

*Privilege—Mr. Stevens; Mr. Kaplan*

a standing committee, we are only inviting difficulty. It is a well established practice of this House—and one which recommends itself, upon reflection—that events which take place in a standing committee cannot only be questioned there in the manner in which I have cited, but also in other ways, and that this Chair ought not to sit as a court of appeal in respect of the proceedings in standing committees.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** I therefore simply indicate that, this difficulty having arisen on both sides by first permitting the hon. member for York-Simcoe to establish this question of non-privilege and to speak for some time provoked responses from the other side, and in fairness it seemed to be desirable that in that situation the Chair should allow equal comment from both sides notwithstanding the fact that the Chair is firmly of the opinion that no question of privilege exists.

Accordingly, it seems to be the proper course in the future to insist that when questions of privilege are to be raised concerning events in standing committees, the notice must contain some singular feature which takes it out of the general area of the proceedings in standing committees, otherwise the Chair ought not to allow the member to raise his question in the House at all.

Finally, I will make two other observations. First, both members at one time or another suggested that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections ought to have these questions referred to it, which to me would seem to establish a precedent and initiate or encourage a practice whereby the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections would become some kind of court of appeal on the proceedings of other standing committees. It seems to me that nothing could be more unacceptable as a practice and should be more directly discouraged.

I will conclude simply by saying that if either hon. member feels that the grievance he has put forward, and which I feel compelled to set aside is still of sufficient strength that it ought to be dealt with further, the remedy of a substantive motion of censure by either member still remains, although it certainly seems to the Chair at this moment that the matter has had a pretty full airing.

**Mr. McGrath:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order because the Minister of Agriculture is about to leave the House and during the course of the question period he agreed to table certain documents with regard to the question I directed to him. I rise now to alert the minister to the fact that he will have an opportunity on the next order, or after that when tabling of documents is called, and I hope he will table these documents.

**Mr. Whelan:** Mr. Speaker, I did not say when I would table them. I will put them in proper order and proper perspective. Some of them are in the form of notes. I will put them in proper form and I hope to table them tomorrow.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[Translation]

## AGRICULTURE

Sixth and seventh reports of Standing Committee on Agriculture, in both official languages—Mr. Smith (Saint-Jean).

[Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.]

\* \* \*

## MARITIME CODE ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE A MARITIME CODE FOR CANADA

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (for the Minister of Transport)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-61, to provide a maritime code for Canada, to amend the Canada Shipping Act and other acts in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential or related provisions.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 1,227, 1,832, 1,921, 1,987, 2,080, 2,092, 2,119, 2,176, 2,226, 2,235, 2,236, 2,260, 2,263, 2,272 and 2,283.

Mr. Speaker, if question No. 1,162 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call starred question No. 2,443?

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Text]

## PRIME MINISTER'S CADILLAC

Question No. 1,227—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. With reference to the purchase from public funds of a second armoured Cadillac automobile for the Prime Minister and to the Prime Minister's subsequent statement that the purchase was made at RCMP instance (a) what are the names and positions of any and all members of the RCMP who played any part whatsoever in such instance (b) on what date and by whom in the RCMP was the final decision made to insist on such a purchase (c) on what date and by whom was such insistence conveyed to the Prime Minister (d) what part, if any, did the Solicitor General have in this entire process (e) on what date and by whom were instructions given to the Department of Supply and Services to proceed with the purchase of the car?

2. If the RCMP did not insist on such a purchase, for what reason did the Prime Minister state otherwise?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Ministry of the Solicitor General