

Mr. Crosbie: Tom Mayo is going to be in China with his cousin when I am through with him in the next election. That is the only mention his name is ever going to get in this House. He is never going to get here as a member as long I represent St. John's West.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: They are very upset next door to me here.

● (2112)

I want to give the House another quote. It has been proven false here today. A man named Barter Holyday said this:

A man may as well open an oyster without a knife as a lawyer's mouth without a fee.

It can be obviously seen that that is not true here today because lawyers are opening their mouths without fees, so far as we know. This is an important issue and it is a good thing we have them to speak.

Yesterday, the government House leader made his corkscrew defence of why the government was going to vote against this motion. Thank God I did not hear the hon. gentleman yesterday. He was like a boa constrictor. It was as if he had swallowed a donkey. He had a whole donkey down his throat, or a horse. He was like a boa constrictor twisting this way and that way, trying to digest what he had been ordered to do by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and have the House support it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: Listen to them bray over there. Obviously he did not swallow all the donkeys because some of them are still braying over there.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us examine the House leader's speech made yesterday. What are the points he made as to why this matter should not go to committee?

An hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: Is that the donkey braying again? Has the House leader returned? I am looking at page 1865 of *Hansard* to examine what defence the government House leader made yesterday.

Mr. Boulanger: You are brainwashed.

Mr. Crosbie: I do not think the hon. gentleman is brainwashed; he does not have that article to wash.

The House leader, as reported at page 1864 of *Hansard*, advanced his reasons why—

Mr. Boulanger: You are brainwashed.

Mr. Crosbie: The House leader said he probed beneath the surface. God knows what he found when he probed beneath the surface of that caucus.

Privilege—Mr. Lawrence

Mr. Boulanger: Brainwashed.

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to lose my train of thought here. At page 1865 of *Hansard* the government House leader is reported to have said of the government:

We set up the McDonald royal commission at the request of the official opposition.

How does that score with what the Prime Minister said a few short months ago? He said this at a press conference on October 28, 1977, when he appointed and gave additional terms of reference to the McDonald commission. He said, at the time when we had heard of some outrages by the RCMP, of breaking and entering and the like:

—I said, well, in that case, we will set up this commission of inquiry.

The Prime Minister decided to set up a commission of inquiry. Yet the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) suggested that they set up the commission because we had requested it. They had not set it up for that reason at all, Mr. Speaker.

What did the then solicitor general do? We have had so many solicitors general that it is hard to remember all their names. In this case it was the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux Montagnes (Mr. Fox). He came to the House on October 28 and said that in the spring of 1976 they had been made aware of certain break-ins and some thefts on the premises of the APLQ in Montreal, but they did not think that was important and they did not set up a royal commission. But later on, in the summer of 1977, other allegations were made, and having inquired into these allegations—now I am quoting from page 8—it says here:

—the commissioner of the RCMP advised that he believed that in the circumstances it would be in the best interests of the RCMP that a commission of inquiry be set up to look into the operations. . . . The government agreed that public support of the RCMP—

—was necessary, and they therefore set up the commission, not because the opposition requested that this commission be set up.

First the Prime Minister claimed that he set it up because in his great wisdom he decided it should be set up. Then the solicitor general said it was set up because the commissioner of the RCMP wanted it set up. Well, it was not set up to decide whether or not our privileges as members of the House have been violated. It was set up for certain other reasons, and it has been pursuing them ever since. As Mr. Speaker himself said, to knock down another argument of the government House leader—there are a lot of them over there who should be knocked on the head but we will only knock their arguments on the head—as reported at page 1856 of *Hansard*:

—because the parallel inquiry that would be involved was not in any way a trial and there was no verdict which I felt could be prejudiced by a parallel inquiry. I therefore did not think the doctrine has an application in that sense.

So that puts that argument to rest.

Then the government House leader went on with his defence—it must have been painful to him because today he looked as if he had a bad case of the bends from having given these arguments yesterday—and said this: