

Member could spend another dime and get the whole matter straightened out.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With due respect to the Right Hon. Prime Minister, this appears to be a difference of opinion as to fact. A difference of opinion concerning facts is not a matter of privilege.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Broadbent: As a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I am on my feet and I say to the House that the Prime Minister has lied to the House.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

• (1210)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Language has been used by the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) which is unparliamentary. I request the Hon. Member for Oshawa to withdraw the unparliamentary language.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister a few minutes ago made a comment, with reference to a conversation which took place at a dinner at his place, in which he attributed words to the Premier of Manitoba, and I have just checked with the Premier of Manitoba who has told me that it is incorrect. In normal language that means lying. I repeat, the Prime Minister has misinformed the House about that conversation. If he were a man of integrity, instead of turning around and waltzing out of the House, he would have had the courtesy to say to the House that he misinformed the House. He did not do that. I do not withdraw my comment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Again, Hon. Members are acutely aware of the language which is considered parliamentary and unparliamentary by the House. I must ask the Hon. Member for Oshawa if he would rephrase his remarks so that he would not use language which is clearly unparliamentary. Again I must ask the Hon. Member for Oshawa, for whom I have a high regard and who has generally observed parliamentary procedures, as well as other Hon. Members of this House, to withdraw the remark, which I am sure he knows is not parliamentary.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I will try to be helpful. I am the one who said to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) that the Premier of Manitoba had indicated he was satisfied and was pleased with the changes I had made.

Mr. Broadbent: At the dinner at 24 Sussex?

Mr. Pepin: No, no. I do not think that was a reference, in the last contribution by the Prime Minister, to the dinner. I do not think so. Anyway, I just want to take the credit or the blame for having said to the Prime Minister that Premier Pawley had rejoiced in the changes which I had made. My reasoning is that in the past, the Government of Saskatchewan,

Privilege—Mr. Broadbent

for example, had indicated that it had nine conditions which it wanted to apply, and there was a vote in the Legislature in Regina, Saskatchewan, to the effect that if the Government of Canada were to accept those nine conditions, it would be in favour of change.

That would indicate therefore that the Government of Saskatchewan is in favour of change. The same resolution which was passed in the Legislature in Regina was copied and was passed also by the Legislature in Manitoba. That also would indicate that in certain conditions are met, the provincial Government, the Assemblies in Manitoba and in Saskatchewan, would be in favour of change also. Hence, the general conclusion which the Prime Minister reached, and I had reached a long time ago, that leading politicians in Saskatchewan and Manitoba are in favour of change, that is, of a transformation, a reform, an adjustment, a modernization of the Crowsnest rate.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I as a relatively long-time Member of this House have always had respect for the rules but, to be perfectly candid, I am sick and tired of the Prime Minister's having it both ways, a Prime Minister who systematically has misinformed this House many times in the past, who plays his cute little tricks and then waltzes out of here. If that Prime Minister, for once, behaves with a certain respect for all the Hon. Members of the House, and respects the rules of the House himself, and if he came back here and faced head on his assertion that he was told at a dinner in his residence that Premier Pawley accepted the change in the Crow, if he came back and dealt with that honestly, he would have to withdraw his remarks. If he withdraws his remarks, I will withdraw my comment, but not one minute before!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Order. While I can understand the arguments which have been raised by the Hon. Member for Oshawa, the fact remains that he has used language which is clearly unparliamentary.

An Hon. Member: The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) lied. What do you think?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would again request the Hon. Member, who is an experienced and distinguished parliamentarian, to respect the rules and practices of this House and withdraw his remark. I would hope that there would be another forum in which the differences concerning the facts could be resolved. However, the differences concerning the facts and the possible way in which such differences can be resolved, can hardly be a matter to which the Chair can pay attention at this time. The Chair must ask the Hon. Member for Oshawa to withdraw language which is clearly unparliamentary.

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I believe, whatever may be the line of