

*Questions of Privilege*

to entertain further debate on the matter. I would be willing to listen to a legal argument if that were the case, albeit a short one.

**Mr. Nystrom:** Mr. Speaker, it is the same matter raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps).

**Mr. Tobin:** I rise on a point of order. I would like the Speaker to know that it was my intention to rise on the same point of privilege raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) with respect to the Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney). I do not know if the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville (Mr. Nystrom) is on a different point or not.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I will hear the Hon. Member on the second question of privilege. We are back for a minute, the Chair hopes, on the first question of privilege. The Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville (Mr. Nystrom).

\* \* \*

**PRIVILEGE**

## ALLEGATION BY SENIOR PUBLIC SERVANT—REISMAN

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** I will be very brief. The comment has been made that no specific accusation has been made against a specific Member. I want to refer to Mr. Speaker Jerome, a highly respected Speaker of this House back in the 1970s, who responded to a question of privilege raised by Walter Baker, a very distinguished House Leader of the Conservative Party. In that case a Mr. August Choquette had made a slanderous accusation against the House while giving testimony. Mr. Choquette was quoted as saying in open court that if everyone who had ever taken or given \$600 or \$700 in bribes in their life was arrested, 50 per cent of the MPs would no longer be sitting.

After citing various authorities in support of his position, Mr. Baker of the Conservative Party moved that the accusation that a substantial portion of the Members of House of Commons were receiving bribes be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. While the Speaker stated that he had no difficulty in agreeing that there was a question of privilege, he expressed some doubt as to the form of the motion.

Mr. Speaker Jerome said that in this case, the motion having been amended to include the name of Mr. August Choquette, constituted a question of privilege, and the Baker motion was adopted by the House. Mr. Speaker Jerome cites a whole number of Standing Orders and citations from Beauchesne's, but I will not bore you with those. They appear on page 26 of his book.

I think we should look into this matter because what the Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney) has said today in reference to the Reisman statements does have an impact on

the privileges of all Members of the House. I think in this case, you should decide whether or not Walter Baker's motion of May 7, 1976, is indeed a precedent.

My last point is that I think the Minister for International Trade, in supporting what Mr. Reisman said, is also making a reflection on other Canadians who are not in a position to defend themselves on the floor of the House. They refer to a lot of ordinary Canadians who feel very strongly on this particular issue and are not able to defend themselves.

There are some precedents for that that I recall from my experience in the House as well. In those days, the Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark) was a staunch defender of those ordinary Canadians who are not here in the House and not able to defend themselves.

\* \* \*

**PRIVILEGE**

## ALLEGED ASSOCIATION BY MINISTER WITH UNACCEPTABLE REMARKS

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, the record should show clearly that the point of privilege raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps), indeed repeated by myself, is not directed at the comments of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). The Prime Minister made what I believe to be an appropriate response in the House today when he undertook to check the record and respond back to the House at the first opportunity, presumably next week.

The Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney) was confronted as the Minister responsible for the ambassador with these remarks. *Hansard* will show, as soon as the Speaker has a chance to review her comments, that when confronted with the remarks reportedly made by the ambassador, the Minister did not dissociate herself from the remarks in responding to an NDP questioner. She did not take the position of the Prime Minister, who said that he would check the record and make an appropriate response in due course, but rather said that if the ambassador is suggesting that those who are engaged in a campaign against free trade—I am sorry, a separate point.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I do not want to cut off the Hon. Member, but I think he is again getting into debate. If the Hon. Member has a specific point to raise, as did the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville (Mr. Nystrom), I am certainly willing to hear it, but as the Hon. Member understands, the Chair does not want this debate to continue.

**Mr. Tobin:** Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief. I am advising the Chair that if he checks the record, he will find that the Minister for International Trade has defended the notion that opposition Members are Nazis and are engaging in "the big lie", as was done by Nazis in World War II, in opposing the Government's free trade initiative. I advise the Chair that