

This is the fifth debate on this subject in which I have taken part in the House of Commons, and to my mind it is the worst. It is true that some of the best speeches might have been made in it, but the subject matter is the worst. The government is not asking parliament to return to the use of capital punishment. It is asking for its abolition even in the case of the murder of policemen and prison guards.

An hon. Member: And treason.

Mr. Horner: "And treason", as correctly stated by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie). Policemen and prison guards have asked that this legislation be voted down. Who knows best? Let hon. members answer to their constituents. This is an important piece of legislation about which I wish there were more new thought on the part of the backbenchers of the Liberal party who rise to speak and represent their constituents.

● (2100)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Horner: I have not finished, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It being nine o'clock, pursuant to order made earlier this day it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings now before the House so that we may resume debate on the motion moved earlier this day, upon which debate was adjourned.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE MOTION FOR EXTENDED SITTINGS

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

That, notwithstanding any Standing or Special Order, for the remainder of the session, no private members' business shall be taken up, and on Tuesdays and Thursdays the House shall sit from 11.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. to consider government bills, provided that, on those days, the normal daily routine of business shall be taken up at 2.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Is the President of the Privy Council rising on a point of order?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. You may recall that you very wisely made the suggestion that the House leaders might assemble again to consider the situation that had arisen during the exchange of pleasantries earlier this day. I should like to inform the House, through you, that we have had some further discussions.

The government is now in a position to agree not to insist on proceeding with Bill C-87, regarding expenditure restraints—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: I had not quite finished the sentence, Mr. Speaker. The government is now in a position to agree not

Extended Sittings

to insist on proceeding with Bill C-87, regarding expenditure restraints, before the summer adjournment. If it is not approved in the fall before prorogation it will, however, be brought back in the next session for passage before the end of the year.

Bill C-83 causes greater difficulty, however, since we do not have a clear indication of when it may be reported from committee. If it is reported comparatively early and if there are signs that its passage will not be much delayed, there is a chance that we shall endeavour to make further progress on it before the break. I say this because the committee is hard at work. In any case, if it is not passed before then it will have the very highest priority in the autumn, whether in a brief continuation of this session or at a reinstated stage in the next one.

We will not adjourn until Bill C-84, regarding capital punishment, is disposed of—either way—at all stages.

I must also inform the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that we must also seek third reading of Bill C-68, regarding medicare, for this bill emanates from the budget of almost one year ago, has been debated at great length, and is now at third reading stage. In addition, Bill S-35, respecting proprietary and patent medicines, and Bill S-88, amending the Canadian Wheat Board Act, are needed before we adjourn. I understand as well that there may be a mutual desire to complete Bill S-32, regarding certain tax conventions. I say this because I have had representations from other countries, and from Canadian businessmen who would like to have that bill approved so that they can proceed with some transactions that are now underway. When royal assent has been given to these items, even if it is before June 30, we should be in a position to begin the summer break.

Many members have expressed concern about the timing of a division on second reading of Bill C-84. The House, of course, has made a special order providing for a negotiated timing of that division within one week of the conclusion of the debate. We had a discussion among the House leaders in an effort to see if we could pinpoint a time when a division might take place, since it is desirable that as much notice as possible should be given to members, regardless of their views on this bill, so they can be here when the division takes place. We looked at the schedule, and most especially the schedule of budget debate and supply days, and we came to the conclusion—I hope I am expressing the views of all my colleagues—that it would not be unrealistic for members to plan on the division occurring on the morning of June 22. We could not make that an order; it is simply—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is second reading?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, that is the division on second reading. That seems to be the most likely date, given all the considerations and all the time constraints. This is the basis upon which we met and, I hope, agreed, Mr. Speaker, and it is my understanding that on this basis we can now proceed to take a vote on the motion that is before the House.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, just a brief reply to the government House leader. He has correctly put forth the understanding that we reached at the meeting today, except for S-32, which he is not pressing in