

**Speaker's Rulings and Statements – (Continued)***Munsinger Case – (Concluded)*

before calling on them, he would once again remind the House that only one question of privilege at a time could be before the House and, unless followed by a motion there could be no debate, 291. Question of privilege raised by Mr. Lambert and proposed to move,—That the terms of reference in the Order in Council dated Mar. 14, 1966, be referred to a seven man House committee, 292. Mr. Speaker ruled that the motion was a substantive motion requiring notice, therefore was not acceptable, 292-3.

*Private Members Business Hour:*

See ruling under heading *Chairman's Decisions Appealed*.

*Private Members Motions:*

Ruling by Mr. Speaker that he was not justified in taking the initiative and separating into two parts the resolution on capital punishment on the grounds that there was only one proposition before the House and that the other aspects of the question were of a secondary nature which in the circumstances were not separable, 334.

Mr. Laflamme (Québec-Montmorency) during debate on Notice of Motion No. 66 proposed a sub-amendment; to add certain words in order to retain capital punishment for certain categories of offences, 361. Mr. Speaker ruled subamendment out of order on the grounds that it was inconsistent with the amendment and was more in the form of an amendment to the main motion, 361.

*Privilege, Question of:*

On a question of privilege raised by Mr. Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona) on Oct. 20, 1966, concerning an article in *Le Droit*, Oct. 14, 1966, under the by-line of Mr. Marcel Pepin, on which he gave notice of a motion that Mr. Pepin be called before the Bar of the House, Mr. Speaker stated that after consultation with the member he was allowing him to alter his motion; whereupon, Mr. Nugent proposed to move,—That the matter be referred to Privileges and Elections Committee, on which a point of order was raised as to its admissibility, 911-3. Mr. Speaker ruled that as a *prima facie* case was questionable, he was giving the member the benefit of the doubt, 913-5.

*Questions on Order Paper:*

Questions of privilege raised by Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West) and Mr. Irvine (London) concerning answers to questions seeking information from the Electoral Boundaries Commissions which report to the House, 459. Mr. Speaker ruled that his responsibilities under the Act are limited and in no way was he able to compel the commissions to answer. He further stated that although the statement by the Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh) cannot be regarded as an answer to the questions a member cannot insist upon an answer from a minister. Mr. Speaker thereupon suggested that the members could place motions for the Production of Papers on the Order Paper and the Governor in Council might produce the information, 459-60.

*Sittings of the House:*

On a motion proposed by Mr. Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre) to amend provisional S.O. 6 re forgoing luncheon and dinnertime sittings, Mr. Speaker ruled that motions dealing with the business of the House require notice and should be introduced by the House Leader, and therefore was not acceptable, 1243-4.

*Supply Motion Amendments:*

Amendment to Supply Motion No. 2: On a point of order to the effect that member was seeking to deal with a portion of evidence now being given before a Royal Commission, Mr. Speaker ruled that the creation of Royal Commissions is purely an administrative matter, that the commissioners are not called upon to render decisions only to make recommendations. The wording of the Inquiries Act does not constitute them a court of record therefore matters before them are not *sub judice*. In any event the evidence referred to was of a collateral issue, 491-3. And a further point of order being raised to the effect that the amendment was founded on evidence given before a Royal Commission, Mr. Speaker stated that the ruling to which he referred previously still applies, 494-5.