

Mr. Nielsen: Now you have a question of privilege. Go ahead.

Mr. Neil: I am entitled to rise on a question of privilege with respect to that motion. Otherwise, if that is not the case, the situation is that any Member of the House can rise on a motion under Standing Order 43 and impute motives, accuse people of something, and there is no recourse. I suggest that I have a question of privilege based on that motion under Standing Order 43. The suggestion was that I, in particular, along with two other Members, have changed my position with respect to Canagrex. This is not the case.

If the Hon. Member who proposed the motion and the Hon. Member who seconded it would read *Hansard* for January 29, they would find that that was not the case. In particular, if they look at *Hansard* for February 5, 1982 when the vote was taken on second reading, they will find there was no unanimous consent for second reading of Bill C-85 but that the vote on second reading was on division.

I suggest the motion was a deliberate attempt by the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre to cast aspersions on myself and other Members of my Party named in the motion, and I believe I have a question of privilege.

Madam Speaker: I believe that is a point of order. The Hon. Member was mentioned in the motion under Standing Order 43. I suppose I have to take this as his desire to make a statement about the fact that his name was used. He has a point of order, and I guess the Hon. Member has made his point.

Mr. Epp: Madam Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. In referring to the comments of the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil), I would like to indicate that my name was mentioned as well as the Hon. Member for Provencher. I want to associate myself with the words of the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) and suggest that this type of attempt to draw people into these kinds of statements has been a tactic the New Democratic Party has used for a long time and is not worthy of the House.

Madam Speaker: The point has been made.

MR. NOWLAN—REMARKS OF MR. TRUDEAU DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley-Hants): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I rose earlier to let the Chair know that I intended to raise a question of privilege at three o'clock. Quite frankly I would like to elaborate on it. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is not here. I asked to see the "blues" or to have the "blues" here so that I could lay the facts on the table. In response to a question from me this afternoon, I heard the Prime Minister say that I fabricated—the word was "fabricated"—the quotes that I was using in my question. It is very clear under Beauchesne that "fabrication" or "fabricated"—

Point of Order—Mr. Harquail

Madam Speaker: Order, please. It is also very clear that that is a point of order, not a question of privilege.

Mr. Nowlan: Madam Speaker, with respect, it says right in Beauchesne that this is a matter of privilege reflecting on a Member, in effect saying that I lied in the House of Commons. If that is not a fundamental question of privilege, I do not know what is.

Quite frankly, I will look at the "blues" tomorrow and I will not take too much of the time of the House. I want to give the Prime Minister notice that I was quoting from the historic document, "Cité Libre", of April, 1963 entitled: "Pearson or The Abandonment Of Conviction; 'Lester B. Pearson . . . the defrocked priest of peace'." This article was written by the Prime Minister, about whom many of us have heard before in terms of the article. I very deliberately used three quotations taken right from the article which, in effect, castigated the then Liberal Party for making a fundamental flip-flop on the Bomarc missile. Not a Liberal spoke out either in the Party or, more particularly, in the House of Commons. Those were the quotes which I used. The Prime Minister knows well from what I quoted; he knows this article. This article helped make a reputation for the gentleman in terms of a clear political and analytical finding. I am asking the Prime Minister to withdraw—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member is not going to continue this speech because he is continuing to debate a question which he raised during Question Period. He has pointed out that he is not certain he heard the word. When he makes certain that he did hear it, he can raise his point of order and I will accept it at that time, but not at this time.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. HARQUAIL—RIGHT TO RESPOND TO QUESTIONS RAISED

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Madam Speaker, perhaps this will be helpful for Members on all sides. I would like to learn about the following from you. Three times this afternoon questions of privilege were raised and I thought it was a time-honoured rule that Members involved in questions of privilege be in the House to respond. The Hon. Member from Halifax West (Mr. Crosby) raised a question of privilege with respect to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané), who was not here. Another question was raised with respect to the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who was not here.

Some Hon. Members: That is their problem.

Mr. Harquail: Is it not an accepted practice that, if a question of privilege is to be raised, there at least be agreement, understanding or common courtesy that the Member involved in the question of privilege be in the House to hear the question and be able to respond to it? Perhaps, Madam