

Fourthly, I think in this situation perhaps the time has come for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) to come to his senses and tell us how much time he really wants to deal with this bill. Now that we have dealt with report stage, now that it is completed and we are going to have votes in a few minutes, he may find that we do not have the anxiety he seems to have to delay the debate another two days. Perhaps the government should take quite seriously the admonition given them about bringing forward this kind of motion in the first place.

Mr. Cafik: Make it a House order.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The deputy House leader of the government interjects and says "a House order". Of course, if we can agree there could be a House order. The government has indicated in their motion a period of time within which they would like this matter to be completed. I wonder if we can have this matter discussed to see if we can complete it within the time suggested by the order. I think there is a certain matter of consultation that ought to go on that obviously has not taken place in this case. I have come to the conclusion that for political purposes alone the government is conspiring to delay this piece of legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have obviously a number of rather difficult choices to make. It occurs to me that we are getting into a situation that has a number of ironies. If I accept the theory that report stage of this bill is over—

An hon. Member: That is a fact, not theory.

Mr. Speaker: If I accept that argument, it would seem to me that what remains are some votes ordered by the House. If I accept that position then I presume that if I do not let this motion go ahead at this time, the third reading of the bill begins today without consent. Because the position is that we are not dealing with report stage and third reading on the same day because the contention has been put forward that report stage is finished.

If that is the case, then I would think the sensible thing for the Chair to do would be to accede to the arguments, strike down this order, call the votes that had been ordered and then call third reading of the bill after orders of the day, which means that third reading would then commence. That does not put it under a time allocation order but at least it begins the debate. That would seem to me to be a sensible course.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, with respect to that matter I presume that it was never the government's intention not to deal with Bill C-42. If this solution you have put forward is acceptable to the government, it is acceptable to us and has been acceptable to us for some considerable time. We are not anxious to delay the bill. If you do accede—

Time Allocation

● (1530)

Mr. Pinard: The Speaker said he would recognize two hon. members. Why is he speaking again?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): —to the argument put forward by this side, namely that the motion put by the government is a nullity for a number of reasons, then I undertake with you, and through you to members on the other side, that we have no objection whatsoever to starting third reading debate immediately after the bell; and if hon. members now say they want to enter into discussions with respect to the appropriate time, that, of course, is what we have wanted the government to do for some period of time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, yours is a very difficult task indeed and sometimes, as it is the case today, we unintentionally make it still more difficult.

Mr. Speaker, through this point of order I should like to call the attention of the House and the Chair to the fact that yesterday the minister gave notice of his motion before the debate on Bill C-42 could continue, as reported in *Hansard* on page 4281. Anyone examining his statement on the allocation of time to consider the report and third reading stages of Bill C-42 might wonder whether the time thus allocated refers only to the time spent debating the motions at the report stage, or also the time spent voting on the various motions. As I understand it, the minister stated: "Therefore, I wish to give notice that a minister will move, at the next sitting of the House, that not more than one additional day be allocated, if necessary . . ."—this "if necessary" is very important—"to each of the said stages of the said bill". That is why I keep asking myself this question: When the debate came to an end yesterday, the minister or the government might have demanded that the question be put forthwith. Then, Mr. Speaker, would the issue which has been raised today after the minister moved his motion, as currently drafted, have been raised? I suggest not.

On the other hand, if the time allocated under yesterday's motion must include the necessary time for voting, I suggest that the motion as drafted warrants the use of the expression "report stage". This issue should be referred to our Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization for the purpose of preventing the repeat of a situation similar to that which is occurring today. Be that as it may, I think that the report stage will be over only after the vote is taken, because the motion does not determine whether the time allocated is only for the particular debate. The text refers only to the time allocated for the report stage. But in my opinion the report stage is not over as long as the question has not been put. That is what I wanted to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker. The time has now come for a decision, and such decisions are generally fairly wise.