

that question and the time he gave the answer to the press outside the House. I do not say that he intentionally did that.

Mr. Nielsen: How could it be anything else?

Mr. Lawrence: I am not agreeing with anonymous voices that come over the PA system asking whether it could be anything else. I say it was a breach of the privileges in this House, if not a breach of common courtesy and etiquette to all members of the House.

That, simply, is my question of privilege. I believe that the Solicitor General misled this House, misled you and misled me by an answer which he completely contradicted a few minutes later outside in the corridors of this House.

There is no question now in my mind concerning the information that he gave to the press outside this House, because since Friday morning his comments have appeared in direct quotations in a number of other press stories. I shall not repeat them to you as I do not want intentionally to hold up proceedings in this House.

I bring to you now, Madam Speaker, what I sincerely and honestly believe to be a very serious breach of my privileges as a member of this House resulting from the actions and comments in this House of the Solicitor General. If you are prepared to find that a prima facie case exists, I have prepared a notice of motion in the usual form for reference of that matter to a committee.

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General): Madam Speaker, I should like to begin by thanking you for deferring consideration of this question of privilege until I could be present in the House. I was watching the proceedings on television the other day when my hon. friend rose to begin his question of privilege. I prepared to rush into the House but I saw, after one or two seconds, that you decided to defer it.

Like my hon. friend, I do not want to prolong the matter or to appear to be engaging in any dilatory tactics. I would simply observe that I do not believe a valid question of privilege has been made out. Beauchesne's fifth edition is quite clear on this. I draw your attention to Citations 363(1), 19(2) and (3) and 264 without even quoting them, since they have been quoted so often in this debate.

I would simply say that the question that the hon. member for Durham-Northumberland (Mr. Lawrence) asked me contained a great many allegations that I did not want to comment on and which I still have not commented upon. I did not reply to the part of the question, only a small part, which touched on the identity of British interrogators.

I have not received a full answer to the question whether Mr. Gouzenko had been interrogated by other British interrogators. I do not know the full answer to that question; I have not got to the bottom of it. I knew, though, that he was interrogated by one in particular, whom I identified in reply to a specific question outside the House. If the hon. member for Durham-Northumberland had asked that very specific question in the House instead of the long song and dance that

Business of the House

constituted his question, I would have given him the straight and direct answer to it.

As I understand the rules of this House, I am not obliged to do that. If I were to respond to every allegation that he laid and every question that he asked me, I would have needed all of the question period to do so and he knows that perfectly well.

In conclusion, I do not think that a valid question of privilege has been raised or, from the point of view of gentlemanly practice in this House, that I was in default in any way.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order regarding something I have discussed with the government House leader. It is with respect to what he said in the middle of his statement on the sub justice question which is now before you. It relates to House business.

I confess that I did not hear quite what he said as well as I might have, so I wonder what his intention is. What did he say with respect to the borrowing authority bill and his intentions, I believe on motions, with respect to that matter? Could he repeat that for me please?

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, as I said to my colleague in the hall a few minutes ago, and I am glad to repeat it here, if we were to reach motions, that is, even before orders of the day, before six o'clock, then the Minister of State for Finance will move the motion to allocate two days to conclude the debate on report stage and third reading stage on the borrowing authority bill. If he cannot move it before six o'clock, then we will see about it later.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the President of the Privy Council for clarifying that question. I have an additional question.

The motion in the name of the Minister of State for Finance says that he gives notice of his intention to move a motion at the next sitting of the House to allocate one sitting day to each of the stages of the bill. There are two stages left, the report stage amendment and third reading stage. Can the government House leader tell me what his intention is with respect to calling the report stage and third reading stage of this bill? Does he intend to call it tomorrow and the next day and the next day? I think it would be helpful if we knew what the government's intentions were with respect to the other business that he refers to.

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, it has not been decided yet when the two-day debate to be granted under the motion is going to take place. Still, in view of the urgency of the matter, we shall act quickly. As for the suggestion of the hon. member to proceed with one or two days this week, we shall certainly take it into consideration. As soon as a decision has been