

the hon. member is now, I understand, speaking to a point of order, and he knows what a point of order is. It cannot be a substantial speech, and he should limit his comments strictly to the point of order.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, I will. I am sorry; I got a little carried away. This is not a personal quarrel between myself and the minister. What is at stake here is a very serious breach of the rules of the house. What is at stake is the standard of honour and integrity that should prevail in the house.

If a member is to make a charge—and that is why the rules are so specific—he must stand on his feet and make the charge and take his responsibility, which is what I have done. But I think there is a corresponding responsibility that if another member is going to make remarks about me he must take responsibility for them; and certainly the standard of integrity of this house is such that where there is a difference such as in this case, then we have a duty to the house, to the honour, integrity and high standards of parliament, to search everywhere to find a way by which the matter can be inquired into and a proper finding made as to who is abusing the privilege of the house.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but a look at the motion I have drafted and brought before the house will indicate that it is a very deep, very important question. The remarks of the minister as to his powers and authority in briefing witnesses are certainly something that affects the very working of parliament and in this connection I would only bring to Your Honour's attention the way in which the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas), when there was a suggestion of irregularity in his election, immediately jumped to his feet and asked the house for an inquiry—and got it, sir.

● (3:00 p.m.)

I suggest that certainly when the matter is as serious as the entire existence of our committee system, its effectiveness, what may be made available to it, and the question of the responsibilities of ministers to bring forward all the facts, in view of the remarks made by the minister all I am asking this house is, that these very serious charges I have made in the only proper way be investigated and pursued so the minister's case can be cleared, or otherwise. In the name of the honour and integrity of this house these spurious charges cannot be allowed to stand.

23033—555

Question of Privilege

Otherwise there is no way we can bring about an investigation to defend one hon. member or another.

Mr. Speaker: I thank hon. members for their assistance in enlightening the Chair on the point of order. I thank the Minister of National Defence for his ready acceptance of the suggestion I made yesterday to say a few words in explanation of the statement he is alleged to have made against the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Kamloops there are two points before the Chair at the moment. One—and it is not an easy point for the Chair to decide—is whether the motion presented today by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona follows upon the question of privilege which he raised yesterday. I think in fairness to the Chair it should be pointed out that no motion was moved yesterday, and that today the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona presented a motion which he submitted to the Chair. In my mind, looking at it very objectively, it certainly goes considerably beyond the scope of the limited question of privilege raised by the hon. member. This is the essence or purport of the words or the thought I was trying to express a moment ago before the point of order was raised by the hon. member for Kamloops.

Obviously, to my mind, this proposed motion is not limited to the point of privilege raised by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona. It seems to revive a point on which there already has been a ruling by the Chair. In looking at it, obviously it is the type of motion which the hon. member might have wished to move as a substantive motion, the type of motion which I suggested to the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona he should have given some thought to last week and should not submit it to the Chair to accept as a privileged motion, and also suggesting to him that this is a matter of substance.

His motion actually is a motion of substance; but this is the second point. His argument would have to be considered and would be particularly relevant if I had ruled there was a prima facie case of privilege. The hon. member said that because I referred to the question of motive the other day, I must conclude that the moment there is an imputation of motive there is automatically a question of privilege. I suggest to him that is drawing a rather wide conclusion. It is a very

[19-4502-10K]