

Supply—Justice

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to repeat in a short form the argument made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), with which I agree fully. The first point arises from the decision taken by the house and recorded in *Votes and Proceedings* of April 26, 1967, that there be established an over-all limit of 38 days for the business of supply. There is no debate or doubt about that.

In *Votes and Proceeding* of June 26 there is recorded a further decision of the house that the supply motions be segregated from the remaining business of supply, and because of that operation the time for supply, exclusive of supply motions, was limited to 30 days. There is no doubt about that. It is a matter of counting to decide when the 30 days are finished, and the count showed that the 30 days were finished at ten o'clock tonight. The hon. member for Carleton says that because there is another rule saying that the house adjourns at ten o'clock, this other rule supersedes the continuation of proceedings beyond ten o'clock and therefore we cannot proceed with the vote. That is the issue.

I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is correct when he refers to standing order 6(4) in the regular standing orders which says:

When it is provided in any standing order that the business under consideration at the ordinary time of adjournment be forthwith disposed of or concluded, Mr. Speaker shall not adjourn the house until the specified proceedings be completed.

In other words this particular general standing order supersedes the operation of the normal adjournment proceedings because there is a business before the house to be completed.

I think it is made even clearer in provisional standing order 6(5)(b) which has already been read by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and which seems to me to provide the answer to the question raised by the hon. member for Carleton, which was: Are we entitled to continue beyond ten o'clock to dispose of all these resolutions? The answer is provided in this standing order, which reads:

When a sitting is extended pursuant to section (6) of this order—

That is irrelevant, as the hon. member for Carleton says.

—or 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—

That provides the method by which the house is enabled to supersede the ten o'clock adjournment and to continue with the motions that are involved in the passage of the resolutions and the supply bills based thereon.

• (11:00 p.m.)

Mr. Bell (Carleton): For the purpose of clarity would the minister indicate to me whether he is arguing that the old standing order 6(4) is still in effect? As I understand the situation that standing order, which was also referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), is gone. It has been nullified completely. Such substance as it has is now in standing order 6(5) (b).

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I do not think anything turns on that point. I think that 6(5) (b) provides for a resolution of the dilemma raised by the hon. member for Carleton, namely that this particular provision provides for the continuation of business beyond ten o'clock in order to dispose of the business that has been laid down under other standing orders.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, surely something turns upon the quoting of a repealed standing order as an authority?

An hon. Member: What about standing order 6(4)?

Mr. MacEachen: Nothing turns upon standing order 6(4), which has been read. It follows completely upon the standing order in effect now.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, has not the language of the old standing order 6(4) been completely incorporated in the language of the new rule?

Mr. MacEachen: I said it was a foundation.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two on this matter. I am surprised that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the government house leader have to attempt to bemuse the house by reading standing order 6(4), which was revised and is no longer in existence. Their case is very weak indeed when they must rely on something which they, in their work