

Members of Parliament, these can be made only by laying a specific charge by way of a substantive motion of which proper notice is given. This is the only course open to a Member who wishes to accuse another Member of a wrongdoing or condemn another Member for an impropriety or misdemeanour. This can be verified by reference to page 378 or Erskine May's Twentieth Edition. I suggest the Hon. Member read that.

I would also refer to a ruling of Mr. Speaker Michener on June 19, 1959 in which he affirmed that the conduct of a Member of Parliament, even though reprehensible, cannot form the basis of a question of privilege although it can form the basis of a charge by way of a substantive motion. The ruling is a long one, but I should like to quote the following sentence:

In my view, simple justice requires that no Hon. Member should have to submit to investigation of his conduct by the House or a committee until he has been charged with an offence.

There are, of course, exceptions to this principle in cases where the conduct of a Member has led to the obstruction of other Members or of the House in the fulfilment of their duties. There is one further citation to which I would refer. On page 82 of Erskine May's Twentieth Edition, it is indicated:

Subject to the rules of order in debate, a Member may state whatever he thinks fit in debate, however offensive it may be to the feelings, or injurious to the character, of individuals; and he is protected by his privilege from any action for libel, as well as from any other question or molestation.

I think this makes the situation very clear. It is not for me to discuss whether Members should or should not have this protection. It would be for Parliament to change the law if it felt this degree of immunity were too great. In terms of our practice, I have no alternative but to rule that the matter raised by the Hon. Member for York South-Weston does not fulfil the conditions necessary to enable me to accord it priority as a question of privilege.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Paul Dick (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Government House Leader)):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 14 and 25.

[Text]

#### DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT LAWYERS

Question No. 14—**Mr. Howie:**

How many lawyers are employed by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development?

#### *Investment Canada Act*

**Hon. David Crombie (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** There are 21 lawyers assigned to the Department from the Department of Justice.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE LAWYERS

Question No. 25—**Mr. Howie:**

How many lawyers are employed by the Department of Agriculture?

**Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture):** There are seven lawyers assigned to the Department from the Department of Justice.

[English]

**Mr. Dick:** I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Speaker:** The questions as enumerated by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining question be allowed to stand?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### INVESTMENT CANADA ACT

#### MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Stevens that Bill C-15, an Act respecting investment in Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I join in this debate because I think the Bill tabled by the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens) has far-reaching consequences for many regions of Canada, particularly the less fortunate ones.

There are a number of concerns, but at the outset I want to thank the Minister for bringing forward Bill C-15. This is the first opportunity the Government has taken to indicate to the House and to the Canadian people the actual type of climate it wants to see created in the country for economic opportunities. I am a little confused, however, knowing the personality of the Minister involved. Perhaps other Members can well understand what has taken place.

It seemed to me that the tabling or introduction of this legislation should have taken place well after or simultaneous to the tabling of the Budget which is to come down in February, 1985. Unfortunately, this piece of legislation has been set out by the Government and the Minister without knowing the full parameters of the economic policy of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) or the direction in which the Conservative Party wants to take the Canadian economy.