

Privilege—Mr. Kilgour

As I recall the correspondence read into the record, the so-called aggrieved individual did not have the courage to put his reputation on the line and reveal his name. To say, simply and pathetically: I do not want to reveal the bribery charge in case I lose further orders; that makes me wonder who would be the bigger crook if indeed such bribery took place.

Now, I would suggest in conclusion that the hon. gentleman had better, in the next 48 hours, be prepared to withdraw his allegation or do the honourable thing and refer it to the appropriate committee of the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: I was just about to move in on the hon. member to warn him that if he is referring to offences under the Criminal Code, he had better very clearly lay the charges and be very careful not to throw around allegations. He has to stand behind any charges he makes in this respect.

Mr. Kilgour: I assure the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Mackasey) that there is nothing that disgusts me more than this type of practice and that is one of the reasons why I am not a Liberal. You guys have been living with this kind of thing for too many years.

I would point out again, Madam Speaker, as I read the letter, I did not accuse anybody of committing a crime and I guess I have been a Crown attorney for too many years for the hon. member for Lincoln. I simply referred him to the provisions of the Criminal Code and invited him to read them because I suspect that he, like many people, was not aware of that section and I am certain the hon. member for Lincoln is not aware of the section.

Mr. Mackasey: The hon. members opposite may think it is funny but I do not. My point of order is an important one. There are certain customs, traditions and privileges which we are talking about that we want preserved in this House and that is why you rise on a question of privilege. That is why I am not overly concerned about the number of questions of privilege if indeed we want to retain the privileges we are entitled to. One of the privileges we have as members is immunity from lawsuits, and I am not a lawyer but I know that this is an extraordinary immunity that makes it possible for us to speak to the fullest extent in order to make our point. I am not talking about criminal charges, I am saying that in order to preserve that freedom, that privilege, it is incumbent upon us not to abuse it, because if we do, we are going to see it removed.

In the 1960s, Madam Speaker, and I do not want to go into history, but I can remember a young member named Lord, a young lawyer attached to Mr. Favreau's office who, despite later exoneration by the appropriate court, had his career ruined by innuendo in this House by members who were just within the legal—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I would not like to discuss this point further; it was well made by some hon. members. I again remind the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona that

he must be careful not to make these accusations without being prepared to follow them up with the proper charges. If he is referring to dispositions of the Criminal Code, he might be able to do that, but he would have to be very careful not to accuse anyone of anything he is unable to stand behind. If the hon. member will try to summarize or resume his question of privilege—

Mr. Kilgour: I am finished, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Well, it seems to me that this whole matter of donations to political parties, no matter how they were solicited, is not a question covered by the Standing Orders of this House. It might be improper, it might be all sorts of things that the hon. member might want to expose, but it certainly does not fall under the purview of the question of privilege nor does it relate precisely to the proceedings of this House. There was some delay which I have to take into account as well, but the matter itself does not come under the purview of a question of privilege.

Presenting reports from standing and special committees.

Mr. Andre: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre).

* * *

● (2120)

POINT OF ORDER

MR. ANDRE—ITEMS UNDER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES—
RAISING OF OBJECTIONS OUT OF ORDER

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order which is very similar to the one I raised on March 24. At that time I was dealing with the supplementary estimates and items contained therein which, in my view, were out of order—

Mr. Collenette: Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Madam Speaker: I am awfully sorry, but the estimates are not before us. That point of order should have been raised at the time—

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, they are.

Madam Speaker: What is the point of order? It must be related to the proceedings of the House.

Mr. Chrétien: Call orders of the day.

Mr. Andre: Madam Speaker, my point of order—

Mr. Collenette: Madam Speaker, my privileges are in question, as I am sure are the privileges of all members of the House. In view of the fact that Your Honour called "Presenting reports from standing or special committees"—