

May I refer honourable Members to Abraham and Hawtrey's Parliamentary Dictionary, at page 40, where it is stated: "What the Speaker has to decide is whether, assuming that the facts are as stated, the conduct complained of could reasonably be held to be a breach of privilege."

As honourable Members know, it is for the Speaker to determine points of order as they arise, and in the situation before the House, even though a *prima facie* case did obtain, for the reasons I have explained I cannot come to the conclusion that any of the motions moved yesterday are in order.

---

And debate continuing;

The honourable Member for Lapointe, (Mr. Grégoire), seconded by Mr. Caouette, proposed to move,—That the House recommends to the government that the subject-matter of the statements made by the Minister of Justice in the House of Commons on Friday, March 4, 1966; his subsequent statements made on Thursday, March 10, 1966, relating to the Munsinger Case and the complaint of the honourable Member for Calgary North based thereon be referred to a judicial enquiry for examination and report.

Mr. Speaker ruled the proposed motion out of order on the grounds that it was in the nature of a substantive motion, and as such required due notice.

And debate continuing;

The honourable Member for Ontario (Mr. Starr), seconded by Mr. Dinsdale, proposed to move,—That this House call upon the Minister of Justice to substantiate the charges and allegations he has made against the Leader of the Opposition and members of the Privy Council of the former government.

#### RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Ontario, seconded by the honourable Member for Brandon-Souris, has moved that the House call upon the Minister of Justice to substantiate the charges and allegations he has made against the Leader of the Opposition and Members of the Privy Council of the former government. I wonder whether there is any point in asking honourable Members to address the Chair as to the admissibility of the motion. I should point out to the honourable Member that this motion is substantially the same as the three that were moved yesterday. I think it would be unfair to the House for me to read again the judgment I have delivered, but I will do so if the honourable Member wishes. I have given the reasons why I think this type of motion cannot be received. I, therefore, rule that this motion is also out of order.

*And later—*

MR. SPEAKER: I understand the case to which the honourable Member referred was one which affected the Chair and the Speaker which is why that procedure was followed at that time.

For the benefit of honourable Members, perhaps I should read again a part of the ruling which I read a moment ago and which applies to the motion just proposed by the honourable Member for Ontario.

I made reference to Mr. Speaker Michener's decision of Friday, June 19, 1959, when I ruled on the first motion yesterday, and it seems to me that this also applies to the motion just proposed by the honourable Member. The proposed motions are invalid also on the basis of the opinion expressed by Mr.