

a motion for an investigation must necessarily be a substantive motion and, being a substantive motion, cannot be moved as an amendment to an original motion.

I would also point out to the house that under the reference which is made to the public accounts committee and all standing committees, persons and records may be brought before that committee; there is nothing to prevent members of the standing committee, when these matters are under discussion, from asking for the attendance of any witness, because they have that power now under the standing order; and the committee then will be the judge as to whether or not the investigation shall be completed, and if necessary they in turn can come back to the house for further instructions.

In the meantime we are faced with a motion, and, as I am of opinion, a substantive motion moved as an amendment, which is not in accordance with the rules of the house. Therefore I must rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. HARRY LEADER: (Portage la Prairie): Perhaps it will be in order for me to say a word or two, Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion. I believe I am a member of the public accounts committee, and therefore will have the opportunity to discharge my duties in that capacity. I was struck by what the Prime Minister said a few moments ago, that the members of this house owe a duty to parliament, and I presume that includes those who elected us to parliament. I believe that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas), instead of being declared out of order, should have been accepted by the Prime Minister. I have not even read the newspaper article referred to by the hon. member for Weyburn. But I have gathered that suspicion will be aroused in the minds of the taxpayers, and we should do everything within our power to see that their minds are not poisoned. If the information is false, we should see that everything is brought out into broad daylight.

I was going to give an example of what happened years ago. The auditor general's report was being discussed in the house. I had gone through that report pretty thoroughly, and I noted that the auditor general brought to our attention the fact that there had been overpayment in a department of government. I am not saying it was altogether when the Liberals were in office; it was going on when either party was in office. But the watchdog of the treasury drew the attention of the members representing the people of Canada to the fact that overpayment had been made and had never been repaid. I ran

across this also, which goes to show that something can be done even in parliament. A certain civil servant was moved from Ottawa to new duties in Calgary. He was a surveyor, receiving, if I remember correctly, a salary of over \$4,000 a year. When he was moved to Calgary he was given a living allowance, I believe about six dollars a day. After about a year he was brought back to Ottawa, and I think for two or three years after he returned to Ottawa he was still getting his salary plus living allowance.

When I noted that the auditor general drew the attention of members of parliament to the fact that these overpayments were being made, as a representative of the people I thought it my duty to bring the matter before parliament, which I did. It was in the department of the Minister of the Interior of that time. When I mentioned it he said he was not aware that that situation existed, and being very sympathetic I asked the minister if he had not the information at the time to bring it down later. He promised to do so, and later did; he said that the situation as depicted by the member for Portage la Prairie was true. I met him on the street some time later and I am not giving away any confidences—he said, "Harry, I did not know anything about that."

There is an example. Such conditions as these things existed then and perhaps they exist now. We have charges to-day, or a quotation from a civil servant, as reported in the press, and the Prime Minister should be the first to say, we must explore this to the limit. I want to make my position clear. If a vote is taken on this amendment I shall have to vote against the government. My conscience dictates nothing else.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) in the course of his remarks stated that the Prime Minister should accept the amendment. I should like to point out to the house that only during the last two weeks an amendment was accepted by the house which, as I indicated, if it had been placed before the Chair I should have ruled it out of order. Following that, within a week, another similar amendment was made and I had then to rule it out of order. I would say to the house that if the Prime Minister had moved the adoption of this amendment as part of the motion I should have felt it my duty to point out to him that it was entirely contrary to the rules of the house, and I should have to declare it out of order.