

tion of other Standing Orders. It has been my pleasure, good fortune and privilege to hear all the contributions which have been made to this debate during the last two weeks. I have had the impression that at times the discussion has not related to the amendment before the House. At the same time I thought some of the speeches which referred to the motion initially presented by the honourable Member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) had greater relevancy to the motion proposed by the Honourable President of the Privy Council.

Let me now go to the argument advanced by the honourable Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka who has suggested that in view of the fact there may be some point at issue in the interpretation of Standing Order 33, we might be further ahead to consider the similar Standing Order in the British Parliament, and how it has been interpreted. I would be in full agreement with this suggestion if there was not considerable Canadian precedent and practice in the interpretation of our Standing Order 33 as this Standing Order has been in effect in the House of Commons—over 50 years.

There are many precedents, and more than those which have been quoted and referred to by honourable Members when this point of order was raised. These precedents have been studied very closely, the *Journals* have been looked into and the debates have been read.

I should like to assume the dubious honour of taking the time of the House to go through these precedents. I think after referring to a lot of these practices the conclusion will be clear.

On August 30 of 1917, and I begin this review of precedents with this particular one, a motion was proposed and adopted in the following terms: "That the debate on the third reading of Bill No. 125, providing for the acquisition by His Majesty of the capital stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company shall not be further adjourned."

At that time an amendment to the motion for the third reading of Bill No. 125 was also under consideration. Both the amendment and the main motion were subsequently disposed of under the provisions of what is now Standing Order 33. I refer honourable Members to *Journals* of August 30, 1917, pages 606 to 608 inclusive.

On September 10, 1917, a motion was proposed and adopted as follows: "That the debate upon the second reading of Bill No. 133, the War-time Elections Act, shall not be further adjourned."

It should be noted that in this case there was no amendment before the House when the motion to close the debate was adopted. Later in the sitting of September 10, 1917, in the course of the debate following the submission of the motion under what is now Standing Order 33 an amendment was proposed and disposed of by a division. Subsequently in the same sitting a further amendment was proposed and debated. The latter amendment and the main motion were both disposed of by the operation of the provisions of the closure rule. In this connection I refer honourable Members to *Journals* of September 10, 1917, pages 643 to 645 inclusive.

On September 14, 1917, a motion was proposed and adopted as follows: "That the debate on the third reading of Bill No. 133, the War-time Elections Act, shall not be further adjourned."

Again, it should be noted that when the motion to close debate was adopted there was no amendment before the House. Later in the same sitting an amendment was proposed and debated. Both the amendment and the main motion were disposed of by the operation of the provision of what is now Standing Order 33. This is to be found in *Journals* of September 14, 1917, pages 659 to 661 inclusive.

On March 2, 1926, when the House was considering the Address in Reply a motion was proposed and adopted as follows: "That the debate on the pro-