

entirely new supply procedure and eliminate all other supply procedures so that there was only one way to proceed on supply. The way to proceed on supply is either on an allotted day, which is a certain day called an opposition day, or on a government day, at a time when the government feels there is a matter of urgency and, in its own time, asks the House to consider a certain item. It does this in its own time, as I say, and to my way of thinking that is the only difference between the two proceedings. In the one case the House is considering an item in opposition time; in the other case, where there is urgency or, in the view of the government, an emergency—and that must be the decision of the government—the matter is proceeded with in government time.

I think the government would have to feel deeply that this is an emergency, because they would have to give up their time for the purpose of considering business that normally would be studied by the House in opposition time, in conformity with the dispositions of Standing Order 58. The Standing Order as revised in 1968 establishes, as I say, a mechanism for the consideration of supply, and essentially this procedure contemplates a reference of estimates to a committee or committees, their return to the House under a timetable, and debate on allotted days.

The interpretation of section (18) of Standing Order 58 must be that, in certain circumstances, consideration of supply must take place in government time rather than on allotted days, which are opposition days under the provisions of the standing order. The proceedings are identical, except that opposition days cannot be used for the purpose of the business of supply when the government brings forward supply outside the cycle contemplated by the Standing Order. Except for the time allocation provisions of the Standing Order and the use of certain days by the opposition, the same machinery must apply in both cases.

In this particular case notice of objection to the passing of the estimates has been given in conformity with Standing Order 58(4)(a). The conclusion is that those notices are properly presented to the House and that the required motions should be made in order to bring the business of supply under debate.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1a, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

**Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board)** moved:

That vote 1a, in the amount of \$200,000 of the Department of Finance for financial and economic policies—program expenditures in supplementary estimates (a) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, be concurred in.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker, could we stand the first one, please?

**Mr. MacEachen:** No.

**Some hon. Members:** Carried.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is a government motion, of course. Is the House ready for the question?

25714—68

*Supply*

**Mr. Hellyer:** Mr. Speaker, is the House not willing to allow this motion to stand?

**Mr. Speaker:** That is obvious. This is a government motion and the government alone can ask that it be stood. The hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) and the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) appreciate that it is not for the Chair to determine whether a motion, if it is before the House, shall stand, unless there is unanimous agreement that the motion shall not be proceeded with.

• (1630)

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the government House leader for his co-operation in standing the first item and proceeding with the second item, Vote L12a to do with winter capital projects.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the hon. member's reasons, but since it is our desire to co-operate I will certainly extend that co-operation. I hope it will be reciprocated, and not in the usual manner.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the wish of the House that Motion No. 1 shall stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion stands.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE L12a, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

**Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board)** moved:

That Vote L12a in the amount of \$350,000,000 of the Department of Finance for Winter Capital Projects Fund—Loans in Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, be concurred in.

**Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I am about to refer to the document that was tabled by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) entitled "supplementary Estimates (A)" which, on its front cover, is said to be "for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973". I now refer to Vote L12a in the estimates, to be found at page 16. That item is described as a non-budgetary vote and is set out as being a request for funds for winter capital projects. The vote reads:

Winter Capital Projects Fund—Loans to provinces, provincial agencies and municipalities as defined in the Municipal Development and Loan Act in the 1972-73 to 1975-76 fiscal years inclusive for the purpose of creating employment through the construction, in the period commencing with December 6, 1972 and ending with June 30, 1975 . . .

I will not read the rest. The point I make is that this vote calls for authority to spend \$350 million in three fiscal years, yet the supplementary estimate is described as being for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973.

As I said just now, this vote covers three fiscal periods or years. To that extent the vote, in my submission, unless there is some rational explanation, is not in order. I do not think the government should be asking in supplementary estimates which purport to cover the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for authority to spend moneys as far in the future as 1975. To my knowledge, that kind of authori-