

Administration of Justice

While you are looking at my motion, sir, I point out I have had it framed, in this way in order that the hon. member for Villeneuve may be brought to account; that he may stand in his place and make his charges, clearly and distinctly, and prove his accusation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: I should like to raise a purely technical point of order. We have been purporting—I never quite understood how—to be debating one question of privilege all day. Now, if another purported question of privilege—and I do not know whether you can raise another one in the midst of debate on the first one—is raised, does this mean that the first question of privilege is now superseded, and we cannot return to the debate on it. Are we dealing only with the second question? It seems to me Your Honour should address yourself to this point before considering whether the motion itself is in order.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Would the minister permit a question? Since the minister is wondering how we could raise a question of privilege during another question of privilege, would he turn around and ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) who raised one himself this afternoon?

Mr. Churchill: That is what he did. Touché.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): That trip to Vancouver was too much for the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wish I was still there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; yesterday and again today on a couple of occasions it was the view of the Chair, particularly yesterday as expressed by Mr. Speaker, that a motion to adjourn could not be moved on a point of order.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Earlier today that same ruling was made by the Chair. Now, it would appear that if the statement made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre could not have been a point of privilege, it might be considered as a question of order. But if that were so, then the Chair would have to rule this motion out of order as has been done in the two previous cases, and the Chair so rules.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, speaking to this point of privilege, it seems to me that what I had to say to the house this morning has now almost come to pass and most surely will. We

are seized again with another question of privilege created by a statement from another member of this house.

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

Mr. Winkler: I am on privilege, if you don't mind. I have been recognized, and I am speaking to the matter of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, is the hon. member for Grey-Bruce on this question of privilege or a new one just at the moment?

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Lapointe on a point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, you have not yet ruled on whether or not the question raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) is a prima facie question. The Chair has not yet made a decision on that.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre did not raise a real prima facie question of privilege, since the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) mentioned an article in the *Toronto Star* and asked: Is it not true that according to the article in the *Toronto Star* this person, and that person are involved in the affair?

The member for Villeneuve did not make any charge but took a newspaper article published today and asked whether it was true, as reported in the article, that this person and that person were involved.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) had not really raised a question of privilege since the hon. member for Villeneuve only asked "whether it was true that...", with regard to a newspaper article. This often happens during the question period when the right hon. Prime Minister is asked "Is it not true, as reported in a newspaper article, that a minister made such and such a statement?" The usual question is: "Is it not true that a newspaper quotes a minister as having said such and such a thing?" In such a case the hon. member who