

Administration of Justice

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I should like to clarify that point. I wanted to make it quite clear that the Prime Minister stated what the consequences would be if the things that were said in the press conference were not substantiated. That was made clear earlier today.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Let the minister get up and deny them.

Mr. McIlraith: The position taken by the Prime Minister today was very, very clear on that point.

Mr. Lambert: What about names?

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member says, "What about names?" The hon. member knows perfectly well that the correct way to deal with this matter is not to give names. He certainly should not try to go on with this bluff, which he has been pulling all day,—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIlraith: —trying to prevent the proper resolution of this very grave matter.

Mr. Churchill: Is the minister prepared to name me?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Come on.

Mr. McIlraith: I will not be sucked into that trap. That is bluff of the poorest sort by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Peters: Five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I regret to inform the hon. member that, much as I personally would like to move into private members' business, this cannot be done because we are still on the item of business that has precedence. If we returned to anything, it would not be private members' business; it would be government business. The hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I have a question for the house leader.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The house leader has resumed his seat and the Chair has recognized the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, could we have unanimous consent to call it five o'clock? Surely, we have had enough.

[Mr. Douglas.]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If there is unanimous consent we could, of course, call it five o'clock. If there is unanimous agreement we could go on with private members' business at five o'clock. But it can only be done on that basis because, normally, if we suspended consideration of the question of privilege now before the house we would go on to government business. We would call routine proceedings.

Mr. Nielsen: As long as it does not prejudice the matter of privilege before the house, we would agree. The first matter of business, of course, on Monday would be the question of privilege before the house. Is this agreed?

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Of course; I am sure there is no difficulty about this. While I am on my feet I wish to make a further appeal to hon. members to consider the rulings that were made by the Chair yesterday and today. These rulings indicate to hon. members who have taken part in this debate how the matter can be resolved in the house from a strict procedural standpoint and in accordance with the rules. I had hoped that hon. members would see the situation in the light of the ruling that had been made by the Chair. I hoped that by six o'clock today some way might have been found to resolve the difficulty in which we are at the present time. Obviously, this will not come to pass this afternoon. However, I invite hon. members to give consideration to the rulings I have made, and to the suggestions I have made, as to what should be done by hon. members if they want to present a motion that will be acceptable to the Chair and that will be satisfactory according to precedent. If this were to be done at some time we might resolve the difficulty in which we are.

By agreement we have called it five o'clock?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it quite clear that on Monday the first item before this house will be the question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot assure the hon. member what will be the first item of business on Monday.

Mr. Nielsen: Then I cannot go along with it.

Mr. Speaker: There is no agreement.