

the House—it was decided to change the procedure, and instead of considering these votes in Committee of Supply it was suggested that these debates and votes should take place in the standing committees of the House. Under special procedures our estimates are now referred to different standing committees, and in each committee the estimates of a department or agency of the government are considered, and honourable Members while considering those estimates have an opportunity to either vote for an item, against an item or to reduce an item. That is the right, privilege or opportunity which we had when we had a Committee of Supply that we have passed on to the standing committees.

It may well be that was not the intention of honourable Members when they worked very diligently in reforming, changing or amending our rules in 1968. It may well be they were anxious to preserve an opportunity for the House itself, either in Committee of Supply, Committee of the Whole or in the House with the Speaker in the Chair, to vote to reduce an item, but I am not sure that this particular opportunity has been preserved. Obviously in the past four years since the rules were changed there has not been that opportunity.

It may well be that honourable Members want to change that procedure, and it may be that some interpretation of the rules will come forward in the weeks ahead which would make it possible for Members to vote not only against an item but against part of an item. It is, in an effort to obtain this result, that honourable Members sometimes give notice of an objection to an item by referring to part of it, but as the honourable Member for Ontario (Mr. Cafk) says, there is some difficulty in this kind of interpretation of the rules under which honourable Members, rather than oppose an item, give notice that they oppose part of it. In practice the result is the same, but what we are called upon to vote on is not that part of the item opposed by the honourable Member, but the whole item. This is the procedure we have followed until now, and I think it would be difficult to interpret the rules differently.

The discussion we have had up to now, which has been very enlightening, and my comments, which are very much less so, I am afraid, are somewhat hypothetical, as I took the opportunity to say earlier, because the situation we are faced with now involves the possibility of debate today on the motion standing in the name of the honourable Member for Yukon. The Standing Orders make it quite clear that the honourable Member does not have to proceed with his motion, in which case the motion is dropped, and then under Standing Order 58(12) we are limited to the consideration of Supply, and on an allotted day we proceed to the consideration of motions standing in the name of the Honourable the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury).

Honourable Members will have to agree with me that in this hypothetical situation we have not yet reached that point. I understood that honourable Members thought this discussion should take place to determine what the

position of the government might be if the honourable Member for Yukon decided not to proceed with his motion. I believe under the guise of the point of order the honourable Member has now ascertained what the position of the government will be, as expressed by the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), and now knows what the position of the Chair might be in respect of a point of order raised later on. It now remains for the honourable Member for Yukon to have the last word and indicate whether he intends to proceed with his motion, and in that regard I think the House would like to hear from the honourable Member or someone on his behalf.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, moved,—That this House opposes the following items:

(a) Vote 70 of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development—Department, Conservation Program to the amount of \$1,000,000 (for Professional and Special Services);

(b) (i) Vote 5 of the Department of Labour for Information Canada—exclusive of Queen's Printer Program expenditures;

(ii) Expositions Revolving Fund of Information Canada, authorized by Supply and Services, Vote L149b, *Appropriation Act No. 1, 1970*, and increased by Supply and Services, Vote L30, *Appropriation Act No. 3, 1971*;

(c) Vote 15 of the Department of Public Works—Accommodation Program, Capital Expenditures, to the amount of \$43,900,000 (General Purpose Buildings);

(d) Vote 1 of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion—Regional Economic Expansion, Operating Expenditures, to the amount of \$1,000,000 (for Professional and Special Services);

(e) Vote 50 of the Department of the Secretary of State—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, to the amount of \$59,999 (for the President's salary);

(f) Vote L30 of the Department of Transport—Air Transport Program, to the amount of \$4,310,000 (Construction and Design) for the Toronto International Airport No. 2 at Pickering;

(g) Vote 5 of the Treasury Board—Government Contingencies and Centrally Financed Programs, except for an amount of \$60,000,000.

And debate arising thereon;

It being the thirteenth and final allotted day for the Supply period ending June 30, 1973, at 9.45 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker interrupted the proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 58(10);

And a point of order having been raised by the honourable Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) to the effect