

Urban Affairs

Messrs:

Nielsen
O'Connor
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Reilly
Ritchie
Roche

Rodriguez
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schummacher
Scott
Stackhouse
Stanfield
Stevens

NAYS

Messrs:

Allard
Allmand
Andras
Barnett
Basford
Beaudoin
Bécharde
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaker
Blouin
Boisvert
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Caccia
Cafik
Campbell
Caouette
(Charlevoix)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
De Bané
Demers
Dionne
Douglas
Drury
Dubé
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Firth
Fleming
Foster
Fox
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goyer
Gray
Grier

Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harding
Harney
Herbert
Hopkins
Howard
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jerome
Knight
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Lachance
Laflamme
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc
(Laurier)
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-
Kent)
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
L'Heureux
Loiselle
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
(Vancouver
Kingsway)
Marceau
Marchand
(Kamloops-
Cariboo)
Matte
McRae
Morin (Mrs.)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Neale
(Vancouver
East)

Stewart
(Marquette)
Thomas
(Moncton)
Towers
Wagner
Whittaker
Wise
Wooliams
Yewchuk—96.

Nelson
Nesdoly
Nystrom
Olausson
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Pelletier
(Hochelaga)
Pelletier
(Sherbrooke)
Penner
Peters
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Reid
Richardson
Rompkey
Rondeau
Rooney
Rose
Rowland
Roy
(Timmins)
Roy
(Laval)
Saltsman
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart
(Okanagan-Kootenay)
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Stollery
Symes
Tétrault
Thomas
(Maisonneuve-
Rosemont)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
(London East)
Turner
(Ottawa-
Carleton)
Walker
Watson
Whelan
Whicher
Yanakis—140.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES
(B)

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, laid before the House March 7, 1974, be concurred in.

[English]

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point of order with respect to this motion to concur in supplementary estimates (B). I might say at the outset that there are several items in the estimates that could be seriously questioned, but it is not my intention to take up the time of the House to deal with the procedural arguments tonight. However, one of the irregularities is so blatant that the item cannot be allowed to pass and my contention will be that the motion to concur in this particular estimate cannot be put tonight.

The item in question is vote 25b of supplementary estimates (B) concerning the Food Prices Review Board, under the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. This item relates to almost \$1 million of public funds which are to be appropriated if the motion is passed. The sole description of the purpose of this vote appears on page 16 of the supplementary estimates. Under the heading "Budgetary" we see "vote 25b—Food Prices Review Board—program expenditures", and then a further sub-heading which reads "Activity to be supplemented". Then follow particulars of the administrative objects on which this money is to be spent and the amounts in which the money is to be apportioned.

However, I point out to Your Honour that there is no further description of the purpose of this vote. Despite the phrase "activity to be supplemented", there is no vote 25 in the main estimates for 1973-74 to which reference can be made for a fuller description. There is no reference to any other source by which the purpose of this vote can be identified. There is no statute or previous vote in any past Appropriation Act. Indeed—I stand to be corrected on this—because of the fact that there is no reference in any past Appropriation Act, it can be concluded that this is the first time this estimate has appeared before the House.

The vote stands alone and of itself. It is listed under the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. However, a scrutiny of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs Act, which is chapter 27 of the Revised Statutes of 1970, reveals that the act does not appear to authorize the minister to set up a board, unless it be a departmental board. Section 3 of the act gives the minister the management and direction of the department.

I suggest that this question must then be asked: Does this include the management and direction of the board here referred to? I suggest that it does not. Certainly we have not seen the management and direction of the board by either the minister responsible for the department or by the government. Section 5 and 6 of the act set out the jurisdiction, the powers and duties of the minister. There is no power there to set up a board, certainly not a board that can function independently of the minister's powers to manage and direct. If this vote is intended to enhance the minister's powers to include the setting up of a board, whether a board over which he has management and