

Parliament and the country, when he referred to his mark and style as being "Ottawa's oldest, established, permanent floating crap game". That more or less describes the vigour with which negotiations proceeded.

• (1510)

He will be remembered as the person who, at the pinnacle of an outstanding professional career, put all aside to lead the design of a system of accountability essential to the continuity and quality of the parliamentary form of Government. Value for money management concepts, the new Auditor General Act, the office of the Comptroller General of Canada, systems in place to measure effectiveness, the new form of the Estimates and comprehensive auditing were all products of that game which was the mark and style of James J. Macdonell.

The conclusion of his great effort rests with us in the House, the backbench Parliamentarian and the Government, that is, to deliver a Committee system which will allow us to use effectively the information system he did so much to put in place.

**Hon. Herb Gray (President of Treasury Board):** Madam Speaker, as the current President of Treasury Board, I want particularly to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by my predecessor, now the Minister of State for Economic Development (Mr. Johnston).

The late J. J. Macdonell made a very important contribution to the public life of Canada. I will not take the time to repeat his many achievements and interests. I might say, however, that while I did not serve, as some of the people who have spoken, on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts during his time as Auditor General, I had the opportunity to have a number of discussions with Mr. Macdonell on a personal basis about his concerns and the initiatives connected with them.

There is no doubt that he has made a very important contribution, as I said, to the public life of Canada. I join with the other Hon. Members of the House who have spoken at this time in expressing my sincerest sympathy to his family and friends on his passing.

**Madam Speaker:** I am sure the House will want me to convey to the family of the late J. J. Macdonell the sympathy of the House on his untimely death, a sense of gratitude for his remarkable contributions to parliamentary accountability and a recognition of the gentle and firm manner in which he prompted all of us to be more accountable.

\* \* \*

#### POINT OF ORDER

MR. LEWIS—PRIVILEGE OF MR. MACKASEY—OFFENDING MATERIAL NOT TABLED

**Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order relating to the reference yesterday to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections of the allegations contained in *The Gazette* of Montreal of March 10, 11

and 12 concerning the activities of the Hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Mackasey) with respect to 109609 Company Canada Ltd.

I made some reference yesterday to our concern about the sufficiency of the motion, but be that as it may, quite apart from the question of the sufficiency of the motion, it is our concern that the practices of the House have not been followed with respect to a complaint made of a newspaper.

It is my understanding that when an Hon. Member rises to complain about statements made in a newspaper, the offending words should be read into the record. Furthermore, United Kingdom practice indicates that complete copies of the newspaper or newspapers in which the offending article or articles in this case, appeared should be filed with the Table.

We would contend that until such time as these articles are put on record, the House is not seized of them. To suggest otherwise would be to suggest that anything put in print anywhere in Canada would be a matter of record in the House of Commons.

My case is based upon Citations 83 and 332 of *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition* which deal with questions of privilege based on published material. Citation 332(2) of *Beauchesne* reads as follows:

It is in order to quote a newspaper reflecting on proceedings in the House if the quotation is followed by a privilege motion.

When a complaint is made of a newspaper, it is the practice in the House of Commons for the Member to rise on a question of privilege and point out that he has been libelled or misrepresented. He may read as much of the article as is necessary to prove his case but he cannot go further. He is bound to confine himself strictly to the question of privilege.

The root of my argument now lies in Citation 83 of *Beauchesne*, page 25, which reads as follows:

Should a question of privilege be based on published material, the article in question must be submitted and read at the Table.

As a further example of the established practice of the House in this regard, I refer to Appendix D of the first report of the Special Committee on Rights and Immunities of Members, which was laid before the Thirtieth Parliament on July 12, 1976. It indicated that during questions of privilege raised in 1956, 1964 and 1968, newspaper articles criticizing Members were read into the records of the House. These instances can be found in *Hansard* at page 4528, pages 4431 and 4432 and page 9855.

The Canadian practice is further supported by references in *Erskine May* to the practice in the United Kingdom. I could provide the Chair with the references for that, but on page 164 of *Erskine May*, in a rather large paragraph, there appears the following sentence:

When the Member has concluded his complaint the Speaker desires him to bring the document to the table and, when the document has been brought to the table, directs the Clerk of the House to read the passages complained of.

Without trying to interfere with what has gone forward, we would submit that the actual articles have not been read into the record. Therefore, the Committee that is trying to proceed has nothing firm upon which to proceed until they are either