

Mr. Nielsen: It is not.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are obviously getting into debate. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Hees: Consultation consists of you saying no; that is what it is.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Would the minister not agree, as the fair-minded man I always thought he was—

Mr. Hees: Until now.

Mr. Stanfield:—that a letter going out over his signature indicating that a grant had been rejected after consultation with the Member of Parliament indicates to the recipient that the Member of Parliament has objected to the grant?

Mr. Hees: That is straight dishonesty.

Mr. Faulkner: Mr. Speaker, in fairness I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition should note that the letter of acceptance contains exactly the same words.

Mr. Hees: There are a lot more rejections.

Mr. Faulkner: All we attempted to do through that rather longer letter—

Mr. Hees:—is pass the buck!

Mr. Faulkner: Just relax, George—was to explain to those whose projects were refused, as well as to those that were accepted, the process. It is perfectly true—the hon. member for Yukon makes this point and it is a valid point which I will probably have to consider—that those members who systematically stayed out of any consultations and did not want to see the list of projects are left in an ambiguous position. I think probably we should try to clear that, but the fact remains that all Members of Parliament had the opportunity to look at the complete list of projects and the preferred list—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps there will be an opportunity to look into the matter a little more deeply later, but for the moment we have to make some headway. I am still hoping to recognize the hon. member for Grey-Simcoe.

* * *

● (1200)

NATIONAL DEFENCE

MEAFORD TANK RANGE—INQUIRY AS TO FUTURE USE

Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. In view of the fact that Camp Meaford, better known as the Meaford tank range, has to some extent again been reactivated as an armoured training area for the army, can the minister inform us whether this is a temporary measure or one of a more permanent nature because of the concern of the

Control of Public Funds

people in the area whose basic desire is to use this range as a national park some time in the foreseeable future?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, we have advised those concerned that the Meaford range will be required for training purposes long into the future. It is not a short-term program.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—ALLEGED LACK OF PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL OF PUBLIC FUNDS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River) moved:

That this House, protesting the Government's continuing take-over of Parliamentary control of public money and the Government's mismanagement in spending escalating public revenues, warns that immediate and decisive action must be taken to restore control of public funds to Parliament.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, before I begin my comments may I say that there has been general understanding that after the first four speakers have taken the time allotted to them under the pertinent rule, all other speakers shall speak for 15 minutes. There has been great interest in this subject and that time limitation will give more members an opportunity to make comments and intervene in the debate.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member suggest that after the first round of speakers have completed their remarks, each speaker is to be limited to 15 minutes. We are in agreement with that.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker: Is the House in agreement?

Mr. Laprise: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[English]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, one wonders why this subject is being brought before the House again today. This is the fourth time in three years that Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition has considered it essential to bring this matter to the attention of the House, of the government and of the country. A good many other subjects could provide a topic for discussion today. Nevertheless, we take such a serious view of the situation regarding government expenditures that we feel, as the government has done nothing at all as a consequence of the three debates held in the last three years since 1970, that it is our duty as well as prerogative to make sure that the facts are ventilated so that, hopefully, at some time in the future this government will be aware of its delinquency in the area of government spending.

The government has a duty to perform in three areas, as has parliament. First, we must enact legislation; second,