

*Speaker's Ruling*

arguments extremely clearly and with a certain compelling significance. I will deal with the first point.

• (1700)

The question of whether it is fair is a very subjective one. I have to point out that the rules of the House make it very clear that what the government is moving is within the rules of the House. I am bound by the rules of the House and I must make my decision on the question of whether or not the motion by the government is procedurally acceptable.

With respect to procedure, I have to say that it is acceptable. But the question was a purpose for which it was never intended and to counter members' freedom of speech. Even if that were so, I am not going to comment yea or nay on that because that is a philosophic and procedural debate that ought to take place perhaps in some other place. However, I do want to draw to the attention of hon. members the distinction between freedom of speech and continued debate. There is a distinction.

The rule which binds us with respect to allocation of time and closure does limit debate at certain stages of the process of a bill through this place, but it is probably too far to say that it contravenes freedom of speech in the House. I do want to point out that even if the hon. minister's motion is accepted by this House then there is an extensive debate later on today and tonight, there is then committee, there are other ways in which this matter can be raised in the House on a daily basis. Then the bill has to come back again to this House where there is further debate.

The hon. member makes a very interesting argument. I am not prepared again to rule on it because if I did I would be straying into an area in which I am not allowed to go. He states that our rule in the House contravenes our Constitution. That may or may not be, but the authorities for many, many years back make it quite clear that I cannot rule on a legal or a constitutional issue.

Lastly, I will deal with the argument that it is inconsistent with the United Kingdom, the use of closure here. It may be, but in the United Kingdom there is a specific rule which attaches to the Speaker a very clear discretion as to whether or not a motion of closure ought to be entertained under all the circumstances. There is no such rule in this House.

Therefore, having listened very carefully to the hon. member for Kamloops, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, and because no Speaker is immune to what is going on in this Chamber, having listened to representations as to what has been taking place over a number of days and without making any judgment on that, I have taken it into account. I hope the hon. Minister of Justice will not be offended that I felt that it was not necessary to recite all of what had taken place. Looking at all of the circumstances and coming back again to the essential thing that I have to decide, and that is whether or not the motion is procedurally sound, I must rule that it is.

In ruling that it is, I am not in any way taking away from the cogency of arguments the hon. member for Kamloops put up with respect to constitutional and other matters. They may well be matters which the House may wish to pursue. It may well be that the House would wish to look again at the rules, but that is a matter for another day.

Therefore, my ruling is that the motion is in order.

MOTION THAT DEBATE BE NOT FURTHER ADJOURNED

**Mr. Speaker:** I will put the motion:

That debate on the motion for second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Finance of Bill C-62 and on any amendments proposed thereto shall not be further adjourned.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Speaker:** Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 188)

YEAS

Members

Andre  
Attewell  
Bertrand

Atkinson  
Belsher  
Bird