

*Supply—Citizenship and Immigration*

The minister says that every right of censure over the government is preserved by the course now being followed. He knows, because he is a student of Beauchesne and all these other chaps, that there is a citation in Beauchesne, No. 480, of the third edition, which reads as follows:

The only motion allowed, when a resolution is under consideration in committee of supply, is that the amount be reduced or that the chairman leave the chair either without making a report or to report progress on certain resolutions.

There are only two motions that I can make at this moment. One would be to reduce the amount of the estimate—

**Mr. Fulton:** That would be a vote of censure.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**—and the other would be to ask the chairman to rise.

**An hon. Member:** Let us do that.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** But I do not disagree with this vote of \$8 million. I approve it. I am not going to move for its reduction, and if I were to move that you, sir, leave the chair, that would be a motion against passing this \$8 million.

**Mr. Fulton:** It is an accepted method of censure, and you are ducking this again.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I will at least give hon. gentlemen opposite credit for smiling. The hon. member for Renfrew South, like the Minister of Justice, is actually laughing at the suggestion that we would duck an issue or run away from it in this parliament. They know what we have done since this parliament met. We are not going to be placed in the dishonest position in which the minister wants to place us. We approve of this item of \$8 million. We approve of the additional expenditure of \$2,428,000, which was made available for this item by means of the governor general's warrant, and we are not going to take any action which would reduce the amount of money available for this purpose; and the Minister of Justice will not make any yardage by taking that attitude, because everyone in this committee is for it.

What we want is something that is not open to a private member to move. What we want is this estimate of \$8 million to be raised to \$10,428,000 so that it will include the amount of \$2,428,000 which was appropriated in cabinet council, within those four walls, by order in council last August, and I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that if the minister will bring in such an increase or bring in another item, we will vote for it, and I think every member of this committee would vote for it. But what hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem

to realize is that even though we are prepared to vote for a resolution, that does not mean that parliament is being satisfied when it is not being given a chance to do so.

The same thing is, apparently, going to happen again in the next few months. The estimates before parliament this year total some \$5,600 million of which about \$2 billion are statutory expenditures, leaving about \$3,600 million to be passed in the estimates. Interim supply has provided for about five-sixths of those estimates, which means that about \$600 million of the estimates have not been provided for, and even the amount for which provision has been made has been secured on an undertaking by the Minister of Finance that we would get the chance to discuss all those items. So, Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$600 million is likely to be spent in the balance of this fiscal year without parliament having the chance to vote on this expenditure, and if an election is coming—and we all know it is—there will be another two months in the new fiscal year before parliament can meet and vote supply. I estimate that aside from statutory items, expenditure is running at about \$300 million a month. So there is another \$600 million from April 1, until parliament is able to meet again and vote money. Add \$600 million before April 1 to \$600 million after April 1 and you arrive at a sum of the order of \$1,200 million—over a billion—which will be passed by order in council. That is the pattern which this minister and this government are now introducing to parliament, and it is such that parliament will have no chance to discuss these items at all, either in this parliament, or in the next parliament or at any time in the future.

The blue book of estimates we have been kicking around for 10 or 11 months will be down the drain. We will never see it again. The new book of estimates will have the first part in it, but it will not be discussed by parliament at all. That is what flows from the attitude the minister is taking now and it seems to me that the hon. gentleman, whom I have always regarded as a wise man, would have been much wiser if he had admitted that perhaps the old course was a better one, and had said to the House of Commons that if a majority of members felt the government should reconsider the matter any governor general's warrants would be dealt with in the old way in the future.

I will repeat the point I have been making from the time this issue was first raised. I think the issue is one of great seriousness. It is a case of taking parliament around the corner and down a dangerous path as far as parliamentary control over expenditure is concerned. And the minister, I think, should