

Procedure and Organization

has been an intermediate proceeding here as referred to in citation 99 (2), and therefore I will not argue that point. I should emphasize that the important words of Standing Order 25 are the words "to the same effect". The hon. member used several different turns of phrase; he said that this was not the same motion, that there was no question of its being of the same nature or character. If any of those words had appeared in the Standing Order, then obviously they would apply to the motion.

I submit the Standing Order is clear in this regard. It refers to a motion that shall have the same result as a former motion, regardless of the words used to frame the former. For this reason I suggest that what we have here are two motions which, in effect, are identical, are back to back, and therefore in accordance with the terms of Standing Order 25 the second motion cannot be received.

May I just deal with the hon. member's reference to the last sentence of citation 99(2). He appears to be saying that there is no difference in effect between a motion to adjourn the house and a motion to adjourn the debate. I think Your Honour will recognize that there is a very great difference between the two. If the house adjourns no further business can be conducted. If the debate adjourns then there can be further business on that day, though not on the same question. For these reasons I suggest the motion is out of order.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all reply to the argument of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) that the wording of the rule is that no second motion to the same effect shall be made until some intermediate proceeding has taken place. I admit that if this motion is put and carried, then at 5.30 it might have the same result in that the house will adjourn. But I submit the motion is not to the same effect.

It has been clearly pointed out that the previous motion moved by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) was a motion to adjourn under Standing Order 42 (1) for a specific purpose, a purpose he explained, namely to try to negotiate further on the question of the closure rule. A time was set at which the house would adjourn so that the house leaders could get together.

The motion now before the house falls under Standing Order 25, which provides that a motion to adjourn may be made at any time. The one big difference, Mr. Speaker, is this. Your Honour was obliged to rule the

main motion out of order because we had passed the hour of four o'clock. That ruling has been accepted and no second motion was put. But, Mr. Speaker, that same argument cannot apply to this particular motion because it may be put at any time at all. I think this shows the essential difference between the two motions. It is close to 5.30 p.m. and the house would adjourn if either motion were carried. I submit, nevertheless, that it cannot be said that this motion is "to the same effect", and I therefore think that it should be allowed.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, you have heard submissions by those who are professed experts on the rules. I do not profess to be an expert on the rules but I suggest to Your Honour that rule 25 which we are considering here is very clear in its meaning. The question that faces you is one of extreme simplicity, namely, the simple English meaning of the words, "to the same effect".

I submit it is quite impossible to say that the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—or indeed, if it comes to that, the motion introduced by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) which Your Honour ruled out of order—and the motion we are presently considering can be said to be "to the same effect". If anyone were to say they are to the same effect I submit he would be torturing the English language. How can a motion calling on the house to adjourn at five o'clock, or 5.30, be to the same effect as a motion calling on the house to adjourn forthwith, or immediately upon the taking of the vote?

I do not think I need to elaborate my argument by saying that we are not dealing with the same *corpus*. The two motions are not to the same effect and I do not see why we should have this great difficulty on this particular point. The wording of the rule is crystal clear.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make one point in addition to those which have been made by my colleagues on this side of the house. I am sorry that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the government house leader seem to have been driven from the chamber by my rising to speak.

An hon. Member: King Canute is not here.