

successively be put forthwith that may be necessary to dispose of the estimates of ten departments and any resolution or bill based thereon, and also such resolutions and bills as are necessary to provide for a fourth month interim supply;

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, if there was a provision in the order of April 26 such as was inserted in the order of June 26, there would be no argument at all. The fact that this provision is absent makes it clear that nothing here comes within the very clear exception under standing order 6(5)(b), which states there can only be an interruption of a mandatory adjournment if it is provided under a standing order that the business shall be disposed of or concluded.

That is putting the matter as simply and as plainly as it is possible to put it. It is put for a deliberate purpose, namely to demonstrate the fact that 171 votes totalling a billion and a quarter dollars have not had any consideration at all in this house, and that the guillotine is falling without there being any possibility of the House of Commons doing the basic job its members were elected. We have failed to do what we were sent here to do.

I am not taking advantage of this situation from any technical point of view but on the basis that we must achieve proper rules, rules which will govern and bring this House of Commons back to the type of institution that the Canadian people want to see.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I feel a bit out of character coming to the defence of the government, but it is late at night and I suppose anything has to be anticipated.

Mr. Fulton: Get back into character.

Mr. Knowles: I accept the correction I heard from the other side. I am supporting the position taken by Mr. Chairman in committee of the whole, and I am not out of character in doing that. The issue before us tonight is not whether we should or should not have a time limit on supply; that is a matter to be decided by the House of Commons. The issue is not how many departments we have finished and how many we have not finished.

An hon. Member: That's a good red herring.

Mr. Knowles: The issue is simply, do we finish the business of supply by taking the formal votes tonight or do we adjourn and take the votes tomorrow or on some other occasion.

I wish to point out that provisional standing orders 6(4) and 6(5) should be read in the

Supply—Justice

light of standing order 6(4) of the old rules which existed before we adopted the present, temporary rules.

An hon. Member: Oh?

Mr. Knowles: Just a moment. Do not say "oh" so quickly. Standing order 6(4), before we adopted the temporary rules, read as follows:

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.

The point I wish to make is that it is a practice of long standing that when there is an order that something has to be concluded on a particular day, the adjournment time is ignored until that completion has been effected.

When we wrote temporary standing orders 6(4) and 6(5) we put together that old standing order and the provisions that we have made for the adjournment proceedings. If one will compare the language of the old standing order, which I have just read, with the exception that the hon. member for Carleton has read, temporary standing order 6(5)(b), one will see that this is what happened. It reads:

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

Which we are doing:

—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—

Of course, they are:

—and that sitting shall not be adjourned except pursuant to a motion to adjourn moved by a minister of the crown.

My point is that the new, temporary standing orders at that point combined the general practice, that we do not adjourn until we have finished the day's business, with the special provisions relating to debates on adjournment proceedings.

I think, sir, it is therefore clear that you should rule that we continue to sit under the basis of standing order 6(5)(b), provided some other order says that this is an item of business which should be finished.

That provision, I believe, is set out for us in paragraph 5(c) of the special order of the house that was adopted on April 26, 1967. That order provided us with our rules for the