

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: I should like to rise on a point of order.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the house I should like to refer to the point raised by the house leader the other day when I mentioned some things in respect of Admiral Landymore's affidavits. Let me make it plain to the house that if hon. members wish the affidavits and attached exhibits tabled, I am prepared to do so. I did not originally offer to do so, but if any member has any question in his mind as to the validity of what I have said I shall do so today.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on a point of order for the purpose of obtaining some assistance from the Chair to clarify matters of privilege. It has been my understanding up to this time that when a matter of privilege is raised in this house Mr. Speaker makes a ruling as to whether it is in fact a matter of privilege. If the Chair rules that it is, it may be followed by a motion to be dealt with immediately or referred to a committee.

We seem now to have reached a different situation, and this is where I wish some guidance, as a result of suggestions made in this house last week on a matter of privilege presented by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona. Today the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona has strengthened his matter of privilege with a motion. That having been done, apparently the house is not to be given the privilege of deciding whether that motion is acceptable. We now have a ruling to the effect that there is no matter of privilege and, therefore, the motion is superfluous. I should like to know why there was a request last week that a motion be presented. Perhaps we should have some guidance for future matters of privilege that may be raised.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking an abstract question. I do not believe the Chair should at any time be placed in a position of having to advise an hon. member as to what should be done in any instance, or what ruling will be made. Certainly I do not wish to enter into an argument with the hon. member who has had infinitely more experience than I. I respect the point he is trying to make, but the decision I have made is based particularly on the authority contained in a statement made in this house by Mr. Speaker

23033—555½

Private Bill

Macnaughton as reported on page 4141 of *Hansard* of June 10, 1964, as follows:

I suggest that hon. members in future when raising questions of privilege, such as those raised last Thursday, should at the very beginning of their speech advise the Speaker that at the end of their statement they will conclude with a motion so that, if such a matter is found to be a prima facie case of breach of privilege and also if it has been raised at the earliest opportunity, the house may deal with it according to the rules and the recognized practice.

That is my understanding of the rules and practice. I shall certainly look into the matter further in an attempt to buttress my position with further precedents, and if a question of privilege is raised at any time in the future I will perhaps be in a stronger position to support the stand I have now taken.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS—CONCURRENCE IN ELEVENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Joseph Macaluso (Hamilton West) presented the eleventh report of the standing committee on transport and communications, and moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Third report of standing committee on justice and legal affairs—Mr. Cameron (High Park).

[Translation]

PRIVATE BILL

REFERENCE OF PETITION TO COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

Mr. Patrick T. Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. McNulty) that:

The petition of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, for a bill to amend its incorporation act, filed after the time limit provided under standing order 93 be referred to the standing committee on standing orders, together with the 17th report made thereon by the clerk of petitions and presented to the house on Monday, October 17, 1966 so that the committee might consider making such recommendations as may be deemed advisable.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Peters: Without prejudice.

Motion agreed to.