

was 30 per cent. I apologize. The decline forecast was 41 per cent.

Madam Speaker: The logic I was asking the hon. member to use was that which should have applied to what he knows is the foundation of the question of privilege. If he feels that the minister has given him answers which offend his logic, that is another matter. It is a matter of debate and of divergence of opinions with regard to what I recognize to be a very serious question, but it certainly is not a question of privilege.

MR. BAKER (NEPEAN-CARLETON)—USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS TO ASSIST POLITICAL PARTIES

Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The issue in this question of privilege is the probability that public funds have been used to support one political party only.

I will be referring to judgments of Your Honour's predecessor, Mr. Speaker Jerome, during the period of time in which our government was in office, and certain quotations from members of the New Democratic Party and members of the Liberal Party about the impropriety of using public funds and resources where caucus research funds should be used.

The case arises out of a news report in this morning's *Globe and Mail* which I am going to read, in part in any event, to frame the case.

Mr. Collette: "Frame" is the right word.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): The report is datelined Ottawa and reads as follows:

It's a rather embarrassing coincidence, but it appears that New Democratic Party leader Edward Broadbent and Liberal Justice Minister Jean Chrétien have the same ghostwriter.

The evidence turns up in a study paper Mr. Broadbent sent to British Labour Party MPs a month ago commenting on an internal Labour Party document, Canada and the Constitutional Question.

The story is referring to the contribution of the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent). He is described as "Mr. Broadbent" in the article.

Mr. Broadbent's contribution, entitled Comments by the Office of the Leader of the New Democratic Party of Canada, contains several long passages—

This the point, "several long passages".

Mr. Collette: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not object to the Conservative Party's engaging in a filibuster, but I think hon. members opposite should observe the rules. As Your Honour knows, hon. members cannot refer to other hon. members by their proper names.

An hon. Member: He was quoting.

Mr. Collette: Madam Speaker, a few days ago—perhaps it was last week—I drew the attention of the Chair to the fact that even when such language is used indirectly in quotations, it is clearly out of order. One cannot do indirectly what cannot be done in the House. I ask Your Honour to caution the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton that he cannot refer to members

Privilege—Mr. W. Baker

of this House by their proper names. He must refer to them by their party designation, their ministerial designation or their constituency name.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I am aware that there has been a conflict for some time on that particular point. Because it has been raised by my friend—and I have great respect for his helpful attitude and helpful interventions in relation to the rules, and this is one of them—I want to lay out why I believe it is appropriate for me to proceed in the way I did.

As all hon. members know, when a member completes an argument to the Chair, the *Hansard* messengers ask for all the notes and documents referred to by hon. members so that those items can guide *Hansard* in producing an accurate record. While it is inappropriate for me to identify an hon. member by his name in any other context, in order that *Hansard* will depict precisely what did occur on the floor of the House of Commons, I believe it is appropriate in those circumstances—when I am quoting from a document—to quote the words precisely.

● (1230)

Mr. McGrath: The Prime Minister does it all the time.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): It is inappropriate, of course, for me to do it in any other way, I suggest with respect. Cognizant of the issue which has developed, you will note, Madam Speaker, that when I tried to deal with the matter I identified the hon. gentleman by his constituency and then proceeded to read the quotation and refer to his name. I know there is a difficulty there, but I think it is one which perhaps the House would want to clear up.

I would have no objection to having this matter argued, since it has been raised by the parliamentary secretary in his usual helpful way, but I do reserve the right to complete my question of privilege. Your Honour may be prepared to rule on the matter now, but I hope we can expedite the proceedings of the House—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): —by your allowing us to continue with my question of privilege. I am in your hands, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: There is a considerable divergence of views as to the time when a member can be referred to by his proper name, whether a member, in the course of reading a quotation, can refer to another member by his proper name rather than by the name of his constituency. I tend to think that when a member is quoting, he might be allowed to quote the article as it is written, and if the name of a member appears in a quotation, it would be acceptable to read it that way since it is in the body of the quotation. Also, if the name of a member is used as a reference, such as, for instance, the MacEachen budget—

Mr. Beatty: Or the Trudeau disaster.