

*Interim Supply*

challenge the ruling. He has not done so. The ruling has been made but the hon. gentleman chooses to disregard it and go right on talking as though it had never been made.

**The Chairman:** Yes. Of course, the Chair has made a ruling. I should hope that the hon. member for Assiniboia would co-operate and try to conduct an orderly discussion in this debate. As I said, we can discuss reasons why interim supply should not be voted, but I do not think we can go into details. The hon. member will have other occasions—in fact I am sure he will have several other occasions—to discuss the matter he wishes to discuss now.

**Mr. Argue:** We are asking that this appropriation, as it applies to the privy council, be not passed. We ask that it be not passed for the particular reason that we feel the privy council has failed to do its duty as far as basic human rights and fundamental freedoms in this country are concerned.

I should like to move, Mr. Chairman:

That the motion be amended by adding at the end of paragraph (a) the following words: "save and excepting one sixth of vote 309 as contained in the main estimates".

**The Chairman:** Does the hon. member for Assiniboia not realize that such an amendment would not be in order because it does not refer to the motion before the committee? If it referred to any item mentioned in the motion before the house it might be in order but I will have to rule it out of order.

**Mr. Winch:** How is it that the estimates of the privy council are not before the committee when one sixth of the entire estimates are before the committee?

**The Chairman:** What I said is that all the estimates are before the committee but not with reference to a particular vote. It is one sixth of the estimates. I might try to explain to the hon. member that there must be a reference in the amendment to the main motion before the committee.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Mr. Chairman, may I ask you whether during the dinner hour you pursued this matter further? I have and I could not find in four different parliaments any ruling along the lines which you are now making and which you made today. I would ask you, in a matter of this importance, to consider the far-reaching implications of the ruling you are making and which you say you made earlier.

**Mr. Aiken:** Mr. Chairman, may I speak on this amendment because I had something to say on it this afternoon. The hon. member for Bonavista-Twillington proposed certain amendments and the hon. member for Laurier

[Mr. Fleming (Eglinton).]

proposed a third. At that time I raised the issue and it was stated then that the previous two had been ruled out of order. That was accepted and the amendments were then dropped. I see no reason why, if the amendments at that time were accepted as being out of order, there should be any difference now.

**Mr. Winch:** I have asked for an explanation on three different occasions.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Certainly this one is in order.

**The Chairman:** I will say in reply to the hon. member for Essex East that, although he may not have found any precedents, I am not so much worried about making a new decision as about not making a decision contrary to other decisions that have been made before. If the hon. member for Essex East has any special authority to refer me to which would be in accordance with his view I will certainly give it my fullest consideration, but I think I have explained sufficiently the reasons why I took this view this afternoon. It seems to me, even if there is no precedent, it is logical even if there are no precedents against it.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Mr. Chairman, I pointed out that there are no precedents one way, but there are precedents showing what has been the practice. A few moments ago the Leader of the Opposition read a statement which established what the practice was. I say I have not been able to find in the record of four parliaments any contrary practice, and practice certainly has the force of custom and regulation in this house unless there is something explicit to the contrary in the standing orders or in the citations.

**Mr. Pearson:** There is a specific ruling on this point made by the chairman of committees, which I have already quoted. On June 22, 1956, the then leader of the opposition, Mr. Drew, brought this matter to the attention of the chairman of the committees. Mr. Drew said, as reported at page 5288 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Chairman, every subject which can be dealt with by this parliament can now be properly dealt with on the motion for interim supply.

The chairman agreed with the leader of the opposition that that was correct and made a ruling to that effect, and that ruling has never been challenged since that time.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** The point of order was on a different matter entirely.

**Mr. Pearson:** Here is the chairman's ruling: The hon. member for Rosthern has raised a point of order and perhaps I should deal with it following the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition. I have looked at the motion which was