

Oral Questions

we check the dates mentioned by the Minister and by the Leader of the Opposition, it seems that the transaction took place more than two years later. I am therefore hesitant to accept allegations of dishonest or dubious behaviour. Apparently, when we look at the dates mentioned by the Opposition, there does not seem to have been any violation of the conflict of interest guidelines. Therefore, the Opposition should get organized and at least ask questions that clearly demonstrate that conflict of interest guidelines have been violated. These guidelines are public documents, read to us by the Leader of the Opposition, which prescribe that a former Minister is prohibited from doing such and such a thing within a two-year period, and it seems that according to the Opposition's figures, the transaction took place more than two years later.

Mr. La Salle: When did he start negotiating?

An Hon. Member: Why do you not listen, La Salle!

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Madam Speaker, I can hear other dates being quoted on the opposite side, and I wish they would table them. This is the first time I have heard about it. Why does the Hon. Member not get up and ask supplementary questions instead of staying in his seat and smirking and shouting?

DATE OF NEGOTIATIONS BEGUN BY ALASTAIR GILLESPIE

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary. The Right Hon. Prime Minister is trying to prove that the signing of this agreement does not violate criteria which he himself established. In that case, I wish to ask the Right Hon. Prime Minister to make enquiries and let us know when Mr. Gillespie started lobbying and negotiating with the Government or Petro-Canada. The public might be interested.

Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member did not have to go to all that trouble, because I just informed his colleague that we are going to make those enquiries.

An Hon. Member: He does not understand English.

Mr. Trudeau: Madam Speaker, that is not his problem. His problem is that he does not pay attention to what Members on his side are saying. If he did, he would know that I said quite clearly that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, who has just gone to make those enquiries—

Mr. La Salle: If you think there is a conflict of interest—

Mr. Trudeau: Well, there—

Madam Speaker: Order. I am going to end the question period. It is three o'clock, in any case, but I also want to

remind Hon. Members that they should not talk across the House.

The Hon. Member for Rosemont, on a point of order.

* * *

● (1500)

POINT OF ORDER

MR. LACHANCE—ALLEGED MISAPPLICATION OF S.O. 21

Mr. Claude-André Lachance (Rosemont): Madam Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to the wording of Standing Order 21, and my point of order arises from the statement under the provisions of S.O. 21 made by the Member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) this afternoon.

Standing Order 21 prescribes that the Speaker may order a Member to resume his or her seat if, in the opinion of the Speaker, improper use is made of this Standing Order.

Madam Speaker, today, you called to order an Hon. Member who was extending a message of congratulations. As a Member of the Committee on Standing Orders and Procedures, and therefore as one who participated in the drafting of Standing Order 21, I would like to draw your attention to page 7:19 of the proceedings of the Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure. There we find that the Chair would have the discretion to call to order any Member who sought to use this opportunity to convey congratulatory messages or for frivolous purposes.

Madam Speaker, I read the blues showing the statement made by the Member for Joliette, and I shall quote from them.

... considering the Minister's irresponsibility or incompetence,

He is referring to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Caccia),

... I wish to ask the Right Hon. Prime Minister of Canada to immediately remove this Minister who is refusing to discharge his responsibilities.

Madam Speaker, my point of order is strictly concerned with the form of this statement. I think that if congratulatory messages are taboo, this should certainly apply to personal attacks under this Standing Order, which is being tried on an experimental basis. I would therefore suggest that perhaps the Chair might wish to look into this matter.

Madam Speaker: No, I do not think so. As I understand the manner in which statements made by Members may be interpreted, I thought the statement by the Hon. Member for Joliette met the conditions of the Standing Order. I think it is quite acceptable for Members on all sides of the House to launch verbal attacks at each other, and I do not think the statement by the Member for Joliette in any way breached the conditions set in the Standing Order.