

Question of Privilege

should not be asked to sit with a member who has had such serious charges made against him, and who had the opportunity last night of having them investigated but did not take that opportunity. These charges are still hanging over him, and this would be another opportunity to have these charges dealt with. My motion is substantially the same as my motion yesterday except that I have added that the committee should also decide whether my charges were spurious.

I would ask Your Honour to take a very broad look at the rules in this regard. This is another question of privilege that Your Honour has to consider, and it arises as soon as the member involved comes into the house. Here is a member against whom very serious charges have been made in connection with a breach of privilege, which charges have not been dealt with. He himself did not give consent to have them dealt with and under those circumstances the members of this house should not have to sit with a member who refuses to have his name cleared.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if he is guilty as I allege we should not have to sit with him. If he does not want his name cleared he should not sit in this chamber. Therefore I would ask Your Honour to rule on my point of privilege that the sequence of the statements made in this house yesterday is of such a nature that the imputations against me contained therein can only be cleared by a full and complete investigation before the privileges and elections committee. I would further ask you to consider the fact that the minister can only clear his name by a full and complete investigation before that committee.

Finally I would ask the Chair to consider the position of the members of this house and whether a man can breach the privileges of the house, refuse to have an investigation to clear his name and still ask us to sit with him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member says he has a new question of privilege; I gather this is the purport of his assertion now. If he has not, obviously there has already been a ruling on the other question of privilege, so I assume that he is asking for another ruling from the Chair on the basis of a new question of privilege.

Mr. Nugent: For a second interpretation, sir.

[Mr. Nugent.]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member says he wants a second interpretation of the same question of privilege, but I do not think the rules contemplate this alternative possibility.

I have read the standing orders, the rules and the precedents but I have certainly never seen, and I very much doubt whether the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona could bring for the assistance of the Speaker in ruling in this particular instance, a precedent which would justify his suggestion that a new interpretation of the same question should get a second ruling.

The hon. member brought up a question of which he gave me notice, according to the rules, and this is the only matter I have before me. This question of privilege referred specifically to the use of a particular word. I have made a ruling on this question.

The hon. member says that other words were used, and that I should rule on those. The hon. member knows that the time to raise this question was yesterday, not today. The reason a discussion is allowed at this time on the use of this particular word is that the hon. member said that he himself had misunderstood the word when it was used. He thought the word was "curious", but on reading *Hansard* he saw that it was "spurious". There is no suggestion that he did not understand the meaning or purport of the other words of which he now complains. I suggest to him that when the words were spoken would have been the time to object.

With all due respect to the hon. member, he did raise the point yesterday that he thought the minister should not impute motives; and I fully agree that one of the basic principles of debate is that there should be no imputation of motives. In any event, the minister said a moment ago that he did not intend to impute motives.

• (3:00 p.m.)

For all these reasons I cannot judge that the hon. member has a new question of privilege on which a new ruling should be required from the Chair. We had a question yesterday on which I made a ruling, and a second question brought up today of which the hon. member gave me notice in writing, according to the rules, and on which I have given my opinion and made my ruling. I am sorry to say to the hon. member that I do not judge that there is a third question of privilege at this time.