

Privilege—Mr. McCleave

dealing with the matter intelligently. I do not know if hon. members need the official record in front of them to participate in the discussion, but I do know I am certainly going to require it. It would require it, first, to determine the validity of any point of order, if it exists in terms of the raising of the question; second, to determine accurately what was said; and third, to determine if what was said in fact was unparliamentary or was at the time and in the context unparliamentary in terms of our practices and precedents and then, thereafter, requiring further action if the first three points are established.

I do not want to be repetitive, but the discussion, obviously, will have to be raised tomorrow if, in the opinion of those who have given the Chair notice today, it ought to be raised tomorrow, and I think that is where the matter should be left.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, on this point I think you find yourself and the House finds itself in a somewhat narrow dilemma. I have had to deal with this problem in the past, and in view of the fact that the working copies, or what we call the "blues", go to the press gallery and are used as the basis for press stories, I suggest it is not the right argument to say that those copies are irrelevant.

There have been times when I had some things to say, when the record was examined, about what appeared in *Hansard* and what appeared in what we call the "blues". There were times when people were being very improper when making catcalls, but they were sitting in, shall we say, the privileged circle, within the hearing of the reporters who develop an ear for a particular voice and are able to take down remarks which may not be heard in the far reaches of the chamber; so these remarks appear in *Hansard*. They are not known to the speaker, nor has the Chair had a chance to hear them.

While we can say that the blues are not the final proof, I can say that *Hansard* tomorrow will not necessarily reflect what was actually said. I have seen amended "blues" where whole phrases and paragraphs have been blue-pencilled. They have been blue-pencilled either by the individual who made the remarks or by someone on his staff. There have been many instances of that.

In addition, if it is valid for this House to consider that one of the working copies, a green copy, shall be forwarded to the press as its working document—and no one objects to that—how can we in our, shall we say, sanctity ignore those copies when it might happen that tomorrow the official record of what was said will not disclose that the phrase was used at all, notwithstanding the fact that the government House leader says he heard it? The opposition House leader says he heard it, and the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave), who raised the question of privilege, says he heard it; yet it is conceivable that it will not appear in the official record. The hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. O'Connell) may shake his head, but it is a fact. Therefore, I suggest that the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants was correct in saying that reference would have to be made to the working copies and not just to *Hansard*.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, there is one point which I hope is clear, and that is that the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) is not to be disqualified from raising this point of order because it was an hour or so after the words were uttered when he did so. I was going to rise some minutes ago and make this point, but I thought Your Honour made it quite clear from the chair. However, my friend the government House leader disagreed with you. I hope it is clear that the hon. member did raise it at the first opportunity which was presented to him.

Mr. MacEachen: That is not right.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The situation on that is precisely this: as I attempted to indicate to the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave), we shall have to have some official record in order to argue this point intelligently and to come to some decision on it. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) indicated that the official record will support his argument that the matter was not raised at the first available opportunity. I have already given my preliminary sentiments on that. It would take a very persuasive argument indeed to convince me otherwise. However, I think the matter is entirely open on all counts until we see the official record and hear whatever arguments might arise.

I cannot prejudge any arguments which might be made on the basis of and supported by whatever the official transcript may show. I do not want to try to deal with part of the problem without the transcript and the rest of it with the transcript. I have indicated my preliminary feeling and recognized the difficulty the hon. member was in; so the matter stays open until we see the official transcript.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, that satisfies me, namely, that your preliminary opinion is that he raised it at the earliest possible opportunity, and I doubt if my friend across the way could produce arguments to set aside that opinion. Therefore, because I also agree that all of us ought to see the record before we proceed further, I hope that is what we will do. However, the matter could be resolved very easily by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) withdrawing the words he used.

Mr. Speaker: The matter, therefore, will stand over until tomorrow immediately after the question period.