

Speaker's Rulings and Statements - (Continued)

Munsinger Case:

Question of privilege raised by Mr. Harkness (Calgary North) concerning remarks of Justice Minister, 267. Mr. Speaker ruled that he had not received notice as required by provisional S.O. 41-A, therefore the question of privilege could not be entertained, 267. Mr. Harkness rose once again and proposed to move, -That the Justice Minister substantiate his charges reflecting on members of the Privy Council or submit his resignation and forfeit his seat, 268. Mr. Speaker stated that the motion was too general in terms and did not specify a specific charge, therefore was not acceptable, 268-9. Mr. Nielsen (Yukon) proposed to move, -That the Minister resign, 269. Mr. Speaker indicated the motion was in the nature of a substantive motion which requires notice, but asked leave to reserve his decision, 269. Mr. Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre) rose on a question of privilege concerning remarks of Justice Minister, 270. Mr. Speaker ruled that the question of privilege was the same as the one moved previously, 270. Mr. Churchill moved, -That the Prime Minister immediately call for the Justice Minister's resignation on the basis of his accusations against the Leader of the Opposition and all Privy Councillors in the former government, 270. Mr. Speaker ruled that the motion was substantially the same as the one now before the Chair and stated that he would reserve his decision, 270-1. Mr. Lewis (York South) proposed to move, -That this House now stand adjourned until 6.00 p.m., 271. Mr. Speaker ruled that the motion as presented could not be accepted as a privileged motion, 271. Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) rising on a point of order proposed to move, -That this House do now adjourn, 271. Mr. Speaker ruled that the member having risen on a point of order was not entitled to move such a motion, 271. Mr. Nielsen rose on a question of privilege concerning remarks of Justice Minister made earlier in the sitting, 273. Debate resumed on the question of privilege and Mr. Nielsen proposed to move, -That the House call upon the Justice Minister to substantiate his charges and allegations against the Leader of the Opposition and members of the former Conservative government, 275. Mr. Speaker stated that he would consider the motion along with the other two motions and that, unless some member had a completely new question of privilege the House should go on with other business. He further stated that the motions should be considered for their acceptability before any amendment is moved, 275. Mr. Grégoire (Lapointe) proposed to move, -That the "Orders of the Day" be now read, 275. Mr. Speaker ruled that the House had already entered upon "Orders of the Day", 275. Mr. Graffey (Brome-Missisquoi) moved, -That the House do now adjourn, 276. Mr. Speaker declined to receive the motion on the ground of a lack of intermediate proceeding, 276. Debate resumed on the question of privilege, 279. Mr. Speaker ruled that the motions presented yesterday were not in order, in that they assume as a conclusion that an actual breach of privilege has been established, substantive motions cannot be accepted under guise of a question of privilege, no specific charge has been made against the Minister, and the Speaker's responsibilities do not extend beyond ascertaining if there has been a *prima facie* breach of the privileges of the House, 279-81. Mr. Grégoire proposed to move, -That the Justice Minister's statements and the question of privilege of Mr. Harkness be referred to a judicial inquiry, 281. Mr. Speaker ruled that the motion was in the nature of a substantive motion requiring notice, 281. Mr. Starr (Ontario) proposed to move, -That the House call upon the Justice Minister to substantiate his charges and allegations, 281. Mr. Speaker ruled that the motion was substantially the same as the three moved previously and that it did not contain a specific charge, therefore was out of order. Advice of the Chair as to what kind of a motion could be received, cannot be given, as the Chair can only rule on what is actually before it, 281-2. Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West) proposed to move, -That the Justice Minister substantiate his charges, and in default thereof, withdraw, apologize to the House and resign, 282. Mr. Speaker ruled that the motion was a substantive motion requiring notice, therefore could not be accepted, 282. Mr. Bell (Carleton) proposed to move, -That the House do now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole in order that the Justice Minister may give evidence to substantiate his charges, 283. Mr. Speaker ruled the motion out of order in that the function of the Committee of the Whole House is deliberation, not enquiry, it was a substantive motion requiring notice, and it did not contain a specific charge, 283. Mr. Churchill proposed to move, -That the member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) substantiate the charges made against a member of the Privy Council, or resign his seat, 284. Mr. Deputy Speaker ruled that the motion could not be moved at this time, 284. Question of privilege raised by Mr. Fulton (Kamloops) concerning statements made by the Justice Minister, 287. By unanimous consent, consideration of the question of privilege was postponed until 8.00 p.m., 287. Consideration of the question of privilege, resumed, 289. Statement by Mr. Speaker that he had received notice from three members wishing to raise questions of privilege, but