

The ruling was that the motion of the President of the Treasury Board did take precedence, and the notice had to be voted on without debate under Standing Order 58(10), where a prohibition against debate is clearly laid out on an allotted day.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Was it the notice for a reduction in the item that was voted on or the full item as proposed by the President of the Treasury Board? In other words, what did the Chair rule?

**Mr. Nielsen:** The Chair ruled that the item of the estimates must be called by the President of the Treasury Board first, and then when the notices affecting the items which were called eventually came up in the ordinary course, the motion was voted on which disposed of the notice. From reading these debates that is what I got from the Speaker's ruling.

There were three exceptions to that because, as the hon. member pointed out, in that debate three of the notices purported to delete the entire item. I have certain remarks to make about that procedure which I will not make here. I only refer to this debate to point out that on that occasion the hon. member took the position that it was quite proper to file a notice of opposition that had the effect of reducing but not entirely eliminating an item. Unless he has changed his position, we feel that the argument is just as forceful today as it was then. Merely because we are proceeding under Standing Order 58(18) does not alter the force of that argument in my submission.

I think I can leave those two points now, Mr. Speaker. The proceeding obviously is under Standing Order 58(18). I do not think there can be any suggestion that we are proceeding under Standing Order 58(10) because it simply does not apply. Standing Order 58(10) is thrown out the window on the very first five words. Those words are "On the last allotted day".

My submission is that the old Standing Order applies only in circumstances where we are dealing with the last allotted day, and we are not there. We are not proceeding under Standing Order 58(16) because that only applies on an allotted day. We must be proceeding under Standing Order 58(18), because that is the only other place in the standing order where we have a vehicle to deal with the report of the standing committee on the appropriations bill. There is nothing in Standing Order 58(18) which in any way restricts debate.

We are prepared to go along with the government's suggestion that we proceed under Standing Order 58(18) and deal with the report stage of the appropriations bill, but I want to make it abundantly clear that we are not prepared to go along with the government under Standing Order 58(18) if the government intends to impose restrictions on the debate on these nine notices, because if it follows that course we want to forcefully submit, Your Honour, that the government must establish the urgency and, in order to do that, go through the procedure which is set out by Standing Order 44.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, I normally would be inclined to let Your Honour rule on this without any further intervention, but because of the importance of the issue and

### Supply

the fact that this is the first time it has been raised, I feel compelled to do so.

I think the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has disposed quite effectively of the laboured, forced, contrived and tortuous argument of my hon. friend, the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** My hon. friend!

**Mr. Baldwin:** I know that Your Honour will probably smile to yourself and say that hon. members in procedural arguments sometimes do embark upon discussions which sound like that, and I suppose if I were to go back far enough in *Hansard* I might find some place where I, myself, was guilty of using expressions like that. If that is the case, I would plead in extenuation the fact that I was trying to widen the opportunity for divorce—

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

**Mr. Baldwin:** —for divorce between the two parties over there. I am sorry, I should have said "for debate". I am amazed by my hon. friend, the member for Winnipeg North Centre, with whom I have stood so stoutly on so many occasions in an attempt to find ways and means by which the House could widen opportunities for debate, to find him now attempting to foreclose, limit and restrict debate, and using arguments of this kind. I am happy to say, however, because of the attachment I have for him, that I will not have to deal with him as he has been effectively disposed of by the hon. member for Yukon.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Baldwin:** Yes, indeed, I would be delighted.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Did he not hear me say that one of my main concerns was to get this supply bill into committee of the whole where we can have unlimited debate? Will he tell me how he can say I was arguing for restriction of debate when, in fact, I was arguing the very opposite?

**Mr. Baldwin:** It is quite plain because the hon. member is saying we are going to debate this particular notice, and if that is not an attempt to restrict the debate I do not know what is.

I should like to go a little further into the historical reasons behind this particular ruling and practice to which we are adhering. I think this is what the House and the Chair are interested in and should bear in mind. If we go back to the days when we had the committee of supply and there was unlimited opportunity to discuss supply, I suppose some would say those were the good old days, being in the opposition, but those in the Cabinet would probably say they were the bad old days. I can recall occasions when my hon. friend said exactly the opposite. The government House leader was not sitting in the House then, but standing in the wings preparing the bullets his friends were firing when the then Liberal opposition took up to 75 or 80 days to deal with issues of supply. It was for reasons of that kind the House decided to find ways and means of restricting debate, wrongly so as the facts have proven. The Committee on Organization and