

Reference to Statement by Prime Minister

say "rotten"—trick. That is the accepted word. Surely that is not a sufficient reason to say that we have been guilty of a rotten Grit trick.

Let us not get upset over this incident. I should like to repeat the words of the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert—perhaps he borrowed them from another great political figure—"If you cannot stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen".

I say that it was a trickery situation. The hon. member for Kamloops said it was not a trickery situation. I say it was a manufactured crisis. The hon. member for Kamloops said it was not a manufactured crisis. When I say that it is a trickery situation and that it is a manufactured crisis the leader of the New Democratic party is entitled to say that I am inaccurate. He is entitled to say that what I have said is contrary to the facts. He is entitled to say I have distorted the situation. Of course he is entitled to say that. That is debate; that is what the House of Commons is for.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEachen: Every time an hon. gentleman on this side says something and another hon. gentleman on that side disagrees violently and passionately, is there then a question of privilege? Of course not. Beauchesne makes the point very clearly. He states that a dispute arising between two hon. members as to allegations of fact hardly fulfils the condition of a privileged question.

An hon. Member: That is in this house.

Mr. Lambert: Do you mean to say that television is this house?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, this interjection by the hon. member for Edmonton West does not change the situation in any respect. It is not a matter of privilege. It is a question of debate between hon. members. We say it was a trickery situation and you say it was not. We say it was a manufactured crisis and you say it was not. Is that a question of privilege? That is debate, and let us get on with the debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat made reference to a most effective speech. It may well have been, but I should like to say that it was not the kind of speech we on this side would make. On this

[Mr. MacEachen.]

side we have the handicap of saying only what the facts are.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Baldwin: The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen), with a skirl of the bagpipes, has attempted to lead us into a detour. This is not a question of a conflict between two members of this house. As Your Honour indicated in the few comments you made, this is a question concerning what is the pith and substance of a statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) on a television broadcast which has been referred to by the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton). I should like to repeat the definition of the word "trickery" which the hon. member for Kamloops has read into the record. It is:

The practice of tricks; deceitful conduct or practice; deception, artifice; imposture.

Your Honour said something about the words recited by the hon. member for Kamloops. I suggest that Your Honour must go beyond these words and examine the entire transcript. I think this is essential. Your Honour, as I was, was brought up in an honourable profession. I am sure you will agree that libel is the clear and simple issue here. I should like to quote from citation 108(3) of Beauchesne, fourth edition:

Libels on members have also been constantly punished; but to constitute a breach of privilege they must concern the character or conduct of members in that capacity—

I suggest to Your Honour that the simple issue is whether an examination of the entire transcript would indicate that any person listening to the speech would think that members of this house when engaged in their duty on Monday night indulged in disreputable conduct. I believe this is the simple issue. There is an innuendo. I do not think it is sufficient for Your Honour simply to consider the words to which the hon. member for Kamloops referred. He referred to two like statements which were made during the broadcast.

● (3:40 p.m.)

I suggest that any reasonable examination of the entire transcript would bring us to but one conclusion. It would indicate to any person examining or reading the transcript, or who listened to the remarks, that the members of this House of Commons who were here in this house on Monday night engaged in deceitful tricks or in conduct in which they