

*Supplementary Estimates*

reasoned amendment, opposes the principle of the motion now before the House. The hon. member for Peace River knows better than I that the basic principle of a reasoned amendment is that it has first to oppose the principle or give reasons why the House is invited to vote against the motion which is before the House. This is the reservation which I have.

I would be very grateful if hon. members would guide the Chair and give advice on which I could base a decision at this time. If we were operating under other circumstances, I would tell the House I would give further consideration in the next hour, next few hours or wait until tomorrow, but we are under considerable pressure. I think hon. members would prefer that we go on with the substance of the matter referred to by the hon. member rather than have an extended procedural debate on the point. In any event if hon. members have views they could express briefly on the procedural aspect of the matter, I could hear them now.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Might I just add a few words on the procedural aspect, and then I will leave myself a sitting target for other hon. members. I realize the difficulty with which Your Honour has confronted me. On the other hand, Your Honour must recognize that an appropriation bill does not contain a principle, although when an appropriation bill has items of this kind in my opinion it completely lacks principles.

In any event, my submission is that we can interpret this measure in such a way that every vote in the estimates, which appear as a part of this schedule, must be read as part of the whole bill. Consequently, the operative clauses in the bill must be applied to each vote in the estimates, in this case the supplementary estimates, which appear in the schedule. In that sense, I and members of my party object strenuously to this or any other attempt to legislate by a simple vote in the estimates, particularly one which is so obnoxious because of its reference to three different ways by which the Governor in Council can make regulations prescribing the way in which the moneys are going to be paid. Our only method of opposing this practice is by means of a reasoned amendment which states that we object to this principle. I will be frank. I can find no precedent for and no precedent against this method which leaves the matter directly in the lap of Your Honour.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, old timers know I am a veteran of the war against dollar items. That appears to put me on the side of the hon. member for Peace River.

**Mr. Baldwin:** The side of the angels.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** But I must say I am not really on his side in this particular respect. I wish also to say that my colleagues who represent rural constituencies in western Canada have authorized me to say they are against the Lift program. That, too, appears to put me on the side of the hon. member for Peace River.

However there are a couple of comments I wish to make. My opposition to dollar items is that in most cases they seem to import into a money bill legislation that may have no relation to money, or that does not call for the voting of money. We have often felt that these dollar items were devices to obviate the necessity of a piece of legislation standing on its own. In the case of this Lift program what is before us is not a dollar item, but a \$100 million item. Money is involved. I do not think it is quite as foreign to a supply bill to put in a \$100 million item with terms and conditions as it is to put in a dollar item.

Let me say again that my colleagues and I are against this \$100 million Lift program. I am speaking procedurally, not in terms of substance. It seems there is that difference. I know this is said sometimes when we complain about dollar items, but we must remember that a supply bill is a bill. It is an act of Parliament. It is a form of legislation. I still think that dollar items are repugnant. They are as repugnant as omnibus bills sometimes are. There was one such bill in recent days which we did not like because two or three items were included in the same bill.

Having said that, may I try to come to Your Honour's assistance by suggesting that I think that what the hon. member for Peace River has placed in this amendment is not so much an amendment as a point of order. He is arguing in his amendment that the government has no right to introduce item 17b, set up this Lift program and attach the terms and conditions to it. I am repeating ad nauseam that my colleagues will oppose the program. As a matter of fact, they want to get on with this job. They told me not to take too long on this procedural point because they want to get at the Minister without Portfolio and have a real go at the Lift program.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!