

*Privilege—Mr. R. Guay*

the hon. member for Lévis is perfectly entitled to disagree with me and with the opposition. That is quite normal since he is on the government side. However, it is my right and privilege to express my disagreement.

Anyone reading my speech will realize that I did not go beyond my rights under our Standing Orders. Every member however that was in this House yesterday evening will testify that the hon. member for Lévis did not stop for a minute interrupting me, shouting his disapproval, voicing protests while I was speaking. He repeatedly interrupted my speech, contrary to our rules.

That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why I told him to keep quiet while we were making speeches, as appears in the official reports on page 12386. This is not the first time, Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing that problem. I show every respect for the hon. member for Lévis. And he knows it. I will not throw back to him what he said earlier about an absent member. I feel that attacking the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) in his absence, the way he did, is rather debasing.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that Opposition members, in situations where they are constantly interrupted by government members, make this kind of remark, as "Let him stop bothering me during my speech. Let him stop railing at me. Let him rise to speak on the subject when his turn comes, if he has the courage to do so." This happens hundred of times during our debates. And the hon. member for Lévis knows it.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore submit I said nothing that went beyond my rights and privileges under our Standing Orders, and I respectfully wish that hon. members on the other side would let us make our speeches unhindered.

Mr. Speaker, it is enough that we are muzzled without being constantly interrupted when we speak in this House.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Chair intervened during the speech of opposition members from three parties. On pages 12383, 12372, 12367 and 12366 of *Hansard*, we find four interventions by the Acting Speaker who wanted to restore order in this House so as to allow the speakers to be heard, especially since speeches were limited to ten minutes. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that as recorded in *Hansard*, the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay) interrupted me exactly eight times, while—

**Some hon. Members:** Shame, shame!

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, citation 113 in the 4th edition of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms says, and I quote:

But a dispute arising between two members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

Mr. Speaker, the last point that I want to make is this. The hon. member for Lévis, who feels so injured today, seems to forget that, as *Hansard* shows, he himself called me a coward yesterday. On page 12386, the hon. member for Lévis is reported as having said:

... I demand that the hon. member for Lotbinière treat the others as they do him ...

Which meant that he was calling me a coward.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lévis called me a coward in the heat of the discussion. I understand him and

[Mr. Fortin.]

do not bear him any grudge. I just wonder why he himself dramatizes such things. As reported on page 12387 of *Hansard*, he himself said yesterday:

... if we say we must muzzle the House, as the hon. member now seems to be trying to prove ...

Mr. Speaker, this was not true. The hon. member was imputing motives to me. I was trying to prove exactly the opposite. No one would pretend that it was the opposition who introduced the closure motion under Standing Order 75C.

The hon. member for Lévis added

... I think he is the one ...

—talking about myself—

... who should be muzzled for all the nonsense he is saying.

—talking about myself. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, that is not parliamentary language either. I think the hon. member for Lévis exceeds the limit. First, he gives a wrong interpretation of my words, he wants to muzzle me, prevent me from speaking in the House, and then he states plainly that I talk nonsense today in order to taint the reputation of the hon. member for Joliette.

Finally, as evidenced by the debates, the hon. member interfered with my right to speak by interrupting me more than eight times in ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I refer to the 18th edition of Parliamentary Practice by Erskine May, chapter XIX dealing with

... Maintenance of order during debate ...

In paragraph 2 entitled:

● (1210)

[English]

In Erskine May's eighteenth edition, chapter XIX concerning the maintenance of order during debate, paragraph (2), in reference to minor breaches of order, states:

When any members transgresses the rules of debate, otherwise than by using disorderly or unparliamentary expressions, or makes any noise or disturbance whilst another member is speaking—

In that event, Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, the Speaker calls the offending member to order.

[Translation]

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am asking you today, to call the hon. member to order so that he will understand like the other government members that he must let the opposition fulfill its duty without degrading it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It is always hard for the Chair to make a ruling on a question of privilege, especially when the matter concerns the definition of one word or other. It is obviously clear that often in the past, a member has been allowed to express the feelings of another member who had tried on many occasions to interrupt another member. Either one must have the courage to rise and take part in the debate. I therefore accept the explanation given by the hon. member for Lotbinière, whatever words were used during yesterday's debate. His intention was quite clear. Then again, I accept the explanation of the hon. member because, in my opinion, there is no question of privilege under the circumstances.