

Questions of Privilege

interesting to note that at a later date the Liberal Government of the day found that study so valuable that it paid for our expenses and in fact used the study for the purposes of the federal Government.

I want to close by saying that an abuse of the privileges of a Member of Parliament is an abuse whether it is prior to an election or during an election. The only difference is that if it is during an election, then it must be included in election expenses. If it is an abuse of the privileges of the House and the privileges we enjoy as members before an election, it is still an abuse.

I call upon the Leader of the New Democratic Party to produce his evidence. I do not doubt that he has it; I do not doubt that the Party has it. I call upon them to produce all evidence proving that it was paid for, every last expense in connection with that letter, so that they can demonstrate that they have done this with some honour, and not come into the House to leave out there the great suspicion that possibly they are doing the same thing in Yukon and Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, this is a classic example of a Government trying to make use of the best defence known, which is offence. It is quite clear, in terms of the \$40,000 on the film and the 135,000 leaflets going around in Newfoundland, paid for by the people of Canada, that it is something they want to cover up and keep the press from thinking about.

However, let me deal with the issue made by the Parliamentary Secretary because I think it opened an enormous Pandora's box. It was something that I did not feel any necessity to raise during the provincial election in British Columbia. However, the Hon. Member for Vancouver Centre, the Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney), happened to send out somewhere between 50,000 and 100,000 householders with a picture of herself and Bill Vander Zalm standing arm in arm on the front of it. It just happened to be there in the middle of the election campaign.

If this issue is to be dealt with seriously, the House will never be able to deal with anything serious again. I can bring in thousands of documents mailed out by Conservatives which are obviously partisan and obviously paid for by the House of Commons. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie) abused the Leader of my Party. He has not even apologized after my Leader produced a certified copy from the Postmaster of the House of Commons that we had paid for the mailing. He still sits there on his rump like a cod tongue, acting as though, "Ho, ho, I am the high and mighty Minister of Transport. We have no issues in Newfoundland. We are losing. We are going to try to fabricate some kind of mamby-pamby issue to shove into the mouths of the people of Newfoundland". Well, I do not buy it and Newfoundlanders will not buy it, because they know you have been caught with your hands in the till for the movie and for those little diddley-daws on what really is not true about the Canada-France agreement. It is a lot of blah, and you should be embarrassed about it.

Mr. Speaker: Before recognizing the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain), I understand that there is some strong feeling about the matter, but I ask all Hon. Members to refrain from using the personal word "you".

Perhaps, now that the matter has been explored with great vigour by several interventions, the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody would try to confine his remarks to the issues.

There are two issues here. One was raised by the Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie) who says that a frank has been used to deliver a message, a political message, which is aimed at an upcoming by-election. The Hon. Leader of the New Democratic Party has said that a publication put out by the Government of Canada in respect of the fisheries situation and the relationship between Canada and France in terms of certain fish stocks is an abuse of the Government's position. That also is aimed at resulting in some political advantage for the Government. Those are the two issues.

• (1530)

The question is whether or not there is a question of privilege. There is clearly a complaint on both sides and clearly there is an issue of what is appropriate when parliamentary rights to communicate with constituents are used. I am not saying it is a question of privilege, but I do want Hon. Members to try to address that specific point because that is what I have to decide.

Mr. Gerry St. Germain (Mission—Port Moody): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. This is a breach of individuals' privileges. The Hon. Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) tried to put forth something that is not the true picture. He spoke in his opening remarks when countering the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie), of householders being utilized, a totally different situation from that with which we are dealing. We are dealing with our own ridings. When householders are of a partisan nature, they are often rejected and not printed. A member is told to produce a householder which does not solicit votes, and that is the whole issue here.

What is revolting to all Canadians, Mr. Speaker, is the sanctimonious attitude of the New Democrats. They speak of the abuse of public funds. This matter unquestionably is a deliberate abuse of public funds. All of us are tainted, whether we like it or not, when one member abuses his privileged position to either his or his Party's advantage. This is not right either morally or legally, *vis-à-vis* the rules of this place. When it comes to public spending—and make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, this is public spending in the true sense of the word—the NDP over there yell the longest and the loudest about it.

We are dealing here with the privileges of each and every Member of this House having been abused by the misuse of stationery in this case and possibly the misuse of the frank. I