

of my colleague with respect to his reasons why the motion is out of order. I would further submit, Sir, the wording chosen by the Hon. Minister would also render his motion to be out of order. I would like to read it for the House. He moved a few moments ago, presumably under Standing Order 57 of the Standing Orders, and I quote:

That further consideration of Clauses 1 to 150, the Preamble, Title and Schedule and any amendments proposed thereto at the Committee of the Whole stage of Bill C-2 shall be the first business of the committee and shall not be further postponed.

The operative words are: "shall not be further postponed". The intent of the motion moved by the Hon. Minister is that the debate ought not to be further adjourned. Under Standing Order 57 of the Standing Orders it speaks of the notice that must be given at a previous sitting of the House. It refers to the difference between not further adjourning a debate and not further postponing consideration of any particular clause that may be under consideration.

As my hon. friend submitted, how can one further postpone something that has not yet been postponed? As I understand it, the only clause under consideration at the present moment is Clause 2. At no point was Clause 2 ever postponed.

With respect to adjournment, I suspect that what the Minister is trying to do is to limit debate until later this day, in other words, to exhaust debate not only on Clause 2 but on every clause in Bill C-2. But he chose the wrong motion. Once again he used the words "shall not be further postponed".

If you refer, Sir, to Standing Order 57 of the Standing Orders you will see that the first part of the clause indicates that at a previous sitting of the House a certain notice must be given. It states that the Minister:

—may move that the debate shall not be further adjourned, or that the further consideration of any resolution or resolutions, clause or clauses, section or sections, preamble or preambles, title or titles shall be the first business of the Committee, and shall not be further be postponed;

I submit to you, Sir, that the motion is out of order because the Minister chose the wrong wording, as well as for the reasons given by my learned friend. In order to further the intent of what the Minister was trying to do he ought to have used the words "that the debate shall not be further adjourned and that any clauses presently postponed shall not be further postponed".

In closing, I would ask that you, Sir, refer to the dictionary definitions of the words "adjourn" and "postpone". In the Oxford dictionary "adjourn" is

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

defined as "being moved to another place or time"; and "postpone" is defined as "keep from occurring until a later time".

• (1620)

At no point did this House "keep from occurring until a later time" any particular clause under consideration, especially Clause 2. We did in fact adjourn the debate yesterday until today.

For those reasons I ask that you rule the motion moved by the Minister out of order.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Chairman, I want to participate briefly in this point of order. I do not need to revisit a lot of the ground already covered.

I think it is very clear this motion is in order for a number of reasons. If we refer to Citation 334 of Beauchesne's, as was done by the NDP House Leader, it says very clearly we have the precedent to proceed with this motion. We are backed by precedent, we can proceed, and as anyone who looks at the procedures of the House well knows, we tend to look at the most recent precedents as setting the tone and determining the rules that we can use in this institution today.

The other point made about that particular precedent is that it was agreed to by the entire House of Commons. It was put to a vote and Members endorsed it. However, I think there is one other element which has to be taken into account.

This happened back in the 1950s. Since that time there has not been an attempt, as far as I am aware, by any committee to go back and revisit this clause, to look at the precedent that was established in the pipeline debate, and attempt to overturn that precedent. I have participated in two groups which looked at the rules of the House of Commons and the precedents and suggested reforms, the Lefebvre Commission and the McGrath Committee. The latter committee was the author of the many rule changes we saw in the last Parliament.

I submit that the reason for there never having been an attempt to look at the closure rules and say that the pipeline debate precedent should not be used, is very simple. The majority decision of the House of Commons at that time was found acceptable and it has allowed this House to continue to do the type of thing we are doing today by introducing this motion. In fact, the precedent does apply and there has been no attempt to change it.