

Mr. Boudria: We are not challenging the Speaker, come on. You know better than that.

Mr. Lewis: The question is: Will the Opposition have an opportunity to review the Supplementary Estimates? Obviously, there will be an opportunity within the review of the Estimates. I have never yet seen a narrow treatment of Estimates in committee. I am sure that the Ministers who go before the committees on the various Estimates for 1989-90 will be fully prepared to deal with any Estimates that are contained within the special warrants.

I would suggest that if this had been brought up in the House Leaders' meeting we would have had an opportunity to discuss it rather than to discuss it here on the floor of the House. I do not believe that there is any point of order. I think we should proceed with the New Democratic Party's opposition day motion and get on with debate.

Mr. Speaker: I will reserve for at least a few minutes on this matter.

I would like to draw to the attention of Hon. Members comments that I made several days ago. Hon. Members might want to consider them. I quote from them as they were reported at page 1179 of *Hansard*:

While Members may complain that they do not have an opportunity to examine these expenditures before they have been allotted, the very nature of special warrants calls for the approval of the House after the fact. The cure for that complaint lies more properly within the legislative process by amending the Financial Administration Act to the greater satisfaction of the majority of Hon. Members in the House.

Hon. Members might want to look at that citation.

The second point is that I have no authority to refer this matter to the committee.

The third point is that it may well be that both sides would want to have a discussion as to the subject of the matter. It may be the wish of Members to come back to advise the Chair that what seems to be the essential request of the Opposition might have met with favour by the Government. However, that is something I cannot foretell at the moment.

In any event, I will consider the matter. I know that it is a matter of concern to both the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands and the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.

Supply

At this point we should proceed with the debate.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I rise very briefly on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I would remind Hon. Members that on this point of order they are taking the time of the debate.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I only want to indicate on behalf of my colleague that in no way are we attempting to challenge the previous ruling of the Speaker made earlier this week on the question of privilege. I want to clarify that.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member. I understand that. I understand the argument, too. I think it might be helpful if Hon. Members read the ruling of several days ago.

In any event, I will consider the matter. However, now, I think in fairness to the New Democratic Party we should proceed.

• (1520)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 81—THE ENVIRONMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Broadbent that this House condemn the Government for failing to ensure fairness and equality to all Canadians, and for failing to make protection of the environment a priority.

Mr. Pierre H. Vincent (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity today to speak to an Opposition motion that, I believe, mentions the environment. Mr. Speaker, I shall, if I may, read the Opposition motion for today's debate.

That this House condemn the Government for failing to ensure fairness and equality to all Canadians, and for failing to make protection of the environment a priority.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate that a leader of the Opposition, though not the Official Opposition, should move a motion in the House on an opposition day, a motion so vague, so unspecific and so lacking in substance, and that the House should take a whole day to talk about a motion that means absolutely nothing. As I said, it is about fairness and equality and about failing to make protection of the environment a priority.