

*Privilege—Mr. Cafik*

also a rule of reason as well as a rule of law. When the law prohibits someone from doing something that they must do for the protection of themselves, their property, their family, their loved ones, or whatever, the rule of reason has to come into play. In this particular case—and I am not talking about the RCMP but about the illustration I gave—if someone had a loved one whose life was in danger and he was impeded from doing something by the law in order to save that life, the rule of reason would have to come into play and the courts would understand this on a consistent basis.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have respected many times in the past the right of any member who has been seriously aggrieved by any kind of journalistic mistreatment to raise the matter by way of privilege in the House and to put some explanation on the record. However, I think we have to be very careful not to extend this practice unduly. I respect the right of the hon. member if he has been misquoted. On several occasions in the past, the Chair has given members who feel they have been misquoted by the press an opportunity to set the record straight, particularly if there might be some misleading of the House, some grievance or contempt of the House contained therein. I think the deputy House leader ought to put the matter on the record, but it should be very limited.

**Mr. Cafik:** Mr. Speaker, I rose, not to correct the press—I have given up on that a long time ago—but as a result of the question of privilege raised earlier by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby. Had it not been for that, I would not have raised the question. But I do not want it put on the record publicly or in the House of Commons that I in any way indicated that the RCMP really ought to be above the law. That is not my position and never has been my position. In light of the comments made by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, I simply wanted the record to show that.

**Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, may I make a brief comment with respect to the matter raised by the deputy House leader on the government side. While he may be aggrieved by what is written about him, the fact of the matter is that the Minister of Justice, for example, has been widely quoted over the course of the last weekend as well as being of similar sentiment to that of the deputy House leader. In fact, I suppose it might be said he was quoted as taking a position similar to that of the Prime Minister, in which there seems to be an implicit tolerance toward lawbreaking on the part of some police authorities whether federal or otherwise. While the deputy House leader wants to bring to the attention of the House the fact that he does not hold that point of view, the reasonable interpretation can be put on the statements made by the Prime Minister, the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice that this will in fact be tolerated by the government.

I would simply bring to the attention of Your Honour, and put on the record of the House, a statement made by the Minister of Justice who took that position in February of this year. I am curious to know whether he will maintain that position. He said in this House—

[Mr. Cafik.]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Is the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar referring the Minister of Justice to a quotation made in February of this year?

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** I am simply pointing out that the Minister of Justice has made a number of speeches in which he made certain statements and allegations respecting police forces being able to break the law. I want to point out to Your Honour that there has been a change in the attitude of this government to this issue, made more obvious by statements made in the House, as opposed to statements appearing in the press as alleged by the deputy House leader.

At an earlier time in this House, when protection of privilege was more appropriately brought to your attention rather than through press reports, the Minister of Justice indicated that he had great concern over the extent of the powers held by investigative agencies, and that he would look into ways in which these powers should be brought under control by legislation. I simply want the deputy House leader to know, in the course of his point of privilege, that his position in this House as enunciated is diametrically opposed to that taken by the Minister of Justice.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. This is the difficulty we face whenever we attempt to stretch the rules of the House to fit a situation they were never intended to fit. The question of privilege raised here today was a very interesting, substantive argument for a motion which can be put before the House in several ways. However, no part of it at any time had any real connection to the question of privilege. Once we extend any one of our procedures to accommodate an argument that seems to lie at the periphery of these procedures, we invite just what is happening now—namely, one member commenting on what a previous member has said. In my opinion, the matter has been contributed to equally by members on both sides of the House. It does not in any way constitute a question of privilege, and the matter should stop right here.

**Mr. Basford:** Mr. Speaker, having been dragged into the last question of privilege, I think I should be allowed to indicate that I agree with the Chair. I am just grateful to the opposition for indicating that we on this side have had a successful and active weekend.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Victoria on a point of order.

**Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point of order which concerns the Minister of Finance. Since he is not in the chamber at this time, I will raise it later.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands on a point of order.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order arising out of the question of privilege introduced by the deputy House leader. Under the guise of correcting a statement which appeared in the press,