

arguments, those of us on this side of the house the bill should not be passed, I take no exception to that statement.

But if, on the other hand, he meant that he felt the opposition had a right to prevent hon. members on both sides of the house from expressing by their votes their opinions on this bill in time to make the bill effective, then I suggest, sir, he was claiming for a minority in this house the right to override the majority.

I am confident that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar will admit every member on this side of the house has just as much right as any hon. member on the other side of the house to express his opinion on this measure and I feel he should have an opportunity to express it in time to be effective.

I am not unmindful of what was said by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway in his moving speech on Monday as reported at page 4377 of *Hansard*:

May I tell hon. members, government members, official opposition members, C.C.F. members and Social Credit members, that I favour closure. The government has a perfect right—not only a right but a duty—to invoke closure at the right time; that is, when it has been demonstrated that the business of the house cannot be carried on in any other way but by closure.

I hope it will be possible for the house to agree on this additional time for discussion of the bill in the committee stage, and I invite the leaders of the parties opposite to authorize those who customarily act for them to seek to arrange, through the usual channels, to make this additional time available.

Meanwhile, I have no choice, if the deadline which the government faces is to be met, but to give notice and I hereby do give notice pursuant to standing order 33 that at the next sitting of this committee of the whole house on Bill No. 298, an act to establish the Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation, I will move that the further consideration of clauses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, the title of the said bill and any amendments proposed thereto, shall be the first business of the said committee and shall not further be postponed.

Mr. Fleming: The axe again.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I hope, Mr. Chairman, that an understanding can be reached which will make it unnecessary for me to make this motion.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Knowles: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. My point of order, which I am prepared to argue now or to argue at

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

another time if you think it more appropriate, is that the notice which the Prime Minister has sought to give is invalid and cannot be acted upon at the next sitting of the house. I am prepared to give my reasons based on the wording of standing order 33; based also on the explanation of closure given by Arthur Meighen in 1913; based also on three precedents, one of them in 1913 and two in 1917; and based also on my answer to the mistaken use of closure perpetrated by Mr. Bennett in 1932. Whether you wish to have that argument now or when the Prime Minister attempts to make the motion I leave in your hands. However, I felt that unless I registered objection immediately you might tomorrow say that I had no right to object. My point of order is that this motion could not be moved without the remaining clauses, namely 5, 6 and 7, having been called at least once and postponed.

The Deputy Chairman: I realize entirely what the hon. member is announcing. I think he will agree with me that there is nothing before the chair except clause 4. I have no motion to put before this committee. The house has been advised that such motion will be moved at the next sitting at which time, of course, the question of whether or not it is in order and whether or not it falls out of any order because the preliminaries which are required to put it in order were out of order, will be the subject of debate. But I cannot rule out of order a notice of a motion which is not before the chair—it is admittedly before the committee of the whole under the standing order—as I think it would be fair to say perhaps that a motion or a question which appeared in the appendix to the *Votes and Proceedings* of today announcing that it was going to be moved the day after tomorrow would not be a fair subject for a ruling until such time as it reached routine proceedings and was presented to the house.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, that is quite satisfactory to me. I just wanted to be sure that you would recognize me on the point of order if the Prime Minister attempts to move that motion tomorrow.

Mr. Coldwell: Mr. Chairman, may I just rise on a point of privilege? The Prime Minister referred to a remark I made at the conclusion of my speech. May I say to him that I believe that, if one feels as strongly as I do that this is not in the best interests of the country, anything I can do to stop this going through, under proper parliamentary procedure, I am right in undertaking.