

Mr. Speaker, there are four essential ingredients laid out in that citation. I would suggest to you that each of those four are met by my question of privilege. The fact, first, is there has been a reflection upon my character or conduct in my capacity as a member of this House. Second, the actions referred to or the words uttered were used in the transaction of the business of the House. Third, bad faith was imputed and, finally, the charges were very definite: the minister specifically said I was promoting the interest of Westinghouse and was acting as their agent. There could hardly be anything more definite than that.

Citation 111 refers to imputations of corruption against members, in the execution of their duties, as involving privilege. This is supported by May at page 153 of the nineteenth edition. These two citations are precisely relevant to the malicious slander which the minister put on record yesterday.

Further, we usually think of an agent as someone who acts on behalf of a person, or interest, for payment. This is particularly true when speaking of myself, a lawyer. In this connection I would refer Your Honour to the definition in the Oxford Dictionary. The dictionary refers to an agent as follows:

One who does the actual work of anything, as distinguished from the instigator or employer; hence, one who acts for another.

We then go on to read that it is a term commonly used in commerce, politics and law. The minister's statement implies misconduct on my part as set out and described at page 142 of May as follows:

The acceptance of any member of either House of a bribe to influence him in his conduct as such member, or of any fee, compensation or award in connection with the promotion of, or opposition to, any bill, resolution or thing, submitted or intended to be submitted to the House or any committee thereof is a breach of privilege.

In British usage, the term "parliamentary agent" has a very specific meaning and members are not permitted to act in that capacity. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the term "parliamentary agent" first began to be used in the British parliament in 1837. It consequently became part of our precedents under the British North America Act and is basically a function of our parliamentary system.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I do not think the hon. member should dwell on his point about "parliamentary agent". The term which was used was not "parliamentary agent". That term has a very specific usage with respect to the sponsorship of legislation, and I think it ought not to be dealt with extensively.

**Mr. Stevens:** Mr. Speaker, I am making this point about "parliamentary agent" because I believe it is relevant. May deals with the question of parliamentary agents at page 902. He makes two points. Parliamentary agents promote, and they are agents. Those are exactly the words which were used by the minister yesterday, and I believe those words were used after some forethought on his part.

There are several cases which I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention. This kind of charge was levelled by Mr. Ralston against the then prime minister, Mr. Bennett, in 1935,

### Privilege—Mr. Stevens

as reported on page 3639 of *Hansard* for June 14 of that year. We find that the passage to which Mr. Ralston took exception was as follows. The prime minister stated:

● (1512)

The leading member who spoke for the opposition is a distinguished lawyer; he did not desire to make that speech; he has made his statements and they are well known, but he was told to speak, so he took the brief and made the statement. From whom did he get his facts that he referred to with their "ifs"? Who supplied them to him? Who gave him his brief and what does it represent on the back of it? That is the question.

Those words were challenged by Mr. Ralston and there are 10 pages of discussion in *Hansard* concerning whether in fact the words did constitute a question of privilege. The prime minister hastened to say that he did not intend to impute anything and, based on his statement that he did not intend to impute anything, the Speaker held that there was not a question of privilege. May I refer Your Honour to the statements as they appear in *Hansard*, specifically to the Speaker's statement which appears at page 3669 for June 14, 1935. The Speaker had this to say, and I would emphasize it:

If I had taken any such imputation I certainly would have requested the Prime Minister to withdraw. The Prime Minister has stated that he made no imputation in the matter and naturally I must accept his statement. He has stated emphatically on more than one occasion since the question of privilege has been raised that he made no such imputation and that is the statement I am bound to accept.

If I may continue, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer Your Honour to United Kingdom cases. There have been a number of instances in the United Kingdom where cases of privilege or contempt have been held to exist when members have been accused of acting under improper influences, whether by another member or in the press. The appendix to issue No. 1 of your committee, sir, Rights and Immunities of Members, lists two such cases where a prima facie case was found. One was the Ashton case, where the member had said that certain members had accepted financial payment for binding their future actions. The other was the case of Mrs. Gwyneth Dunwoody, a 1974 case, who was accused in a newspaper article of being improperly influenced by certain power brokers.

If I may refer Your Honour more specifically to that case and the report of it from the committee on privileges in the 1974-75 session in the British House of Commons, I think the words which were a question of privilege in that instance are quite similar to the words used by the minister yesterday. The words in question were these:

The question being asked is: What is the real significance of the Dunwoody broadside?

Is she speaking for the holidaymaker at larger when she claims they could eventually need protection from tour operator collapse by the intervention of a national government?

Or is she being used as a powerful pawn in a protracted battle of travel trade chess aimed at dethroning the present ABTA leadership?

I would ask Your Honour to note that those are all questions in the same sense that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources was asked questions yesterday. When the matter was raised in the House, it was ordered that the matter of complaint be referred to the committee on privileges. There