

Supply—Citizenship and Immigration

to pursue a course which is legal in every respect because in fact the hon. member says that it was never done before?

That is the answer to my hon. friend's position. I will say this, sir, that the hon. member's description of his treatment in this house by this government, compared with the treatment my hon. friend received a couple of years ago, is far from hitting the truth. He knows that had that type of treatment been meted out he would have been cut off by special instructions and told he was out of order before he had proceeded for five minutes.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Your minister tried to do it today.

Mr. Hamilton (York West): I have answered that.

Mr. Pickersgill: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Hamilton (York West): I should like to answer this one first. My minister answered the question in this way. He said the reason he raised this point of order was that this hon. gentleman had an opportunity on two previous occasions to question the matter. I want to ask you, Mr. Chairman, do the rules in this house govern us all or is there an exception made for the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre? You know, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Do not point that Diefenbaker finger at me.

Mr. Pickersgill: Will the hon. gentleman permit my question now?

Mr. Hamilton (York West): Just let me finish with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, if it is possible to finish with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I should like to tell him that I admire his reputation and his ability to talk on the rules; I admire his ability to debate in this house. However, I want to say that there are at least 112 members on this side who would like to take part just as often as the hon. member, but I ask you, Mr. Chairman, what a shambles the House of Commons would be if there were 265 Stanley Knowles.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I, too, should keep my eye on that door in case a certain person comes in. May I say that it has been a source of amazement to discover the number of members of the Conservative party who could completely miss the issue. This has happened today on the part of the Acting Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, the Minister of Finance—

Mr. Fulton: Everybody is out of step but Stanley.

[Mr. Hamilton (York West).]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):—and the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. I suppose it is true also of all those who have been doing the applauding from the back benches. There is no question about the desirability of the object for which this money has been obtained. There is no question but that the government followed to the letter what is required in the statute, namely that a document be tabled showing a list of governor general's warrants that had been passed. But all previous governments have done that, too.

In this parliament, Mr. Chairman, we are governed not only by the letter of the law, but we are governed by tradition and practices. According to the tradition and practice of this parliament, in addition to the information to be conveyed by means of laying a document on the table, there has been included in subsequent supplementary estimates an appropriate estimate covering the amount passed by the governor general's warrants. It is that that has not been done this time. It is that that is different; it is that that is changed. It is that that has taken us around the corner. It is that that is the whole issue today. All my hon. friends opposite needed to do if they did not want this long debate, which is now longer than the minister thought it would be, was to admit that perhaps the practice of the decades of our history was correct and that they should get back on the track by doing it as it has been done before.

I am not going to take any further time by arguing, in more than a sentence or two, with these repeated assertions that I should have raised this matter earlier. If a wrong is a wrong, Mr. Chairman, a person should raise it as soon as he is aware of it. It was not until yesterday, on the basis of the facts that I obtained, that I was aware of it. This is the first opportunity I have had since then to raise the matter. Then, there is this utterly silly talk about our not being willing to challenge this government. Surely, the hon. member opposite knows that we in this corner have moved several want of confidence motions this session. We have voted for every one of those want of confidence motions we have moved. We have voted also for want of confidence motions moved by some other members of the house. Indeed, the only one for which we did not vote was that one on January 20, which suggested that the Liberals would be better than the Conservatives. This was a silly amendment. We did not vote for it because it was our belief that that decision should be made by the people of Canada. We are glad that chance is going to come soon.