General started his speech; he took only fifteen minutes out of the 40 minutes allotted to him. In his speech, he gave notice of a motion. He moved a motion today but not during the debate on the business of the House. He had the floor. He may therefore continue his speech, except that today, under Standing Order 33, if one reads it intelligently, he may not speak more than twenty minutes. Madam Speaker, if I may, I would like to quote from Standing Order 33 which stipulates that if the resolution is

... resolved in the affirmative, no member shall thereafter ...