

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

MR. PETERS—ALLEGED UNPARLIAMENTARY REMARK  
DURING TODAY'S QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Speaker:** I should like to refer very briefly to an incident which took place this morning when we had a few alleged questions of privilege, one of them involving an exchange between the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand). During the course of the exchange there were words spoken by the hon. member for Timiskaming from his seat and I said at the time that I would look at the record. However, pending this the Solicitor General indicated he was charging that the hon. member had said that he, the Solicitor General, lied. The hon. member explained that he meant it was not the minister who was uttering the lie but that the statement that was given to the minister was in itself a lie.

● (1550)

I have looked at the record, and certainly what the hon. member said is substantiated in it. His explanation, when he was called to order, was: "Mr. Speaker, I think *Hansard* will clearly indicate that I said that is a lie, and there seems to be some difference of opinion as to the fact. I did not say that the minister was a liar but that the report he gave was a lie."

I still have some hesitation about hon. members using such strong language even in the case of a report given to the House by a minister or another member; but certainly there is a distinction. It is important that all hon. members should realize it is incumbent upon the Chair to ensure that there is respect among members. No member, whether on one side of this House or the other, whether he be minister or not, frontbencher or backbencher, should be accused by another member of dishonesty, of intentionally misleading the House or of lying to the House. I think that is important. The hon. member has given his explanation and the Chair is willing to accept it. The minister is not here but I think he would accept it in the same way that I do. I therefore consider the incident closed.

I will now recognize the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen).

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, in accordance with an order made earlier this day, I wonder if we could now revert to motions to deal with the motion in the name of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand).

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## Motions

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS

CHRISTMAS ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to proceed with the motion at this time, having considered an alternative motion which has been discussed and which I think will have the support of all members of the House. Maybe I should briefly summarize the contents of the motion before reading it.

It would provide that upon the adjournment of the House today, it would stand adjourned until January 3 next. Then it provides that there be a method for dealing with three items on the order paper. The first is the export tax bill, providing that it would be dealt with in not more than three days; the oil allocation bill, providing for two more days of committee consideration, not more than three days at report stage and not more than a further day at third reading; then dealing with the election expenses bill it provides that the report stage and third reading be disposed of without further debate or amendment. Mr. Speaker, I could read the motion; or should Your Honour read it?

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not sure whether it was intended to make this motion before we had completed consideration of the four motions which are still to be called on the election expenses bill, Nos. 40, 41, 42 and 1. If this motion is put and carried it will mean we should immediately thereafter put the election expenses bill motions without further debate. I should like to have this question clarified before the motion is put.

**Mr. Howard:** Mr. Speaker, I would think that because we are in the midst of these report stage amendments and one or two of them require a bit of explanation, particularly motion No. 1 with respect to a position hoped to be taken on the vote at third reading of the election expenses bill, we should either hold off the motion of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) for a House order or dispense with private members' hour between four o'clock and five o'clock in order to provide an opportunity for the report stage amendments to be cleared up.

Then we could take a few minutes to put forward a position which some hon. members want to place on the record regarding their position with respect to third reading stage, even though when the order is passed and we return there would be no debate.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I sought the floor before four o'clock in view of the possibility that I might not be able to get it after four o'clock. It is quite agreeable to me, and I am sure to other hon. members, to suspend private members' hour—but with the understanding that we return to this motion before five o'clock.

**Mr. Bell:** Mr. Speaker, we would co-operate in this suggestion, but the hon. member who was going to speak on private members' hour is standing by and we want to preserve that hour, or most of it. We would not mind cutting into it by five or ten minutes.