

Supply—Citizenship and Immigration

governor general's warrant was issued by order in council last summer it had, by the force of a statute, the Financial Administration Act, the quality of an appropriation, an appropriation in that respect having the same legal effect as an appropriation by an item in the appropriation bill passed by this parliament.

Now, what remains to be done to give the appropriation by this governor general's warrant that is under discussion today the final, legal, binding quality and effect? It is to be found in subsection (3):

Every warrant issued under this section shall be published in the *Canada Gazette* within 30 days after it is issued, and a statement showing all warrants issued under this section and the amounts thereof shall be laid by the minister before the House of Commons within 15 days after the commencement of the next ensuing session of parliament.

There are two requirements enacted by parliament in order that the existence of these governor general's warrants may be known. The first is publication in the *Canada Gazette*. I might tell you, Mr. Chairman, that these warrants were published in the *Canada Gazette* Part I, August 31, 1957 at page 3053. I am going to suggest to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the Leader of the Opposition that they subscribe to the *Canada Gazette* hereafter.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We get it free.

Mr. Fleming: The other requirement imposed by statute is that a statement showing the amount of the warrant should be tabled by the minister, which means the Minister of Finance, before the House of Commons within 15 days after the commencement of the next ensuing session. The next ensuing session of parliament commenced on October 14. We did not wait for the 15 days; we tabled this the next day, October 15. The law of this country has been followed to the letter by the government in this matter. We have followed the course prescribed by the sovereign parliament of Canada embodied in the Financial Administration Act.

Mr. Harrison: How about a budget?

Mr. Fleming: You would not know a budget if you saw one.

Mr. Pickersgill: Give him a chance.

Mr. Fleming: So, Mr. Chairman, we have listened to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. About 10 per cent of what he had to say was intended to be related to the matter of these warrants that were tabled in the house on October 15.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is another of the minister's inaccuracies.

[Mr. Fleming.]

Mr. Fleming: Of course, what he in effect was trying to do was to get on the record of parliament in this House of Commons a hustings speech in anticipation of an event which he and his ilk face with dread.

The Chairman: I recognize the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I note where the word "ilk" comes from so I will not pay any attention to it.

Mr. Fleming: I can assure my hon. friend that I intended no offence by the use of the word "ilk". It is a very good English word. It is also a very appropriate word.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I think I have the floor. Now that the Minister of Finance has finished his muttering I will proceed to deal with what he had to say. I shall try to do so without prejudice and certainly without passion. The minister made a great deal of the fact that the government had followed the letter of the law. Neither the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre nor the Leader of the Opposition ever said anything to the contrary.

An hon. Member: What is the argument?

Mr. Pickersgill: The argument is that they ignored the spirit of the law.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: The argument is that they ignored the practice of the constitution. The argument is that on previous occasions the appropriations in these governor general's warrants were subsequently inserted in the estimates where they could be discussed in parliament. Under a Liberal government—and previous Tory governments also—parliament was given a chance to vote on these warrants, for or against them. It is true that the expenditure could not be revoked but the government that made the expenditure could be defeated; and that is the essence of responsible government. We have now gone back to the old regime, to the old practice in the colonial legislatures where the executive informed the assembly of their expenditures and said "You have no control over them and no right to exercise any control over them or to express any opinion about them". The Acting Minister of Citizenship and Immigration did his best, by raising a point of order when the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre rose, to prevent this matter from being discussed,—

Mr. Fulton: No. It was discussed on January 30.

Mr. Pickersgill:—right in the manner of the old colonial governments, of the old family compact.

Mr. Fulton: It was discussed on January 30.