

To conclude, I say those who, like myself, want the party now forming the government to be not just a Liberal Party in name but a party of Liberals in policy orientation and action should be concerned about what the hon. member, who after all is parliamentary secretary to the government House leader, appears to be arguing in his question of privilege.

If there is any group which should believe that the encouragement of wide-ranging and constructive discussion, not just of issues but of legislation as well, is fundamental to its principles, that group should be the Liberal Party. I say that all of us in that party who are sitting in this House, and those who support it across the country, should be diligent in seeing that the right of the member of parliament to engage in that kind of discussion is not abridged under the guise of protecting it. In our work for the people of our ridings and the people of Canada, there are times when we must speak in committees of caucus and other groups in which our work is most appropriately carried out under roles of confidentiality and solidarity. But, Mr. Speaker, there are other times when we must express our views publicly when we speak in whatever setting, in whatever forum we consider most appropriate if those organizing the meeting are willing to hear us.

This is the way I see myself carrying out my duties for the people of my riding and our country. I urge that this question of privilege be rejected in order to further confirm the validity of the kind of role I have outlined, not just for myself but for all members of this House who are striving to work in the interests of all the people of their ridings and all the people of Canada.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) was speaking, I heard some members behind me saying, "This man should be in the government". I say no, he has been too honest, too frank and shows too much ability to be in the government.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baldwin:** The parliamentary secretary launched his attack in an attempt to recoup the ground he lost some time ago. He lost it when in a moment of honest exasperation he launched an attack against ministers. Now he attempts to work his way back into the favour of the ministry and I must assume that he spoke with the knowledge and approval of the government House leader and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). If they disapprove of what he said, they will say so. If they say nothing, I take it that they not only countenance what the parliamentary secretary said, but initiated the move which he made today.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** There is only stony silence on the government benches.

**Mr. Baldwin:** What we have heard today is the first chapter of the book "Reid on How to Muzzle Ex-cabinet Ministers". Considering the reaction we have obtained, I suggest that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who appears not to be paying attention but who I know is listening closely, should fire other cabinet ministers. Heaven only knows what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) might say about financial questions, the Minister

*Privilege—Mr. Reid*

of Transport (Mr. Marchand) about transportation, and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) about some of the problems he has encountered. What a great parliament this would be, Mr. Speaker, if these ministers made forthright, frank and honest statements. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) might really tell us what he knows about energy.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** That would be a short speech.

**Mr. Baldwin:** We could hear the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) speak on eggs. What a revelation that would be.

Having disposed of these preliminaries, let me say that I associate myself with the cogent, learned and intelligent remarks to which we just listened by the hon. member for Windsor West. The parliamentary secretary's argument respecting the rules of this House, of the other place and of the English parliament only apply when there is a need to demand compulsory attendance of a member in the other place. There should not be and must not be anything in our rules which in any way provides that a member of this place or of the other place shall not appear voluntarily as a witness before a committee dealing with a bill or any subject. A member should be free to give any such committee the benefit of his advice.

Election to this House should not preclude our being called as witnesses or at least appearing voluntarily before committees of the other place and giving those committees the benefit of our experience. Any suggestion to the contrary should not be countenanced, and surely Your Honour will not accept such arguments. I suggest that the rules which have been quoted provide, under certain conditions, for compulsory attendance. For example, if the parliamentary secretary were called as a witness before a committee of the other place and he did not wish to attend, there are certain ways in which his attendance might be compelled. On the other hand, I suggest it would be completely wrong to say that a member of this House should not have the right to appear before a committee.

Ministers appear regularly. Ministers sponsoring bills or wishing to introduce white papers and green papers which are discussed in the other place appear before committees of the other place and give their reasons for sponsoring what they are doing. If they can appear before a committee and speak in support of a bill, why in the name of heaven cannot a member of the opposition or even a member on the government side speak against the bill and oppose it?

For these reasons, as well as the other cogent reasons advanced by the hon. member for Windsor West, I urge Your Honour to throw this matter out of the window as far as it can possibly be thrown.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, there are a few things which the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) said in his defence which might well be commented on initially. First, the hon. member seemed to be in some doubt as to whether the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Reid) had given the proper and necessary notice. I take it that since Your Honour recognized the hon. member on