

Privilege—Mr. R. Stewart

claims I have said. I think that the whole matter should be aired. I would welcome it, and when it is I think that the hon. member who made those charges will be seen once again for what he really is.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) come dangerously close to the allegation made just a few moments ago by the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart). He seemed to imply in his remarks in this House that there are two kinds of members, those who are in and those who are out, in terms of what he said. That is precisely the point that has been made by the hon. member for Cochrane.

Given that state of mind and given the fact that there has been no denial whatever by the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) or any other member who is alleged to be involved in this matter that these remarks were made in the context indicated by the hon. member for Cochrane, then I think that the hon. member for Thunder Bay is quite right, and we had just better wait for that evidence. I hope that you, sir, will see fit to reserve judgment on this matter so that the evidence can be collected and the House itself can look into the matter and settle it once and for all. Clearly, in view of what the hon. member for Thunder Bay said today, there is at least a hint of suspicion.

Mr. Alexander: No hint; he said it.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I will put it on that very, very generous and open scale. There is at least a hint that perhaps the hon. member for Cochrane is not so wrong, that there has been a concerted effort to create the feeling in the northern part of Ontario that there are two kinds of members. You come from that area, Mr. Speaker, and you would not want that suspicion to exist, would you?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member referred to the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Roy), who is absent today because he is attending—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Excuse me, I should correct myself. I recognize the hat of the hon. member for Timmins!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out two things only. The first I bring up on behalf of the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Roy) who is absent because he is attending the funeral of his brother. I should like to ask that he be reserved the privilege of answering the accusations made against him. The second point is one of procedure. Mr. Speaker, I find it rather preposterous for you to be asked to find that there is a prima facie question of privilege when the hon. member, who

[Mr. Penner.]

presented the motion, limits himself to quoting his doctrine or principles without any specific incident or detail which could justify, as you yourself mentioned, a ruling on whether or not there is at first glance a question of privilege. When the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) says that a "hint" would be sufficient, to my mind he is not being fair, Mr. Speaker. The House does not base its decisions on whether or not there is a question of privilege on "hints". The hon. member who rises on a question of privilege, which procedure must not be abused and must be seldom used according to Beauchesne, the hon. member, I say again, must quote a newspaper article, a television broadcast, or mention the person who is alleged to have made the statement on which his claims are based, to give you something specific on which to base your ruling on whether or not the beautiful principles he mentions are applicable or not.

The second point on my intervention, Mr. Speaker, is intended merely to draw your attention to the fact that the hon. member who presented the motion today completely omitted referring to any specific incident. He limited himself to saying that the hon. members for Timmins (Mr. Roy) and Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner), according to what he heard, had claimed that. I say that is a gross abuse of our Standing Orders which allow hon. members to rise on questions of privilege, and that you need not wait for the hon. member for Thunder Bay or even the hon. member for Timmins to deny it officially: you can simply find the motion out of order because its allegation is not supported by any specific incidents.

In any event, out of consideration for the hon. member for Timmins, who should have the right to deny accusations that at first glance seem ill-founded, I should like him to be reserved the right to make his views known and to deny formally the allegations founded on the rumour reported by the hon. member who presented the motion.

● (1530)

[*English*]

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, as another member involved in this question of privilege but not named, and taking over part of the riding of Cochrane when an election is called, and also having always believed that anyone who had a problem in northern Ontario and felt that I could be of help knew I was always willing to do what I could, I do not object to the matter being made public although my mail is sufficiently heavy that I am certainly not asking for that kind of publicity.

In conjunction with what was said by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) on the second point of order arising out of this issue, perhaps if Your Honour finds there is a prima facie case you could also look at what I consider to be the undemocratic and certainly dishonest statement made by the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner). He indicated that the only way people in Cochrane are going to be serviced is by having a member who can speak for the government.