

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

place in the heart of every member of the house uncertainty as to whether or not the rules are really to be applied in the strict meaning of the words.

It has been said here that there has been reason for concern on the part of every member about the nature of some of the exchanges that have been taking place. Let there be no uncertainty, let there be no pretence that the chair and the chairmanship of the committee have not been called into question by the members of this house. They have by votes which have tested the rulings that have been made. If on this occasion the words of this ruling are now extended to embrace the interpretation that is sought by the Prime Minister, then I submit it would be most difficult for members of the house at any time to refer to any rule and to say that it meant what it said in the plain language in which it was printed. On this occasion, Mr. Chairman, I submit there is a great opportunity to restore in their full meaning the acceptance of the rules we have, and to restore to the chair the dignity it should possess in this house.

The Deputy Chairman: I preface this ruling with a reference to the last remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition. It is always the duty of a chairman, I take it, when a ruling is to be made to make a ruling which will be unpalatable to one side or the other. I have every respect for the warmth of feeling on both sides of the house on this occasion, but I think I am entitled to express some regret that it should be indicated to the chair in advance that you either think as we do or—I will go a little farther than the Leader of the Opposition went—you are not worthy of the office you hold. I am sorry to say that, but I can put no other interpretation upon his remarks.

Mr. Drew: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman; I would hope that we would not continue the nature of the discussions which have disturbed this house in recent days. I do not think what I said was open to that meaning. I am suggesting that it would greatly add to the confidence of this house in the meaning of words if the chair, on this occasion, came to the conclusion that words had their simple, ordinary meaning.

The Deputy Chairman: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that clarification paragraph. I suppose it would be a very small compliment coming from me if I were to say that those members who have spoken today should be complimented on the work that they have done in connection with this case. I have done a little myself, but I have had considerable help from those who have spoken.

[Mr. Drew.]

Now, as this matter has aroused so much debate I presume it is my duty to give some reasons for the ruling that I am about to make. I do that knowing full well that it is said so often in the legal profession that many a judge's case would stand up against appeal if he had not given written reasons to support his decision. The whole question really seems to revolve around the interpretation to be put on the words "further consideration" found in standing order 33. It is submitted by those who oppose the legality of the Prime Minister's motion that further consideration cannot possibly be interpreted as applying to the two different classes of sections which we have before us, the first three of which were called and which certain members of the opposition claim did not receive consideration worthy of the name, and the last three which admittedly have not yet been called.

I think that decision has already been made. I think the position I am in at the moment is not to indicate to the committee what I think the rules of this house should be but what they are. In most, not all, of the submissions made this afternoon there has been a great deal of quotation from statements made in similar debates to this in previous years. While the people who made those speeches, perhaps by their prominence in the life of the country, are entitled to be quoted and listened to with respect, those quotations none the less were arguments and not decisions. We have been told, and it is so, that four somewhat similar incidents have been before this house. In three of those four the question which has been raised as a point of order never came up. In those first three the clauses had been considered and therefore the question as to whether or not it was necessary did not come up and was not argued.

This leaves only the case of 1932, and incidentally in point of time the most recent case of this kind to come before the house. I believe it was the last time closure came before the house, but I am not sure about that. On page 1605 of *Hansard* for March 31, 1932, Mr. Bennett made this statement:

I beg leave to give notice that, at the next sitting of the committee of the whole house, I shall move that the further consideration of the title and clauses 1, 2 and 3 of the Unemployment and Farm Relief Continuance Act, 1932, shall be the first business of the committee and shall not be further postponed.

There was some discussion at that time, but of course that was the notice and the matter was not before the Chair.

On page 1609, the following day, when the committee resumed Mr. Bennett said:

Before the order is proceeded with, Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the motion of which I