

gal" in referring to the late tabling of a document as being an illegal act. Last night, in his usual persuasive manner, he put forward his point and stated, from *Hansard*:

What administration at a senior level of government in Canada other than this administration would be allowing cabinet ministers who have acted illegally to carry on in their posts?

He then went on to persuade the House that the word "illegal" is really a word with different connotations, as I have already said, depending on certain circumstances. But what the hon. gentleman failed to point out is that the word "illegal" in this case is clearly tied to something specific. He neglected to read the first part of the paragraph where he said:

"Do as I say, not as I do" appears to be the creed of the present administration. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this type of thinking is shown up so clearly in the judges' affair that is now before us.

In other words, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) was using the word "illegal" in respect of the judges' affair and not in any other connotation which, as the hon. gentleman quite properly pointed out, could give a different definition to the word "illegal". So the hon. gentleman has prejudged or predetermined, without the benefit of this inquiry which the opposition has been seeking so desperately, that the acts of the ministers were illegal in the sense that they were in contravention of the law. He compounded this when he blatantly rose in the House today and spoke of all ministers, collectively, which puts a different connotation on it so far as I am concerned because then the hon. member should be prepared to tell the House how the Postmaster General has acted illegally as part of that collectivity in relation to the judges' affair.

The hon. gentleman should have withdrawn his statement entirely, which anybody with any sense of decency would have done. The hon. member has ignored this entirely, and he had full opportunity to act as an honourable gentleman in this House by taking advantage of the opportunity that all hon. members have, which all of us at one time or another have done, including myself, to apologize when sometimes we get carried away. The hon. member has had all evening to reflect on whether or not he had been carried away, as many of us are in debate. He should have asked himself whether perhaps he had not prejudged the event without the benefit of some form of inquiry.

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Mackasey:** Having had that opportunity he still refuses to apologize.

**Some hon. Members:** One o'clock.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. There are other hon. members who have indicated their desire to participate in this discussion. I would like some guidance from the House as to whether we should allow these arguments to expire shortly after one o'clock, or whether we should return at two o'clock and continue this discussion.

**Some hon. Members:** Return at two o'clock.

**Mr. Speaker:** It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

*Privilege—Mr. Sharp*

#### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

**Mr. Mackasey:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to keep my remarks very brief, because before the break I had not realized the significance of the opposition day and the fact that there are many visitors in town who are interested in the future of the dairy industry who, quite properly, want to have the Social Credit party proceed with its day.

I just want to summarize very briefly the point I was attempting to make, that the word "illegal" certainly is very broad in its definition. It can mean a number of things. To a sports buff it can be as simple as an offside in a hockey game, which is an illegal act. As the hon. member for Yukon said, the late tabling of a paper or a document is illegal. However, in this particular case the question of an illegal act has taken on the precise connotation, as it relates to the judges' case, of a criminal act or not a criminal act. It is certainly well beyond propriety, wrong, or even stupid, and I hope the hon. gentleman, who has shown that he is basically a House of Commons man, will understand that some of these rules to which we seem to overreact are really to make the House of Commons work as it should, which is the concern of most of us. As the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) put it the other day, democracy depends on this House of Commons and the House of Commons depends on certain basic rules which may look rather silly but in the general context of things make the difference between this House operating and not operating.

This is not Sunday school, it is a debating society, and if we are going to debate, periodically we are bound to go beyond the normal realm of things. We are bound to go beyond what we really intended to say. I had hoped, and still hope, that the hon. gentleman will reflect on my point. By virtue of his own words, "illegal" is related to the judges' case, as we call it, which in the opinion of the House obviously—and I have sat through the question periods—has been unresolved.

If the opposition were firmly of the belief that everything had been resolved, it would not be asking for an inquiry. Rightly or wrongly, the hon. gentleman has left the impression that at least in his mind there is no doubt as to guilt, wrongdoing or illegality which, in the legal sense—as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) pointed out today—has a very narrow context. In the opinion of the hon. member, he does not need an inquiry to establish it; his mind is already made up—and that is very serious.

That is why we have this opportunity of retraction. It is a wonderful opportunity for honourable members—and I stress that phase—to take advantage of the rule which simply says that an hon. member can get up and apologize if he has perhaps gone too far. The hon. member could get up and say that he used the word "illegal" as he uses it in everyday jargon to cover a broad spectrum of acts, some which are simply improper, some stupid and, as I mentioned, some where rules are clearcut and defined in sports as illegal acts.

This is why we have this opportunity, and this is why, despite the fact that we say we should refer this to a special committee or "put your seat at stake", in the 15 years I have been around here that has happened very