

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot accept in this House a situation where on one day a minister of the Crown gives information or impressions which the next day he withdraws after questioning reveals that, whether advertently or not, the information given the first day under questioning was not correct. At the very least, this government, which changes its story on this matter from day to day, intends to continue to block an inquiry or royal commission. All the facts relating to the entry into Canada of the people known as the Five Dragons and others associated with them should be made available to the House both by tabling and through an opportunity for a special or standing committee to examine the officers and the ministers who were involved.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) sought, and was given, the floor on the basis of a notice sent to me in relation to a question of privilege. It turned out at the beginning to be a point of order relating to a correction to be made to yesterday's declaration, whether in fact it was a correction to *Hansard* or not. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) has contributed to that point, and there is really no procedure by which I can hear the Minister of Justice on the same point without again allowing the Leader of the Opposition to speak, and going on indefinitely.

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen).

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, may I answer the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) who asked about the status of an individual, Mr. Hon Shum. He was a landed immigrant in 1973—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Are we carrying on with the question period, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Cullen: Do you want clarification, or not?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Make a statement on motions.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Without the consent of the House there is no opportunity for a minister to expand on an answer he gave in the question period. If the minister desires to do so now, he will require unanimous consent. Is the House prepared to give its consent to hear an expanded answer from the minister?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Cullen: I was not seeking to expand on my answer, Mr. Speaker. However, I had indicated to the hon. member that I did not have the information to hand, whereas as a matter of fact I have. The individual in question, Mr. Shum, was landed in 1973 and an attempt to extradite him failed on a legal technicality. I understand an appeal is pending at the present time.

Privilege—Mr. Reynolds

PRIVILEGE

MR. REYNOLDS—REMARKS ON CBC TELEVISION PROGRAM

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege involving my reputation as a member of this House.

Members will have seen or heard about the program on CBC television on Sunday and Monday nights which accused me of consorting with and acting on behalf of underworld figures in Vancouver. This accusation is totally false and I join with other members on both sides of the House who were grossly slandered, or whose words were twisted and edited beyond recognition, in expressing revulsion that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should feel it part of its mandate to deliberately lie to its viewers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Reynolds: The CBC insinuated that I was a close acquaintance of people that I knew to be underworld figures. This is completely untrue. My dealings with these men were limited to the response a member of parliament normally makes to people who seek his help. Like all members, I reply daily to dozens of phone messages and letters. I do not have the resources to investigate all the people I talk to on the phone, or write to, or meet. Nor have I any way of knowing the background of everyone who owns a restaurant in which I sometimes eat, or a business I would visit. How many members of parliament can say they do, Mr. Speaker? It is unreasonable to think that an MP can have complete information on the connections of casual acquaintances.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a full-time member of parliament for five years. I have worked extremely hard and have always had an open-door policy for anyone who wanted to see me. I am proud of that record.

The CBC accused me of either corruption or naivety. I must remind the House that I could hardly have been stronger in my requests for action to combat the criminal elements in Canadian society. I am not about to totally reverse the main purpose of my political career and start acting on their half. The CBC has advanced nothing more than a sly, cut-up version of film clips to suggest otherwise. The help sought by Mr. Cala is the same as that sought daily by hundreds of constituents of all members, and my response was even less helpful than most would give. I told him I had no idea where the Mackenzie Valley pipeline would be built and advised him to call another MP and an oil lobbying person. I could not even give him an educated guess.

I would like to point out in passing that the House dealt with this problem once before, when the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) was accused of having violated budget secrecy with respect to motor boat taxes. I ask hon. members to recall that the Montreal *Gazette* was criticized by a committee of this House for totally misrepresenting the hon. member's actions.

As to the suggestion that I am naive, I feel that if there is naivety anywhere, it was on the part of the gentlemen who