

an examination before the committee would reveal that the only remaining possibility is that the representatives of the New Democratic Party were given help by officials of the government who were preparing the government's own paper for London.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Mr. Speaker Jerome settled a long time ago in this House that the resources of the government should be made available on an equal basis to all members of the House. If they are not made available to all members of the House on the same basis, then the privileges of members have been infringed. With that in mind, Madam Speaker, if you see a *prima facie* case, which is all that has to be shown at this time, I would move:

That the matter of the assistance given by the government to the Leader of the New Democratic Party, in helping him to prepare a document entitled "Comments by the Office of the Leader of the New Democratic Party", as evidenced by the identical wording of portions of that document and portions of the government document entitled "The Role of the United Kingdom in the Amendment of the Canadian Constitution", and the possibility that such help involved the allocation of public service manpower and financial resources to one party in the House of Commons in a discriminatory manner, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to follow the master of synthetic emotion, the House leader for the Conservative Party, who takes longer to say nothing than any member in the history of the Canadian Parliament, if not the history of parliaments throughout the world.

We listened at considerable length to a series of banalities connected by semi-colons, commas, and occasionally even a period. Let me allay the hon. member's concerns right away. We do not have a spy that I am aware of in the office of the government to which he refers.

Miss MacDonald: No, it is a mole.

Mr. Broadbent: Second, in case there is any doubt in the hon. member's mind that certain material came from the federal-provincial relations office at our request, I want to tell him it is true. It is the scandalous reality that we requested certain information from the federal-provincial relations office. Having said that, I would tell the hon. member that if we thought we could have got comparable technical data that made any intellectual sense at all, I would have asked his party for it.

Unlike the House leader of the Conservative Party, if we can find relevant arguments in a book by MacGregor Dawson, Kenneth Wheare, Professor Cory or in a speech by a Conservative academic that we happen to agree with, not to mention a federal department employing civil servants, then we use those arguments. I never thought it an intellectual or political sin to take certain arguments from persons with whom on other matters you might disagree and use them. It is a problem for the Conservatives to accept that rather banal reality in the intellectual world, but for thinking people in the universe it is taken as elementary common sense.

Privilege—Mr. W. Baker

I am a little amused but not surprised by the long, discursive, rambling pile of words we just had to sit through from the man who, through his brilliant management of the Conservative government, managed to bring that government down after nine months.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): I must have hurt you, Ed.

Mr. Broadbent: He should have known that the federal-provincial relations office, even as it existed under the Conservative government, made information available to anyone who requested it, whether they were Social Crediters, members of the rhinoceros party, the Liberal Party or Conservative Party. I would have thought that a party which has preached a lot about freedom of information would have taken as an accepted fact that one of the established principles of the office of federal-provincial relations when it was established by the previous Liberal government was that it would provide information to whoever wanted it, and that that practice was continued by the Conservatives when they were in office. I am not aware that they changed that practice.

Of course, the feigned scandal and the mock horror of the master of synthetic emotion was precisely a bogus argument from the word go, intended simply to use up more time of Parliament. No one with an ounce of knowledge about the process of government or how governments work in providing information would take that argument seriously for one minute. It is a pile of nonsense and the member knows it.

I would be happy to provide the argumentation that was used in the document we prepared—

An hon. Member: Argumentation?

Mr. Broadbent: —part of which did come from the office alluded to. A substantial part came from some of us who have some experience in teaching Canadian government, to know something about the federal system, unlike my colleagues to the right. I would be happy to send the Conservative Party a copy of what he described as the Broadbent paper if they promise me two things—that they will read it and that they will attempt to understand it.

Having devoted about four minutes more than was necessary to that two-hour diatribe that the hon. member inflicted upon the House, I want to raise in this context a related question of privilege that concerns me as a Member of Parliament very much.

Mr. Fraser: I thought the NDP were not in favour of privilege.

• (1430)

Mr. Broadbent: We are now in our third day in which no business of the people of Canada has been conducted in this House.

Madam Speaker: I presume the hon. member is not raising a new question of privilege; he is speaking of privilege in another sense. We cannot have two questions of privilege at