

Therefore, we are at the point that if this procedure is denied us, if the Chair does not agree with my submission that it is one of the ways in which the Chair intimated that items in supply could be tested, then we in the opposition—and this appears to be what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and those who support him want—are denied the opportunity for the very reason that this place exists, namely, to control expenditures of public funds. I am sure that that was never the intent of any rule change.

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

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the procedural argument advanced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). I looked at the notices put down on the order paper by the hon. member: they were available over the weekend. It seemed very clear that they had no place within the procedure that we are following at present. Procedurally, the denial to accept these motions does not take in any way away from the House of Commons or the standing committee the ability to control the supply of the House. We disposed a few moments ago of a motion that was the determining one in the ability of the government to proceed further with the question of supply. So there rests fully within the House the ability to control, to withhold, to offer supply to the government, and we have completed the first part of that process already.

Under this proceeding, the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is permitted to put down a notice to oppose an item in the estimates. That has been well established by a ruling of Mr. Deputy Speaker found in the *Journals* of the House of Commons for June 22, 1972. The point of order was exhaustively argued, and Mr. Deputy Speaker ruled that it was possible to put down a notice to oppose an item in the estimates; and once that notice to oppose was put down, it was then possible for the president of the treasury board to put down a motion to support the item in the estimates against which the notice had been put, and that the vote would take place upon the motion and not upon the notice to oppose. But in this case the hon. member for Yukon has done something that is somewhat bewildering because it does not fit into the understanding of what is to take place here. He has not put down a notice to oppose; he has put down a motion to amend.

**Mr. Nielsen:** That is not so.

**Mr. MacEachen:** It is:

That the motion be amended by striking out the period—

**Mr. Nielsen:** There is also the notice to oppose.

**Mr. MacEachen:** I am dealing with the notice to amend. There is no way in this proceeding by which a notice to amend the motion can be put. It is just not possible. My hon. friends must know that. But more than that, if it were possible I would suggest that the amendment is totally irrelevant. As a matter of fact, I suggest that it is not possible at this stage to get at the vote to which the hon. member has referred in the way in which he wishes to get at it.

### *Disposition of Supply Motions*

The way in which he should get at it is either in the supply bill or in the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates. But here it is a somewhat different situation. We are asked to deal, in a bogus, irregular amendment with the salary of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) which is supposed to be contained in vote 20a. We are asked to reduce the motion put down by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) by a particular amount, the amount equivalent to the salary of the minister.

What is vote 20a? It is a vote that is related to the amount of \$1,009,000 covered in total by four items: field and air surveys, mapping and aeronautical charting, geological research and surveys, research in geophysics, Canada Centre for Remote Sensing. One would have to really be equipped with the ability for remote sensing to relate the minister's salary to this particular item because, as we know, the minister's salary is not even mentioned in the supplementary estimates. You can look from the beginning to the end; it has nothing to do with it. The minister's salary is covered in the main estimates, and nowhere else. It is certainly not covered here. It is in the statute, but the statutory items are covered in the main estimates. So we are both right.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. MacEachen:** Therefore I just say that this is the kind of intellectual conundrum with which one should not be expected to deal at five to eleven at night, especially after the week we have had and the day we have had. It is just nonsense and mature men should not be dealing with it, especially at five to eleven at night.

● (2250)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) raised a particularly important problem. On a number of occasions, at the time of consideration of supplementary estimates in this House, I objected to the outdated method which prevented hon. members from expressing their views on the consideration of these estimates.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the hon. member's arguments and I studied Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms as well as the Standing Orders of the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, if my Liberal colleagues could have the courage to be less political manoeuvrers and play more frankly their role as members of this House, if they would be kind enough to listen to me, then, I may be able to express myself freely. I accept the principle and the request of the hon. member for Yukon, but I will have to agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and with the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen). In fact, with regard to works relating to estimates as well as to ways and means, Standing Order 58(9) reads in part as follows:

... the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put, without further debate or amendment, every question necessary to dispose of the said proceeding.