

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

that April 1 would be a more appropriate date for such an announcement?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be in Ottawa on April 1, so I will not be making any appointments on that date. I am trying to have the commission appointed as quickly as I can, but whether we meet the end of March deadline or not remains to be seen.

**PRIVILEGE**

MR. MUIR (CAPE BRETON-THE SYDNEYS)—  
ALLEGED INACCURACY IN STATEMENT  
OF HON. MEMBER FOR DAVENPORT

**Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I wish to raise a matter that has just come to my attention. Yesterday I made a speech in this house and was followed by the hon. member for Davenport. As reported at page 7093 the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) said:

The hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. Muir) developed certain generalities. He has also disappeared immediately afterwards.

I should like to state that I was called to the telephone on constituency business and was absent from the house for about four minutes. I returned and listened to the hon. member, and then the hon. member for Selkirk. The hon. member's statement is completely erroneous. At five minutes after six I discussed with the Solicitor General a matter regarding my constituency. This is a deliberate distortion of the facts by the hon. member for Davenport. In other words, he has been most careless with the truth.

**PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS**

REQUEST FOR RESUMPTION OF DEBATE  
ON MOTION TO CONCUR

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the hon. member for St. John's East rising on a point of order?

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I had hoped to put this in the form of a question to the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as government house leader.

My point of order is this. In view of the very serious difference that exists between the government house leader and the hon. member for LaSalle, who is a very successful and outstanding chairman of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, and in view of the very serious consequential effects this difference is having on

[Mr. Stanfield.]

the work of the committees of this house, would the government house leader agree to call government order No. 54, which is the third report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections? Then this whole matter could be debated in the house and the future work of committees of the house cleared up once and for all?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear that there is no difference between the hon. member for LaSalle and myself. I am glad to hear that the hon. member is supporting the very able work of my colleague, rather than attacking the chairman, as has happened in the past.

With regard to changing the order of the business of the house, I take it that the hon. member for St. John's East does not think very highly of the subject chosen by the hon. member for Peace River in his motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member for St. John's East that his intervention is not a proper point of order. Actually, he has used the device of a point of order to ask a question of the President of the Privy Council. It seems to me that if we were to allow the matter to go further we might spend the afternoon on this very touchy subject. I understand a motion will be moved by the hon. member for Peace River about which the house is very anxious to hear, so I suggest that at this point we go on with government orders.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS****BUSINESS OF SUPPLY**

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—BROADCASTING OF  
HOUSE AND COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS  
BY TELEVISION AND RADIO

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River)** moved:

That this house should give consideration to television and radio broadcasting of the proceedings of the house and/or its committees.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise a point of order before I commence the remarks I have to make. In view of the time, and the fact that a number of members have indicated an interest in this subject and would like an opportunity to make their contribution, I would be prepared to propose a self-denying ordinance, of which I would be the first victim. I suggest that we might well limit our speeches during the course of this debate to 15 minutes. This would then permit