

Procedure and Organization

that it is permissible for us to proceed to deal with the matter.

• (5:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank first of all all the hon. members who expressed their views on the acceptability of this motion.

Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is this: My purpose in proposing this motion was very specific and very different from the previous motions. That is why—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order. I remind the hon. member that even if the motions for adjournment of the house submitted earlier this afternoon were subject to debate, this one is not. Accordingly, the hon. member is not allowed to state an argument similar to those put forward when the previous amendments were put before the house.

What we have to consider at the present time is solely and exclusively a question of procedure, that is, whether the motion is acceptable or not. I am ready to listen to the hon. member in the hope that the arguments he may submit in support of his motion, of the acceptability of the motion, will add something new to the arguments submitted so far.

Mr. Fortin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My object in rising after having submitted this motion was first of all to thank the hon. members for their kindness in supporting this motion and—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am ready to co-operate with the hon. members in so far as they are ready to co-operate with me. I took the liberty of calling the hon. member to order and he absolutely cannot disregard the Chair's warning and repeat what he had started to say a moment ago. He must, and I made this suggestion with all due respect and in a spirit of friendship restrict his remarks to the debate on procedure.

Mr. Fortin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am quite ready to accept your ruling with the utmost humility. I was just coming to the point.

When I moved this motion, I did it according to the Beuchesne's citation, as pointed out previously and I would like to make it clear that it was my firm intention to move a motion totally different from the preceding

motions, according to sub-clause (20) of Beuchesne's citation.

Such was the aim of my comments.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I do not want to be unfair to the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Bigg). I hope if he has an argument to submit it will be different from those which have already been presented for the guidance of the Chair because at the moment some of them are not very helpful.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): I accede to the wish of the Chair, Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for his generous co-operation.

I have listened to hon. members who have taken part in this procedural debate. As I indicated when the motion was moved some few minutes ago by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), I had serious doubts about the motion. Hon. members have argued this motion should be receivable under the provisions of Standing Order 25 without the necessity of an intermediate proceeding because it is not the same motion. Certainly I recognize the motion to adjourn at 5.30 p.m. is not the same as a simple motion to adjourn the house, but I pointed out in the first instance that this is not what the Standing Order states.

The Standing Order is to the effect that:

—no second motion to the same effect shall be made until some intermediate proceeding has taken place.

I doubt that it is the intention of the Standing Order to allow a second motion of adjournment after one has already been considered without an intermediate proceeding, even though the first motion had a condition attached to it.

I realize that this is perhaps new law. I was tempted to ask the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and other members who took part in the procedural debate, whether they had a precedent to support their views. I am sure they did not because I do not think we have ever had this type of motion following a motion of the kind moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams).

All this having been said, I would say that the real test we now have to apply is: had the first motion carried, would this motion be in order? The answer is obvious. To my mind the only conclusion I can reach is that the