

That, notwithstanding any Standing or special order of this House, at 5 p.m. this day the sitting shall be suspended to the call of the Chair for the purpose of witnessing the Royal Assent to certain Bills.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, can the Parliamentary Secretary tell the House at what time we can expect the messenger from the Senate to come in with Royal Assent? Does the Parliamentary Secretary have any idea?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the messenger will arrive at or about 5 p.m. What we are talking about is to avoid any technical problems. Royal Assent will take place very close to 5 p.m. I think this Order will take care of any technicalities.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. Just so I have a full understanding of what the Parliamentary Secretary is suggesting, is he suggesting that rather than adjourning at 5 p.m. that the House continue to sit?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Nunziata: Perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary could explain exactly what he is proposing so we on this side of the House understand fully.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in explaining the matter to the Hon. Member. It was worked out with Mr. Yanover of his Party to avoid any difficulty.

At 5 p.m. the sitting shall be suspended to the call of the Chair for the purpose of Royal Assent. There will be no further government business after 5 p.m.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary is using the terminology "suspend". As I understand it the House would be adjourning—

Mr. Deans: No.

Mr. Nunziata:—for the summer recess. I would like a very clear and unequivocal explanation as to the distinction between the House suspending and the House adjourning. Are we adjourning at five o'clock or are we suspending?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, unaccustomed as I am to a great deal of debate on this particular matter, it seems to me that we would be suspending at 5 p.m. until Royal Assent is obtained and at that point we would return to the House and adjourn without any further business.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I hope the Parliamentary Secretary understands that we will, I am sure, give consent. If, however, we were not to be co-operative, and I want to show that we can co-operate, we could say no at five o'clock. Everything would be over. We could refuse to stay and, therefore, there would be no Royal Assent, meaning that none of these Bills would get Royal Assent before some time in September. I do not think that is the mood of the House. Therefore, I think we will co-operate.

Canada Shipping Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion presented by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Lewis). It requires unanimous consent. Is there such consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

• (1530)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AND RELATED ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Mazankowski that Bill C-75, an Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act and to amend the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, the Maritime Code Act and the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act in consequence thereof, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, if the Parliamentary Secretary is willing to suspend the sentence which he is attempting to impose on the shipping industry of Canada and many primary producers, we would be glad to have Royal Assent right now. Otherwise, I will be more than happy to spend the next hour and a half educating Members as to the concerns of Canadians about Clause 4. If the Government prefers that I wait and educate Members in the fall, I will be glad to do that because I do not believe that you ought to cram too much down a student's throat in the final days before summer holidays. My friend, the Member for Burin—St. George's (Mr. Price) told me that. He was a teacher for many years. He said that minds are always much more receptive to new information in the fall of the year when school resumes. However, if the Parliamentary Secretary would like me to continue, I will. If he is not interested in my offer, that is fine. There is nothing I would rather do than educate Members.

Earlier in my remarks I indicated that I have two problems with Bill C-75. One is that it is flawed because of what is in it, that being Clause 4, and one is because it is flawed because of what is not in it, that is any provision to include oil rigs as ships to fall under the jurisdiction of the Canada Shipping Act.

I reminded Members that on February 15, 1982, the *Ocean Ranger* tragically went down off the shores of Newfoundland. There were 84 men on board. All lives were lost. Sixty-nine members of that crew were Canadians and 56 of them were Newfoundlanders. Flowing from that disaster was a royal commission report sponsored by both Governments which cost \$15 million. Its major recommendation was that oil rigs operating off the East Coast of Canada ought to be included in