

correct in saying this, but at what cost to the dignity, the self-esteem, and the economic health of American citizens?

A couple of percentage points more in the rate of inflation are fine with me if it means that the old will not go hungry, the young will not be poorly clothed, and the worker will not end up in a lineup at an unemployment insurance office.

If we had decided to limit government expenditures, if we had kept tax levels at previous levels so that we might have had a balanced budget, as is often advocated by hon. members on the other side, what would have been the result? I shall tell you, Mr. Speaker, and members on the other side. It would have meant lower personal income, lower personal spending, lower national output and lower profits, but substantially higher unemployment. Is this what members on the other side want?

I see that my time has almost expired. I do not really want to review the very excellent summary in the 1975 Bank of Canada Report which detailed the health of this country, but I do suggest that the hon. member for York-Simcoe might do well to read it.

Hon. members opposite would do well to generate their talents and energies into thinking about the type of society we want in the post-controls period rather upon government policies of the past. It is coincidental that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) said at a convention recently, "We want to tell Canadians what the Progressive Conservative party is for and not what they are against." I suggest that hon. members opposite might heed their own leader's advice.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTION TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Whelan), Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane), Nipissing (Mr. Blais), Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner), Welland (Mr. Railton), Stormont-Dundas (Mr. Lumley), St. Catharines (Mr. Parent), Kitchener (Mr. Flynn), Scarborough West (Mr. Martin), Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Milne) and Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Ethier), has been filed with me pursuant to Section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-2, R.S.C., 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario. Is it agreed that the said objection shall be appended to today's *Votes and Proceedings*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Disposition of Supply Motions GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10B, DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE

Mr. Speaker: It being 5.45 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier this day, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply relating to Supplementary Estimates (B), and all stages of the bill based thereon, together with interim supply and first reading of the bill based thereon.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 10b, in the amount of \$298,000 of the Department of National Revenue for Taxation—Office of the Administrator—Anti-inflation—Programme expenditures in Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1976, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is a matter to which reference has been made in the past, and it is one to which I would take great exception, particularly in respect of the nature of its appearing on the order paper.

Standing Order 58(4) reads as follows:

Forty-eight hours' written notice shall be given of motions to concur in interim supply, main or supplementary estimates, to restore or reinstate any item in the estimates. Twenty-four hours' written notice shall be given of an opposition motion on an allotted day, or of a notice to oppose any item in the estimates, or for the purpose of setting down any item or items in the main or supplementary estimates for consideration in a committee of the whole.

The hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling) gave notice at precisely 6 p.m. yesterday, just at the limit of the 24 hours, of his intention to oppose an item in the estimates. That was written notice of intention to oppose or, in other words, to reduce the item. How is it now that there appears ahead of it a motion restoring the item? I see that Mr. Speaker is shaking his head, but the motion in respect of Vote 10b involves the restoring of the item.

There was a motion put down by the hon. member which complied with the rules requesting approval for a reduction of a particular item. Now the procedure, and I suggest it is quite erroneous procedure of this House, which has become the practice is that the motion is never put, but there is a prior motion which appears somehow out of thin air. How did it get there unless it was by an arrangement with the Clerks at the Table? There can be no other way.

An hon. Member: Collusion.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I do not suggest there is collusion because there is no time for that. On previous occasions, as on this occasion, it is 24 hours' notice. The rule says specifically that 48 hours' written notice shall be given.

What I am concerned about is an expression of the House with regard to the motion of the hon. member. Your Honour was a member of the procedure committee when