

Speaker's Rulings and Statements – (Concluded)*Private Members Motions:*

Point of order by Mr. Baldwin contending that his Notice of Motion to appoint a committee to prepare and bring in a bill should have been placed on the Order Paper under "Routine Proceedings" and not under "Private Members' Notices of Motions". Mr. Speaker ruled that he could find no precedent where this procedure had been used. Under S.O. 15(2), introduction of bills was allowed under Routine Proceedings, but not on a motion to appoint a committee to prepare a bill, and under S.O. 15(4) such a motion could be considered under private members business. Since the member now had two Notices of Motions on the Order Paper, contrary to the rules, the motion would have to be removed, 73-5.

Mr. McGrath rose on a point of order concerning the position on the Order Paper of his notice of motion purporting to raise a question of privilege relating to whether or not a private member can call a meeting of a standing committee for the purpose of electing a Chairman and Vice-Chairman, etc. Mr. Speaker ruled that it was generally understood that such power does not rest with every individual member of a standing committee and referred to a ruling made in 1963. He further ruled that there was no *prima facie* breach of privilege therefore the notice of motion was placed correctly on the Order Paper under the heading of "Private Members' Notices of Motions", 157-9.

Privilege, Question of:

Mr. Macquarrie rose on a question of privilege concerning a letter by the Communications Department addressed to all radio stations stating that the Minister's policy statements will soon be made available by simply dialing a certain number, and proposed to move,—That the matter be referred to Privileges and Elections Committee. Mr. Speaker ruled that he could find no precedent whereby policy statements had to be made in the House and quoted a ruling he made on Mar. 31, 1969, printed at page 869 of *Votes and Proceedings*, 39-40.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) raised a question of privilege relating to what was described as propaganda material paid for out of public funds. Mr. Speaker ruled that due to a lack of proper precedent and assistance from other recognized authorities he must as a final recourse refer to a general definition of acts or conduct which constitute a breach of privilege as recorded at page 109 of May's 17th edition and conclude that although there may be a grievance against the government a *prima facie* case of privilege has not been established, 183-4.

On similar questions of privilege raised by Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) concerning statements, which because of their nature, ought to have been made in the House and misleading replies to questions in the House, Mr. Speaker ruled that the question of making statements outside the House was not really one of privilege. He further ruled that if action were taken on the question of misleading replies to questions then the conduct of a minister would be under consideration and cited precedents that specific charges must be laid in such a case therefore there was no *prima facie* case of breach of privilege, 965-6.

On a question of privilege raised by Mr. Comeau on Oct. 5, 1970, concerning a conflict of interest in that Mr. Morison while Chairman of the Regional Development Committee was employed by the Newfoundland Government, Mr. Speaker ruled that the question of electing a chairman in the next session was a matter of future determination and that precedent had been established that a member should not have his conduct submitted to investigation by the House until he has been charged with an offence and that there was no *prima facie* case of breach of privilege, 1423-4.

Supply Motions (Non-confidence):

Point of order raised by Mr. Aiken that it was the prerogative of the official opposition to present non-confidence motions and that the proposed motion by another party was not to be taken as a precedent. Mr. Speaker stated that the prerogative of parties was a matter of arrangement between party representatives and as only one motion had been presented S.O. 58 did not apply. He further stated that although the motion does not indicate that by a vote members would be expressing non-confidence in the government, similar motions have been put in this form and taken to a vote therefore debate could proceed with reservations, 742-3.

Speech from the Throne:

See Address in Reply, Debate on.