

matter and report to the House at the earliest opportunity. I have done that, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased to share my findings with you and Hon. Members today.

First, I have discovered that the Hon. Member for Peace River at no time had talked directly with the officer of Canada Post. The matter raised by the Hon. Member is based entirely on conversations between the Member's assistant and the officer at Canada Post. In other words, the allegations of the Hon. Member are based on the interpretation of his assistant of a conversation with an officer of Canada Post.

● (1510)

I have personally been in communication with this officer and have been assured that at no time during the conversation were any threats made which could have conceivably inhibited the Hon. Member from performing his role as a spokesman of the Official Opposition or which could deny co-operation from Canada Post.

I can testify that the officer in question has worked in the President's office for two years and deals with requests and inquiries from MPs on both sides of the House, Senators and the general public. Not once in those two years has this officer's professionalism been questioned in what is often a difficult and demanding position. To be described by the Hon. Member for Peace River as being abusive, threatening to a Member of Parliament, unco-operative to the point of being obstructive and showing contempt for Parliament—all of these accusations on hearsay because, I repeat, the Member never spoke directly with the officer in question—is in my view undeserved and unwarranted.

I honestly think, in light of the explanation I have received, that there is absolutely no ground to the allegation of the Hon. Member for Peace River that his privilege as a parliamentarian has been breached.

In closing, as Minister responsible for Canada Post I can assure the Hon. Member and all other Hon. Members opposite that they will continue to have the fullest co-operation from Canada Post, particularly the Hon. Member in his duty as critic for Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and other Members as they make representations from time to time on behalf of their constituents.

**Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon):** On this point, Mr. Speaker, you will recall when the matter was first raised by the Hon. Member for Peace River (Mr. Cooper) that I suggested to the Chair the prudent course to follow might well be for the Minister to make inquiries and report back to the House, which he has now done. I would suggest to the Chair that the prudent course we might now follow, in view of the Minister's explanation, is to allow the Hon. Member for Peace River an opportunity to study, when *Hansard* is printed tomorrow, the response of the Minister. If at all necessary after that study, we may or may not deal with the matter again.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), with his usual reasonableness, has made an eminently sensible suggestion. I am happy to accept it.

*Point of Order—Mr. Duclos*

**An Hon. Member:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Sincerely, it is a reasonable suggestion.

\* \* \*

## FINANCE

### ALLOCATION OF JOB-CREATION GRANT TO JUDO CLUB

**Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency-Orléans):** Mr. Speaker, I seek your guidance. A while ago I raised a point of order and you did not allow me to correct unfounded allegations made by a Member of the New Democratic Party. I would like to know why I was not given the opportunity to correct fully those false allegations.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member rose; it was not on a question of privilege, nor indeed did he suggest that it was a question of privilege. It was hardly a point of order. It is a matter of debate. The Hon. Member said that he categorically denied the accusations. The Chair very carefully did not interrupt until he had put some very clear statements on the record. He was entitled to set the facts straight.

I think the *Hansard* record will disclose that the Hon. Member categorically denied the accusations and said that they were false. I presume he would repeat that. In the circumstances, the Chair would hope that this obvious difference between Hon. Members, which is not unique, might now be left in abeyance. The Hon. Member for Montmorency-Orléans (Mr. Duclos) will have a chance to examine *Hansard*. He may well want to raise the matter in some other form or some other way before the House or before one of the committees.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** On the same point of order, I was accused of making an allegation, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

If you look at *Hansard* on page—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I would ask the Hon. Member to please tell me whether he is rising on a question of privilege or raising a point of order. What does he want to do?

**Mr. Nystrom:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, because the Hon. Member for Montmorency-Orléans has suggested that I said something.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** No, at this point the Chair would like to proceed.