

Here we have a committee with a Liberal majority which is challenging the views of one of that party's greatest leaders, a man who said that the cabinet, not the bank, should have the last word, because the cabinet represents the people of the country.

Mr. Coyne said that there was no disagreement with this Government. In a statement dated June 19, accompanying his brief of February 15, he wrote:

I am not in favour of imposing controls or restrictions.

But what do we find in this brief? This is what he proposes:

1. A restriction of imports by a tariff surcharge of 10 per cent.

2. A restriction on the free import of automobile parts up to 40 per cent of their value.

3. A restriction of the free entry of tourist purchases by imposition of a Canadian sales tax, and imposition of customs duties on tourist purchases.

4. A restriction on Canadian travel in the United States.

5. A restriction on automobile mileage by—

(a) a federal sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel oil;

(b) toll charges on certain highways and bridges.

6. A restriction of the consumption of various luxury items by new and higher taxes on these and on personal income.

7. A restriction of the "present indiscriminate three-year exemption of new mine operations from income tax".

8. A restriction of the present "standard depreciation schedules".

The committee found that Mr. Coyne did not misconduct himself while in office. How about his oath of office? Mr. Coyne said he was attacked and, therefore, he had to defend himself and was no longer bound by his oath. He said he had the right to divulge any secret documents that he thought fit to divulge. But we must remember that when he joined the bank, in 1938, he took his oath of office without any reservation whatsoever. Is it because the man thinks he is attacked that he can take it upon himself to break his oath of office and publish anything he desires? Even his most tenacious supporters are not certain of themselves on this ground. For instance, Mr. Martin, in the House of Commons on July 7, 1961, in talking about the oath of office, had this to say:

I do not rise to defend any disclosure made by the Governor of the Bank of

Canada, which may after proper determination be regarded as a violation of an oath taken by senior Government officials.

But the Senate committee did defend the disclosure.

I think the report of the committee should have read thus:

The committee does not report the bill.

That would have been the end of it. I do not think the committee had any power to decide on the guilt or innocence of the Governor of the Bank of Canada, because there was no such question before it. There was no question of misconduct. There was merely the question as to whether this man had disagreed with the Minister of Finance to such an extent that the situation was untenable, and he had to go. That is the sole question before this house.

Hon. Mr. Hugessen: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question? He says that there was no accusation of misconduct against the governor prior to May 30. Did he hear what I read from the statement of the Minister of Finance, that the governor had been guilty of a serious dereliction of duty? Does he tell us that that is not an allegation of misconduct?

Hon. Mr. Choquette: I would take that to apply to the question of the breaking of his oath. I am still of the opinion—

Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Brantford): Question!

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Question!

Hon. A. J. Brooks: Honourable senators, it is not my intention to prolong this debate to any extent. I think everything that can be said in this matter has been said. There is one point, however, which I would like to make. I had no expectation, and I think very few members of the committee had, that this bill would not be reported back to the Senate for third reading. The honourable senator from Inkerman (Hon. Mr. Hugessen) has given the reason why he thinks it was not necessary to do so, and why a motion to that effect was defeated in the committee. His reason is that Mr. Coyne has promised to resign. But we have no definite reason to expect from Mr. Coyne's promise that he will resign. Personally, I do not doubt that he will. I cannot say that such an event will or will not occur. But I do think that there would have been some justification for the committee not reporting the bill back to the Senate if Mr. Coyne had actually resigned. If he had resigned yesterday as he promised, and if his resignation had been sent by him to the Minister of Finance, then there would have