

The Honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) raised a question of privilege and proposed to move, seconded by Mr. Macquarrie,—That the terms of reference of Order in Council P.C. 1966—482, dated March 14, 1966 and tabled in this House on March 14, 1966 be referred to a Special Committee to be composed of seven members of this House and that such Special Committee be empowered to sit at such times it deems necessary to examine the said terms of reference and to report what revisions and amendments it may recommend to this House for decision by 2.30 p.m. on Thursday, March 17, 1966.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: With a great deal of patience during the last few days I have listened to honourable Members, every one of them, including those who have spoken more than once when perhaps they should have spoken only once on a question of privilege. But we all agree that things got somewhat complicated. One of our difficulties last week was that we had three questions of privilege before the House at the same time. The reason was that each was followed by a motion, each of them unusual, to the extent that the Chair thought there might be something so unusual about these motions that they might be in order. But they were not. We eventually came back to one question of privilege which was raised subsequently, that is, yesterday afternoon, by the honourable Member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) and I suggest this is the question which was before us until today, although, as the honourable Member knows, no motion was made as required by the rules. The honourable Member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) also brought up a question of privilege this afternoon on which no motion was moved. So we are left with the motion moved by the honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), of which he has kindly given me notice and which we have now discussed together at length. As he says, there is a degree of disagreement as to whether or not it should be accepted.

Perhaps I may restate the views I have expressed on Thursday, Friday, yesterday and, again, today as to the general rules on the question of privilege. I do not think it should be necessary for me to repeat the citations—Nos. 104, 105 and 113 of Beauchesne, except for the one which says—and this has been quoted by a number of honourable Members—“A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy.”

That is from citation No. 113. I am now doing what Members of the House sometimes do—what I said I would not do; I am quoting from both Beauchesne and May. “It is irregular to make a complaint unless the honourable Member intends to follow it up with a substantive motion referring to the matter which he has introduced to the notice of the House”.

That is from May's 17th edition, page 134. I would also remind honourable Members “that the House cannot carry on a debate unless there is a motion before it and in the case of a question of privilege, the subject-matter of discussion has to be a question of privilege.”

In other words, not another substantive motion but a motion of privilege.

In my opinion, here I express a view which is shared by many honourable Members who have had considerably more experience than I have had in this matter. I may say, as an aside, that when I tried to go back in *Hansard* to look for precedents I am always impressed to see that so many honourable Members who are still in the House today are those who have contributed the precedents upon which the Chair must rely at this time. This includes the honourable