

did not mean to say that the hon. member was uttering complete lies. I think that can be arranged quite easily.

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, if you would give me the time I could go through the hon. member's address and show where there are at least three complete lies. If you want me to say—

Madam Speaker: Statements of hon. members are accepted in the House. One can have an opinion on those statements but one may not, in the House, accuse an hon. member of uttering complete lies. The hon. member is not helping the House too much by repeating that expression. I think it is very simple, if the hon. member would assure the House that what is recorded in *Hansard* certainly went beyond whatever he intended to say.

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, I cannot say I went beyond anything I intended to say. I intended to say just what I said. If you want me to say "complete fabrication", okay, but he did give a lie. The "jackal" itself was a lie; a complete fabrication. If you want me to lie, I would have to lie, and I am not prepared to lie.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I think we all recognize that the hon. member may have an opinion on whatever another hon. member is saying, but he cannot openly and clearly accuse an hon. member of uttering complete lies. I would ask the hon. member not to substitute another word now because that is not possible, but to withdraw those words.

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, I am not prepared to withdraw it. I will say it is a complete fabrication, because that is what it was.

Madam Speaker: The hon. member should understand that I will accept "complete fabrication" but he must withdraw the first two words, "complete lies"; otherwise he knows what the consequences are.

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, if you want to replace "complete lies" with "complete fabrication", that is okay with me.

Madam Speaker: Does the hon. member withdraw "complete lies"? Does he do it now?

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, if you want to replace the words "complete lies" with "complete fabrication", okay.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Taylor: Withdraw, my eye!

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I would suggest that the words that have been used by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) can be and should be taken as satisfactory—

Some hon. Members: No!

Mr. Nielsen:—compliance with the position taken by the Chair. I would think also that it should be acceptable to the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Heap). Otherwise, should debate continue I could raise other questions of privilege which have a direct relationship to that exchange, such as the use of

Privilege—Mr. Heap

the term "jackal". I will not raise that now. It is not my intention to do so. However, the words that have been used by the hon. member for Bow River, I strongly suggest, should be acceptable to the Chair and to the hon. member concerned.

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, if I could make a slight contribution to this very serious debate—

Mr. Crosbie: It usually is.

Mr. Broadbent:—the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) obviously objected to the word "jackal". I understand the context in which that expression was uttered and I am sure my colleague did not mean, quite literally, that the people sitting to his right were jackals—or the entities to his right. He made the error of thinking that those things that sound like and look like jackals are jackals. He was not lying; he was making a judgment, Madam Speaker.

● (1510)

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Madam Speaker, in the strictest sense, when a member is charged by the Speaker to withdraw, normally that is the only matter dealt with. That is the issue. When the opposition House leader suggests to you that that is not what the hon. member had said, when in fact he has refused three times to withdraw, then indeed you must instruct him once again to withdraw.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, that with respect to our rights and privileges the rules apply to everyone on all sides of the House. If the hon. member is going to call someone a liar and he is requested by you to withdraw, he has no alternative but to withdraw.

Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I have been sitting here quietly listening to what has occurred. I listened to what the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) said and, as I recall it, he said, "Madam Speaker, if you wish to substitute the word "fabrication", or "complete fabrication" for "complete lie", that is all right with me". I believe that is a withdrawal.

Madam Speaker: There is a certain nuance to the words "substituting" and "withdrawing", but I think this debate can be solved perhaps by the two hon. members agreeing on something. There is another factor in the matter of using unparliamentary language, which is whether or not it creates a disturbance in the House even if the word is listed. Sometimes it goes by and does not create a disturbance in the House.

I wonder if the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) would feel his honour is restored by the fact that the hon. member for Bow River has substituted "fabrication" for the word he had uttered previously in the House.

Mr. Heap: Madam Speaker, I find that on page 106 of *Beauchesne's* the word "fabrication" is listed as a word not to be used.