

ance of a special stamp commemorating the Silver Anniversary of the Royal Couple and the replies thereto.—(Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 124—Mr. Dinsdale).

Resolved,—That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of any correspondence exchanged between the Province of Nova Scotia and the Government of Canada, or any authority acting on their behalf, since December 1, 1969, together with maps and any other documents including the Memorandum of Agreement, and the minutes of any meetings that have been held by the Joint Federal Provincial Advisory Committee, with respect to the establishment of a Third National Park in the Province of Nova Scotia along the Eastern Shore of that Province.—(Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 131—Mr. Forrestall).

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

And a point of order having been raised by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles);

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: I thank honourable Members for their very interesting comments. Honourable Members who have not studied this interesting procedural point too closely I think will have reached the same conclusion as I, that the matter is somewhat confusing. As some of the honourable Members who took part in this discussion have pointed out, this is actually the first time we are faced with this situation, with this difficulty, so it does take perhaps a bit of imagination, and I would think a lot of goodwill on the part of the Chair, on behalf of honourable Members, to interpret the rules and the Standing Orders in a way that will be fair to the House, and to all honourable Members. It is perhaps in this light that I have tried to interpret the arguments put forth by honourable Members during the course of this discussion.

I should like to refer at the outset to the arguments advanced by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre. He made reference in the first instance to the form of the notices which have been filed. The President of the Privy Council also referred to that point, and I think it also was mentioned by the honourable Member for Yukon. All who referred to the point agreed that it was not the substance of the discussion, and with this I also agree. However, I would still like to enter the caveat that although this form of notice has been used before, it was used in circumstances where there was not too much time for the Chair to object.

It is always difficult for the Chair to declare such motions out of order, preventing honourable Members from having the opportunity of voting upon them. That is why in all such circumstances the Chair must exercise leniency and bring to the attention of honourable Members that

what the Standing Order provides for is for a notice of objection, not a motion or an amendment as such.

If honourable Members were to adopt the practice of making these notices motions rather than notices of objection to an item, importing argument and debate, then I can see that we would get into some difficulties because they would be more motions, on which actually we could not vote, than they would be notices. I hope the practice will develop in the other direction and members will make an effort to limit the wording of these notices to that of a notice of objection, instead of making the notices amendments which are put in the form of argument. Therefore, I agree on this point with honourable Members that a ruling on such an important matter should not be made on the form of the notices that are before us.

The second point made by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre—so long ago that I forget whether it was his second, third, or fourth point, but I believe it was the second point he made—was to the effect that notices of opposition are intended to provide an opportunity to vote on certain items only at the cut-off time, or when the guillotine comes into play—if guillotines ever come into play. My impression is that this is the procedure that we have followed until now. Notices have been considered and a vote taken on the item opposed only at the very last moment when the guillotine came into play at the end of the period.

Actually, there is nothing to prevent the House from considering these motions outside of the provisions of Standing Order 58(10). I refer honourable Members to the possibility of doing this under the provisions of Standing Order 32(1)(k) which reads as follows: "The following motions are debatable: (k) for the consideration of any motion under the order for the consideration of the business of supply." I have even wondered why the House has not taken advantage of these provisions to bring these items under consideration forward for debate before the House reaches the last minute on a finally allotted day. That is a possibility that is always open to the House, and for this reason I do not think I can accept the argument advanced by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre on this particular point.

I was also impressed, if I may say so, by his argument with reference to the difficulty of following the procedure now proposed by honourable Members who have brought these notices of motions, namely that the House might be called upon to vote twice on the same item. It could be said that this situation is hypothetical or that the objection is premature, that it would be at a later date when the matter came up for a vote the second time that that argument could be taken.

It may be an *obiter dictum* at this time to rule on this point, but I think it might be worth referring honourable Members to May's 18th Edition, the last paragraph at the foot of page 483 and the first paragraph at the top of page 484. I will not read it all because it would take