

or Whips, or Parliamentary Secretaries but strictly in their capacity as Members. Allegations of misjudgment, or mismanagement, or maladministration on the part of a Minister in the performance of his ministerial duties, does not come within the purview of parliamentary privilege.

A thorough study of each and every one of the cases of privilege raised in the British House during a period of 20 years shows clearly that each and every one of the cases reported deal with situations where Members felt they had been adversely affected in their right to participate in parliamentary work without undue pressure, influence or accusations either from inside or outside the House. In fact nowhere in the British or Canadian precedents can there be found authority for the proposition that administrative "misdeeds" as such can be raised by way of questions of privilege.

The honourable Member for Calgary North made reference to two cases in the British House and it may be helpful if I were to summarize these two precedents.

The first one relates to what is known as the Thomas case, and that summary is as follows:

In this case Mr. Thomas resigned from the government over a budget leak in the budget of 1936. There was no question of privilege, but on May 5, 1936, Mr. Chamberlain on behalf of the government moved: "That it is expedient that a tribunal be established for inquiring into an urgent matter of public importance, that is to say, whether, and if so, in what circumstances and by what persons, any unauthorized disclosure was made of information relating to the budget for the present year or any use made of any such information for the purposes of private gain."

This motion was made under the Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act, 1921, and after debate the motion was carried, and it is known that the tribunal was set up and made a report because on June 11, 1936, a further motion was made by the Prime Minister, Mr. Baldwin, as follows: "That the report of the tribunal appointed under the Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act, 1921, be now considered."

After debate on that motion it was resolved on the main question that the report be accepted, and this occurred on June 11, 1936. In parenthesis, before the motion was moved Mr. Thomas resigned his seat having previously resigned from the Cabinet.

The point here I suggest that is relevant to our discussion was that the matter was not considered at any moment by way of question of privilege.

The second case referred to by the honourable Member for Calgary North relates to the Dalton case, and here again I summarize the proceedings in relation to that case.

On November 13, 1947, Mr. Dalton as Chancellor of the Exchequer was asked a question concerning the forecast of budget proposals in a newspaper. Mr. Dalton stated that in reply to questions put to him by the correspondent of the *Star* newspaper he had indicated to that correspondent a subject-matter contained in the publication in question. He said that this was a grave indiscretion on his part and offered his apologies to the House.

The next step occurred when Mr. Churchill put a notice or motion down for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the circumstances of the disclosures of the budget information. Mr. Churchill raised this on November 17 and, in the meantime, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had resigned.