

Question of Privilege

which privileges of the house, if any, have been violated.

As far as I am concerned, if I did not intervene a while ago when the hon. member made his allegations, it was not because I share the views of the hon. gentleman, or because I approve of the fact that he invokes bilingualism here for personal reasons or because I am in sympathy with his feelings toward the behaviour of the R.C.M.P. but because I do not want to prejudge the work that the privileges and elections committee may do or the decisions it may take.

I must say that I fully agree with part of his remarks to the effect that if he had been authorized to call me there would have been, as there will never be, any danger of collusion between us, and I am ready to admit it. For myself, under the circumstances, I am ready to vote in favour of the original motion, even though, in due time and before the committee, I shall state the facts as I know them.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I think that the debate on this matter which has lasted at least half an hour has been long enough—

Mr. Grégoire: If you allow me, Mr. Speaker, I think that there has been an attempt to prevent an individual whose privileges were infringed to state his case.

The President of the Privy Council has risen on a question of privilege when I am the one who was arrested and jailed for four hours.

How is it, Mr. Speaker, that it is the President of the Privy Council who rises on a question of privilege in such circumstances?

It is obvious that this was done to prevent me from introducing a motion and I think that the President of the Privy Council has resorted to some very shabby tactics.

[Text]

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps it is time to recall to the house citation 104(5) of Beauchesne's fourth edition:

As a motion taken at the time for matters of privilege is thereby given precedence over the pre-arranged program of public business, the Speaker requires to be satisfied, both that there is a prima facie case that a breach of privilege has been committed, and also that the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity. If he is not so satisfied he may allow the member to make a statement with a view to ascertaining whether or not a prima facie case can be made out. The right of making complaint of a breach of privilege is open to any member of the house, and, even if an

[Mr. Favreau.]

individual member alone is affected, is not confined to that member.

In the circumstances, in view of the discussion we have had and the broad terms of the motion which the President of the Privy Council proposes to move, I shall put the motion now. It is moved by the President of the Privy Council:

That the circumstances relating to the arrest on February 12, 1965 of the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) be referred to the standing committee on privileges and elections.

[Translation]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I would have an amendment to move—

[Text]

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has had more than ample opportunity to explain his case, and it is becoming almost an abuse to continue further. The hon. member will have full opportunity to explain his case before the committee, and it seems to me that the terms of the motion are sufficiently wide to cover any and all circumstances. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Howard: On division, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned.

Motion agreed to, on division.

[Translation]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on another question of privilege concerning the behaviour of the R.C.M.P.

A while ago the house passed a motion to refer to the privileges and elections committee the facts connected with my arrest. Today, I intend to present a motion immediately without further comment. It deals with the same topic but I should like it to be referred to the privileges and elections committee. Consequently: I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That the following question be referred to the privileges and elections committee: Does a member of parliament or a Canadian citizen who is served with a warrant or a summons by the R.C.M.P. have the right to demand that he be served in both official languages of Canada?

[Text]

Mr. Speaker: I have listened once more with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for Lapointe, but the motion which he proposes is in the nature of a substantive motion which requires notice, and under the circumstances I cannot accept it at this time. The