

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 28, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

[Translation]

PRIVILEGE

MR. LANGLOIS—REMARKS IN DEBATE
ON NOVEMBER 24

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege to make a correction in *Hansard* for Friday, November 24, at which time I took part in the debate on the situation in Montreal harbour, which matter was put before the house by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) under standing order 26.

I was interrupted in my speech by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) who pointed out to me at that time that there were only three members from the island of Montreal present in the house. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I did not mention those figures and that it was the hon. member for Lapointe who did so. I did not mention any figures at the time, Mr. Speaker, and I continued as you will find on page 4662 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, I had indeed noticed it. I am not as blind as some hon. members opposite who do not see the importance of that problem, etc.—

Thereafter, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson), as recorded on pages 4673 and 4674 of *Hansard*, that is 14 pages further on following the dinner recess, said this about me:

There is one point that I do not think should go unanswered. The hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Langlois) said there were no members on the government side from Montreal present during the debate.

I never said such a thing.

I should like to point out that throughout the whole debate my colleague the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) was here—

I admit that I also saw him.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Trudeau) was also here as well as my parliamentary secretary (Mr. Mackasey) who is from Verdun—

I referred to him during my comments and I agree that he was here.

The hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry (Mr. Laniel).

He is not from the island of Montreal but from the outskirts of Montreal.

An hon. Member: He was here.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): Yes, he was here. And the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) who is from Quebec, was even mentioned.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the hon. member indicate the nature of his question of privilege and tell the Chair whether it will be followed by a motion?

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, here is the nature of my question of privilege.

According to the statement or the conclusions of the minister, nine or ten members from Montreal have taken a keen interest in the debate. It seems to me, that instead of speaking through their hats, some members should be a little more reasonable and moderate in their statements about their colleagues in the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, I am not making preposterous and untimely statements. When the Minister of Labour credits me with having said those words, he is acting irresponsibly, and that is unthinkable on the part of a minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I doubt very much that the hon. member can claim that there are actual grounds for a question of privilege. If there really was such a question of privilege it should be followed by a motion, but the hon. member did not move any.

It is in order to point out also that a question of privilege must be raised at the first opportunity. That does not mean at the first opportunity which suits the hon. member but rather as soon as the breach of privilege takes place. The incident now in question dates back to last Friday. Therefore, it seems to me that the question was not raised at the first possible opportunity.

● (2:40 p.m.)

Indeed, even if the hon. member had raised his grievance at that time, I should have made the same ruling.

An hon. member claims there were a certain number of members in the house at a given time; the minister claims that there were more. According to the standing orders, both