

represents \$200 million per year. Primarily in the areas of health and education our women in Canada will feel the effect because they are more likely to be poor and in need of services. Women are more likely to be poor and in need of affordable access to education.

The biggest insult of all to Canadian women is the axing of \$2 million from the Secretary of State's women's program. This translates into a 15 per cent cut in funding for many groups that for the first time have given women a voice in this country, especially immigrant women.

There is also a whopping 50 per cent cut to the National Action Committee on the Status of Women. This organization has represented almost 600 women's groups. What have we done? One cannot help but wonder at a Government that espouses its commitment to including women's voices in the national consensus, but the minute it hears something it does not like, it silences those voices.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate to government Members that Canadian families are not fooled by the Budget. Canadian workers are not fooled. Canadian seniors are not fooled. Canadian women are not fooled. Most of all, Canadian children will hold the Government accountable for lack of shoes, food, and shelter in the name of a paid up Rolls Royce.

On April 28 Canadians mourned those workers who died building this country. The day the Budget passes will also be a day of mourning for the Canada that will be forever lost at the expense of those most in need.

Hon. Steven Paproski (Edmonton North): Before I entertain questions or comments, the Speaker would like to make a ruling.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

INTERIM SUPPLY—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: I said a few minutes ago, in response to points of order raised by the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands and the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, that I would consider the points. It is important to understand the point that both Hon. Members are making. Put as simply as I can put it, it comes down to the following.

While the House was adjourned there were certain special warrants issued because the Government needed money. Those special warrants were issued under the provisions of the Financial Administration Act. There is

Points of Order

a Bill which will be voted on tonight at 5.45 p.m. which, among other things, in Clause 3, and I am reading from the note in the margin, refers to the confirmation of payment under special warrants for the fiscal year 1988–89. Those are the special warrants complained of by the Hon. Members.

In order that everyone does understand, ordinarily a Bill comes in, there is first reading, second reading, second reading debate, and if that passes it goes to committee, comes back again in report stage, and then there is third reading.

This Bill which confirms those warrants will not proceed in that manner, because there is a special order which states:

That, when the House reaches Orders of the Day on Thursday, May 4, the House shall debate an opposition motion, notice of which shall have been given the previous day, and no later than 5:45 o'clock p.m. on May 4, the Speaker shall interrupt debate and put, forthwith and successively, without amendment or debate, every question necessary to dispose of the said motion; and then the Speaker shall put forthwith, and successively, without amendment or debate, every question that may be necessary to dispose of any motion relating to interim supply and for the passing at all stages of the Bill based thereon, following which the Speaker shall adjourn the House;—

That is the special order, and I know that Hon. Members know that I am bound by that special order. I cannot interrupt it or interfere with it. It is an order of the House. I point out that it is also an order that applies today by consent, but that is not a matter which changes the substance of the issue.

The effect of this special order is that provided the opposition motion is debated throughout the rest of the afternoon, there will be no time under this special order to debate the content of this Bill. In other words, Hon. Members have put the point that there is no opportunity to debate the contents, the whys and the wherefores of the moneys asked for and spent under the special warrants. I think I have the Hon. Members' point.

I suppose it could also be said that if the opposition motion ended early today, technically there might be some time for debate, but one cannot foretell that. There is a very real possibility that there would not be any time for debate.

The Hon. Members also referred to a special report which was filed with the House by the then President of the Treasury Board in 1980. I have been informed that that particular report was filed for information purposes only and it does not form part of the supply process. While it might very well be a good thing that such reports are given to the House under those circumstances, it is not required and I cannot insist upon it.