

*Question of Privilege*

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Mr. Speaker, you asked what are the arguments in favour of this particular course. In reply one could ask what are the arguments against it, or what authorities are there. There are none. I referred to the precedent of the similar act of the Minister of Justice the other day, which I regard not as a powerful precedent coming from that particular quarter—

**Mr. Fulton:** Will my hon. friend—

**Mr. Speaker:** I understood the Minister of Justice to say—and it is a matter within his own knowledge and the hon. member must accept his statement—that he had not been quoting.

**Mr. Fulton:** I think I should read what appears in *Hansard* to establish the accuracy of what I said. It appears at page 4831:

Here is what the Leader of the Opposition said about that statement as I took down his words this morning and made notes of them and if he believes I am misrepresenting them I shall be glad to be corrected. As I understood him this morning, he said that the Prime Minister's contention that a charge would be required, and the statement by myself that a charge must be embodied in the motion, and the Prime Minister's statement that there had to be an allegation of improper conduct whereby the member concerned had furthered his private interests, had no foundation whatsoever.

I was not quoting from a document, nor are there any quotation marks appearing in *Hansard*. I had before me a certain document which I paraphrased, and I made it clear that I was not quoting any document or representing it as being an official report of what was said. That procedure is entirely different from what the hon. member for Essex East did. When the hon. member for Essex East seeks to represent that I quoted from a document he is stating what he himself knows to be false.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask you to ask the Minister of Justice to withdraw those last remarks to the effect that I made a statement knowing it to be false. I will put my reputation against that of the Minister of Justice any time.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** If the minister stated that the hon. member for Essex East made a statement knowing it to be false, I would certainly ask him to withdraw that charge.

**Mr. Fulton:** If you rule that the word "false" in that context is unparliamentary—

**Mr. Speaker:** May I make it clear that in my view to charge that an hon. member knowingly said something which was false is not in accordance with our practice.

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Mr. Fulton:** In that case, perhaps, in view of your ruling, I might say that the hon. member is stating what the record shows to be incorrect.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** It is clear from what the minister said that he was using the *Hansard* preliminary sheets, as I am doing now, to establish the usage of certain words.

**An hon. Member:** No.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Well, hon. gentlemen say the opposite, and I propose to continue—

**Mr. Speaker:** Before the hon. member proceeds, I feel that as the point has been raised I must ask the hon. member either to give me a chance to determine whether there is foundation for this point of order or to desist, and I give him the choice of deferring this matter until I have looked into the question or refraining from reading further from that particular document.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** I think the position Your Honour is taking is quite proper as to the course which is to be followed, and all I can say is that the *Hansard* sheets to which I made reference confirm my own understanding of what the Prime Minister said and, as a matter of fact, the implications of the Prime Minister himself clearly establish that the words which he originally used were those contained in the *Hansard* record which I used in support of the contention I made yesterday.

In this context I might remind the Prime Minister of what I did say yesterday. At page 4861 of *Hansard* for yesterday, a little more than half way down the first column, I said this:

My question of privilege is that this change in the unrevised edition of *Hansard* alters the meaning of what I said. What the Prime Minister said was "a charge on the basis of his opinion and belief in respect to the alleged findings of a judge in that direction." These were the words I took down as being the words uttered in this house yesterday by the Prime Minister. I find that this is confirmed by some of my colleagues who likewise took down the Prime Minister's words. But lest there be any doubt in the matter, I have yesterday's *Hansard* blues which confirm what I myself took down and which read as follows:

"A charge on the basis of his opinion and belief with respect to the alleged findings of a judge in that direction."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister sought to use this particular situation to indicate what he thought should be our practice in the future. Perhaps I should remind the Prime Minister of what he said in this house on April 17 of this year when the hon. member for Trinity had called his attention