

Some hon. Members: No.

● (2240)

The Chairman: The hon. member can see that there is no unanimous consent. I shall therefore proceed immediately with the vote.

[English]

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4 agreed to.

On clause 5—*Power to raise loan of \$4,000,000,000 for public works and general purposes.*

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Can the President of the Treasury Board indicate what sums are now remaining unborrowed and negotiated in loans authorized by parliament?

The Chairman: Order, please. Again the rules do not permit debate. Asking questions is debate. If the hon. member wants to seek the unanimous consent of the committee, he should do so.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Chairman: From the answer I am getting from the other side, I would be surprised if the hon. member could get unanimous consent. The hon. member may have a procedural point of order concerning clause 5, but he cannot ask for information as far as the bill is concerned.

[Translation]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman I rise on a point of order about a very technical matter. I did not understand quite well when you stated the title and the number of this bill. Did you say Bill C-44 or Bill C-55?

The Chairman: I am sure the hon. member will be pleased to know that this is Bill C-55, not Bill C-44.

[English]

Clause agreed to.

Clause 6 agreed to.

On Schedule A.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. When was notice given with respect to this bill? Was it when it came before the House?

An hon. Member: Where were you?

Mr. Jones: I have been here. Where have you been?

The Chairman: I did not get the point raised by the hon. member. Is he asking when notice was given?

Mr. Jones: When was the motion made to concur in an item of this nature? When was the notice given in writing?

The Chairman: Notice was given in Tuesday's notice paper.

Schedule A agreed to.

Schedules B to E inclusive, agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Interim Supply

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I listened to my hon. friend from Calgary North raise his point of order, and I do not know how we got into this mess, but it seems to me very unrealistic that we have just spent \$4 billion. The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) said that I have the opportunity to question these estimates. I respectfully state that we must look into this matter because I think it is wrong that we spend \$4 billion in this way. I do not know what has happened, and no one on that side seems to care.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Alexander: I am on a point of order and until the Speaker tells me to sit down I am going to keep talking. I think this whole procedure has to be reviewed. It is a farce, a sham. It is just ridiculous that we spend \$4 billion and no one can ask any questions. If this procedure does not call for review, then I do not know what is going on around here.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) and others have raised points of order. The fact of the matter is that under the procedures now used by the House the question of the supply of money to the government, which is the subject matter of both bills before the House tonight, is predicated upon a previous procedure of examination of the spending estimates. Under that procedure the estimates, whether they be main or supplementary estimates, such as is the case with respect to these two bills, are examined in the standing committees.

There have been discussions in the procedure committee which have resulted in the presentation of a report which, according to remarks made earlier this afternoon by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp), would repatriate some of the examination of these estimates from standing committees to the floor of the House of Commons on supply or allotted days. This process of examination of the spending estimates which are in the schedules to the bills, and therefore the subject matter of the supply bills, is the continuing subject of discussion by that committee. The passage of these bills this evening must be predicated upon the previous opportunity of examining the spending estimates, which after all are the substance of debate either in standing committees or on the floor of the House.

Whether this is a satisfactory way of examining the spending estimates which lead into this supply process is a question that has been actively considered by the standing committee on procedure, and it is hoped that the experiment suggested in the report which will come before the House may be a satisfactory improvement. If it be not a wholly satisfactory improvement, other experiments may be attempted which, it may be hoped, will meet with the satisfaction of all members.

● (2250)

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, having heard the wording of your ruling I would ask your comments on Item 5—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!