

posed motion of Mr. Elliott, for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in answer to His Speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed motion of Mr. Bird: "That this question be now put", shall not be further adjourned."

Once more, it should be noted that the motion to close debate related to more than one question, namely, the Address in Reply and also to a motion "That the question be now put". I refer honourable Members to *Journals* of March 2, 1926, pages 123 to 126 inclusive.

On March 29, 1932, a motion was proposed and adopted as follows: "That the present debate, namely the debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bennett: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a bill to amend chapter 58 of the Statutes of Canada, 1931, striking out the word "March" in section 8, and substituting the word "May" therefor; and the proposed motion of Mr. Weir (Melfort): "That this question be now put", shall not be further adjourned."

Here again, it is suggested that the motion to close debate referred to two debatable motions. I refer honourable Members to *Journals* of March 29, 1932, pages 177 to 181 inclusive.

On May 22, 1956, a motion was proposed and adopted as follows: "That the debate on the motion for the second reading of Bill No. 298, an act to establish the Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation, and on any amendments thereto, shall not be further adjourned."

On that occasion, in addition to the main motion there was an amendment and also a subamendment under consideration by the House. The reference here is to *Journals* of May 22, 1956, pages 587 to 594 inclusive.

On June 5, 1956, a motion was proposed and adopted as follows: "That the debate on the motion for the third reading of Bill No. 298, an act to establish the Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation, and on any amendments thereto, shall not be further adjourned."

On that occasion, in addition to the main motion there was also an amendment under consideration by the House. Honourable Members will find the reference in the *Journals* for June 5, 1956, pages 699 to 705 inclusive. The latest precedent for the use of Standing Order 33 on a proceeding with Mr. Speaker in the Chair is to be found at pages 996 to 1002 inclusive of the *Journals* for December 14, 1964, when a motion to concur in the sixth report of the Special Committee on a Canadian flag was being debated.

On that occasion, when the motion to impose the provisions of Standing Order 33 was adopted, an amendment to the main motion was also under consideration. However, that amendment was disposed of prior to the cut-off time specified in Standing Order 33. To that extent I agree with the honourable Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka that this precedent is not of particular assistance in the present circumstances.

In summary, it is suggested that all precedents support the viewpoint that any amendment or other motion that may be proposed to a main motion comes under the provisions of the cut-off time set out in Standing Order 33. No precedent has been found to support the suggestion that each amendment is a separate debate that must be covered by a motion in each case.

The honourable Member has suggested that the adjourned debate is the debate on the amendment. If he will look at the proceedings of the House he will see that the adjourned debate is not only on the amendment but on the main motion. This is what is before the House at the present time. He would have a very serious point and one which would have to be given extremely close consideration if, in fact, it were agreed that what is before the House at the present time is the adjourned debate exclusively on the amendment. But that is