

*Immigration*

not desired in this country. The Canadian government has so few processing teams on the continent to examine would-be Canadians that it is utterly impossible to bring in any great number.

It is high time that the government reviewed its policy of exclusion. I submit that we should have an immigration board made up not merely of government employees or of influential employers of labour but of representatives of the congresses of labour. Such a board could advise the government on immigration matters and assist in selecting the type of person that should be admitted and not have the selection made only by large-scale employers. This board could help to plan development of our resources in such a way that they could be used for the benefit of all Canadians, not just for the benefit of those who have capital or who have acquired capital and want to exploit these resources on their own terms.

In the meantime the federal government should consider the requests made by Canadian citizens who desire the admission of their own relatives. A more sympathetic ear should be given to these requests and less obstruction should be placed in the way of those who desire to come to Canada.

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has its own employees in charge of colonization schemes and they are represented on the Canadian Christian council for the resettlement of refugees. The result is that these refugees are brought to Canada on terms suitable to the Canadian Pacific Railway. A few months ago I asked a question as to how many officials of the C.P.R. were members of the council for the resettlement of refugees. The answer given at that time was, one. Upon inquiry of the officials of the Canadian-German league I have found that that answer was false. Actually, there are three highly placed officials of the Canadian Christian council for the resettlement of refugees who are also employees of the Canadian Pacific Railway's land settlement group. That is not satisfactory to those people who may want to use other vehicles than those provided by the Canadian Pacific Railway for entry into this country.

I should like to ask, too, that the government make the staff of the department of immigration a little more sympathetic to the desire of those people to enter Canada. I cannot make that too emphatic. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that some people in the department have an abhorrence to granting the request of any of our Canadians for the entry of their relatives. A few weeks ago a charge was made in the House of Commons by the member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart) to the effect that certain highly

placed officials of the French Nazi party were admitted to Canada against the wishes of the French government. This party objects to that sort of thing and we fight against it with all the power we have. The people who desire the benefits of what democracy we have in Canada should find it as easy as possible to come to this country.

**Mr. Jackman:** The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has remarked that there were many things on his mind which he would like to take up on behalf of his constituents. I am sure if he were to examine the desires of his people at home he would find that they have a slight interest at least in the expenditure of some \$400 million for which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) is now asking by way of interim supply.

I am sure that practically all members of this house would like to have some investigation of the estimates and the expenditures and some examination of the budget before this parliament dissolves. It is hard to believe, Mr. Chairman, that Canadians are living in the year 1949, in a country which is governed by British institutions. When was there a case where a budget was brought down, where estimates were tabled, where a public accounts committee was set up to examine the expenditures of the previous year, and parliament dissolved forthwith?

When this house voted interim supply on March 29, the Minister of Finance said, at page 2148 of *Hansard*:

As I have said, the form of this bill is exactly the same as in previous years, and the passing of the bill does not prejudice the rights and privileges of members of the House of Commons to criticize any of the individual items in the estimates. And I give the usual undertaking that such rights and privileges will be respected and will not be curtailed or restricted in any way as a result of passing this interim supply measure.

What do we find, sir? We find what is perhaps one of the finest examples of hair-splitting ever witnessed. The Minister of Finance says that that undertaking is just the usual undertaking of a minister of finance when he asks for interim supply. He goes on to explain that, when he said that members of parliament would have an opportunity of investigating the various expenditures, he meant not necessarily the members of this parliament but the members of some subsequent Canadian parliament.

What do we find the situation to be? This government has not given the members of this parliament an opportunity, on behalf of their people at home, to investigate the expenditures of the previous year. The public accounts committee which has been called has had one meeting—I think only one. No opportunity has been afforded the members