

*Disposition of Supply Motions*

these rules were devised and you will know it was clearly indicated at that time, and this was followed for a period in this House, that an hon. member can oppose an item in order to allow for the expression of an opinion by the House either in respect of the reduction of the item to \$1, or to a specific amount, or in opposition to it entirely.

Then there was a change, notwithstanding protests from this side of the House. Former Speaker Lamoureux decided that somehow a procedure could be followed whereby automatically out of thin air there appeared a motion under the name of the minister of the department with which the item is concerned to restore the total amount.

This caused a great deal of difficulty in the House because in many instances when there are main estimates the House is being asked to vote on an omnibus item when there is no procedure whereby the House can be asked to express its opinion on the item that is posted.

These rules were put in for a particular purpose, namely, to allow an individual member of the House to get an expression of the House on an item in the estimates. This is now totally impossible.

First of all, I say it is irregular for this motion appearing in the name of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) to appear on the order paper. I find no authority whatsoever for it in the rules. Secondly, I find no authority whatsoever, whether it is Standing Order 58(9), (10) or (11) which governs the procedure as to how the item shall be disposed of, and appropriation bills shall be considered, namely, the motion on behalf of the President of the Treasury Board to restore the item.

● (1750)

**Mr. Speaker:** I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but I think we should be clear about the terms we are using. I will permit the hon. member to carry on in a moment. The motion to which he is referring in the name of the President of the Treasury Board is not a motion to restore an item. That would presuppose that the House had made a disposition to reduce it.

The motion in the name of the President of Treasury Board is a motion for concurrence in the item, and it is there because there is a blanket motion in the name of the President of Treasury Board for concurrence in all of the items in the supplementary estimates. They are not listed individually, because it is not felt necessary in the practice followed by the House over many years to list the items individually unless there is a notice of opposition. Therefore, in the face of a notice of opposition, in order to accommodate that vote, the motion is separated by practice—and by no other reason—in order to see to it that the notice of opposition by the hon. member is on the order paper together with a specific aspect of the general notice for concurrence. But it is not a motion to restore the item; it is a motion for concurrence.

If there were notices of opposition on every item contained in the supplementary estimates, presumably the House, for the purpose of recording that, would have to separate the general, blanket, omnibus motion for concurrence by the President of the Treasury Board into each item so that it would face opposite an item of objection. But it is not a motion to restore the item. A motion to restore the item could presumably only be made after the

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

House had addressed itself to a notice of objection and had accepted it in some way.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** By your own words, Mr. Speaker, you have drawn my attention to what is contained in 58(4). It provides that 48 hours' written notice shall be given to motions to concur in a supplementary estimate. Where was the compliance of the 48 hours' requirement with regard to this particular item? There was no 48 hours' notice. There was undoubtedly a general 48 hours' notice for the motion which appears on the order paper to concur in Supplementary Estimates B. That I am not disputing. That item I am not disputing.

But I do find it singular, and I do object, that any hon. member on either side of the House who wishes to post a single item within the 24 hours is confined to the 24-hour rule, comes to the deadline, and finds that there suddenly appears on the order paper a counter-motion and, particularly, that the counter-motion takes precedence in being put. The net result is that there is no vote, there is no opportunity for opinions to be expressed by the House on the particular motion of an hon. member who has complied with the rules. That is the frustration, and that is where I suggest that in the past the Chair has misdirected itself.

I am not suggesting that ultimately, if a vote on the motion of the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth is not carried by the House, the general motion therefore takes precedence. I am not questioning the general motion which I shall accept was filed within 48 hours to concur in Supplementary Estimates B, the same way that yesterday there was filed a notice to concur in interim supply. But nothing has been done with regard to this particular item appearing as 10(b) with regard to the Administrator of the Anti-Inflation Board.

How else is the House to proceed but to follow the procedure which I insist is the right one? It is my contention that the motion which should be put is that which stands in the name of the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth.

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

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** The other motion, I suggest with respect, is both irregular and not according to the rules. What happened to the 48 hours' notice? It was not on the order paper; it has not complied with the 48-hour requirement, and on the side of the government there has to be compliance. There cannot just be a general motion put down which can then be translated somehow by the Chair into a particularized item on the order paper.

**Mr. Speaker:** If the hon. member for Edmonton West will permit me, in accordance with the rules the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth has filed a notice of objection; it is not a motion. There is no question to which the House can address itself. There is, in fact, a notice of objection which, in accordance with the rules, notified the House that the hon. member insists on a separate vote on the particular item.

There must be a question to which the House can address itself, and the notice of objection by the hon. member is not a question. Therefore the House has nothing to which it can address itself. It is therefore necessary that