

just said, which is that, with the exception of certain people referred to by Beauchesne as being members of a protected group including members of the Royal family, judges and one or two other categories, the precedents with respect to unparliamentary language apply not to the public at large, individual members of the public or companies, but rather to Members of this House.

Finally, my recollection of the words used by the Hon. Member for Mount Royal is not that they were in any way an attack on the company in question but a plea to the Government to act in such a way that the conduct of the Government itself or officers of the Government could turn out to besmirch the name of a reputable company, and I do hope that that will not happen. There was nothing I heard in the words of the Hon. Member for Mount Royal that sounded to any reasonable person, if I may say so, as an attack on the company in question.

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, very briefly, my recollection of the remarks of the Hon. Member for Mount Royal (Mrs. Finestone) is in keeping with the recollection of the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray). The Hon. Member for Mount Royal in no way put into question the integrity of Memotec or in any way besmirched or maligned the name of that particular company. She simply indicated that the Government should have waited before announcing the decision to sell Teleglobe to Memotec until the investigation into the alleged insider trading was complete. I would ask the Hon. Member who raised the point of order to review the "blues". Upon review of the "blues", I am certain he will agree with me that the Hon. Member for Mount Royal in no way called into question the good name of Memotec.

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, just as briefly, I would reiterate what I said the other day in support of my colleague. I suggest to the House that our parliamentary privilege of immunity within this House is a time-honoured tradition and in order to deserve it, we have to treat it with respect and not abuse it or hide behind it.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta (Mr. Friesen), who is a senior and very highly respected Member of this House, for bringing the matter to the attention of the Chair. I listened with care to the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray), to the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) and to the Parliamentary Secretary.

I think the essence of the complaint made by the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta is that when a question seems to carry an innuendo of wrongdoing, naturally there is a certain reaction from other Hon. Members. I took it that the Hon. Member hoped that all Hon. Members, in asking questions, would at least base their questions on some known facts more than on suspicions. I think that is the point the Hon. Member was making.

Question of Privilege—Mr. Guilbault

I listened with care to the representations of the Hon. Member for Windsor West and the Hon. Member for York South—Weston. According to my recollection of what the Hon. Member for Mount Royal (Mrs. Finestone) said, she was not in fact trying to besmirch the reputation of the company but rather to urge the Government to do something so that the company's reputation might not be besmirched. One would probably have to examine exactly what was said, but I think the point taken by the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta is one that the Chair has heard before and is in the interests of fair play.

Of course, I am cognizant of the fact that the Hon. Member for Windsor West is also a very senior Member of the Chamber and has the immediate responsibility of considering the rules and traditions of this place. He speaks eloquently and with authority. I do not think, under the circumstances, that the word "besmirch" is in itself unparliamentary.

I am assisted by the interventions that have been brought before me. I would urge all Hon. Members to take into account what their colleagues have to say. At times, Hon. Members might feel that something does offend or is not as clear as it should be, and I would hope that all Hon. Members keep that in mind in the conduct of their affairs.

There is another important matter to which the Chair has made reference. I recognize the Hon. Member for Drummond (Mr. Guilbault).

* * *

[Translation]

PRIVILEGE

THE BRODILAF-HAMA AFFAIR—THE ALLEGED PRIVILEGED INFORMATION ABOUT CERTAIN FACTS

Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Hon. Member for Shefford (Mr. Lapierre) informed the House he was in possession of a document, dated May 7, 1986, that came from my office at the House of Commons in Ottawa, a document he showed to the press.

Mr. Speaker, I can prove I was in my riding on May 5, 1986, so I could not have met anyone in Ottawa that day to talk about the Canada Employment Centre in Drummondville, as was mentioned in the document.

I did not draft or sign or send the document referred to by the Hon. Member for Shefford, and I never saw it until yesterday. Legal action will be taken against the person who originated this document and this political smear campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I demand an apology from the Hon. Member for Shefford on the floor of the House, because he has abused his privileges as a parliamentarian to indulge in political smear tactics. If the Hon. Member for Shefford believes I have done something illegal, he should go and prefer charges against me outside the House.