

in 1964. Let me repeat now what I said then. I said, "What, in the House of Commons, do we do to protect the innocent in our zeal to get at the guilty?"

The furniture dealings ruined the careers of two hon. members. The contribution of one of them to the Canada Council has never been fully realized in this county. The other hon. member is a good man who came here, as you and I and as the rest of us have come here, in the interests of the country. His career has been ruined.

An hon. Member: He resigned.

Mr. Mackasey: He was completely exonerated. I thought everybody knew this. His name came into the Dorion case, and I am not blaming anybody for that. His name was dragged into that probe as part of the evidence, as part of the inferences drawn, as part of skilful manoeuvrings. I did ask at the time who would protect him if he was found innocent of wrongdoing, as indeed he was. I think it is a great shame, when the Dorion report was tabled, that the house did not officially apologize to that man who was completely exonerated by a judge.

When we finished with the furniture deals, Mr. Speaker, was that the end of the disturbing atmosphere in this house? No. It was only the beginning of an attitude and of an atmosphere that is leading to the self-destruction of all parties of the house, because shortly after that we embarked on an election campaign. The tenor of the election campaign unfortunately was set by the tone of the house when it dissolved.

Therefore, as though it were smoke coming out of a bottle, that spirit of belligerence and hostility which marked the Dorion debate, which marked the debate on the furniture business, came into the question period, and carried on into election time.

I have a file here. I will read a few comments from it into the record tomorrow. These are headlines that made news across Canada. I would ask the older members of the house, from the New Democratic Party, from the Liberal party, or from the front bench of the Conservative party to compare these headlines with the types of headlines that you traditionally see in the heat of an election campaign, either out west, in the east or in central Canada. We all expect a little freedom, a little licence and a little irresponsibility in an election campaign. But how irresponsible do you get? Take the *Toronto Star* for instance—

23033—293½

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

[Translation]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

[English]

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS—INQUIRY AS TO PRESENTATION OF FIRST REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, on December 20, 1963, two and a half years ago, the committee on privileges and elections under the chairmanship of the hon. gentleman who is now the Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell) considered the Canada Elections Act, but did not complete its studies at that time. In its final report to the house the committee unanimously recommended, and I quote from the *Journals* of that year, at page 765:

—that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be empowered to study the Canada Elections Act, at the earliest possible date next session with a view to affording this committee an opportunity for exhaustive and constructive examination and study of the said act.

That was in 1963. Even though the Prime Minister has been asked on a number of occasions since that time to carry out the wishes recommended unanimously by that committee, he has failed to carry out those legitimate requests and has denied the committee the opportunity to study fully and completely the Canada Elections Act, as has been the practice for quite a number of years.

Some two months ago I moved that the committee report to the house, and that the Canada Elections Act be referred to it for study. That motion of mine was carried unanimously in the committee. There was not a whisper of objection to the idea that we should complete the examination begun in 1963.

We waited in vain for the committee to report. The chairman, the hon. member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. McWilliam) who is not here this evening, said in answer to one question of mine that someone had objected to the proceedings of the committee. But this was a unanimous decision. So we must ask ourselves: Who objected, and for what reason?

The only conclusion one can reach is that one of the close supporters of the government