

ment of the honourable Member for Carleton (Mr. Bell), when he made it originally with the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees in the Chair and again when he repeated it clearly later on. He argues, among other things, a point which is of interest, that is, that when a similar situation arose previously, on June 26 last, it was required to be settled by an order to allow that all matters dealing with supply be concluded on that day.

It has been brought to my attention, and I believe this has been mentioned by honourable Members in the course of the discussion, that in the original order of June 26 it was impossible, really, to complete the 30 days that were allowed then until all departments had been called and the supply motions completed. It was then specified that one department would still be outstanding even if the fourth order was called. Under the order of June 26 as adopted, this provision was suspended, allowing the House to call all departments even before the four supply motions were called. Therefore, it seems to me we could complete the 30 days considering supply and even have one supply motion outstanding which perhaps could be called some time later, before December 6 or earlier in that month.

While it was necessary on a previous occasion to have an order, this is no longer necessary since the 30 supply days could be called even before the four supply motions have been called.

Having dealt with this point to the best of my ability I have to refer honourable Members, as has been done by the Deputy Speaker and by honourable Members, to Standing Order 6(5)(b), which states, beginning at line 3 on page 5: "—when it is provided in any other Standing Order that the business under consideration at the ordinary time of adjournment shall be disposed of or concluded, the adjournment proceedings in that sitting shall be suspended and that sitting shall not be adjourned except pursuant to a motion to adjourn moved by a Minister of the Crown."

There must be a purpose for stating that the adjournment proceeding in that sitting shall be suspended, and that purpose in my mind is not just to allow Members to go home at ten o'clock. Surely it must be for the purpose of doing business, and the business that has to be done at that point is the business of supply. I base my view in this regard on Standing Order 56 which deals with supply proceedings.

Standing Order 56 was the subject of a suggested amendment in the report of the Procedure Committee which was concurred in by the House on April 26, 1967. In this resolution of the House there was a 38 day overall limitation during the Session for the business of supply. This included four two day debates on supply motions, leaving the balance of 30 days for supply. I shall not go into the question about the 30 days rather than 36 days because that has been explained quite clearly by honourable Members who have taken part in this debate on the point of order.

If honourable Members will now turn to page 50 they will read in the annotations to Standing Order 56, in the precise wording of the report and concurred in by the House, in paragraph (c): "Subject to the conditions specified below there shall be an overall limitation of thirty-eight days allotted to the business of supply during the Session. For the purposes of this order the business of supply shall consist of supply motions; main estimates; interim supply with the exceptions noted below—"

As the honourable Member for Carleton has said, these are not relevant here. It continues: "—supplementary and additional estimates with the exception noted below; and supply bills based on the foregoing."

To my mind these words are extremely relevant; that is: "—supply bills based on the foregoing."