

Business of the House

1963, which was the decision of the Chair, it is difficult to understand that a new privilege has in some way been created since then. The enactment, in itself, of Standing Order 17(2) does not create a new procedure for the consideration of a prima facie question of privilege. The true and conclusive test in giving priority to a motion of privilege is that a prima facie case be first established.

I suggest it is open to any member to call attention to the listing of the position of his motion on the order paper. Indeed, the hon. member for St. John's East did so today. In this regard his point of order was quite well taken and was within his right. I suggest to the House this is the way to proceed, that is, the notice having appeared where it appeared on the order paper, it was left to the hon. member to raise the matter as a point of order for the consideration of the Chair.

The first specific proposal stated in the motion is the following:

(a) whether there was a breach of the privilege of the member for St. John's East in the failure of his effort on the 2nd December, 1969, to call a meeting of the Standing Committee on Regional Development under Standing Order 65(2).

● (8:10 p.m.)

In the opinion of the Chair, it must follow that when it is not open to any and every member of a standing committee to call an organizational meeting of the committee, there is no breach of the privilege of the hon. member for St. John's East in the failure of his effort on December 2, 1969, to call a meeting of the standing committee. In proposition (b), the Committee on Privileges and Elections would be asked to consider:

Whether there has been a breach of the privileges of all members of this House in the neglect, by that member who may be charged with the duty of calling a meeting of the Standing Committee on Regional Development in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 65 (2), of such duty to call a meeting of that committee as soon as possible after the commencement of this session—

The considerations which apply to part (a) of the motion, I suggest, are equally relevant to part (b) of the hon. member's proposition.

In finding that a question of the privileges of the House is not prima facie involved in this motion, I am making a procedural decision the effect of which will not prevent the further discussion by the House of the matters in issue. The effect is to refuse precedence to this discussion but not to prevent it.

If hon. members will refer to the decision of Mr. Speaker Michener, reported in the *Journals* of the House of Commons for

[Mr. Speaker.]

June 19, 1959, at pages 582 to 586, they will observe that Mr. Speaker Michener's decision, in analogous circumstances, ruled that when a private member's motion is not prima facie a question of privilege, it must be placed under the heading Private Members' Notices of Motions.

It is my decision that the notice of motion filed by the hon. member for St. John's East, in accordance with the precedent to which I have referred and other precedents, should remain on the order paper under the heading Private Members' Notices of Motions.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS,
AIR CANADA****PROVISION FOR CAPITAL EXPENDITURES,
GUARANTEEING OF SECURITIES**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Gray that Bill C-7, to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways system and Air Canada for the period from the 1st of January, 1969, to the 30th day of June, 1970, and to authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of certain securities to be issued by the Canadian National Railway Company and certain debentures to be issued by Air Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Peters (p. 1578).

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, I am not in very good physical shape because coming, as I do, from Newfoundland and not being accustomed to the harsh climate of Ottawa, I have come down with the flu.

Mr. Forrestall: It does not seem to have affected your sense of humour.

Mr. Peddle: However, I should like to make a few remarks on Bill C-7 which deals with financing the CNR and of Air Canada. I do not wish to delay its passage too long. I would hate to be the one responsible for the government invoking one of its anti-debate, muzzle laws which it is holding in readiness and has not yet had the opportunity to try out.

I confess that every time last year that I have heard or read about the CNR in newspapers, on radio or television, I could not help my blood pressure rising. Last year at about this time we stood in this chamber discussing