

[English]

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the order—and I am not referring to discussions among House leaders—as agreed to was that all questions would be deferred until Wednesday next. It seems to me that the amendment indeed is a question that would be included in that category.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, obviously there has to be a ruling in respect of the interpretation of the order so we should have all matters before us in respect of this extremely important legislation. We ought to have all possible interpretations before the House in order that Your Honour can consider the matter. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) has put forward one possible interpretation. I should like the House to look at *Votes and Proceedings* for July 9, 1976, distributed this morning, and page 1419 which states:

That, if the debate on all stages of Bill C-84 is concluded not later than Tuesday, July 13, 1976, any division or divisions required to dispose of the third reading—

I gather from this that a division of this nature would not constitute the completion of the debate at all stages. I think that is a proper interpretation of the words. The debate at all stages has not been completed. Whatever that may mean in terms of this argument, I think we must realize that the agreement which was worked out by unanimous consent must be dealt with on that basis. I do not think we can slur over this fact and assume that all stages have been completed. I do not believe that is the case. That is my respectful submission to the Chair on this matter.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, references have been made to the order passed on Friday. It is true that one person might interpret it one way, and another person in another way. But, I certainly understood that any votes at the third reading stage would be put off until Wednesday.

May I also remind Your Honour and the House that there was a previous order. I have been trying to locate it, but have not yet turned it up. I refer to the one that was passed by an overwhelming vote and which said that at the report stage and at third reading any divisions called for would not be taken immediately, but would be held at a time to be determined, by recommendation of the House leaders, not more than five days later. I submit that order still holds and that because of that order, if we cannot agree on what Friday's order says in respect of votes on Wednesday, we cannot take the vote now but, rather, that the House leaders have to meet and decide when the vote on the three months' hoist amendment will be taken.

It seems to me that if there is any doubt about what was meant by Friday's order, the previous order was very clear. I am sure I speak for both sides in this debate when I say that we agreed that this debate was so important there should not be a snap vote with the possibility of many members not being here. I submit, therefore, that if there is not unanimous consent that the debate be regarded as concluded at this point, with all votes to be taken on Wednesday, then by virtue of the previous order the House leaders will now have to meet and fix a time within the next five days.

### Capital Punishment

**Mr. Lawrence:** Mr. Speaker, I think the logic of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is impeccable, except for one flaw. That is, of course, that the House order passed on Friday, I suggest to you, sir, would certainly supersede the motion passed on June 27, I think it was—either June 27 or June 29.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** June 29.

**Mr. Lawrence:** I am sure the House order passed last Friday would therefore supersede and make completely redundant the previous order. There is ample precedent for that. I would draw to your attention once more, sir, the actual order passed unanimously by the House on Friday last which states, in part:

That, if the debate on all stages of Bill C-84 is concluded not later than Tuesday, July 13, 1976, any division or divisions required to dispose of the third reading... shall be taken on Wednesday, July 14, 1976—

I remind you, sir, of the point made by the opposition House leader that all stages have not been concluded. This is not a motion that concludes the third reading stage of the bill. If the third reading stage is not concluded, then that order does not apply to the requirement for the vote to take place on Wednesday next. Therefore, there is no House order which would require the stacking of this motion, and therefore the vote should be taken right now in the House. I know of no authority which would permit the chair to postpone the taking of the vote. Certainly, the motion passed last Friday would not be the basis for that authority, in any event.

● (1640)

[Translation]

**Mr. Beaudoin:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the House that the motion introduced last Friday, pursuant to the agreement between the House leaders and the government leader reads as follows:

That if the debate on all stages of Bill C-84 is concluded not later than Tuesday, July 13, any division or divisions required to dispose of the third reading and passage stage of the said bill shall be taken on Wednesday, July 14, 1976,...

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this means that the amendment moved this afternoon on third reading has nothing to do with the vote on third reading which has been deferred until 2:15 p.m., next Wednesday. Therefore, under our rules, that motion should be put this afternoon.

**Mr. Blais:** Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that somewhat disappoints me.

[English]

The comments of the House leader of the Conservative Party disappoint me. When I discussed with him the procedure which we intend to follow, as I did with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin), it was understood that the debate had been completed to all intents and purposes at the amendment stage of third reading and the third reading stage, and in effect everyone had agreed that the vote would be taken on the amendment and subsequently the division would be called on third reading and then the vote deferred. That is why I am most disappointed at this turn of events.