

or by those who have spoken in support of his interpretation of the rule. But if from the start we had not placed ourselves in the position of operating in accordance with the Standing Order which some say could apply, and if these days are not allotted days, we would not be proceeding according to the terms which guide discussion on allotted days, I have trouble in deciding how the hon. member for Peace River and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre could file such notices because according to my interpretation of Standing Order 58, this is the Standing Order under which members of the opposition may file such notices.

The suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is that although the Standing Order and the special order refer to allotted days, this is not an allotted day.

I have given the matter serious and careful thought during the last few days because it was discussed outside the house with the members who are considered experts and who I suggest are experts in the matter of interpretation of the rules and with hon. members who were on the committee which adopted this rule and recommended it to the house. I am still as uncertain as I was in the first instance as to how this Standing Order should be interpreted. But if hon. members think there is some virtue or merit to my suggestion, I would make the proposition that because until this afternoon we have adhered to the provisions of the Standing Order and have received the 24 hours' notice, it would be difficult all of a sudden to determine that we are no longer applying the Standing Order, and that we are not dealing with allotted days and therefore we should take a vote on the motion.

The way some hon. member have spoken, there does not seem to be any clear indication that there would in any event be a vote on the matter if my interpretation of the sense of the house is correct.

● (5:00 p.m.)

Perhaps it would be wise for the Chair to have additional time to reflect on this situation and to study in *Hansard* the learned arguments advanced by hon. members and perhaps then be prepared, when we are faced again with a similar situation and required to give a ruling as to whether, when we are considering so-called allotted days, or designated days dealing with the consideration of supplementary estimates, or where special provisions of standing order 58 should apply.

29180—389

### *Business of Supply*

My view is that we have gone too far at the moment to turn back the clock as the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) has suggested all along: but in my opinion proceeded on the basis of a 24 hour notice because these are special days, not allotted days of the normal type.

I also suggest for the guidance of hon. members that we are dealing with a special order, and I wonder if hon. members would want to establish a procedure, once and for all, at this point, when we are not dealing with our standing orders but with a special order of the house. This is a complicating factor, and in view of this additional consideration, and because of the fact that we do not have before us at the present time, a normal situation, where a motion would have been made in an ordinary way under the provisions of the standing order for the consideration of supplementary estimates during three allotted days, it is my view that it would not be wise to make a decision which would bind the house on every occasion in the future when it is asked to study a motion under that part of the standing order.

I have tried to suggest that it would be better to proceed at this point as though we were under allotted days which, according to my interpretation of the standing order, is that, when this discussion is terminated, and no other notice having been given, we should go on and put the motion to the house, that is, the motion that will be proposed by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) for concurrence in the supplementary estimates.

As a final word, it will be obvious that my decision is a non-decision.

### PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

#### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Old Age Security—Payment of income tax on guaranteed income supplement; the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis)—Immigration—Timing of distinction between deserters and draft dodgers; the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax (Mr. Forrestall)—National Defence—C.F.B. Halifax—pay adjustments for personnel.