

mechanism to reinstate the supply proceedings ordered by way of notice and debate.

The July 3, 1917 case was indeed about a bill being reinstated and the Speaker did rule based on a quote of May's twelfth edition, page 219, that the motion did not require notice and was not subject to debate. Following this precedent there are others: Wednesday, March 12, 1919 and August 1, 1956, to mention only two. The latter is important because the House had just reviewed in 1955, the equivalent of Standing Order 67(1)(p), which was essentially worded the same as it is today. Yet a superseded order was reinstated on August 1, 1956, without debate or notice. It was not treated as the equivalent of Standing Order 67(1)(p).

I should also deal with the points of the hon. member for Kamloops who argued that a lapsed order for supply should be considered as a matter of confidence. On that point I shall only say that a lapsed order is not a decision of substance by the House. It is only the consequence of the House not having appointed a day for consideration of such an order. Furthermore, the motion before the House last Friday was due to expire without question put pursuant to Standing Order 81(17). It is therefore difficult to invoke the usual convention of a lost decision in the House on a matter of confidence.

The hon. member also referred to page 422 of Bourinot's fourth edition which refers to a lapsed order in committee of supply. Bourinot states clearly that this would require notice of a motion for the House to resolve itself into committee again. This reference relates to the 19th century British practice. The Chair has however found a more recent case in Canadian practice.

On June 9, 1938, an identical situation developed in committee of supply and the reinstatement for the House to resolve itself back into committee was brought forward on June 10, 1938, that is the next day, without debate or notice and no objection was taken. In any case, the whole supply process was completely revamped in the 1968 reform and the committee of supply was abolished. The present case is unique in our procedure and can only be treated as just another dropped or

superseded order as the Chair can find no basis in logic, convention or common sense to treat it any differently.

In summary then, the Chair has found that the quorum call initiated by the government which resulted in the House adjourning for lack of quorum on an opposition day does not constitute a breach of the privileges of this House. Furthermore, the motion for the redesignation of the continuing order for supply does not require notice, is not subject to debate and can be moved forthwith by the minister.

I want to say something in this regard. Yesterday when the House reached motions, I had indicated by way of a comment earlier that at that point I invited the hon. House leader to respect the difficulties that we were in because it would have required me to make an immediate order on a complex series of points. The House leader courteously did that. But we had reached motions, and I now find that we have to deal with it on the basis as if the House leader was dealing with motions. If the House leader wishes to, I would invite him to move his motion now, because the delay is due to the fact that the Chair had to ask the indulgence of the House to reserve for the ruling.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

SUPPLY

REDESIGNATION OF MOTION

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): I move:

That the continuing order of the day for the consideration of the business of supply in the name of the President of the Treasury Board be redesignated.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.