

procedural points that have been raised during the course of the afternoon, for we are now talking about referring the matter to a committee.

**Mr. Kindt:** No.

**Mr. McIlraith:** I understood that to be the point of the remarks made by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona. If I am correct in that assumption, it seems to me that the house requires to know the precise language of the charge so that the house can pass upon it. It seems to me also that the charge is of such a serious nature that its form and the reference to the committee should not be something haphazard. The house should not be asked to give unanimous consent to some vague, nebulous proposals which are not clear.

**Mr. Nugent:** Would the minister permit a question at this point?

**Mr. McIlraith:** I wonder if I could make my point and then I will be glad to take the question? The essence of a charge of this nature, whether or not there was improper conduct on the part of a minister, is the language used. The difficulties of the language, must be apparent to all hon. members who have heard the exchanges between the hon. member who raised the matter and those members on this side who asked him questions. In all the circumstances the only proper procedure as I see it is to have a charge precisely drafted and laid before the house. A precise motion could be made and consideration could be given as to the committee to which it should be referred. We have the Prime Minister's assurance that when that is done there will be no delay of any kind in having the matter proceeded with immediately. Surely any lesser method is going to be a careless abuse of the rights of parliament, the very thing about which hon. members are complaining.

There is one other small point. The hon. member has made repeated references to and has quoted from an affidavit. He is, of course, obligated to table that affidavit. I assume that will be done in the ordinary way, since he has quoted from it.

**Mr. Nugent:** May I—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, in reply to what has been said

*Motion for Adjournment*

by the Minister of Public Works, surely the responsibility for the wording of the charge and the responsibility for drafting the motion referring this matter to the committee on privileges and elections lies exclusively with the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona who is making the charge.

**Mr. McIlraith:** Exactly.

**Mr. Douglas:** I see no reason why we should be arguing about the terminology of the motion or why the government should try to get its finger into the pie.

**Mr. McIlraith:** Perhaps the hon. member will permit a question?

**Mr. Douglas:** I did not interrupt the minister. May I make this point, Mr. Speaker. If Your Honour had decided earlier—I am not quarrelling with your decision—to allow the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona to proceed with the question of privilege, then he would have moved a motion setting forth the charge and placing whatever documents he has at the disposal of the house. The house could then have chosen whether or not to refer that motion to the committee on privileges and elections.

It seems to me there is no need to wait until tomorrow or to have a conference about the wording. If the house is unanimous in agreeing to revert to the question of privilege, and if His Honour is willing to recognize the opinion of the house in this matter and withdraw any objection to allowing the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona to move his motion and make his statement, the house could then decide whether or not it wants to pass the motion to refer the whole question to the committee on privileges and elections. I see no reason at all why this matter has to wait until tomorrow or why we have to have an extended debate on it. The hon. member can make his speech when he lays the charge and move his motion and the minister can make a reply at that time if he chooses. The house will then decide whether or not it is of sufficient importance to refer the matter to the committee on privileges and elections.

**Mr. McIlraith:** I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question in order to clarify his remarks? Would he not agree it would be preferable, before the house reverts to the question of privilege, if we were told the precise charge the hon. member wants to make? What he appears to be saying now is something less than that kind of charge with