

**Mr. Crosbie:** When I asked my question I was careful in phrasing it. It is found at page 1583 of *Hansard*. I asked the following:

Are the comments made by the Minister of Employment and Immigration last Saturday night in connection with unemployment that we have been spoiled rotten, that Canadians have been living too high on the hog and that we need a kick in the guts . . .

I quoted the minister as saying that we need a kick in the guts. I know the minister thinks we on this side of the House need a kick in the guts, but apparently he was not saying that all Canadians need a kick in the guts. He was saying we need an upset like the Americans had. I accept that.

Any mistake I made in my question is a very slim one. However, the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen) assured me that the statements alleged to be those of the Minister of Employment and Immigration do not represent any considered policy on the part of the government. In other words, it was an aberration of the Minister of Employment and Immigration and not an aberration of the government, although the Deputy Prime Minister found much in the statements and comments of the Minister of Employment and Immigration with which he agreed.

Then the Deputy Prime Minister went on to say, as reported at page 1854 of *Hansard*, and I quote:

Furthermore, I should draw to the hon. member's attention the fact that the quotations to which he referred as allegedly having been made by the minister did not refer to the unemployed of Canada. They were general comments relating to what the minister conceives to have been the lifestyle of Canadians, and that is not and has never been a question of government policy.

The Deputy Prime Minister was guilty of whatever I am guilty of, if Your Honour finds me guilty, but I plead not guilty in this matter.

Finally, the hon. gentleman made these alleged remarks Saturday night. They were in the press on Monday. The minister did not get up in this House on Monday to object—

**An hon. Member:** He wasn't here.

**Mr. Crosbie:** —to the fact that he had been wrongly quoted in the newspapers. He did not come to this House on Tuesday to object. I believe he went to his district. I suppose it is important for a member to go to his district but, if he was seriously concerned, he should have been in the House on Tuesday, and the record could have been corrected then.

The minister's parliamentary secretary could have corrected the record. The Deputy Prime Minister could have corrected it, but he did not do so. He endorsed what the minister said and agreed with it. The Deputy Prime Minister did not say the minister was misquoted.

Therefore, while I am willing to submit to Your Honour's ruling if Your Honour rules against me—I have great respect for Your Honour and Your Honour's rulings—I submit that I am an injured party.

**Mr. Speaker:** Before hearing the contribution of the hon. member for Westmount (Mr. Drury), I think I ought to move now to clarify something said by the hon. member for St.

*Privilege—Mr. Cullen*

John's West (Mr. Crosbie) during the course of his remarks. He made reference to some quotation by the minister and followed that immediately by saying—if I am not mistaken; I had to catch this quickly—"I thought to myself that the pig—"

**Mr. Crosbie:** "Has nothing left but a squeak".

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not know if the hon. member for St. John's West was intending to use some sort of expression, but to me the clear effect of his language was that he was calling the minister a pig.

**Mr. Alexander:** Oh no, Sir. We wouldn't do that.

**Mr. Speaker:** To me that was the effect of the hon. member's language, and I do not think it was intended seriously.

**An hon. Member:** Withdraw.

**Mr. Speaker:** This is a very serious matter of decorum. I honestly believe that the hon. member for St. John's West was attempting to introduce into his remarks an expression rather than an epithet about the minister, and I think it would be better for all if the hon. member were able to confirm that.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The minister said that Canadians are living too high on the hog, and I said I felt that the pig, meaning poor old Canadians—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Crosbie:** —has nothing left but a squeak. I was not referring to the minister.

**Hon. C. M. Drury (Westmount):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Nystrom:** Just "boar" in there, Bud!

**Mr. Drury:** —I would like to address myself very briefly to the intervention of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn). I take exception to two of his propositions. Your Honour has dealt with them partially on the question of precedents, but I think it is even more fundamental than that. In this House we operate on a system of trust.

**An hon. Member:** Ha!

**Mr. Drury:** We do, in spite of the "ha". Some people do not seem to understand that. The machine will not work unless this assumption is made, and when the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar suggests, first, that reading from a transcript is inadequate and if the minister wishes to be believed and before—by implication—he, the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar, and his party will believe the minister, let him table a recording, that is an absence of trust, and I think contrary to one basic rule and that is: an hon. member's word, given in this House, is taken. Unless we operate on that basis the machine will not operate. Parliament will not work.

There is a second fundamental principle against which the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar, wittingly or unwittingly,