

it as an important point. Hon. Members on all sides are obviously treating it as an important point.

I remind Hon. Members that the Hon. Member for York South—Weston, whom I earlier complimented on getting to the point, also said that it may or may not be a question of privilege but that it most certainly was a breach of trust. The Hon. Member for Carleton—Charlotte who has spent many years in the House and many previous years in a provincial legislature is a very experienced parliamentarian. He made exactly the same point.

It seems Hon. Members are asking me to decide—and I think we can agree it is a breach of trust—whether or not the breach of trust under these circumstances is a breach of privilege. I assure all Hon. Members that I will give the matter very careful consideration.

I also want to assure all Hon. Members that I do not take what has been said here as the beginnings of any kind of witch-hunt. I think some concern was expressed by some Hon. Members that that is what might come out of this discussion. I want to assure all Hon. Members that I do not take that view at all. I certainly would not encourage that kind of reaction from a debate like this one.

I think all Members are in agreement that when Hon. Members enter into a good faith arrangement to hold the information they have in an *in camera* meeting, they place themselves in a situation of trust, one with the other. Of course that ought not to be breached. This is why we are called "Honourable Members". We must be able to depend upon the word of an Hon. Member without, as they say, having it signed, sealed and delivered. The Hon. Member's word should be enough.

The Chair will look carefully at the situation and report back to the House as soon as is convenient.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention a piece of information which might make your deliberations somewhat easier. I refer to a decision of Speaker Jerome on October 22, 1975. A draft report of a parliamentary committee on immigration was leaked or made public presumably by one of the participants. It was sent to the appropriate committee for evaluation and came back to Speaker Jerome. He in fact ruled that, because the original motion did not contain the name of an individual person or set of persons, he could not rule that there had been a breach of privilege.

● (1550)

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) for the additional information. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary. I think this is on another matter?

**Mr. Lewis:** Yes, it is, Mr. Speaker.

*Point of Order—Mr. Lewis*

**POINT OF ORDER**

ALLEGED USE OF UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE

**Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, during Question Period I gave you notice—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, for a moment, please. Could I ask the indulgence of the Parliamentary Secretary to advise the House that it was my intention to give certain rulings this afternoon. In view of the hour, I will adjourn that and advise the Hon. Members who were involved. The Parliamentary Secretary.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, for the same reason I will make my remarks brief on this question of privilege. I do not want to impede the opposition day either.

I gave you notice of my intention to raise a question of privilege as a result of the remarks of the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) during a question that he addressed to the Prime Minister during Question Period today. The Hon. Member made the comment "if he has the courage". I submit that his remarks provoked an uproar and disruption in this House which was undignified and disruptive of the proceedings of the House.

Yesterday the same Member made the comment:

I am sure that, unlike the Prime Minister, he could be sincere.

Which also raised the outcry: "Order! order!"

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I would ask the Parliamentary Secretary to confine his remarks to events that happened today. The Chair is aware of the exchange with the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) yesterday. The Chair examined the blues. The Chair was aware that some Hon. Members were not happy with the exchange, but I must advise that the Chair did not feel, strong as the language and the suggestion might have been, that there was any need to interfere.

We are dealing with another matter today and I will hear the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary and other Hon. Members.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, to continue. Today, the Hon. Member used the words: "if he has the courage." I draw your attention to Beauséjour in two instances. First, Citation 319(3):

In the House of Commons a Member will not be permitted by the Speaker to indulge in any reflections on the House itself as a political institution; or to impute to any Member or Members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case;—

I also draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to Beauséjour, Citation 324(1). It reads:

It is impossible to lay down any specific rules in regard to injurious reflections uttered in debate against particular Members, or to declare beforehand what expressions are or are not contrary to order;—

I wanted to read the entire quote, but this point I want to draw to your attention: