

too much time, but the suggestion made by the learned author is that there is nothing wrong with this kind of procedure. He says: "The various stages through which a bill progresses (normally but not necessarily on separate days) are intended by the practice of Parliament to provide so many opportunities not only for consideration, but also for reconsideration. Such stages may be taken to include the passage of any necessary financial resolution. Thus an entire bill may be regarded as one question which is not settled until it is passed. And hence no objection can be taken to an amendment on any particular stage on the ground that it raises against a question decided on an earlier stage."

And the author continues along this line. I think this is a relevant citation and that honourable Members would like to think about it. In any event I do not believe that this was the main point of contention of the honourable Member.

The President of the Privy Council, supporting the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, said that this is either an allotted day or it is not an allotted day. I find it easy to rule that it is not an allotted day. My understanding of the rules presented to the House and adopted by the House in 1968 is that they were intended to set up an entirely new supply procedure and eliminate all other supply procedures so that there was only one way to proceed on supply. The way to proceed on supply is either on an allotted day, which is a certain day called an opposition day, or on a government day at a time when the government feels there is a matter of urgency and in its own time asks the House to consider a certain item. It does this in its own time, as I say, and to my way of thinking that is the only difference between the two proceedings. In the one case the House is considering an item in opposition time; in the other case, where there is urgency or, in the view of the government, an emergency—and that must be the decision of the government—the matter is proceeded with in government time.

I think that the government would have to feel deeply that this is an emergency, because they would have to give up their time for the purpose of considering business that normally would be studied by the House in opposition time, in conformity with the dispositions of Standing Order 58. The Standing Order as revised in 1968 establishes, as I say, a mechanism for the consideration of supply, and essentially this procedure contemplates a reference of estimates to a committee or committees, their return to the House under a timetable, and debate on allotted days.

The interpretation of Section (18) of Standing Order 58 must be that, in certain circumstances, consideration of supply must take place in government time rather than on allotted days, which are opposition days under the provisions of the Standing Order. The proceedings are identical, except that opposition days cannot be used for the purpose of the business of supply when the government brings forward supply outside the cycle contemplated by the Standing Order. Except for the time allocation provisions of the Standing Order and the use of

certain days by the opposition, the same machinery must apply in both cases.

In this particular case notice of objections to passing of the estimates has been given in conformity with Standing Order 58(4)(a). The conclusion is that those notices are properly presented to the House and that the required motions should be made in order to bring the business of supply under debate.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1a, in the amount of \$200,000 of the Department of Finance for Financial and Economic Policies—Program Expenditures in Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, be concurred in.

The said motion was allowed to stand, at the request of the government.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote L12a, in the amount of \$350,000,000 of the Department of Finance for Winter Capital Projects Fund—Loans in Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, be concurred in.

And debate arising thereon;

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Horner (Crowfoot) and McGrath for Messrs. Schumacher and Yewchuk on the Special Committee on Trends in Food Prices.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mrs. Sauvé, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Ministry of State for Science and Technology for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 22 of the Government Organization Act, 1970, chapter 42, Statutes of Canada 1970-71-72. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 291-1/30.

By Mr. Whelan, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972 pursuant to section 6