

Interim Supply

not. I think this is a clear-cut case of a matter under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Transport, and I raise it now so that an investigation, if it is deemed necessary, can be made of this question in order that, when the final estimates come before the committee of supply later on this session, the Minister of Transport may be in a position to announce the result of such investigation and will be able to make sure that money which parliament provides is not being misused or channelled into various uses for which it should not be so channelled.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment negatived: Yeas 29; nays 85.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. Argue: Mr. Chairman, I had anticipated making these remarks earlier in the afternoon and I was quite certain I would be in a position to do so. I think that probably would have been the situation had not the Minister of Finance raised so many objections to discussion of a given item in these estimates.

I should like to raise at this time the question of the delay, certainly the refusal on the part of the government, in dealing with the question of the disallowance of the controversial legislation passed in Newfoundland more than a year ago. I do that, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the privy council vote in the estimates, the fact that this matter comes under the privy council, and that this is the first opportunity that a member of the house has had to discuss this question under the rulings which have been made over the past year.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has indicated that he intends to discuss the fact that the government did not disallow certain Newfoundland legislation, and he is proposing to relate this to an item in the estimates of the privy council.

May I recall to his mind, Mr. Chairman, the fact that we are here dealing with a proposal to vote certain sums out of the estimates for the fiscal year 1960-61. We are not dealing with something in the fiscal year 1959-60, and there is nothing in these estimates anywhere for the fiscal year 1960-61 which has any bearing whatsoever on this subject of the disallowance of certain Newfoundland legislation. The legislation, we were told, became effective by royal assent over a year ago, and the time for disallowance

[Mr. Howard.]

passed some days ago. It is nothing which affects the fiscal year 1960-61 in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Winch: Just how nasty can the government get? Up until a certain date this question could not be considered at all. I refer the minister to *Hansard*. Three times the ruling of the Speaker was that this matter could not be raised until the period for disallowance had run out. The time has now run out and we have these estimates before us. Just how and when can this subject be raised except at this time? I ask the Minister of Finance whether he cannot be just a little bit fair to the hon. members on this side of the house.

Mr. Regier: One of the oldest, if not the oldest, of the rights of parliament in the British commonwealth is the right to debate and discuss the proposals for taxation and expenditure put forward by Her Majesty's advisers and to deny the supply of funds if parliament thinks fit. We are now engaged, as the hon. member for Assiniboia has stated, in discussing whether or not we feel that the government and, more specifically, the office of the privy council are worthy to obtain the right to expend additional moneys and when we are debating whether or not we consider the government to be worthy of this continuing vote of supply it is, I submit, in order to review the record of the government in the past. I should like to repeat the appeal which has been made to the Minister of Finance to measure up to his responsibilities once and for all and to recognize the importance of parliament and not to delay the committee by his nonsensical—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Argue: On the point of order, I think this is perhaps one of the most illogical points of order which the minister has ever raised. He said this adverse decision had been made in the past and that these estimates have to do with the coming fiscal year. On this ground, because I wish to discuss something which has taken place in recent days, and in very recent days, he argues that because this estimate, together with the others, would come into effect on April 1, it would be out of order to discuss the question to which I have referred. If that were taken to be the ruling, Mr. Chairman, parliament would be silenced on these estimates until April 1. However, the government needs the money and therefore the estimates must be discussed at this time. If the minister's view were the correct one, the debate which has just concluded with reference to unemployment at this time could not have taken place. It would have been necessary to wait