

whole question of small loans as far as it desired, and I resent and deny the statement of the minister that there have been blocking tactics in order to deprive parliament of an opportunity of deciding the question. I say further that as yet adequate consideration has not been given to the subject or to the bill.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Finance): I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is no question of privilege involved in what has just been stated by the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Stevens). What I said in the committee last night was my opinion as a member of that committee. I submit that I had a perfect right to state it, and to state also my belief that it was not desirable that bills should be talked out in committee, thus depriving the House of Commons of its privilege of deciding what should be done with the bills. My opinion may not meet the views of others, but surely as a member of the committee I had a perfect right to state it and to state it here again now.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I rise again to a question of privilege. Neither the minister nor any other member of this house has any right to impute motives to any other hon. member, and the minister states brazenly now that he repeats it.

Mr. DUNNING: I rise to a point of order—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the Minister of Finance has imputed any motives to the hon. member for Kootenay East. The minister is simply expressing his opinion.

Mr. DUNNING: I ask for the withdrawal of the word "brazenly," which is out of order.

Mr. STEVENS: I am speaking to a question of privilege. The minister stated it was clear from the minority votes of that committee—

Mr. DUNNING: No, I made no such statement. My hon. friend is again contravening the rules of the house by purporting to quote from the proceedings of a committee, and is distorting the words which I used. I submit that the matter is out of order.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister and the house permit me to read the record?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has stated his point of privilege sufficiently

to suit his purpose; the Minister of Finance has made his statement, and I do not believe there is anything further to add.

COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT

PROVISION FOR ADMINISTRATION BY COMMISSIONER UNDER MINISTER OF LABOUR

The house resumed from Thursday, April 1, 1937, consideration in committee of Bill No. 41, to amend and consolidate the Combines Investigation Act and amending act—Mr. Rogers—Mr. Sanderson in the chair.

On section 20—Investigation into business of alleged parties to combine.

Mr. BENNETT: With respect to this section, no doubt the minister will recall the Wilkes case and the declaration of law made in England in connection with the issue of warrants, general warrants, search warrants and matters of that sort. Here, without anything other than this statement in the section, we are authorizing the commissioner to enter premises and seize books. I followed the remarks of the minister yesterday, and I agree that it is desirable that in your desire to protect the rights of the subject you should not so protect them that the law cannot be enforced or administered. On the other hand, however, this British country has been extremely careful about that. While I can understand this statute being passed in the form in which it was at the time in question, it is a little difficult in this day to understand why we should be asked to authorize a man to enter the premises of another and take his books, documents or records without warrant other than this.

The criminal code provides for a warrant, and it provides the procedure that has to be followed in order to secure a warrant. During the night I happened to think of the Wilkes case, which is on all fours with this sort of thing. Public opinion was very much agitated by the Wilkes case and the conclusion at which the courts arrived in connection with it. I think it was Lord Ellenborough, although I have not had time to look it up this morning, who delivered that great judgment with respect to the issue of warrants. Here, without a search warrant, without anything in the world, the commissioner has authority, not to deal with the person against whom he has a charge, but "any person who the commissioner believes may be a party or privy to" it. He may walk straight into that person's office, including the office of the solicitor who he may believe has assisted in the formation of the combine. Not only he, but his duly authorized representatives may enter and ex-