

*Alleged Leak re New Airport Site*

After debate on that motion it was resolved on the main question that the report be accepted, and this occurred on June 11, 1936. In parenthesis, before the motion was moved Mr. Thomas resigned his seat having previously resigned from the cabinet.

The point here I suggest that is relevant to our discussion was that the matter was not considered at any moment by way of question of privilege.

The second case referred to by the hon. member for Calgary North relates to the Dalton case, and here again I summarize the proceedings in relation to that case.

On November 13, 1947, Mr. Dalton as Chancellor of the Exchequer was asked a question concerning the forecast of budget proposals in a newspaper. Mr. Dalton stated that in reply to questions put to him by the correspondent of the *Star* newspaper he had indicated to that correspondent a subject matter contained in the publication in question. He said that this was a grave indiscretion on his part and offered his apologies to the house.

The next step occurred when Mr. Churchill put a notice of motion down for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the circumstances of the disclosures of the budget information. Mr. Churchill raised this on November 17, and in the meantime the Chancellor of the Exchequer had resigned.

On November 20 the question was proposed on Mr. Churchill's motion and it was agreed to. That motion reads:

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into all the circumstances relating to or associated with the disclosure of budget information by Mr. Dalton, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, on Wednesday 12th November:

That Messrs.—

Then follows the names of committee members.

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records—

And there is also reference to the quorum.

It is of interest of course to note, and again I suggest to hon. members that this is the important point of these two cases which were quoted by the hon. member for Calgary North, that although there were substantive motions made to the house for the consideration of alleged improprieties on the part of cabinet ministers the consideration which took place was not by way of reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections—was not founded on a question of privilege but rather on substantive motions.

[Mr. Speaker.]

In the time at my disposal I have been able to find but one case in our own house in over 100 years of proceedings where the conduct of a minister has been subject to review by means of question of privilege.

On May 22, 1924, an hon. member raised a question with regard to the conduct of the then minister of labour and stated that he was credibly informed and that he believed he was able to establish by satisfactory evidence that the then minister did withdraw from the Home Bank thousands of dollars on deposit therein to his credit, using certain information he had received, as such minister, of the likely immediate failure of said bank, and had received advantage and profit to himself to the extent of such withdrawals, contrary to his obligations as such minister in derogation of his office and the honour, dignity and traditions of parliament.

This precedent, I suggest, was outside the administrative responsibility of the minister in that he used cabinet information to his own personal advantage. It was not a matter of administration but a question of his personal honesty, integrity and conduct. This is the one instance we have in all the precedents. In this instance the matter was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

• (3:10 p.m.)

In closing I could do no better than refer the house to the decision of Mr. Speaker Michener on June 19, 1959 in which he stated:

In finding that a question of the privileges of the House is not prima facie involved in this motion, I am making a procedural decision the effect of which will not prevent the further discussion by the House of the matters in issue. The effect is to refuse precedence to this discussion but not to prevent it. No barrier is raised to the presentation of this matter under different circumstances on another occasion. For example, the subject matter could be brought before the House as an amendment to the next motion to go into Supply. I should add too that the debate on the point of order on Wednesday and the discussion of the same matter on the estimates of the Minister of Transport were so broad that there would be little left to be said if the motion itself were to be debated this morning.

Hon. members have now or will have within the next few days or next few weeks an opportunity if they so wish as members of the opposition to bring this matter back, perhaps as a matter of no confidence. I suggest to hon. members that if they wish this matter to be considered further it should be dealt with in this way either by substantive motion or by a motion of no confidence in the government.