

Mr. Booth stating that the Minister had not agreed to be bound in advance by such a valuation; (5) That Mr. Pallett transmitted to the Minister's executive assistant the valuation reports made by Mr. Clare; (6) That Mr. Clare was not a free and independent appraiser; (7) That according to Mr. Clare's own admission, Mr. Pallett instructed him to put as generous a valuation as possible on the properties and that Mr. Clare told Mr. A. A. Speer, the Department of Transport's District Land Agent, that it was difficult for him to carry out his instructions; (8) That Mr. Clare's land valuations were quite erroneous and excessive and that his property valuations were out of line with other valuations and settlements made in the Malton area.

That, in view of these affirmations in the aforementioned document, the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to examine into the actions and statements of the Hon. Member for Peel (Mr. Pallett) in connection with the valuation and expropriation of the said properties; to report generally on these matters, and in particular to consider and report whether the conduct of the Hon. member was contrary to the usage or derogatory to the dignity of the House or inconsistent with the standards which Parliament is entitled to expect from its members.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: It is my responsibility to rule upon a point of order which arose on Wednesday last and was then debated at length and with vigour. I wish to thank the several honourable Members, representative of all parties, who gave the House the benefit of their views.

The question was whether or not the Notice of Motion relating to the conduct of the honourable Member for Peel, which had been given by the Leader of the Opposition, properly raised a *prima facie* question of privilege for determination by the House through its Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to which the motion would refer the matter for examination and report.

The question is of considerable importance. If the Notice of Motion properly raises a question of the privileges of the House, it is entitled under Standing Order 17 to be taken into consideration immediately, all other business being laid aside until the debate is concluded.

On the other hand, if the motion is not to be regarded as one of privilege, the motion would have to take its turn with other Notices of Motions by private Members which at this stage of the session would mean that it had very little prospect of being called even if in fact it is entitled at all to be placed on the Order Paper. The subject matter could be raised and in fact has been raised in the House and debated in other ways.

The factual basis for the motion as it appears in the Notice itself and in the arguments put forth in the House is simple. It is that the President of the Exchequer Court, Mr. Justice Thorson, in his reasons for judgment, sessional paper No. 237, makes certain affirmations about the honourable Member for Peel. These affirmations are summarized in items (1) to (8) in the Notice of Motion. Perhaps the House will permit me to dispense with reading these as all Members have them.

It is noteworthy: (1) That the judgment is a public document but is not a document required to be submitted to the House of Commons. (2) It became a sessional paper by leave of the House when the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) tabled it in response to a request from a Member of the Opposition. (3) The reasons for the judgment were given in cross-actions between Aileen M. Drew and Her Majesty the Queen, which arose from the expropriation of the property of Aileen M. Drew on February 12, 1954, for the Malton Airport,