

Privilege—Mr. W. Baker

Madam Speaker: If the hon. member wishes to argue the matter, I can recognize him later, but not on a point of order.

Mr. Blais: On a point of order, Madam Speaker. I am suggesting that the hon. member, in raising a spurious question of privilege, is breaching the order of this House. I would like to set the stage and quote the authorities upon which I base this particular point of order.

Madam Speaker: Order. I just heard the minister say that he was expressing the opinion that this was not a serious question of privilege. That has not yet been determined. The person to determine that in the House is the Speaker. If the minister has a point of order that is perfectly in order, I can hear him, but not to argue the case. That can come later, if I decide I want to hear him on it.

Mr. Blais: Madam Speaker, the point I am making is that there is an orchestration being conducted by the opposition of which the hon. gentleman's spurious or alleged question of privilege is but one part. In order for me to establish the point of order, I have to draw to Your Honour's attention the behaviour of the opposition since Tuesday, March 24. I might point out—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. That is not a point of order. A point of order has to refer to something presently happening in the House. It is true we are discussing questions of privilege every day in this House. If the minister wishes to raise a point of order, it has to be directly related to what the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) is presently saying; but it has to be a point of order, not debate.

Mr. Blais: The point of order I am bringing to your attention is the obstruction of the House.

Madam Speaker: I am sorry—

Mr. Blais: That is happening now.

Madam Speaker: I am sorry. I gave the minister three chances to state his point of order. I do not think he has one. The hon. member for Nepean-Carleton.

Mr. McRae: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Kempling: Here come the heavies.

Mr. McRae: My point of order is simply this. The hon. member has risen as a Member of Parliament dealing with the privileges of Members of Parliament. He has not spoken about this privilege. He spoke only about privileges of members of the Bar Association. That has nothing to do with this House.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Just so the hon. member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan (Mr. McRae) will be clear, I did not couch it in that way. I said exactly the opposite. I said it is a duty that falls on all Members of Parliament, and falls particularly heavily on members of the bar. That is the only contention.

I regret the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Blais) is imputing motives to me. I have always spoken very kindly of him. I do not think I am going to be that long, Madam Speaker. If the minister will just contain himself, he can then argue the case.

I think I was at the point of having dealt with the lawyer in public life. I indicated that the proposition put by the Prime Minister in question period yesterday—

Mr. Blais: I rise on a further point of order, Madam Speaker. It is related directly to the comment just made by the hon. member. Your Honour will recall, and it is recorded on page 8714 of *Hansard* for last Friday, the categorical statement of the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton that "we are going to use parliamentary time and we are going to waste it." It is that statement that I want to relate his present behaviour to, in terms of the systematic obstruction of the business of the House. That is the point of order I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention so that you can competently rule on it.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The minister will have to point out to me where the hon. member has violated a rule of this House. The minister may have an opinion of something that is going on, but that is not a point of order.

Mr. Stevens: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order arising from what the minister has just been saying. I would like him to be very specific. Who does he feel is the obstructionist in this House?

Mr. Blais: Madam Speaker, I would point out that the hon. member who has just spoken is part of the attempt to obstruct the business of the House. Because in effect we are not dealing with the obstruction—

Madam Speaker: Order. The minister made that point in another point of order.

Mr. Stevens: Madam Speaker, I have a question of privilege of which I would like to give you notice. I asked who was the obstructionist.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. We are already discussing a question of privilege.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): He is giving you notice, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: In the middle of a question of privilege? I do not need oral notice; I need only written notice.

Mr. Stevens: It is coming.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I should point out, because the Minister of Supply and Services is also a member of the bar, the difference between the circumstances on Friday and those of today. In the intervening time, the Supreme Court of Newfoundland ruled that what Parliament, all of us, are being asked to deal with is illegal. The court ruled that the approach of the Prime Minister with respect to