

*Interim Supply*

government has made a decision in the one case and as to the second we presume that the matter is still under consideration. The two questions I wish to deal with this afternoon on behalf of this group are the request on behalf of the Canadian Labour Congress for inquiry into the unfortunate and regrettable incidents in Newfoundland and the request for a judicial inquiry by the premier of the same province.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend has indicated that he approaches these matters as on a motion to resolve the house into committee of supply. May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that this is not that situation at all. We are not on a motion to resolve the house into committee of supply, we are in committee of supply now. May I point out to the hon. gentleman that the subjects he is proposing to discuss now are surely not appropriate for discussion on interim supply, that is, discussion in committee of supply. If my hon. friend is looking for a place to discuss this question there will be an item in the supplementary estimates dealing with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

**Mr. Robichaud:** The minister will object.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** Whatever may be appropriate for discussion there may be discussed, and whatever is improper obviously will not be permitted. But I do urge that this is not the place to discuss matters as though this were a motion to resolve the house into committee of supply. This is not such a proceeding at all.

**Mr. Herridge:** I cannot agree with the contention of the Minister of Finance. The minister is asking for supply and I understand this request covers all departments. We have a right when the minister is asking for supply for a department to go into any question concerning that department. In support of that contention I want to quote from May's 16th edition, page 739:

Matters which can be discussed upon the grant on which an advance is sought, may be discussed, in anticipation, upon the motion for the grant on account; though the proper occasion to examine the grants in detail is when the final grant to complete the sum demanded is proposed to the committee.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** That last statement is the important one. I do point out to my hon. friend that once we are through with interim supply we are going to have before the committee the supplementary estimates for the year 1958-59. It seems to me that whatever may be relevant to the item for the Royal

Canadian Mounted Police should be said there, and not on this present proceeding in committee of supply.

**Mr. Herridge:** According to the rulings that have been made in connection with dealing with supplementary and further supplementary estimates, we have been tied very closely since this government came into power to the actual item under discussion. The matters I wish to raise here go somewhat wider than that. I think this is the appropriate opportunity to discuss a matter of very urgent concern to the Canadian people.

**The Chairman:** I must bring to the attention of the committee that the item which was read by the hon. member for Kootenay West can be found on page 739 of May's 16th edition. This paragraph reads as follows:

Matters which can be discussed upon the grant on which an advance is sought, may be discussed, in anticipation, upon the motion for the grant on account; though the proper occasion to examine the grants in detail is when the final grant to complete the sum demanded is proposed to the committee.

It is the opinion of the Chair that this question concerning Newfoundland should be discussed when the detailed estimates are brought forward, but not at the present time. Actually, at the present time we are in committee of supply and discussing the estimates on a very broad, general basis. It is the opinion of the Chair this is not the appropriate time for discussing the matter to which the hon. member for Kootenay West refers. It would be preferable, in my opinion, to discuss the matter under the detailed items.

**Mr. Benidickson:** May I speak to the point of order? I feel that this is something which involves the rights of all members of the opposition. I feel that the suggestions of the minister are quite contrary to the practice of this house over a great number of years. I could not, if I were in the position of the hon. member for Kootenay West, agree to the suggestion of the Minister of Finance because recently we have had other supplementary estimates before the committee and I thought the minister was unduly technical. As I say, he completely ignored the practice that he and the present Prime Minister advocated when the supplementary estimates were being considered under the former administration.

I would ask him to cite any illustration in recent years when supplementary estimates were under consideration when points of objection were taken by the former government that was then in power similar to those he took earlier this session in the debate on the