

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[English]

**PETITIONS**

## ETHANOL BLENDED GASOLINE

**Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this House to present petitions containing almost 500 names of persons who call on the government to bring in ethanol blended gasolines that are environmentally friendly and do not contain MMT.

The average cost of ethanol production in the U.S. is 47 cents per U.S. gallon, and one U.S. plant produces it for 38 cents per U.S. gallon. A new Canadian plant has forecast costs at 27 cents a litre. This is in direct contradiction to the 47 cents per litre cost of production in the Canadian government response to a similar petition tabled in November 1990.

I call on this government to update the research on this issue and get on with the implementation of this as an alternative friendly fuel.

\* \* \*

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Shall all questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

**POINT OF ORDER**

## ESTIMATES

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to make some brief submissions in respect of the point of order raised on Friday, March 8, 1991, by the hon. member for Ontario concerning the provision in the estimates, particularly vote 5 in the votes under Parliament on the Senate which authorizes the implementation of the 41st report of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy Budgets and Administration in the other place.

I have reviewed very carefully the comments made by the hon. member for Ontario. At first glance his point of order looks as though it is well taken, but there are a few points that I would like to draw to the attention of the Chair for the Chair's consideration in reviewing the point of order.

First of all, I would suggest that in considering whether the estimate in question is in fact out of order, Your Honour should have regard to the fact that estimates are recommended to this House by the Governor General.

• (1140)

In the case of both Supplementary Estimates C and in the case of the Main Estimates, Your Honour will recall just the other day that a message was received from His Excellency transmitting the estimates to this place and recommending them to the House.

Estimates recommended by the Governor General are not just recommended because His Excellency receives these documents and says: "Boy, these are great". He gets advice from his responsible ministers who advise His Excellency to recommend these estimates to the House. That little constitutional convention is a very important one, in that these estimates have obviously been approved by cabinet, by the Privy Councillors who advise His Excellency.

I submit that in making a recommendation to this House the ministers of the Crown have put their stamp of approval on this set of estimates and have recommended them to the House of Commons through the Government General, because the Governor General, as I have stated, does not recommend these on his own volition. He does so only on advice from his responsible ministers. Indeed it would be contrary to all constitutional convention for the Governor General to make a recommendation on these estimates without the advice of his responsible ministers who sit on the Treasury benches in the House. Those estimates have been recommended in this way.

I note that in the precedents cited by the hon. member for Ontario he has referred to rulings of the Chair made over a period of 20 years which suggest that estimates cannot legislate a new government program. The question whether this particular estimate falls within the