

*Question of Privilege*

This is the embarrassing position in which I think we have placed ourselves in the chamber. And this is why I suggested it would have been so much easier to have delayed the matter for a short while. I am not faulting any hon. member for this. I am saying that is the factual position at present.

I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and I should like to suggest to hon. members, in view of the fact that we are in the same position as before, that we have these three potential motions, it would be so much easier to allow the matter to stand, to leave it in abeyance until we have a chance to look at the other two motions. This is what I hoped we would do and what I am proposing still hopefully to hon. members. I am hopeful that hon. members will agree with me that that is the best way to handle the matter.

**Mr. Nielsen:** On the question of order, I wish to make one point, and it is this: my question of privilege raised this evening was confined to the statement made by the minister this afternoon in this house. It is my understanding, and it certainly was the situation in connection with the motion of 1964, that when a minister or an hon. member makes a charge against another hon. member of the house, he must substantiate that. That was the narrow basis in the privilege question and the narrow basis of my motion. If it will assist, I am prepared to put that motion now. I think Your Honour could also take that one under advisement.

**Mr. Speaker:** I feel that the situation would not be any worse than it is now if we received a third motion. I would be glad to hear it, but the hon. member cannot expect that I will give him a decision on it right now.

**Mr. Nielsen:** I have already read it to Your Honour. It is moved by myself and seconded by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell).

**Mr. Speaker:** As I said a moment ago if hon. members want me to put the motion I would consider it along with the other two motions. I recognize that the motion by the hon. member for Yukon has already been placed on the record. I suggest to hon. members that unless somebody has a completely new question of privilege to raise at this time, that we go on with other business.

**Mr. Bell (Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask with the calmness which I actually do not feel if it is not possible to persuade the right

hon. gentleman from Algoma East to act like a Prime Minister in the settling of this matter.

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. McIlraith:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Just for the sake of clarification, the hon. member for Yukon has been permitted to place his motion before the house without a decision being taken by yourself as to whether it is acceptable. That being so, what is the status of the proposed amendment that was indicated a few moments ago? Is it also to be placed before the house? I suggest it would have to be.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is still lower on the totem pole. I would think that we should first consider whether any of these motions can be accepted, and if the motion is accepted, whether any member has the right to move an amendment.

**Mr. Nugent:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The point of order raised was not just from the hon. member for Yukon, who had a motion. As I indicated to the Chair, I also have a motion that I shall be prepared to move. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) has a motion. However, I think the nub of the question, sir, lies in the suggestion by the Chair that a motion, if it be not in order would stop the debate.

● (9:10 p.m.)

I suggest to Your Honour that there are many questions of privilege which might be raised and many motions which might be put. It is my contention that though a particular motion by one hon. member has been found out of order, this does not dispose of the main point, that is, the question of privilege which has been raised. The Chair has already ruled that this is a question of privilege. The motion is only one solution, intended to show how we should handle this matter. Since there are so many possible motions it is my contention that even if one, two or even three motions were out of order, the ruling on the question itself does not prevent this discussion of the means by which the house should handle the question of privilege. It is, therefore, my contention that it was not necessary to move any motion. Indeed, it might be improper to add any motion to the order paper.

I did suggest to Your Honour that I really believed I was co-operating. There was no suggestion that Your Honour had to give a ruling on the first question before the debate could continue. But since the motion is a method of disposing of the question at the