

Examples of the sort of conduct which amount to a breach of privilege or which disqualify a Member are the taking of an office of profit, as I have said, entering into contracts with the Government which involve a payment or advantage to the Member, in both of which cases there are elements of personal gain, conviction of treason or other felonious crimes. The honourable Member's conduct was not of that order. It may have been "immature", as one honourable Member characterized it, but putting the worst construction on it I do not find that it was the sort of conduct which the House has punished in the past.

If there is some doubt in the matter I am clear that the benefit of the doubt should be given to the unaccused.

I should feel happier if this decision could be made by the House, but there seems to be no means by which that can be done except by the usual process of appeal from the ruling which I am now making.

In finding that a question of the privileges of the House is not *prime facie* involved in this motion, I am making a procedural decision the effect of which will not prevent the further discussion by the House of the matters in issue. The effect is to refuse precedence to this discussion but not to prevent it. No barrier is raised to the presentation of this matter under different circumstances on another occasion. For example, the subject matter could be brought before the House as an amendment to the next motion to go into Supply. I should add too that the debate on the point of order on Wednesday and the discussion of the same matter on the estimates of the Minister of Transport were so broad that there would be little left to be said if the motion itself were to be debated this morning.

Therefore the Notice of Motion standing in the name of the Leader of the Opposition will be removed from Routine Proceedings on the Order Paper and dealt with under paragraph 4 of Standing Order 15.

From this ruling, Mr. Pearson appealed to the House.

And the Members having been called in;

MR. SPEAKER: The question is an appeal to the House from a decision of the Chair as follows: "That the Notice of Motion standing in the name of the Leader of the Opposition does not involve a *prima facie* case of a breach of the privileges of the House of Commons on the part of the honourable Member for Peel, and that such notice is to be removed from 'Routine Proceedings' on the Order Paper and dealt with under paragraph 4 of Standing Order 15."

And the question being put by Mr. Speaker:

Shall the decision of the Chair be sustained?—It was decided in the affirmative on the following division:

YEAS

MESSRS:

Aiken,	Balcer,	Beech,	Belzile,
Aitken (Miss),	Baldwin,	Bell (Carleton),	Bissonnette,
Allmark,	Barrington,	Bell (Saint John-	Brooks,
Anderson,	Baskin,	Albert),	Broome,