

### Appropriation Act

The revised standing orders also contain another important feature that should satisfactorily provide the opposition with the opportunity of debating those government programs for which they have particular concern. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to another part of our standing orders, namely paragraph 5 of Section 58, which states:

For the period ending not later than December 10, five sitting days shall be allotted to the business of supply. Seven additional days shall be allotted to the business of supply in the period ending not later than March 26. Thirteen additional days shall be allotted to the business of supply in the period ending not later than June 30. These 25 days are to be designated as allotted days.

Paragraph 3 of Section 58 also directs that:

Opposition motions on allotted days may be moved only by members in opposition to the government and may relate to any matter within the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada and also may be used for the purpose of considering reports from standing committees relating to the consideration of estimates therein.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, these opposition days provide the opportunity to bring before this House any program of the government that the opposition considers is worthy of debate. The degree of examination that is possible may not be equivalent to the clause-by-clause study afforded to detailed bills, but certainly there has been penetrating debate on some of the opposition days during this session. However, I do not feel that all subjects brought forward by the opposition have been of the highest importance. If opposition days are not used to full advantage, it is the responsibility of the opposition to correct this shortcoming and to organize themselves so that the days are consistently used to discuss national issues rather than minor topics.

There is quite a bit I could say about the administrative implications of the motion before us, but since our time is limited I should like to give other members of the government an opportunity to speak on the matter.

**Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, in supporting the motion moved by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) I should like to say that, in my opinion, there is no place for programs, such as we have been discussing this afternoon, under which money is arbitrarily allotted by a person not directly responsible to the people of Canada.

Under local initiative programs this year in my riding we had two identical communities 30 miles apart asking for an identical amount for the erection of medical centres, one of which received approval and the other did not. This is the type of thing that frequently happens when civil servants have the power to make these decisions rather than having them made by this House.

Recently as a result of questions asked by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) we were provided by the government with figures for 1972-73 LIP programs in Ontario amounting to some \$22 million. It was interesting to note that the top five ridings receiving funds for LIP programs received an average of \$1 million each, whereas the bottom five received an average of \$33,000. It seems to me there must be a question in the mind of anyone looking at these statistics as to why five would receive over \$1 million and the other five only \$33,000 particularly when it is known that the top five has Liberal

[Mr. Herbert.]

members of parliament and the bottom five had representatives sitting in the opposition. That may not have anything to do with it, but some might feel there is an inference to be drawn from those statistics.

Another statistic can be found in the fact that 45 per cent of the ridings in Ontario receiving LIP grants in 1972-73 were represented by Conservative members and received something in excess of \$8 million, whereas 40 per cent of the ridings were represented by Liberal members and received something over \$13 million. Again I would not want to draw an inference from that fact, although I think perhaps others might. I have spent a good deal of time in municipal politics and as mayor of a city I always made sure that the road in front of my home was the last one to receive surface treatment. Others, however, do not seem to do things that way.

In respect of the Opportunities for Youth Program, we were all given questionnaires by the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) and asked to answer them. As we found out later, if we had answered them these answers would have been taken down and in all likelihood used against us. If Opportunities for Youth, the LIP program and others are to stay they should be administered by statute. If that is not the case these programs are redundant, and we must ask the question: Should they be allowed to operate in a pork-barrel manner? If that is not to be the case then let us have legislation to cover them.

I will cut my remarks short because it is almost six o'clock and I am sure hon. members would like to have a vote on this measure.

**Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) has already referred to the degeneracy of this debate over what one might have expected from a reading of the motion proposed by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro). Indeed, it is hard to know what is the point of the motion. Is it a high-minded attempt to reform the rules of parliament, or is it a cheap attempt to take some easy shots at government programs, such as LIP or OFY, which his party has failed to take during other direct opportunities? In other words, the hon. member appears to be putting before us, under the guise of discussing something else, certain objections which were not taken at the appropriate time under parliamentary procedure, directing his criticism at the government in a way which normally could not be answered directly.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m., at which time the House will consider the motion to be moved by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave), in conformity with the provisions of Standing Order 26.

At six o'clock the House took recess.