

Business of the House

least on Monday. It has also been concluded from these discussions that there would be time to debate third reading of this bill before the end of Tuesday. In order to provide some additional time, if that is required, we also discussed the desirability of adding a couple of extra hours on Monday morning just as a precaution to help us to reach this goal, if it is attainable.

● (1210)

Taking all these facts, as we could ascertain them, into account the House leaders have encouraged me to seek unanimous consent today for a motion which would enable us to take a vote on third reading of Bill C-84 on Wednesday, after prayers, without any other routine proceedings, and to adjourn, subject to the usual provisions about recall for royal assent and for emergencies, until October 12.

I therefore seek unanimous consent to move the following motion:

That the House shall sit from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Monday, July 12, 1976 for the purpose of considering Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences;

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, immediately following proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 15(1);

That immediately following the disposal of the third reading and passage stage of the said bill, the House shall adjourn and shall stand adjourned until a time to be fixed by Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the government, when the House may meet for the purpose of dealing with any subsequent proceeding or the giving of royal assent to any bill or bills that have been passed by the House at the time of the said adjournment;

That, after the giving of royal assent to the said bill or bills or in the event the House does not meet for that purpose, the House shall be adjourned or stand adjourned, as the case may be until October 12, 1976, provided that at any time prior to that date if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the government, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he 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 Mr. Speaker's being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker or the Deputy Chairman of Committees shall act in his stead for the purpose of reconvening the House.

That is the motion which I seek unanimous consent to introduce, and I believe it has the approval of the House leaders. However, as this is a matter which concerns more than just the House leaders, and since it concerns, mainly, a bill which is not a matter of confidence, I felt I should give the explanation of the background of this motion and the reason it is being moved at this time.

Apart from the special provisions dealing with sitting for a couple of extra hours on Monday and the taking of the vote on third reading of Bill C-84, the remaining adjournment motion follows the usual pattern.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, as the government House leader has indicated, there is general agreement among House leaders, and I trust with other hon. members of the House, although in this situation they can, of course, speak if they have any questions about the matter. I have one question I would like to raise for the

[Mr. Sharp.]

purposes of this discussion, and that is the question of what might happen today. As the government House leader knows, the debate ended last evening, to all intents and purposes, in terms of substantive amendments, and we met early this morning to set a time which is somewhat short.

I do not know whether all speakers on either side of the House will be here to carry on the report stage or third reading stage today. That is not to say that consent could not be given later to move into third reading stage, but there may be one or two speakers who might not be here. Is there an understanding amongst all of us that, in the event we have moved into third reading or are still at report stage and run out of speakers, in terms of the business then before the House, the House would adjourn today at that time and the debate would commence again on Monday at eleven o'clock in the morning? It is really a question, but not a question with regard to the terms of the motion. I would just like some clarification.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, when this motion was being discussed amongst the House leaders this morning, our view at that time was that apart from getting unanimous consent to deal with this motion today we would be able to deal with the remaining stages without varying the orders and rules of the House. The only complication I see is the possibility that if we do not conclude the report stage today, could we then carry out this program? It had been premised on what we thought was a fact, namely, that the remaining debate at report stage would be concluded today so that we would have the ordinary notice to proceed to third reading on Monday. So it would require, perhaps, some amendment to the House order if we do intend to move toward the target of Wednesday because there might not be sufficient time, if we were at the report stage on Monday, to finish third reading stage on Tuesday and conclude debate on the bill. I hoped there would be agreement on this order—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): There is agreement.

Mr. Sharp:—and that if the hon. gentleman feels there may be some speakers at the report stage who want to be heard before we move to third reading, there would also be unanimous consent now to move to third reading as soon as the report stage is concluded.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I think we understand that.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I indicate quite clearly that so far as my colleagues and I are concerned, we are happy to support the motion which has been presented by the government House leader after consultation with all the House leaders.

If I may address myself to the point which has just been discussed between the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton and the President of the Privy Council, it seems to me that we do not need to write anything more into the order. As I understand it, if the report stage concludes some time today, then it is a question of whether there is unanimous consent to move into third reading. If there is not, then we just adjourn.

If there is unanimous consent to move into third reading, then I think it would be reasonable, if some time later this