

*Privilege—Mr. Baldwin*

Majesty's Loyal Opposition stood suspected of having committed a criminal offence.

If the Prime Minister had seen fit, when I started, to get up and make a generous withdrawal, it might not have been necessary to have taken the matter further. However, I do not see a look of generosity on his face at the moment, so I shall continue. It may be argued that this was a statement made against a number of members who were unnamed.

I would call to Your Honour's attention a number of precedents and, in particular, a very interesting brief by Mr. Laundry of the Library of Parliament research branch, dated May 28, 1969, in which reference is made to a famous case in England where a number of Conservative members who were holding private meetings in connection with government business were the subject of allegations that they were selling private information for food and drink provided by the press gallery.

**Mr. Gillies:** It could never happen here.

**Mr. Baldwin:** The following is from a report which was made by a committee which considered the issue:

An unfounded imputation in regard to such meetings involves an affront to the House as such. Your committee consider that an unjustified allegation that members regularly betray the confidence of private party meetings either for payment or whilst their discretion has been undermined by drink, is a serious contempt.

I maintain that what the Prime Minister said against us is such a statement as to bring the proceedings of the whole House into disrepute. In reverse, if the Prime Minister is allowed to make a statement of that kind, I would be perfectly justified in saying what millions of people may believe—I am putting it forward hypothetically—that it may well be that the government instituted the irregular proceedings which were complained of many years ago, knew about them immediately afterward, and has covered them up ever since. If the Prime Minister is allowed to make the kind of statement he has made, then I am entitled to make such a statement; one which, for the present at least, I have put forward hypothetically.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Peace River has made my task considerably easier by the conclusion he has just reached. If I were able to make that general statement last Thursday, then surely that side of the House would be able, without breaking the rules of the House, to make general statements about this side having covered up an illegal act. Mr. Speaker, they have been saying nothing else for the past week.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Shame.

**Mr. Trudeau:** The hon. member may say "Shame", but to demonstrate the reality of the case put forward by the hon. member for Peace River, all I had to do was read one day's *Hansard* of last week. I chose Monday because members opposite made a lot of speeches that day. But Your Honour will note that during the whole of the week, if one accusation was made about a cover-up, there were 100. I shall refer to some of them—not to the entire 100, of course. Stop me when

[Mr. Baldwin.]

you have heard enough. I intend to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Tory party is a bunch of cry babies.

● (1512)

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Trudeau:** They have been accusing the government, and not only the government but named ministers, myself and the Solicitor General, of an incredible number of illegal acts, not only by innuendo but by direct accusation. "Cover-up" is the phrase which is used all the time. They say there has been a cover-up of illegal acts, making the government an accomplice to illegalities committed by the RCMP, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in this House, Speakers have frequently ruled that when the accusation is general, when it does not relate to a particular member, it is translated by a form of argument or suspicion. I was faced with the hon. member for Central Nova who, after having discovered a listening device in his office, accused the RCMP, said that he suspected them, and then went on to say—

**Mr. Stevens:** You are wrong.

**Mr. Paproski:** Read *Hansard*.

**Mr. Trudeau:** They ask me to read it, Mr. Speaker, and I will; but first let me outline my argument. I am faced with a member who impugns the RCMP and the services with having bugged him. I reverse the charges, Mr. Speaker. I say that if the hon. member for Central Nova has cause to suspect the RCMP, and I suggest he does not, then we might have cause to suspect the Tory party. After all, this bug was discovered on Monday afternoon of last week by an investigation officer who happened to be in town on that particular day.

**Mr. Chrétien:** With the proper instrument.

**Mr. Trudeau:** With the proper instruments for debugging. He found a bug that could only have been placed, if the timing is correct, on Friday afternoon after the Solicitor General had made a statement on security. It all looked very suspicious, Mr. Speaker, but I told the House that I did not have anything more than suspicion. Your Honour can judge whether the kind of suspicion that I direct toward the Tory party is any different, not from suspicion but from the dozens and hundreds of direct accusations which they make in this House all the time about the government being dishonest, crooked, covering up and everything else. Let me read a few quotations, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. member for Central Nova, since I am asked by the opposition to do so. I read from several newspapers. If it were only one, perhaps we could wonder what the member had—

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is not going to be allowed to read excerpts from the press. This was said in the House.

**Mr. Clark:** And I have *Hansard* here, sir.