

Ministerial Conduct

March 2, 1964, I sent him a second cheque in the amount of \$240.41, after adjustments, since some furniture items had not been received by then.

Thus, I was waiting for my last furniture delivery before making the final payment to Futurama, which did not take place before the bankruptcy.

I am still dealing with Fraser Brothers, the company which bought out Futurama and which gave me the assurance that they could complete the order and exchange some lamps, delivered to me by mistake, which did not match the selected design.

That business transaction with the Futurama company was conducted in the most normal way, and at no time did I have the impression of benefiting unduly from that company.

Any insinuation to that effect is malicious, and those who are guilty of such insinuations are assuming a heavy responsibility indeed before this house and the country as a whole.

[Text]

Mr. Speaker: I must now decide whether or not the motion now before the house to adjourn the house under standing order No. 26 should be received.

This morning we had a wide discussion as to the urgency of this matter, and it seems to me that we got into the substance of the matter to a much greater degree than necessary. I must take some responsibility in that regard.

However, we are here dealing primarily, it seems to me, with the conduct of ministers. According to paragraph 3 of the motion submitted to me in these words:

These public admissions indicate action totally inconsistent with proper conduct of ministers of the crown.

In this connection I must—I tried to do this this morning without success—refer to Bourinot's fourth edition, page 300 where the following is stated:

Certain matters cannot be debated save upon a substantive motion which can be dealt with by amendment or by distinct vote of the house, such as, the conduct of the Governor General, the Speaker or Deputy Speaker, members of either house of parliament—

This has frequently been interpreted in this country to include ministers of the crown.

Later on in the same paragraph it is stated:

For the same reason, no charges of a personal character can be raised save upon a distinct and substantive motion to that effect.

[Mr. Tremblay.]

This seems to be borne out by Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 127 (2) which reads:

Unless discussion is based upon a substantive motion drawn in proper terms, reflections must not be cast in debate upon the conduct of the sovereign, the heir to the throne or members of the Royal Family, the Governor General of a dominion, the Speaker, the chairman of ways and means, members of either house of parliament—

Again in my opinion this includes the personal conduct of ministers of the crown, and I do not see any other way of interpreting that particular subsection.

Citation 100(2) of Beauchesne's fourth edition states:

Matters arising out of the debates of the same session, or the term of a bill before the House of Lords, matters of privilege or order, or matters debatable only upon a substantive motion, cannot be submitted to the house under this standing order.

There is then a reference to standing order No. 26.

In the circumstances I regret that I cannot receive the motion which is presented for debate at this time.

COMPANIES ACT

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State) moved the first reading of Bill No. S-22 (from the Senate), to amend the Companies Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE**SEFKIND BANKRUPTCY—REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS IN TRANSACTIONS**

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question, in connection with the matter to which you have just referred, to the Minister of Justice, asking him whether or not there has been an investigation by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police into the bankruptcy of the Sefkind Brothers or the companies which they operated. Has he as Minister of Justice anyone present at the investigation by the government of the province of Quebec into fraudulent bankruptcies? Will he, in order to clear up the matter respecting the question put on the order paper by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, communicate with the trustee, Peter Christie of the firm of McDonald Currie, and empower that official to make available the documents in his possession with regard to the transactions on the part of these people or those connected with them?