

*Business of the House*

export of arms. If the Minister refers to his mail of September 29 he will know that he received correspondence suggesting that this whole matter be referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade so that committee members could give the attention that such a topic deserves. I would encourage the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) to give that matter some consideration.

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, in the same spirit of a point of order, sooner or later members of the New Democratic Party will have to accept some responsibility to put forward specific suggestions and not content themselves with empty cant and criticism.

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

## WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt this fight between the Conservatives and the New Democrats for third place—

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

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):**—but I feel that I should rise on a point of order to ask the Government House Leader to tell us what business he intends to call for the next seven days of sitting time of the House. In particular, does the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) still intend to give a report to the House on his trip to southern Africa, and when will that be?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the order of business for the next few days will be Bill C-38, an Act to privatize Teleglobe, Bill C-21, the Shipping Conference Exemption Act, Bill C-12, amendments to the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act; C-2, Canagrex, and C-6, the Atlantic Accord. We hope that we can have all those through by Wednesday next so we can deal with the Budget with the decks clear.

In so far as the Prime Minister's (Mr. Mulroney) statement is concerned, as I indicated last week, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, (Mr. Clark) has just returned today and the Prime Minister has not had a chance to confer with him. After that is done, I would think that an appropriate statement will be made.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond):** Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Speaker:** Just a moment, please. I will now hear a point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta (Mr. Friesen). After that, the Hon. Member for Drummond (Mr. Guilbault) will have the floor.

[*English*]

**POINT OF ORDER**

## LANGUAGE USED IN HOUSE—MEMBERS' RESPONSIBILITIES

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey—White Rock—North Delta):** Mr. Speaker, I raise this point of order with some caution and care because it involves the office of the Chair. You will recall, Sir, that two days ago the Hon. Member for Peace River (Mr. Cooper) raised a point of order regarding the kind of terminology and language used in the House. He urged you at that time to check with Beauchesne, specifically Citation 55 and subsequent citations regarding, again, the kind of language that is used in the House.

● (1510)

Today the Hon. Member for Mount Royal (Mrs. Finestone) used the phrase: "besmirching the reputation of a company". I am concerned enough when we use language with respect to each other that does not enhance the conduct of the House. It concerns me even more when innocent citizens and companies outside the House are affected by the language used here.

There has been nothing to indicate that the company in question did anything wrong or that anyone else did anything wrong with respect to that company's operations. Therefore, I think it is not helpful for Members of the House to use phrases like "besmirching the reputation of a company" which in fact then besmirches the reputation of a company. I would ask Your Honour to look at that practice.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the point raised by my hon. friend, if you look at rulings by Speakers as to what language is permissible in the House, you will find language far more colourful—

[*Translation*]

You will find terms far more expressive—

[*English*]

—than the word "besmirch". I submit that there is nothing in the precedents on language which is parliamentary or unparliamentary to indicate that the word "besmirch" should be ruled unparliamentary.

If I am not mistaken, the citations on unparliamentary language deal particularly with words or phrases used by Hon. Members with regard to other Hon. Members. Just the other day when I raised the concern that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader had used the word "slandorous" in this House, a word which a previous Speaker had ruled to be unparliamentary, the answer given by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader was that the words were not directed to a particular Member of the House and that it was all right to use a word which was otherwise unparliamentary provided it referred to Members of the House as a group.

I make this point to argue that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader has confirmed what I have