

*Speaker's Ruling*

the extension of the sitting. This it did not do. The invocation of Standing Order 29(3) may have ended the debate earlier than the opposition might have wished, but its effect on the government side is not without considerable consequence as well.

Hon. members who had planned to speak on the motion may well be disappointed that this proved impossible, but a review of the circumstances offers no evidence that their rights were in any way interfered with or their privileges breached.

Let us turn now to the consequences of the count-out, namely the dropping of the continuing order for supply from the Order Paper.

The authorities are clear on this subject. Bourinot's fourth edition states at page 218:

A "count out" will always supersede any question that is before the House; and if an order of the day for supply, or for the reading or committal of a bill, be under consideration at the time, and there is no quorum present, the House must be asked at a subsequent sitting to revive the question that may have lapsed in this way.

The hon. House leader for the Official Opposition cites Standing Order 82(1) which reads:

At the commencement of each session, the House shall designate, by motion, a continuing Order of the Day for the consideration of the business of supply.

• (1110)

He goes on to contend that the loss of the continuing order carries dire consequences, namely the loss of all supply proceedings in this session, and that reinstatement of that order will re-establish the number of votable opposition motions available to the parties in opposition.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier also raised with the Chair the status of the business of supply now before various standing committees of the House, I am referring to the Estimates for fiscal year 1990–91. He claimed that since the continuing order for supply was no longer on the order paper, standing committees no longer have the authority to continue consideration of Budget votes, at least not until the continuing order is reinstated. I must say the hon. member argued his case very convincingly. However, the Chair has great difficulty in accepting his statements.

It is true there are no precedents for this situation, but I fail to see how the loss of the continuing order for supply could erase previous decisions by the House to adopt interim supply or refer consideration of the

Estimates to its committees. However, the fact remains that the House does not at this time have any mechanism for considering supply proceedings until a continuing order is reinstated on the order paper.

[*English*]

The Chair agrees with hon. members that a continuing order must be redesignated, but I do not see how last Friday's events could have simply erased the decisions the House has made to date on supply in this session. I refer hon. members to the document, *Status of Bills and Motions*, where pages 59 through 66 list the business of supply already considered by the House. I would note, in particular, the decisions of February 22, 1990, No. 31 on page 64 of the Status, referring the Main Estimates, 1990–1991 to standing committees where they are now under consideration.

The authorities are clear on the consequences of reviving a dropped order. I quote from Erskine May, twenty-first edition at page 315:

If on such an order of the day procedure has been commenced and interrupted, the proceeding thus revived is set down for resumption at the position indicated by the last decision of the House entered upon the *Votes and Proceedings*.

I would therefore rule that once the order for supply has been re-established, the business of supply will resume at the point of the last House decision; namely awaiting the second allotted day in the current period to be designated. As far as the number of votable motions are concerned, we are also at the same point we were last Friday. There remain no more votable motions available in the current supply calendar.

Next, I would like to deal with the fourth and final point raised by the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier. Put simply, he asks if the motion of the minister for the redesignation of the permanent order of supply is a debatable motion, pursuant to Standing Order 67(1), which reads as follows:

(p) such other motion, made upon Routine Proceedings, as may be required for the observance of the proprieties of the House, the maintenance of its authority, the appointment or conduct of its officers, the management of its business, the arrangement of its proceedings, the correctness of its records, the fixing of its sitting days or the times of its meetings or adjournment.

The argument of the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier was supported by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, who further argued that a July 3, 1917 precedent was not applicable because it dealt with reinstatement of a bill at second reading stage. He also claimed that Standing Order 67(1)(p) is the operative