

Borderline cases and arguable ones would be excluded automatically because in such cases the Speaker could not say that he was of opinion that the act or conduct which was the subject of complaint *prima facie* constituted a breach of privilege.

In my submission the question which the Speaker should ask himself—should be—has the Member an arguable point? If the Speaker feels any doubt on the question, he should—leave it to the House.

That is a quote in a judgment by Speaker Jerome citing, I should make it clear, the United Kingdom Select Committee on Parliamentary Privileges.

In order to clarify my thoughts on the issue of *prima facie* and to dispel the doubts that I have referred to, the Chair has pondered the intent of the offending advertisement as compared to its contents. I can express my own opinion that the content was obviously drafted in a cavalier manner; there is an element of confidence, if not of boldness, in the use of a phrase as definitive as “save this ad”.

The Ministers of Justice and of Finance have said to the House that the intent of the ad was to inform Canadians. Members are well aware of our practice of accepting the word of an hon. member of the House. In accepting the ministers' explanations, the question of intent is answered and accordingly some of the Chair's doubts are also dispelled. The intent of the ad was not to diminish the dignity of the House. It is difficult to find *prima facie* contempt.

However, I want the House to understand very clearly that if your Speaker ever has to consider a situation like this again, the Chair will not be as generous. This is a case which, in my opinion, should never recur. I expect the Department of Finance and other departments to study this ruling carefully and remind everyone within the Public Service that we are a parliamentary democracy, not a so-called executive democracy, nor a so-called administrative democracy.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** In order that all hon. members know exactly what the procedure is, and in order that members of the public who are watching and listening understand clearly what the procedure is, let me return to what I said before, that if I had decided that this matter ought to go to the House, it would be followed, or could be followed, by a debate and a vote.

### *Routine Proceedings*

I believe it is in the interest of our parliamentary system of government to have a clear statement from the Speaker which cannot be misinterpreted either in debate or by a vote. A vote on this issue might not support the very important message which your Speaker wishes to convey and which I hope will be well considered in the future by governments, departmental officials and advertisement agencies retained by them. This advertisement may not be a contempt of the House in the narrow confines of a procedural definition, but it is, in my opinion, ill-conceived and it does a great disservice to the great traditions of this place. If we do not preserve these great traditions, our freedoms are at peril and our conventions become a mockery. I insist, and I believe I am supported by the majority of moderate and responsible members on both sides of the House, that this ad is objectionable and should never be repeated.

• (1130)

I have deliberately made this ruling with great care in order that if ever this issue has to be debated and considered by this House again these comments will serve to guide the House in its deliberations.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### ORDER IN COUNCIL

#### TABLING OF APPOINTMENTS

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of Order in Council appointments which were made by the government pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(1). These have been referred to the appropriate standing committees, a list of which is attached.

\* \* \*

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### BILL C-21—REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

**Mrs. Edna Anderson (Simcoe Centre):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chairman I have honour to present the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-21, an act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act and the Employment and Immigration Department and Com-