

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): In the light of what you suggested, Mr. Speaker, I think the House would be prepared to give unanimous consent to the withdrawal of this motion from the Order Paper.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B), 1969-70

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board) moved that the supplementary estimates (B) of sums required for the service of Canada for the year ending on the 31st March, 1970, placed before the House on March 5, 1970, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Drury thereupon moved that Bill C-200 for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1970, be read the first time and printed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask if it has been printed? Since I am now receiving the bill, that is fast service.

Mr. Drury thereupon moved that Bill C-200, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1970, be read the second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I am going to launch into the icy waters of the second reading of this bill as free from care as was the Humble Oil Company when it sent the *Manhattan* into the Canadian Arctic.

Mr. Drury: Not as powerful, though.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I hope you are not going to engage in any polluting.

Mr. Baldwin: I see I made a mistake in attempting to be facetious, Your Honour. I have too many assistants here.

It will be my intention, at the conclusion of my remarks, to move an amendment to second reading. I have it before me and it will shortly be before the House but I

Supplementary Estimates

have some observations to make. An examination of the bill indicates that attached to it as a schedule is the detail of the supplementary estimates (B). On behalf of this party, I must take exception to the bill and move an amendment for reasons which I hope will commend themselves to hon. members of this House. I direct my remarks particularly to the item which Your Honour just disposed of, item 17b of the Department of Agriculture, the details of which are set out further on in the estimates.

I want to make it abundantly plain, on behalf of this party, Mr. Speaker, that we are greatly concerned by the action of this government, in fact of any government, in attempting to use a vote on the supplementary estimates for the purpose of enacting what are in fact legislative proposals. We have been veering more and more toward that practice for the last three years. It is a very dangerous practice and a serious situation can be created where any motley collection of tinsel autocrats and sawdust Caesars, through the use of this method, would be able to virtually impose their financial will upon this Parliament and the country without the safeguards which are so essential to the legislative process. To see this done is bad enough but to see what has been done in this particular case is even worse. Thinking a particular vote did not contain that which was essential, the government attempted to amend it in committee. This bill, I think, brings into question the provisions of the schedule containing the supplementary estimates. I suppose one could say I am anticipating rebuttals to my argument, because some will no doubt say that there is no real principle to an appropriation bill. Nevertheless, the present provisions of the bill call into question every item of the estimates contained in the schedule, and that alone justifies the proposition I am trying to place before the House.

● (3:40 p.m.)

Here, the government has said, "We are going to spend \$100 million on what we will call the wheat inventory acreage reduction program," and the Minister without Portfolio made a statement to the House. Subsequently, when the supplementary estimates were brought down, we found that Vote 17b was a legislative item in disguise. It is unfortunate that this legislative item should appear in this form. Actually, the government has three methods by which to legislate on this subject. The vote in question purports to give the