

I do not know that I understand the question but I will repeat what I have said and I think the hon. gentleman will understand me. Clause 2 is under discussion and the Government have reason, by what they have observed, to see that it is being obstructed, or on reasons that appear to them good, they move that the discussion be adjourned.

He was interrupted, and then further stated:

Nothing more, however, is done at that time and they pass to clause 3. That is the next thing to do, without a doubt. Clause 3 then becomes the subject of discussion in the committee. Clause 3 is under consideration and the committee discusses it also for a time, and the Government takes the responsibility for the length of that time. Then, if the same conditions develop; if the Government deem it is their duty as the custodians of the rights of the people of this country, they can move that the consideration of that clause be postponed. Then the committee passes to clause 4 and it is in the same category, and nothing is done as yet except merely to move the postponement.

In this committee we have considered one clause only, and it has not been postponed. How can it be further postponed, that is the question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Milliken: Following the introduction of the closure rule in 1913 it was applied in the debate on the naval Bill in that year. The procedure described by Mr. Meighen in the passage I have quoted was followed faithfully throughout the discussion on the naval Bill in Committee of the Whole, and indeed on all other parts of the Bill.

In 1917 closure was invoked again on two occasions. Rather than go back to the 1917 *Debates*, I would like to read from *Hansard* of May 31, 1956 where the events of 1917 were summarized by a person now sitting at the Table of the House, Mr. Stanley Knowles, who rose on a point of order similar to the one that I am raising today. At that time he summarized the use of closure on the naval Bill in 1913, and at page 4509 of *Hansard* he stated:

In the case of the naval aid bill in 1913—hon. members can find this in volume V—after considerable discussion clause 1 was carried. Clause 2 was discussed for a considerable time and then was postponed, as recorded in column 9276. Clause 3 was moved in that column and postponed in column 9339. Clause 4 was moved on that page and not postponed until column 9348. I could go on right down to clause 6. It was only after all of the clauses had had some discussion in the committee—I am not confusing the issue by pointing out the kind of so-called discussion we had on clauses 1, 2 or 3; I am letting that go because the issue about clauses . . .

Mr. Knowles continued to discuss the pipeline Bill, and I need not read that.

Mr. Knowles described two instances in 1917 on a Bill having to do with the Canadian National Railways, and

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

I will not read it all because it is exactly the same procedure that was followed in 1913.

Having referred to those three precedents, there is a further one in 1919 to which I wish to refer you, Mr. Chairman. That is the debate on April 25 and 28, 1919 on the Bill to establish the Canadian National Railways Company. In all of those cases that I have cited the procedure was followed: the clause came up for consideration before the committee, was considered by the committee for however brief a time, then consideration was postponed.

The closure motion was moved after all clauses had been considered, and a day's debate was then held which went at that time until 2 a.m.—now we go until 1 a.m.—and the question on the Bill was finally decided.

That procedure changed in only two instances. I wish to describe them briefly because obviously they will be relied upon by the Government in support of this most unusual procedure. I submit that they are quite different from the circumstances in which we find ourselves today. The first of those occasions arose in 1932 in a discussion on a Bill entitled the Unemployment and Farm Relief Continuance Act of 1932.

That particular Bill contained three clauses. The first was the operative clause, the second required that all Orders in Council and regulations made under the Act be tabled in the House of Commons, and the third was the title. During the consideration in the committee of that Bill, following lengthy discussion on clause 1, the Government invoked the closure motion similar to the one being considered today, and moved that further consideration of all clauses not be postponed.

At the urging of the then Prime Minister, the Chairman ruled that the discussion on clause 1 had covered the discussion on all the other clauses of the Bill because it was the operative clause in the Bill, and he allowed the Government motion to be voted upon. It was first carried in the affirmative and the closure rule went into effect so that the decision was made later that day on the Bill.

The second example of procedure, which I submit was incorrect, as was the 1932 example I have just cited, occurred 32 years ago in the pipeline debate. In an earlier speech in the House on the procedural motion last Friday I have already discussed the import of that particular measure.

During the course of the pipeline debate on May 31 there were seven clauses in the pipeline Bill. There had