

shall never break it. I think there is the convention, and I would like to go back to it, that we allow the Hon. Member an opportunity to take action if he wishes to take action.

I wish to close on this point before I sum up. There have been suggestions as to what the Government should or should not do, and the Government blocking actions of the House. I think it is clear that this is a case for the House. This is a case for its Members. I assure the House the Government will take the time to consider the matter. The Government will take its responsibility seriously, and the Government will accept its responsibility. But we will also do it with the law that exists in mind, for example, appeal periods. The Government will always do it with respect for an individual's rights as a Member of this House.

In closing I say this. I do not believe that there is a *prima facie* case of privilege. Even if there were, I would say with respect that it is premature because the appeal periods have not run out and because the Chair has not been formally notified by the court of the situation.

My hon. friends may make light of that. They may sneer at those appeal periods, but I think they are important. It is important that we go through all the procedures when we are doing something as serious as this.

I close with this comment. The individual is owed a duty, a right or a privilege by this House to make up his own mind as to what course of action he will take. I would defend that with all my heart and soul, as I would his right to due process of law outside this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Burnaby—Kingsway in reply.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, very briefly in reply, I do not think any Member of this House disagrees with the suggestion that it would be desirable for the Hon. Member for Chambly (Mr. Grisé) to do the right thing, the honourable thing, and to submit his resignation himself. He has not done that. That is the point. I had hoped that perhaps at 11 a.m. this morning he would in fact have been here. The Hon. Member for Beauce (Mr. Bernier) suggested he was coming to the House today. However, he is not here. He has not done the honour-

able thing. Thus, we are left with no alternative but to move.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Lewis) suggests that the raising of this question of privilege is premature. Your Honour is well aware that one of the obligations of any Member in raising a question of privilege is to raise that question at the earliest possible opportunity. That has been set out clearly in the precedents and traditions of this House. Indeed, Citation 82 of *Beauchesne's* indicates clearly that this is an obligation on Members.

• (1200)

Had I delayed raising the question of privilege, waiting for the Member for Chambly to do the honourable thing, I assume that the Minister of Justice would have been on his feet saying: "No, no, no, it is not in order because he did not raise it at the first opportunity." There is no alternative in a serious situation of this nature but to raise the question of privilege at the earliest opportunity. That is why I gave Your Honour notice yesterday that I intended to raise the question at the time that I did.

I might just note parenthetically that the Member in question for Chambly also acted as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice for some two years, during the period of time when he has admitted he was taking bribes. I think that is a rather sad reflection as well.

With reference to the appeal period the Minister of Justice has said and I quote: "the precedents suggest that all steps of appeal must be exhausted." What precedents? The Minister of Justice, the Government House Leader, has not cited a single precedent. The reason for that is because he cannot. There is no precedent. There is no precedent suggesting that all avenues of appeal must be exhausted before this House can move. What a mockery that would make of the power of this House to take action in cases of admitted corruption.

What the Minister of Justice is suggesting is that all a Member of Parliament has to do is launch an appeal after having pleaded guilty and effectively that this House is paralyzed, that we can do nothing, that we have to wait until the Court of Appeal has ruled, and that we have to wait until the Supreme Court of Canada has disposed of the matter. That does an incredible injustice, not just to each and every Member of this House, but to the constituents of the Member for Chambly who according to the Minister must continue to be re-