

Points of Order

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague has informed this House and others throughout the country, there were ongoing consultations and discussions about this matter for a period of two years. He has responded in an appropriate fashion and the policy will remain as announced.

RESULTS OF DECIMA POLL

Mr. Rod Laporte (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is for the same Minister. I am not sure with whom the Minister has been consulting, but according to a Decima poll scheduled to be released on Monday—a poll of which I am sure the Minister is aware—two-thirds of producers in Western Canada do not want oats removed from the Wheat Board's jurisdiction.

Why does the Minister not face the facts? Why does he not let producers decide whether or not oats should be removed from the Canadian Wheat Board? Let the producers decide.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member, I am sure, is familiar with a number of farm organizations that exist in Western Canada. For example, the United Grain Growers, the Canadian Wheat Growers' Association, the Western Barley Growers' Association, the Prairie Canola Growers' Association, the Alberta Pork Producers Development, the Alberta Sheep and Wool Commission, the Cattlemen's Association, the Manitoba Farm Business Association, the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board, the Saskatchewan Marketing Board, the Government of Manitoba, the Government of Alberta and the Government of Saskatchewan. They all approve of this policy. Why does the Hon. Member not approve of it as well?

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, will the Government House Leader give a statement of business that he intends to call for the coming week?

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise that tomorrow, May 5, will be an allotted day. Monday, May 8 through to Thursday, May 11 we will deal with days three, four, five and six of the Budget debate.

POINTS OF ORDER

INTERIM SUPPLY

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As you are no doubt aware, I raised a question of privilege dealing with Estimates in this House on April 6 and your Honour handed down a learned ruling on Monday. I am in no way, of course, commenting on that ruling, but I have an additional point of order with respect to the Bill that is to be introduced this evening at the conclusion of the sitting at 5.45 p.m. I wanted to raise the point now to avoid a misunderstanding at that time.

What is happening tonight, from my review of the draft bill, is that we are being asked to approve the use of the Governor General's warrants during the period from January of this year until April 1. I had my concerns about the April 1 warrant and it will be dealt with later, but the three warrants issued on January 19, February 16 and March 23 purported to grant to the Government the right to spend over \$1.5 billion dollars. All of the items are contained, sir, in a statement on Governor General's warrants that was tabled in this House earlier in the session in conformity with the Financial Administration Act.

The difficulty is that the Supplementary Estimates, which form the basis for many of the votes contained in the statement on special Governor General's warrants that was tabled, of course have never been tabled in this House because the House has not been sitting since December of last year. The Government saw fit not to table any Supplementary Estimates during our short session in December for reasons best known to itself.

The problem that I feel we have to deal with here is that the Supplementary Estimates have never been detailed for us. We have never been advised as to what additional funds will be granted by these special Governor General's warrants out of what were Supplementary Estimates. It seems to me that a report ought to have been forthcoming to this House to detail that. In addition, the House will really never get an opportunity through the usual committee structure to study these Estimates.

In your ruling on Monday or Tuesday—I am sorry, I have forgotten—Your Honour detailed explicitly how under the new House procedures Estimates are normally referred to a committee. But the Supplementary Estimates, which form the basis for these Governor General's warrants and which we are approving today in the Bill that is to be introduced at 5.45 p.m., will preclude this House from then considering those Supplementary Estimates. In other words, they will have