

Administration of Justice

and the only thing we can have before the house is a question of privilege. If we have a specific question of privilege before us each member is entitled to speak to it once, but not more than once.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order—

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

At the start of this sitting, a while ago, I moved a motion which was rejected by Your Honour on the grounds that it was a substantive motion, which therefore required 48 hours notice.

Now, as I gave 48 hours' notice and sent such motion in writing, it is by that very fact accepted. As that was the only reason for its rejection, my motion, therefore, is in order and can be discussed.

That is why I maintain that it is now the matter under discussion, because the motion I had moved had been rejected for the sole reason that it was a substantive motion and required 48 hours notice.

Thus, it is before the house. In fact, it is the only acceptable motion before the house, whether it be discussed now or in 48 hours, but it is accepted, since the 48 hours' notice has been given officially.

[English]

Mr. Nielsen: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour has pointed out that no member can speak twice in the same debate. I submit to Your Honour that you quite properly allowed a discussion on the question of privilege which was raised yesterday and which is still before the house. I submit that members are not confined to speaking once in a debate prior to the house being seized of a proper motion. Your Honour has quite properly allowed several members to speak more than once. I think this is very essential in order that—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. members have spoken more than once because there were three questions of privilege. Hon. members did raise different questions of privilege yesterday, and made a point of saying that these were different questions of privilege, as is recorded in *Hansard*. The members who moved the new questions insisted that they were different questions of privilege which

would give rise to different motions. Of course if we had a new question of privilege the Chair would allow hon. members to speak a second time to the second question, and a third time to the third question. However, there is not now a new question of privilege before us. It may be that the hon. member proposes to move a new motion, and if he wants to do so it should be done very soon.

I understand the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) wishes to speak to the point of order.

Mr. Pickersgill: No, the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on the point of order because it might be useful at least for this member to indicate where he thinks we are.

Yesterday the member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) raised a question of privilege. There was some considerable debate before Your Honour made a ruling. Your Honour ruled that in your opinion there was a prima facie case of privilege. At the same time you ruled that the particular motion the hon. member for Calgary North moved was not acceptable. Let it be clear that you did rule there was a prima facie case of privilege.

On the basis of your ruling that there was a prima facie case of privilege the debate went on and other members sought to move motions. Some motions were ruled out of order and some you took under advisement. This morning at eleven o'clock you gave your ruling from the Chair on the motions moved yesterday. You ruled them out of order. Immediately the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) rose and his words were to this effect, that Your Honour has ruled the motions out of order, but the question of privilege is still before us. Whereupon he sought to move as a motion what he attempted to move as an amendment yesterday. Your Honour ruled that motion out of order.

Mr. Grégoire: No.

Mr. Knowles: I am sorry; Your Honour did rule that motion out of order, whereupon the debate continued.

In the course of the debate the Prime Minister, by bringing in a letter from the Minister of Justice, managed to get the house discussing the subject matter of the very motion the hon. member for Lapointe had