

Supply

- (b) the motion shall not be subject to amendment except by a minister of the Crown;
- (c) no member may speak more than once nor longer than ten minutes;
- (d) proceedings on any such motion shall not be interrupted or adjourned by any other proceeding or by the operation of any other order of this House;

The other two subsections are irrelevant to the argument I intend to urge upon Your Honour.

In order to proceed under Standing Order 58(18), I submit that the government must establish a prima facie case of urgency. The order clearly, specifically and cleanly uses the words:

In the event of urgency in relation to any estimate or estimates, the proceedings of the House on a motion to concur therein—

This is where we are now, Mr. Speaker.

—and on the subsequent bill—

Which will be coming before us.

—are to be taken under government orders and not on days allotted in this order.

This is what is being done, so that the government must show some urgency. The very fact that they have not chosen to proceed under Standing Order 44 is strong indication to me that they do not consider the matter so urgent as to invoke this rule. The real reason they are proceeding under Standing Order 58(18) is the fact that they are caught outside the pattern set by the Special Committee on Procedures and so have fallen into Standing Order 58(18).

To deal with Standing Order 44, and I suggest to you, Sir, that if the government insists on proceeding under Standing Order 58(18) and restricting the debate as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre suggests to Your Honour, at this stage, then they must go by Standing Order 44. This gives rise to Your Honour being required to permit debate for a period not exceeding one hour and the motion not being subject to amendment except by a minister of the Crown and the other concomitants which are set forth in that Standing Order, but certainly it is a condition precedent in my submission to the government proceeding under Standing Order 58(18) because that urgency must be established.

I was a little surprised when dealing with that point, Mr. Speaker, to hear the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre say that what we should be doing by these notices, when he criticizes their form, is to eliminate the item entirely. I think I am paraphrasing him correctly when, making his point about the notice being properly drawn, he said that “notices such as these must oppose the items in their entirety”. According to *Hansard* of June 22, 1972, this very question arose. At that time the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was dealing with a situation when there had been an allotted day set aside for discussion under Standing Order 58(16), so there may be a distinction to be drawn. I submit not—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It was 58(10).

Mr. Nielsen: There may be a distinction to be drawn, and maybe he is basing his argument upon such distinction, but my submission is that with respect to these notices and their treatment there can be no distinction

[Mr. Nielsen.]

save that in Standing Order 58(18) against any full debate on notices that have been filed.

Urging his argument upon Your Honour at that time, the hon. member said, as recorded at page 3415 of *Hansard* in the right hand column

What my hon. friend wanted this House to do—

And he is speaking of notices that had been filed here.

—was vote on the reduction of that \$244,000 for the information branch in this particular department to \$61,000.

Now, that was not a notice to oppose the item in its entirety. He quite correctly said on that occasion, and I submit his argument is still valid, that the notice means a notice to oppose the approval of the estimate and, in effect, reduce it. That is precisely what we are purporting to do in the notice I have filed. I draw particular attention to the notice dealing with the Department of Finance and the capital works project where we want to reduce the \$350 million in the estimates to the \$75 million which has been estimated by the minister to be this winter's requirement. He went on to say, when being critical of the strictures being imposed to prevent them from moving a reduction:

I suggest this is making a mockery of such rights as remain to us for the voting of supply as set out in Standing Order 58.

I submit to you, Sir, that it would indeed be making a mockery of such rights as remain to members in this House to control supply if we were denied the right to debate this notice in the clear absence of any prohibition to do so in 58(18). The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre went on to state:

• (1550)

But tonight, for the first time since this procedure came into effect, we are faced with a different situation because what we are asking for now is not the right to vote against an entire item . . . but for the right to vote for or against the reduction in the amount of an item.

I think that effectively disposes of the position taken by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre unless, of course, he has completely changed his mind between last June and today.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question at the risk of leading with my chin? What was the ruling on that?

Mr. Nielsen: The ruling was unimportant because the point the hon. member on that occasion was making—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: Hon. members laugh, yet if they listened for a moment they would get the explanation. If they went back and read these debates they would realize it does not matter, and I will explain why. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will remember that he insisted the notices filed on that occasion should have taken precedence over the motion by the President of the Treasury Board in presenting an estimate, and thus give rise to a debate. That was the point which was established. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in arguing that point made these other comments.