

motions by virtue of Standing Order 26. It seems to me that if the honourable Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) was not satisfied with the explanation given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) it was up to him to make a motion immediately which was one of privilege. The honourable Member does not recall that such incidents have taken place in the House?

The honourable Member knows that no debate can take place except, of course, if a motion is placed before the House. I have noted that in the last few years Members who have raised questions of privilege have never pursued their points far enough in order to make them debatable. Once a question of privilege is raised it may be ended by a motion. Such motion may not be taken up immediately but a day may be appointed when it will be taken up. That, to me, should have been the course followed.

And Debate arising on the point of order;

MR. SPEAKER: If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew) himself were the subject of this motion, I am sure that he would have the right to insist upon having the House decide whether or not he himself had made a statement which was not correct. This motion, if it were allowed, would be debated all day and what would be the effect of it? At six o'clock tonight the House adjourns. The motion is predicated on the assumption that the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the effect that there were no documents is incorrect. There is a point in dispute there. The Minister says there were no documents that he could table. That was the sense of his explanation a moment ago but he said that there was a document or that there were documents marked private and confidential. Whether there was one document or more than one I do not know. Arising out of that discussion that took place on the question of privilege, I think the matter should be the subject of a motion arising out of privilege and should be treated as such. I think that the one who is accused of a misstatement is entitled either to have that accusation confirmed by the House or to have his own stand that there was no misstatement vindicated by the House. As the matter stands now, this motion provides only for a debate but no chance for the House to express its views as to whether or not the statement made by the Minister was a misstatement. I ask honourable Members—any one of them—whether it is not true that if they were the subject of a motion of this kind, they would put forward the point that they are entitled to have their stand either condemned or vindicated by the House. By this motion such a thing could not take place. It is merely a motion to adjourn.

And Debate continuing on the point of Order;

MR. SPEAKER: What happens is this. I admit that it has been a long time since a question of privilege was pursued to its ultimate end. Perhaps it would be nice to have one again so that we would establish the procedure and everyone would know it and then the matter would not be so difficult. As the matter stands, many perhaps will say that I am laying down a new procedure that they have never heard of. However, it is there in the book. I do not bring my black note books into the House with me any more but later on I can get them and I will show honourable Members precedents to the effect that when a question of privilege is raised, the Member who is supposed to be concerned in it is entitled to explain. That is his right. Then the honourable Member who raised the question may pursue the matter with