

Supply

I think it was an attack on the hon. minister when the hon. member talked about the conduct of the minister. I gave the minister an opportunity to introduce his remarks. The hon. member—

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. Rose) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the—

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member for Mission-Port Moody. Order, please. I had recognized the hon. member on a question of privilege. He sat down and now somebody else—

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, when—

An hon. Member: Sit down!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order please. I did recognize the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody on a point of order and I will hear him.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Justice, through a question of privilege, is going to open this whole can of worms again, I think the Speaker might be guided by another citation. In *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition* at page 114, Citation 321 discusses protected persons and has this to say:

All references to judges and courts of justice of the nature of personal attack and censure have always been considered unparliamentary, and the Speaker has always treated them as breaches of order.

Yesterday the Minister of Justice called the behaviour of Mr. Justice Thomas Berger reprehensible and no protection was offered by the Chair whatsoever.

All that was said today by my colleague the hon. member for Kamloops-Shuswap was that the minister's conduct had been inappropriate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I recognized the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody on a point of order but now he is entering into debate on something that is not before the House.

Some hon. Members: No, no!

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the Minister of Justice should not be allowed to smuggle in, by way of a question of privilege, something that is properly debatable by the government making the time of the House available for that purpose. There is a private member's motion standing on the Order Paper, motion No. 78 in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West. It would give a complete airing to the conduct of the Minister of Justice if the government would follow normal parliamentary tradition and procedure and make government time available for that debate. That is where the issue of the minister's conduct should be debated, not by a question of privilege that is smuggled in.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, with your leave, I would like to get back to my question of privilege—

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. The Chair wishes to consult with the Table officers for a moment.

I am sure hon. members are still questioning why the Chair allowed the hon. minister to have the floor. I might refer to the Standing Orders. Standing Order 35 reads as follows:

No Member shall speak disrespectfully of Her Majesty, nor of any of the Royal Family, nor of His Excellency or the person administering the Government of Canada; nor use offensive words against either House, or against any Member thereof. No Member may reflect upon any vote—

Therefore, I recognized the Minister of Justice on a question of privilege. I would now invite the hon. member for Kamloops-Shuswap to enter the debate but not to use disrespectful language.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I will not refer to the Minister of Justice in any negative way.

An hon. Member: Go ahead.

Mr. Riis: The response to what I intended to be a rather innocent statement is not surprising on such a dark day. The inappropriate behaviour of this government, if I can generalize in that way, Mr. Speaker, has certainly resulted in the need for this special debate today on the economic collapse the country is experiencing.

The term "economic collapse" does not come from the New Democratic Party only or from the Progressive Conservative Party only; it comes from the trust companies of Canada. Just a few days ago their representatives appeared before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. It is a very conservative group of people which is not known to cause undue alarm in the country. Yet when the question was put to those trust company representatives around the table, they said that unless the policies of the government are changed dramatically within six months, the country will face total economic collapse.

That statement was given credibility just a few days ago by the chief executive officer of the firm of MacMillan-Bloedel in British Columbia. Again, this is an individual who chooses in words very carefully when they are of a negative nature and dealing with the economy. He indicated that we are heading toward certain collapse in this country as a result of the monetary and fiscal policies of the government.

Today, in the richest country in the world, many of our elderly citizens are terrified by what they see happening around them. Their life savings of the last 60 or 70 years are evaporating before their eyes. Their security is falling away from them. The youth to whom we would look for the future of the country are disillusioned and have essentially given up hope of what the future holds for them and their friends. The