

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

the question in the letter he did not add those words.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I can assure the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that it would make no difference which way they are put, but I would be very happy to have another letter sent quoting him directly on the question. Therefore I hope there is no question of privilege involved. It was not done on purpose. It was not a question put to Mr. Arikpo with any intention of deceiving him. He understood the connotation perfectly.

May I just add that the fundamental reason that objection was taken to the flight from Sao Tomé is that the Portuguese government does not object to arms shipments going from that port, whereas Equatorial Guinea and the previous Spanish authorities permitted only food to be flown from Fernando Po.

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on this question of privilege to make one other point very briefly. What is involved here is not merely an innocent misrepresentation—I accept the minister's statement—of what was said by the hon. member for Greenwood. What is involved here is a very important point of policy of concern both to the members of this house and to the people of Canada. What is involved is whether or not the planes could have been used in a way other than the way they are being used.

When the minister rises and says that even if he had asked in another way the answer would have been the same, he is making certain that he is getting the answer that he wants. That is not the way in which this kind of negotiation can be carried on.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I wonder whether hon. members wish to pursue this matter further. The hon. member for Greenwood has made his point on the question of privilege. He himself has stated what was the situation and according to the rules of the house all hon. members are bound to accept the statement that has been made by the hon. member for Greenwood.

**Mr. Brewin:** Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to pass over the matter, but it seems to me that the statement that has been made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs only compounds the matter. He now directly states that the statement that I made in this house several times and that I repeated today is not a correct statement of fact. He is accepting

the word of these other gentlemen from Nigeria.

Because I think that my credibility and the credibility of other members of this house, including that of the hon. member for Egmont, is in question, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the question of the statements attributed to Andrew Brewin, M.P., and referred to in correspondence tabled this day by the Secretary of State for External Affairs be referred to the standing committee on external affairs and national defence.

I move that motion, Mr. Speaker, subject, of course, to Your Honour ruling that there is a prima facie case of privilege involved here.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have before me the proposed motion of the hon. member for Greenwood. I have some doubt that it is a motion of privilege; it appears to be more in the nature of a substantive motion. Perhaps the hon. member would allow me to have a look at the matter a little more closely and to seek guidance. I would then be in a position later to give a ruling on the point raised by the hon. member by way of a question of privilege.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps the house is willing to have the government house leader indicate the nature of the business for the ensuing week so that we can be guided by this information.

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the intention would be that on Monday next we would call the committee of supply and refer to it the estimates with respect to supply and services. If they are dealt with that day then the estimates of the Department of Public Works would be called.

On Tuesday the budget debate will resume, and that debate will be called the following three days, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday. If the budget debate is not disposed of by then, the final day for the budget debate will be Tuesday, November 12.

I thought it might be helpful to hon. members if I gave them an indication of the work that remains to be done between now and the end of 1968. Including both today and Friday,