

contrary to the point made by the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), there is a definite point of order. I want to quote from *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition*, page 103. Beauchesne is very clear in Citation 316 "That a Member, while speaking, must not" and there follows a long enumeration of what is prohibited, I will skip sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), (c), (d) and come to sub-paragraph (e) which is clear and says that a Member, while speaking must not:

(e) impute bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged to a Member.

● (1630)

I want to submit that when some Members on the opposition side were questioning the validity of a decision with regard to a grant that was made to Fantasyland in Edmonton, they were doing just that. They were just trying to establish, by questioning the Government, that the grant may have been made without the proper procedures being followed.

Now, for the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) to say what he has said and what is recorded in *Hansard* on page 10482, which is that the Liberals and the New Democratic Parties are opposed to the interests of western Canada and that that becomes clearer every day, is certainly, I submit, to impute motives contrary to Citation 316 of Beauchesne's.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that on this side of the House, we are often less than satisfied with what the Government is doing. For instance, the Government has been remarkably slow to react to what is happening in Montreal East and to provide grants. We have asked questions, and I have just done so—

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): I will show you that what I have to say is quite in order. We asked some questions not long ago, and we will ask the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion some more, but we never at any time assumed that the Government was so slow to react because the Minister or the Government were hostile to the interests of the Montreal area. We never said that and we are not going to.

Mr. Speaker: I realize the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) wants to be thorough in his comments. That is understandable. I think the Hon. Member's comments are most interesting, but I think I may have resolved the point at issue. As I said for—

[English]

—Right Hon. Secretary of State, we do not want to extend this argument. I think we are getting into debate. I have the point of the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) and I am quite prepared to consider it. He may want to rise briefly to close off his remarks.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that I am the only one so far in

Privilege—Mr. Mazankowski

the debate who has quoted the rules of this House, and I do not think I should be cut off because I am trying to keep this at the level of procedure, whereas—

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It was not the intention of the Chair.

[English]

It was only that when we get into a debate about questions asked about Montreal or somewhere else, we are getting a little bit beyond the procedural point. I am much indebted to the Hon. Member because he has cited those. As I say, I have invited the Hon. Member to continue his remarks.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Which I will, and I thank you, Mr. Speaker. Citation 316 of Beauchesne's is there for a purpose and it has been used in the past in this House. The purpose obviously is that while some language is specifically prohibited on pages 104, 105 and others of Beauchesne's including the word "lying", for example, which was withdrawn a few minutes ago, there is other language which, while not being specifically prohibited, has an obvious tendency to create disorder in the House. The language that tends to impute motives is language of that kind.

This is the reason I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, to take into account this specific citation in Beauchesne's when you make your decision, and if you come to the conclusion which, I suggest respectfully, the Chair might wish to come to, the words that were uttered by the Prime Minister should be withdrawn. Words that impute motives that are completely other than those that were meant by the one who has the floor should not be used.

I think, Mr. Speaker, you should make a decision that will send a clear message to all Hon. Members that this should not be done. This should serve as an example. If the Prime Minister of Canada is not able to respect the rules and traditions of this House, why should other Hon. Members do so?

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the point raised by the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault), and I know he has done so with a great amount of sincerity. I would submit that the citation he quoted is not applicable in this particular case. The citation says that besides prohibitions contained in Standing Order 35, it has been sanctioned by usage that a Member while speaking must not impute to a Member bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged, and I think that is the most important element here.

There is no question of the Prime Minister imputing motives against a Member. It is really no different from a headline from the *Windsor Star* of November 10, 1984, which reads, "Broadbent says Tories covering up". One could say that that