

privilege or contempt to the Committee of Privileges for investigation and report before summoning an offender to the Bar.”

And later on: “a flagrant and obvious contempt would still however be considered by the House itself without reference to the Committee of Privileges.”

In the light of all the circumstances the honourable Member has agreed that perhaps the motion might be changed, and since a motion can be amended by an honourable Member at any time before it is formally put to the House, I suggest there is no procedural obstacle to the honourable Member for Edmonton-Strathcona being allowed to alter the proposed motion, the one of which he gave notice last week, and I suggest to honourable Members that he might be given an opportunity of doing this now.

Whereupon the Honourable Member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent) proposed to move,—That the question of breach of privilege raised on Thursday, October 20, 1966, by the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, dealing with an article in *Le Droit*, Ottawa, Friday, October 14, 1966, under the by-line of Marcel Pepin, (*English Hansard* page 8890) be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for investigation and report.

And a point of order having been raised and considered as to the admissibility of the said proposed motion;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank honourable Members for the comments they have made to assist the Chair in reaching a decision. It is obvious from the comments we have heard there is a difference of opinion between the Members, and this justifies in my mind the difficulty I have had in reaching a decision. The Minister of Public Works has pointed to a difficulty when he says that there should be something perhaps specific in the motion from the article complained of. My understanding of the honourable Member's complaint, on the basis of his motion, is that it is a question of personal privilege. The privilege is based on these sentences in the article:

(Translation)

The latter directed from the public gallery the attack of the Conservative member Terry Nugent against the hon. Mr. Hellyer, Wednesday.

Not only did he make signs to the member, but he also sent him messages during the debate. Witnesses have stated that Admiral Brock, who has been retired for three years, made a negative sign when Mr. Hellyer called on Mr. Nugent to put his seat at stake by making a specific charge of improper conduct.

The honourable Member's contention is that his personal privileges are adversely affected when the suggestion is made that he is not speaking on his own behalf but he is being directed by someone outside the House in the charges he was making at the time he proposed his original question of privilege. I might add that the precedent to which the honourable Member for Edmonton West has referred, that is the 1962 case to which I will allude in a few minutes, concluded by a reference of not only certain parts of the article but the whole article to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.