

arising out of answers to questions. I think it is important to state for the record that the answers to questions have nothing to do with parliamentary privilege. If a Member is dissatisfied with an answer, he should pursue the matter in some other way. For example, by raising it on the adjournment motion or, as the Member well knows, if there are other accusations or concerns that he has, he has remedies open to him. I therefore find there is no question of privilege.

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have a point of order from the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray).

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, is it your ruling that if in answer to a question a Minister uses unparliamentary language or accuses the person of knowingly misleading the House—

**Mr. Deans:** That is hypothetical.

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):**—then that cannot be raised?

**Mr. Speaker:** The answer is coming from the far corner of the House. No Speaker would ever dare try to give an answer to that question because it is purely hypothetical. I can assure you the Speaker would be indulging in what lawyers know as *obiter dicta*, and every Speaker who tries that has got himself in trouble. This Speaker is not going to give answers in advance to questions that are hypothetical, with due respect.

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order. I appreciate the ruling you made with respect to differing with the Minister's answer, if there is a dispute on a question of fact or if he does not answer a question. I must say I would look for direction from the Chair on what an Hon. Member must do when he has been misled—it is not just a question of fact—in the House on a very sensitive point in the Province of Quebec among English-speaking people.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will take that as a serious matter and suggest to the Member that what he should do is put the matter down for the adjournment motion. The Member knows he has an obligation to do that on the day of the question. However, under the circumstances, given that this is the first time we have dealt with this matter in this way in this Parliament, I am prepared to assume that I have received a notice from the Member with regard to that question and answer if he so chooses.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. gentleman is making false statements in this House about positions I have taken.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is not a point of order. Order, please.

**Mr. Crosbie:** It is absolutely false. I will not say "knowingly false" because he does not know enough to say anything.

**Mr. Nunziata:** Is it any wonder you are not the Leader?

*Privilege—Mr. Allmand*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I guess every Speaker is going to have a day like this!

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Prud'homme:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure with patience on both sides, from the Chair and from the House, we will get to know the rules much better. The Hon. Member just said that the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) misled the House. I would like your direction. If this is not a question of privilege, what is a question of privilege?

**Mr. Speaker:** If a Member uses language which causes disorder in the House or language which is unparliamentary, it is the Speaker's obligation to require that that language be withdrawn. Or if it is brought to the attention of the Speaker by another Member, it is the obligation of the Speaker to require that that language be withdrawn.

● (1510)

The word "false", if one cares to consult Beauchesne, is a fascinating word. It has variously been ruled in order and out of order, if one reads the chapters and the rulings very carefully. If Members want a small lecture for the rest of the day on what a Speaker has to do with his hours of reading Beauchesne, I will give it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** However, turning to the issue of when the word "false" is used, if the word is used normally to say that a Member has stated a falsehood in the sense that one believes what he is saying is wrong or is not true as a matter of fact, then that is parliamentary. Now I am indulging in an *obiter dictum*. Watch out! However, those are basically the rulings which have been made on that basis. If someone were to say that a Member had knowingly uttered a falsehood—in other words, had challenged his character—one would be in a different situation. I heard both Members say that each was speaking falsehoods. They were saying things which they believed were in disagreement. That is what I heard. Now that we have dealt with this question of privilege and have given the Member what I believe is advice as to what he should do with it, I suggest that we should leave this matter to the late show—

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** I think someone took me the wrong way on that! With respect, I think we should leave this matter to the late show if the Member cares to pursue that remedy. Presumably both Members would then have the right to debate the matter.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** With great respect, could we leave this matter here and proceed?