could not be used in the sense given to it by the honourable Member for Peace River, but that the course of action in question had become an order of the House to which the government was required to adhere. That is, I suggest, the difficulty when we come to the expenditure of money. It is fundamental to the parliamentary system that financial initiative belongs to the Crown and I think it is going around this well-established practice to suggest that after a committee has recommended an expenditure of money the House can approve a report from the committee and then consider that an order has been made, which the government must obey, that certain sums of money in respect of which there has been no recommendation, should be expended. That is the problem. It is as simple as that.

Honourable Members have referred to precedents. I have looked at precedents also, with the assistance of the Clerks at the Table, and there are very few real precedents which would support the position adopted by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre and the honourable Member for Peace River.

\* \* \* \* \*

The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre referred to a very recent precedent, a precedent involving a recommendation for the expenditure of money which was included in a report of the Committee on Veterans Affairs as reported in the Journals of the House for June 22 and June 23, 1970. It should be noted that what we were considering then was a report which was dealt with by unanimous consent. The motion read: "That the notice standing in the name of the honourable Member for Ottawa West with respect to concurrence in the second report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs be considered and that the question be put on the same without debate."

That, I think, indicates why there was no occasion to raise the point of order. I do not intend to go into the matter further, but I still suggest to honourable Members that there is virtue in respecting long-established precedents. It is a long-established practice of this House that recommendations coming from a committee and requiring expenditure of money include the traditional words that the government give consideration to the advisability of spending moneys, and honourable Members should give serious thought to having these magic words included in their committee reports when such recommendations are made.

This having been said, we are dealing with only one aspect of this report, as I mentioned the other day, and I would think there is anxiety, a determination on the part of all Members to proceed immediately to the consideration of this very important report, and if honourable Members are satisfied, or half satisfied, with the comments I have made, I will now put the motion which stands in the name of the honourable Member for Vancouver Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis).

Accordingly, paragraph numbered 6 under the heading of Recommendations in the First Report of the Special Committee on Trends in Food Prices was amended to read as follows:

6. That the government give consideration to the advisability of having the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs make specific monies available to consumer's groups to present briefs to various governmental boards, where appropriate.

Mrs. MacInnis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That the First Report of the Special Committee on Trends in Food Prices, presented to the House on April 2, 1973, be concurred in.

And debate arising thereon;

By unanimous consent, the hour for Private Members' Business was suspended.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mrs. MacInnis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That the First Report of the Special Committee on Trends in Food Prices, presented to the House on April 2, 1973, be concurred in.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.01 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

## Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Ritchie and Danforth for Messrs. Danforth and Ritchie on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Ritchie, Broadbent and Grier for Messrs. Blenkarn, Saltsman and Harney on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. Andre, Oberle, Darling and Blenkarn for Messrs. MacLean, McCain, Crouse and Lundrigan on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Messrs. Watson, Harney, Orlikow and Gilbert for Messrs. Cafik, Broadbent, Gilbert and Orlikow on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Messrs. Dupras, Yanakis and Schumacher for Messrs. Blaker, Olivier and Atkey on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.