

I suggest that this has not been done by the motion now proposed by the honourable Member for York South for consideration by the House. His contention is that statements which have been made outside the House since yesterday or during the past few hours change the situation, that such ought to be taken into account by the Chair in ruling that there is a *prima facie* breach of parliamentary privilege. I understood that this was the essence of the argument of the honourable Member for York South, and indeed that was the way his notice was given to the Chair. The honourable Member in his notice said that he wanted to raise a question of privilege related to statements made in and out of the House yesterday concerning the government's attitude toward the requirements of the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. I do not see how I can take into account the precedents to base a *prima facie* case of privilege on statements made outside the House of Commons.

There are many precedents on this account. Honourable Members may well remember an interesting precedent which goes back to June 10, 1964, when a similar matter was raised by the honourable Member for Yukon who suggested that the Chair could not find a *prima facie* case of privilege, could not ask for the withdrawal of certain words, because such statements had been made outside the House of Commons. This is reported at page 4139 of *Hansard* of June 10, 1964 and is based

on a number of precedents. The honourable Member for Yukon at that time among other references quoted Beauchesne's fourth Edition at page 57 where the following citation is found: "The Speaker's jurisdiction does not extend to words outside the House."

I would not think that in the circumstances, in view of this additional precedent, that it is incumbent upon the Chair to follow the advice of the honourable Member to ignore the legal precedents, to ignore the rules, and to say that we ought to consider the matter he has raised by way of breach of parliamentary privilege.

I have thought about the matter very seriously, and as objectively and as fairly as I could when the matter was raised originally, I believe by the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), by way of a question of privilege, but I cannot see that the additional factors brought to light by the honourable Member for York South in support of his proposed motion should change the decision I reached on the previous occasion.

Mr. McGrath, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, moved,—That this House do now adjourn.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Downey,	Lambert	McGrath,	Rowland,
Alexander,	Fairweather,	(Edmonton West),	McIntosh,	Rynard,
Asselin,	Gleave,	Lewis,	McKinley,	Saltsman,
Baldwin,	Grills,	Lundrigan,	McQuaid,	Scott,
Barnett,	Gundlock,	MacDonald	Marshall,	Skoberg,
Benjamin,	Hales,	(Egmont),	Mather,	Southam,
Blackburn,	Harding,	MacInnis,	Mazankowski,	Stanfield,
Broadbent,	Harkness,	(Cape Breton-East	Monteith,	Stewart
Burton,	Howard (Skeena),	Richmond),	Nesbitt,	(Marquette),
Cadieu,	Knowles (Winnipeg	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Orlikow,	Thompson
Carter,	North Centre),	MacKay,	Peddle,	(Red Deer),
Crouse,	Knowles (Norfolk-	MacLean,	Peters,	Thomson
Danforth,	Haldimand),	Macquarrie,	Ricard,	(Battleford-
Dinsdale,	Korchinski,	MacRae,	Ritchie,	Kindersley),
Douglas,		McCleave,	Rose,	Valade,
				Woolliams—65.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Buchanan,	Côté (Longueuil),	Dupras,	Gillespie,
Anderson,	Caccia,	Cullen,	Duquet,	Godin,
Andras,	Cafk,	Cyr,	Émard,	Goyer,
Badanai,	Caouette,	Danson,	Éthier,	Groos,
Barrett,	Chappell,	Davis,	Forget,	Guay (St. Boniface),
Béchar,	Chrétien,	Deachman,	Foster,	Guay (Lévis),
Beer,	Clermont,	Deakon,	Francis,	Guilbault,
Blouin,	Cobbe,	Dionne,	Gauthier,	Haidasz,
Borrie,	Corriveau,	Drury,	Gendron,	Hogarth,
Boulanger,	Côté (Richelieu),	Dubé,	Gervais,	Hopkins,