government should continue on the course. I appeal to the Minister of Justice, who is now arguing the case for the government, to give careful consideration whether he should not turn from that course, acknowledge that it is wrong and do the thing in the right way because what he is attempting to do now, if he persists, is to lay down a precedent which will be a dangerous precedent for any government to follow in the future. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said, if the government, using this as a pattern, is able to spend tens of millions of dollars, perhaps a billion dollars-

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It will be a billion.

Mr. Low: -before parliament has another opportunity to discuss and debate these things, then I say that becomes a most serious breach of the rights of parliament. I want to add my voice to the protests that have been raised today in connection with this unusual course of action. It is most unusual and one that cannot be justified by any argument that is brought forward. I would certainly find myself in the position where, if a motion were proposed, I would have to vote to censure the government for having embarked on this course unless they had the courage to back up, acknowledge their fault and take the other course which would be to give parliament a chance to say whether it approved of the amount of the governor general's warrant.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that in the twelve years I have been here I have heard such shallow arguments-

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fulton: —or seen such an attempt to whip up at the last moment an issue which has no foundation in fact.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear! Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Pickersgill: Is this the last moment?

Mr. Fulton: One can test the validity of the issue raised by reference to the words used by the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke of the hon, member for Winnipeg North Centre. In referring to the hon. member's attitude with regard to a matter of this kind he said, "-whose sincerity we all admit". I should like to ask my hon. friends opposite, did they admit his sincerity in the pipe line debate two years ago?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: I was asked a question, and I should like to answer it.

Mr. Fulton: I was here at the time. I

Supply-Citizenship and Immigration hon, gentleman and I know the opinions that

were expressed on his sincerity or otherwise by the members who composed the government of that day.

Mr. Pearson: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman; the hon, member has asked me a question, and has gone on to relate that question to our motives. The answer to that question is, yes, we all admit we respected the sincerity of the hon. member.

Mr. Fulton: I must, of course, accept the word of the hon, member. I can only say then, that they chose a very peculiar method of expression to indicate their respect.

Another proof of the validity of my contention, if we need another indication as to the lack of any depth in this issue, is in the words used by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in the last speech he made on the subject a few moments ago. He said that a press man came to him after he raised the matter-and of course when he raised it on January 30, he saw nothing wrong with it by the necessary implication of his words-and the press man said: "We did not run a story on that did we?" What a suggestion to put in front of the hon. member!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a question of privilege-

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Rea): The minister has the floor and if he wishes to allow a question to be asked, he may do so.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Will the minister permit a question?

Mr. Fulton: I would be glad to deal with questions at the end of what I have to say, but I should like to be able to present the facts in a comprehensive fashion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Is it not a fact that I allowed the minister to correct me when he said I misquoted him?

An hon. Member: Closure.

Mr. Fulton: It has been admitted, at least by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre—and I take it by implication by the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Social Credit party because they all adopted his arguments—that there is no dispute over the propriety of the expenditure made under the governor general's warrant. There is no dispute either over the propriety of using a governor general's warant under those circumstances. The only dispute, then, is over the method of informing the house as to what had been done. This house stands informed about what has been done. This house is now dealing with fought in that battle on the same side as the the question of what has been done, in the