tute for you something that did not destroy my reputation. The right hon, member will not be able to say the same thing for himself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I therefore move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition:

That the slanderous and libellous allegations made by the Prime Minister in a speech made in the committee of the whole House on Thursday, May 22, 1975, against the right hon member for Prince Albert, particularly the false statements regarding expenditure of public funds alleged to have been made while the said member was the Prime Minister of Canada, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that the said committee be authorized to summon the right hon. Prime Minister as a witness.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the motion of the right hon. member for Prince Albert. Of course, I will want to consider the matter very carefully and take it into account in coming to a decision. The Prime Minister has already stated his intention to the Chair to raise a question of privilege, or alternatively the floor is open to him for his remarks in reply to the comments of the right hon. member for Prince Albert.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege I had to raise was raised in a few seconds at the outset and I will not speak any more on my question of privilege. But if you will allow me, I will respond to the one brought up by the right hon gentleman, particularly because he has followed it with a motion which I believe you, sir, will have to judge and you will have to decide whether there is a prima facie question of privilege.

I will not refer in any detail to the rules, but I will point out that in my speech of May 22 I did make one mistake of fact which I have corrected today. I have withdrawn the error contained in that statement. Beyond that, I would merely want to say that I am prepared to live by the rest of my statement. Undoubtedly there was some rhetoric in some of the expressions I used. I would say that this is a sin that I share with the right hon. gentleman opposite.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: But in regard to the case that I was putting before the House—in response, I emphasize, to a statement the right hon. gentleman made on April 30—the facts and the case I put before the House I am prepared, if you should so decide, to argue in front of whatever committee the House decides would want to hear me on this matter.

However, there are a few errors of fact the right hon. gentleman made this afternoon which I would like to set right so that we can go to the committee, if that is necessary, with a clear record. I will not refer to the errors of fact he made in his April 30 speech. There was certainly at least one error of fact, and perhaps a half-truth. Nor will I refer to the errors he made in his speech on May 27 when I was away. There were at least two errors and, I would say, two half-truths. I just mention them now so as to reserve my right to put these errors on the record if the House decides that it wants to pursue this matter in any greater detail.

Privilege-Mr. Diefenbaker

In my speech I emphasized on several occasions that I found the whole matter rather petty, that I was attempting to respond to the accusations that had been made by the right hon. gentleman and other people at a level which I did not think is very germane to the conduct of the country. But, once again, if a debate is to ensue on that, I want to reserve my position perhaps to enumerate a few mistakes that the right hon. gentleman has made even this afternoon

However, before doing so, I understand that the right hon. gentleman is alleging more than an error in fact. He is alleging that there is a question of privilege. I do not know in what way his privilege as a member of the House has been affected, except perhaps, as he alleged, in the word "shameful". If you, sir, judge that that word is non-parliamentary, I will tell you in advance that I will withdraw that statement. But I hasten to add that you will have a lot of work, because I have heard the word "shameful" at least 100 times—and that is a guess—shouted across the House or contained in speeches on many occasions. I would cite just one occasion: it is in the very text that the right hon. member just read. He said he skipped a line when he read it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is another of those statements that is not true.

Mr. Trudeau: He read from page 6010 of Hansard where I had said the right hon. gentleman had Harrington Lake stocked at public expense with fish for his enjoyment. Then he went on to quote me as saying that that was a shameful incident. Before I said that, some hon. member shouted "Shame!". I am quite certain, although I could not prove it, that the word "shame" came from the other side at that point and was obviously directed at the fact that I was making such a petty point. That is why I went on to say:

That was a shameful incident. It is, I repeat, a petty point; unfortunately it was brought out in the speech of the right hon. member for Prince Albert.

That is the only case that I would see for a question of privilege. The rest is made up of exaggerations, statements with some rhetorical emphasis, in his speeches as well as in mine. But on the basic case, I do not think it would be in the best of taste to repeat it here—

An hon. Member: Fuddle-duddle.

Mr. Trudeau: —but I will gladly do so if hon. members are interested. I would prefer to just enumerate a few of the mistakes he has made this afternoon. He said my statements were unprovoked. I just say that they were in answer not only to his own speech made on April, 30, to which I addressed myself directly, but to constant interruptions from the other side. So that is obviously getting off to a false start. He then indicated, and I noted his words, that I read entirely from a script before me. This is not true

• (1540)

An hon. Member: Pretty close.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is this a spontaneous falsehood?