

Points of Order

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing your ruling, Sir. I am criticizing and asking you to take into consideration the hypocrisy and the double standard of the—

Mr. Speaker: Whatever the hon. member's complaint may be, if he rises now he can rise on a question of privilege, if there is one, or he can rise on a point of order but not on a matter of debate. I am prepared to discuss with all hon. members, and especially the hon. member for York South—Weston, if there are errors made or if there is a better way to do things in here. I would be only too pleased to try to do that, but I do think I have to recognize a senior member here, the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier, and then I will recognize the hon. member for Kamloops.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, traditionally, when a minister or the Prime Minister reads a document in the House or reports what was said by someone, they have an obligation to lay the document on the Table. In his comments, the Prime Minister mentioned that Senator Hébert said such and such. I understand that at the end of the interview, Senator Hébert apologized. I think that for the purposes of this debate, hon. members should know the conclusion and in fact the contents of the entire interview. I would therefore ask the Prime Minister and his parliamentary secretary whether they could give us the complete text, without any—

Mrs. Finestone: Embellishments!

Mr. Gauthier: —without any embellishments or omissions and table the document in the House so that everyone can read it.

[*English*]

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister, I will relay the message and concern of the hon. member, and we will do our best to comply.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, earlier today we witnessed some very unfortunate, nasty remarks being hurled back and forth across the aisle. I simply want to raise this point of order that on October 1, reading from *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, you admonished members in terms of the way they were accusing other members in this House and in other places of doing

various things. You said, Mr. Speaker, at page 13609 of *Hansard* for October 1, and I quote:

No member shall speak disrespectfully of the Sovereign, nor of any of the Royal Family, nor of the Governor General or the person administering the Government of Canada; nor use offensive words against either House, or against any Member thereof.

I think my hon. colleagues were making the point that what the Prime Minister had to say about the hon. senator was anything but honourable in terms of the words which quite frankly were very offensive in terms of the allegations levied against the hon. senator.

• (1540)

I simply want to say that if this was used for admonishment of members of the House a few days back, I think the same thing could be done to the Prime Minister of Canada today.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, I know that you had asked for unanimous consent. I would have thought that the issue would have died several minutes ago. However, the debate continues and I cannot let that ride.

It is very clear that what both the Deputy Prime Minister and Prime Minister were doing was not calling into question Mr. Hébert or his reputation or anything of the hon. member in the Senate. What they were doing was calling to the attention of the House words that were spoken that had a very serious reflection and implication on the Queen. It had nothing to do with the member himself, but rather his words, and I think that is the true form of debate that all of us should be considering and acting upon.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. parliamentary secretary has a very selective memory. We all heard with great fanfare the quote to which the Prime Minister referred, but the Prime Minister went beyond the quote as all hon. members who were here could hear and of course could see. He went beyond that.

In his description as to what should be done with the hon. member in the other place, I think it was quite clear that in the provisions of Standing Order 18 there was indeed a breach of that particular standing order.

I am glad the hon. member would perhaps now want to agree with me that we should leave that to the direction of the Chair so that the Chair can perhaps reflect on what has transpired and also have an opportunity to review the "blues" to see whether or not in point of fact the Chair can see a prima facie case there that would amount to being a breach of Standing Order 18, with