

*Government Orders*

fundamental traditions that makes the parliamentary system work.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** On a point of order, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

**Mr. Milliken:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member is arguing this point. He seems to be getting into a point of order on the question of the admissibility of the amendment, and so on. I know he is not directing his remarks specifically to that. I would like to refer him to Beauchesne's sixth edition on page 257 and I quote citation 926 of that edition:

Formerly, the votable motions presented on allotted days were defined by Standing Order to be automatically motions of no-confidence. Following the recommendations of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure, and the Special Committee on the Reform of the House of Commons, these references have been omitted from the Standing Orders.

And citation 927 reads:

A motion on an allotted day, although not put forward as a votable motion, has been deemed, with unanimous consent, to have been carried unanimously.

Now, clearly these motions can be carried and they cannot, in those circumstances, be considered to be motions of confidence or else, when they had been carried, even unanimously, the government would have been out on its ear. The rules have changed and I ask the hon. member to recognize that fact.

**Mr. MacDonald (Rosedale):** Madam Speaker, the member is a distinguished member of the bar, which I am not, has practised at the bar for some years. He is a relatively new parliamentarian. I invite him to review parliamentary practice. I was not a member when that report, whatever one it was, was agreed to unanimously, but I can tell you that if he thinks simply by the passage of that particular rule or report we have changed the nature of the fundamental way in which Parliament operates, he is very much mistaken.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Why change the rules then?.

**Mr. MacDonald (Rosedale):** Why do we bother having votes on days of supply if—

**Mr. Blaikie:** What's the point of changing the rules. Don't bother me with rules, I have my own idea of Parliament.

**Mr. MacDonald (Rosedale):** I would think if you really want to give up, give up. I was here when we had most of supply on the floor of this House. If you really want to give up one of the important items left for an opposition,

to represent and to register on a regular basis, both by way of debate and vote, its opposition to current government practice or stewardship then that is a very large decision. I do not hear the leader of your party or the leader of the official opposition arguing that they want to give up that important and fundamental parliamentary instrument. So I think you had better go back to the drawing board if you think—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** The hon. member for Rosedale has, as he has said himself, been a member of this House for quite awhile and he should know that he should address the Chair.

**Mr. MacDonald (Rosedale):** I apologize, Madam Speaker. I guess in my enthusiasm of how important I feel it is to retain these particular fundamental parliamentary aspects that I would not want to see for the sake of some short-term or superficial game—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** A point of order, the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Rosedale astounds me. He is entitled to have his own interpretation of how he thinks Parliament works and what the rules may have been before he left here in 1984, but the fact is that in 1985, and as is recorded right here in the annotated Standing Orders, says:

In 1985 the Standing Orders were further amended by removing the no-confidence reference.

That happened in 1985. That did not happen, it happened. The fact of the matter is that when opposition parties want to move motions that, in their judgment, are critical of the government, they are free to do so and the government is free to vote against them. In this case, we have moved something which is consistent with government policy and the government, instead of supporting the motion, has hidden behind the false and completely spurious claim that this is a motion of non-confidence. I have more confidence in the hon. member than that to think that he would get up and make an argument to the contrary. I have never seen such sophistry in my whole life.

## SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** Maybe before we do resume debate we will take a second of the House's time to rule on the amendment which was presented by the hon. member a few minutes ago. We did look for some kind of a precedent and did not. I will