

Order Paper Questions

commercial and fishing vessels in accordance with regulations of the governor in council", listed in the details of the printed estimates for 1970-71, five years earlier. Vote 5 read as follows:

Trade-Industrial—The grants listed in the estimates and contributions and to increase to \$150,000,000 the commitments during the current and subsequent fiscal years for payments to develop and sustain the technological capability of Canadian defence industry, and to increase to \$60,000,000 the commitments during the current and subsequent fiscal years for payments to advance the technological capability of Canadian manufacturing industry by supporting selected civil (non-defence) development projects.

On the basis of that vote six years later the government enacted regulations giving it the power to pay out moneys in connection with the shipbuilding program. Those are the dangers the House and the people of this country face if this kind of practice is allowed to continue without some caveat filed by us which is given serious consideration by Your Honour.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I certainly want to thank all hon. members who contributed to this discussion. As has been described, it is far from an incidental aspect of our procedures. It touches very fundamentally upon the right of parliament to function, the right to examine the spending program and to control the spending program through parliamentary votes, which is perhaps the most fundamental aspect of the work of parliament.

● (1640)

In conjunction with that is the legislative role. It is clear that some statement ought to be attempted to separate those powers which the House possesses by way of supply and those powers which the House possesses by way of legislation. That is not a task that I look forward to with particular relish. It is an important task. It is a statement that I will attempt in the hope that it may assist the House in guiding itself in future procedures. It is a responsibility which I take very seriously.

I thank all the hon. members for their very conscientious and well thought-out presentations on the subject. I note that the last allotted day in the supply period is tomorrow. The first reading of the supply bill will be given in accordance with our slightly modified practices of recent date. By the order passed earlier today, the second reading of that bill is deferred until some other time. Is my impression incorrect?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the supplementary estimates, with contain all these \$1 items, are to be completed tomorrow night. It is the interim supply bill that has been put off until Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: During the course of the argument, I took a quick look at the order to see what impact it had, and I wondered if we were not leaving ourselves open to the deferral of a portion of the decision we would have to face tomorrow night. In any case, if it is possible to do so we will work around the clock to try to come forward with whatever statement I ought to make on this question just as soon as we possibly can.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

There was an indication, during motions, when the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants was called that there had been some arrangement whereby his motion would be called during orders of the day.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, my understanding was that this matter would be proceeded with after presentation of the report of the statutory instruments committee.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that we proceed with the immigration bill under orders of the day?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

AMENDMENTS TO IMPLEMENT CHANGES IN IMMIGRATION POLICY

The House resumed, from Wednesday, March 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. Cullen that Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, members may recall that on the closing of the debate on this measure last Wednesday I was mentioning that it seems to me, in dealing with Bill C-24, that we have before us a basic change in terms of ultimate concepts, if not in terms of practices. I have before me a pamphlet that is widely available in immigration offices throughout the world and our own immigration office here. It is called "How Canada Selects Immigrants". It begins by responding to the question, "Who can apply?" The answer is given, "Anyone can apply to come to Canada. There is no quota on the number of immigrants who may be admitted from any area or country".

Theoretically, that has been the position of the government for many years, and certainly particularly so since the white paper about ten years ago. What we have been launched on over the last two or three years, particularly with the publication of the green paper, and subsequently with the work of the joint committee, has been an attempt to move away from that position with the very active encouragement of the government. I suppose that is the reason the committee, in issuing its report, said in section 29:

For these reasons, the committee recommends a shift from the present immigration system, which allows for the admission of everyone meeting certain criteria regardless of numbers, to a more managed system capable of regulating the total flow. However, the proposed system must do this in a fair and non-discriminatory, efficient, and manageable way.