

	Messrs.	
Lalonde	MacGuigan	Poulin
Landers	Mackasey	Railton
Lang	Maine	Richardson
Langlois	Marchand	Sauvé (Mrs.)
Laniel	(Kamloops-Cariboo)	Sharp
Leblanc	Martin	Smith
(Laurier)	McRae	(Saint-Jean)
LeBlanc	Milne	Stanbury
(Westmorland-Kent)	Munro	Stewart
Lee	(Hamilton East)	(Cochrane)
Lefebvre	Nicholson (Miss)	Stollery
Loiselle	O'Connell	Trudeau
(Saint-Henri)	Ouellet	Turner
MacDonald	Pelletier	(London East)
(Cardigan)	(Hochelaga)	Turner
Macdonald	Pelletier	(Ottawa-Carleton)
(Rosedale)	(Sherbrooke)	Watson
MacEachen	Philbrook	Whelan—85.
MacFarlane	Portance	

● (2110)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Motion (Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Halifax)) negated.

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker):

That this House do now adjourn.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I might refer the hon. member to Standing Order 25 which would appear to me to place a procedural roadblock in the way of moving a motion to adjourn the House after a motion to adjourn the debate in the absence of some intervening procedure taking place.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, before you rule on the basis of Standing Order 25, may I draw your attention to citation 99(2) in Beauchesne's 4th Edition?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It reads as follows:

The term "intermediate proceeding" used in Standing Order 25 means a proceeding that can properly be entered on the *Journals*. The true test is that if any parliamentary proceeding takes place the second motion is regular and the Clerk ought to enter the proceeding in order to show that the motion in question is regular.

I emphasize the following sentence:

It is usual to alternate motions for adjournment of House and debate when a question is under consideration.

I submit that this is in accordance with the practice which has been followed on previous occasions. It is not possible to move the same motion again without some intermediate proceeding intervening, but this is a different motion. The previous motion was that the debate be now adjourned. This is a motion that the House do now adjourn, and I submit that the last sentence in citation 99(2) covers the point that it is usual to alternate such motions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am taking my reading of Standing Order 25, which is in its place pursuant to a revision of standing orders which has been carried out in

Excise Tax Act

the last few years. The precedent to which the hon. member has referred indicates the usual practice of alternating, while a question is under debate, motions to adjourn the debate and motions to adjourn the House.

Be that as it may, it appears to me to be only sensible practice and procedure, within the language of Standing Order 25, that two procedural motions ought not to be taken without the House addressing itself to some substantive matter or some intervening proceeding.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Unless the floor is taken by someone to address himself either to the substance of the question before the House or to some other intervening proceedings, I do not propose to entertain in succession two strictly procedural motions, a motion to adjourn the debate and then a motion to adjourn the House. These are procedural motions which in no way attempt to direct themselves to the substance; the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon) in no way attempted to direct himself to the substance. If there had been a speech on the merits there might have been some grounds for saying there had been a direction of attention to the merits of the question, followed ultimately by a procedural motion. However, there has simply been a vote on a procedural motion followed immediately by an hon. member moving, without commenting on the substance, another procedural motion, and in my view the rules only make sense if they preclude that kind of practice and require some kind of intervening proceeding.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton.

● (2120)

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather interesting that these paragons of efficiency have been in power since 1963.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): They may rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that the country is not cheering. But this afternoon, on a point of procedure concerning the cornerstone of a very questionable budget, they were found wanting. I do not know where the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) gets his legal opinions, but if he gets them from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) then I suggest that he ought to change solicitors immediately. If he is taking his colleague's advice, as apparently he is, regarding the propriety of motions before him—and this question has not yet been settled—then I think his 13 years or so in public life have been more or less wasted.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Let us consider the situation. Obviously the Minister of Justice certified this bill, or if he did not he should have. If he did so certify the bill, he has been found wanting. We now have him fresh from his election victory in Saskatchewan, and if there was ever a reason why the Minister of Justice should not be hampered with the policies of the Wheat Board, it is the