

this man may have come. If he is not deported with his wife, it means that she and her child are to be left in Canada and her husband sent overseas—a family absolutely broken up. Those members of the house who a few years ago objected so strongly to divorce, might I think, very well have something to say about a forcible divorce of that kind, where the head of the family is taken away and the dependent wife and family are left in this country.

Further, the minister says that every opportunity will be given for appeal. Let me read the notice to be sent to the person ordered to be deported:

If you claim to be a Canadian citizen or to have acquired Canadian domicile, you have the right to consult counsel and appeal to the courts against deportation.

These people, I believe, are not naturalized, hence they do not come under the first paragraph of this section. I go on:

In all other cases you may appeal to the Minister of Immigration and Colonization against any decision of the board of inquiry or officer in charge whereby you are ordered to be deported unless such decision is based upon a certificate of the examining medical officer that you are affected with a loathsome disease or a disease which may become dangerous to the public health. The formal notice of appeal will be supplied to you by the immigration officer in charge upon request and upon deposit of the sum of twenty dollars for the cost of your maintenance and the sum of ten dollars for the maintenance of each person dependent upon you until the minister has decided upon your case.

It is that second part of the section which applies to these particular people, and unless they can produce the twenty dollars and the ten dollars for each dependent they have no chance even for an appeal. That is a very serious state of affairs. You take a man quickly away from where he lives without giving him any opportunity to obtain ready cash, and move him two thousand miles from where his friends are located, and it is almost impossible for him to make an appeal to the minister. The result is that he is clapped on board ship and is on his way across the Atlantic without even a chance for an appeal. I know that the Minister of Justice cannot think that that is a fair sort of trial. He must realize that an appeal of that kind is a mere sham. I would urge upon him, as Minister of Justice and as a member of the government, to see to it that these people, whatever their crimes may be, are given a fair trial in Canada.

Item agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—MR. MACKENZIE KING

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): While the Minister of Justice who is acting as leader of the

house is dealing with complaints with respect to what appears in the press, I should like to make mention of another matter which affects vitally the privileges of this house.

I have before me a copy of the Ottawa Journal of this evening, and the headline across the page reads:

Roche, MacTavish, Tremblay to be retired. New Civil Service Commission, two or three members, is advice of committee. Report contains severe criticism of service governing body. Praise is given Charles H. Bland. Post offices under \$3,000 class taken away from commission.

The news column itself sets forth what purports to be the findings of the special committee to which were referred certain matters pertaining to the Civil Service Act and its administration. I have just been asking one of the members of the committee as to whether or not the committee has made its report, and he advises me that it has not. How near this report which appears in to-night's paper may be to any draft which has been before the committee I am not in a position to say, but there is internal evidence, I submit, which will be apparent when the report is brought down, to suggest that in some way the Ottawa Journal has obtained either a draft of the report that has been before the committee or something very similar to it. Naturally I cannot say who is responsible at all for the representations respecting the committee's findings as they appear in this article, but I think a statement should come from the government immediately repudiating the report and repudiating any action on the part of any journal which purports to deal with matters which are before committees of this house or publishes reports of its committees before hon. members themselves have been given any information. It is a gross injustice to the persons whose names are mentioned in the report, and it is a breach of the privileges of this house that a report on a matter that is before a committee of the House of Commons should be presented in this form to the public before hon. members themselves have received the fullest information. I would like the hon. Minister of Justice who at the moment is leading the house to express his views with regard to this matter.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Minister of Justice): If this is a proper time to bring this matter up, Mr. Chairman, and I do not think it is—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A matter affecting the privileges of either house of parliament can be raised at any time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: At any time.