

[Translation]

Second, when he says that this motion is a motion of closure, he is entirely mistaken. I would invite my learned friend to read Standing Order 65 and Citation 452 and following of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, where it clearly says that once the motion is proposed, the debate may continue on the original question, which is the motion for second reading. Since we are now debating the second reading stage, a time limit on speeches is provided under Standing Order 35(2). In any event, the same principle applies when debating an amendment to the main question on second reading. We have just had a very clear example of this. A motion was proposed by the New Democratic Party Members to postpone adoption of the second reading stage for six months. The amendment in question was debated for many days in the House, and speeches were limited to ten minutes because Standing Order 35(2) applies to the second reading stage, and not to the amendment or the main question—it covers everything, consequently, the previous question. Madam Speaker, perhaps I may refer you once again to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, page 157, Citation 452(1), and I quote:

The previous question is moved when the original question is under debate—

That is settled, despite objections from the Members opposite. The Chair has just ruled on the question. The Citation goes on to say:

—in order to—

That is the important part.

—in order to force a direct vote on it, thereby preventing any amendments to the original question to be proposed.

So this is the original question which is now being debated simultaneously with the motion, and the debate is on the second reading stage of the bill, whence the requirement for continuing our ten-minute speeches. Perhaps I may also refer the Chair to Citation 453, which says, and I quote:

Members who have spoken to the main motion or amendments may speak again to the previous question.

That is exactly the point I have just been trying to make. All Members who have already spoken to the main motion or amendments may speak again to the previous question, because the debate is on the second reading stage, and consequently, there is a ten-minute time limit on speeches. I agree with the Hon. Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis), when he says that a motion is debatable. If they have anything to say, let them seek to be recognized by the Chair. No one is questioning that, but I disagree when the Hon. Member claims this is a motion of closure. It is no such thing. It is a sensible motion that allows debate on the main motion and prevents any amendments from being proposed. This means that even Hon. Members who have spoken up to now may all speak again to the second reading stage of the Bill. Third, as far as a time on speeches is concerned, since we are at the second reading stage, there is no doubt that Standing Order 35(2) must apply and that speeches must be limited to ten minutes.

[English]

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, you have an interesting point before you; it is one that I spent some time on over lunch

Western Grain Transportation Act

trying to determine whether or not speeches would proceed under the ten-minute rule. I would like to suggest that they should not. In fact, the time limit for debate as set out in the various Standing Orders detailing length of speeches also applies to the previous question.

• (1540)

I suggest, therefore, that when the previous question was moved, the time limits for debate start from the time of moving the previous question. Upon moving the previous question, the fact that the time limits as set out in the various Standing Orders apply means that you must go back to the beginning and apply them to the question that is before the House. The debate does not continue in the same way that it would if the motion were a motion of substance.

This is one of three potential closure motions or closure of debate motions. You can have a straight closure motion which would be subject to certain rules of debate; you can have a time allocation motion which is subject to certain rules of debate; and you can have this motion on the previous question which is subject to certain rules of debate. The rules of debate in the two previous situations are set out clearly in the Standing Orders. The rules for this motion are set out equally clearly in the Standing Orders inasmuch as the time limits for all other debates become applicable to this debate when it is moved to deal with the subject being dealt with under one of the Standing Orders in the House of Commons for debating purposes.

If the Government had moved closure, then the time limits are clearly set out as to the length of time debate would be permitted on that particular motion. The end result would be a vote on the bill. If the Government were to move time allocation, the length of time permitted is clearly set out and at the end the vote would be taken and a disposition of the Bill made at that stage. In this case it says that whatever Standing Order is applicable—and in this case we are talking about second reading stage—the time limits under the Standing Order become the time limits applicable for the motion to move the previous question.

I suggest, therefore, that at the time the motion is put the time limits become applicable based on the way they are written in the Standing Orders. In the Standing Orders the time limits are, one, that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Government have indefinite time; and two, that Members speaking in the first eight hours of the debate have 20 minutes and thereafter Members speaking beyond that point have ten minutes each. I suggest now that that is the Standing Order in terms of time limits that we are working under and that we should begin by accepting that the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Official Opposition have unlimited time; that any Member during the first eight hours of debate has 20 minutes; and any Member speaking thereafter is permitted ten minutes. I would urge upon you