

everything. However, I have been listening to ministers opposite since 1968, and when I use the phrase "cover-up" in connection with them I do not mean covering up some criminal activity, as Richard Nixon did, but a cover-up in layman's terms. I just cannot believe that this "cry baby" can be so sensitive at this time.

I come now to the next point. The Minister of Justice has charged us with suggesting that the police workday should be monitored from day to day. I say that is utter nonsense. I am not saying that the minister lied, but it is untrue. If I had said that he had deliberately made a statement to falsify facts in this House, then I would not be standing where I am, I would withdraw.

I come to the next statement, that there is merely a plot. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you believe that there have not been plots in the Liberal caucus against this poor old party ever since confederation, then I am not Eldon Woolliams from Calgary North. There have been plots and plots. I am not talking about a criminal conspiracy or some illegal plot, but an ordinary plot. The Liberals often make plots.

Mr. Fraser: In fact, they leave them behind them.

Mr. Woolliams: I am sure that if they ever hid a wire recorder in our caucus room they would sometimes hear about plots. Perhaps we do not plot as well as they do, Mr. Speaker, but we plot. I am telling you honestly that we plot.

We now come to the fifth objection. This was when the noise in the House became so loud that you could not hear yourself think, let alone speak. This has to do with the hon. member for Restigouche. I do not know what happened to him, Mr. Speaker, or what he had for dinner, whether it was mustard on steak, but something upset his digestion, to say the least. He was yelling at me when I said that the minister could not have gathered a standing ovation from his audience by telling the truth but that the one thing the minister did accomplish was to get a pie in the face.

I said that perhaps a little facetiously, Mr. Speaker. I thought it rather funny, having come back from Calgary on an aircraft, when I saw the Minister of Justice wiping the cream from the pie out of his eyeballs. You could not help but think that funny, Mr. Speaker. I always get along with the Minister of Justice and he would be the first to say so. I was not trying to be cruel, unkind or bitter; I just wanted to have a little humour with him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the hon. member enjoyed many opportunities for that last evening, and it looks like he is getting a second run. I want simply to intervene at this point to say that both members have had an opportunity to raise this matter. I think we ought to pay careful attention to the general principle here in accordance with the ruling that I made earlier in the week, namely, that no allegation of law-breaking or of illegality, can be made by one side against the other side in this House. I think that is consistent with the principle of the judgment I made.

Privilege—Mr. Crosbie

The expression referred to by the Minister of Justice can, I suppose, in some contexts have that effect, but I would not want to eliminate that for all time. However, the hon. member has already referred to the main point of culpability, cover-up and matters that might be untruthful; but those words do not seem to carry with them any suggestion of illegality in the context in which they were used.

The other point which gave me some doubt in the minister's argument was the question of blackmail, which at best is a slang term, one which cannot be taken from the annals of the Criminal Code. In the context which was used by the hon. member for Calgary North I do not see any allegation of direct illegality. However, I would ask all hon. members to be vigilant that we do not relax this practice of prohibiting allegations of direct illegality by one member against another.

I think this matter has been thoroughly discussed by both sides. Both members have had an opportunity to contribute to it, and I think we ought to move on to another question.

MR. CROSBIE—REMARKS OF MR. M. DIONNE

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I do not want to keep Your Honour long, but I want to refer to a matter which came up last night, as reported at page 914 of *Hansard*, having to do with remarks made by the hon. member for Northumberland-Miramichi. As recorded at page 914, the hon. member said:

We have heard repeatedly today that there is no effort on the part of the opposition to condemn the RCMP. They say they support the RCMP. Let us look at the record. I refer to a speech made on October 31 by the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). He said as reported at page 496 of *Hansard*:

"—I say the RCMP have to be brought to heel."

That is not a condemnation by the RCMP in their terms! They will bring in another apologist to try to eradicate that statement.

That is a misrepresentation, Mr. Speaker, of what I said on October 31. I refer Your Honour to *Hansard* of that date. As reported at page 496, I said this—and compare it with the previous quotation:

I have no fetish about the RCMP, and if members of the RCMP are going about Canada committing illegal acts in the manner we have evidence they have done in three or four instances, then I say the RCMP have to be brought to heel.

The deliberate partial quotation made by the hon. gentleman is a complete misrepresentation of what I said, Mr. Speaker. May I refer Your Honour to page 130 of *Beauchesne's* fourth edition, where halfway down the page it says that the misrepresentation of the language of another is unparliamentary. This is a misrepresentation of my language. The hon. member took part of a sentence only, and there is a great difference between the two statements, one being "I say the RCMP has to be brought to heel", the other being:

I have no fetish about the RCMP, and if members of the RCMP are going about Canada committing illegal acts in the manner we have evidence they have done in three or four instances, then I say the RCMP have to be brought to heel.

I do not think an hon. member should be allowed to take partial quotes of another member and twist the meaning. I submit that that is a breach of the privilege of that hon.