

the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole in this Chamber. It reads:

The Chairman of Ways and Means during his occupation of that office follows the same tradition of abstention from Party controversy as the Speaker.

[Translation]

Now, if you want me to get down to the point, the fact is that there was flagrant abuse in taking part in the debate, in the sense that extremely partisan remarks were made, and it seems to me to be the thrust of my argument. I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to what the Hon. Member said in words and sentences in the course of his remarks.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: I think I know the point the Hon. Member is trying to make.

[Translation]

I think I understand fairly well the point he wants me to consider. But if he wants me to include in my . . . I think he has made an argument concerning our traditions, what he thinks are our traditions, respecting the appropriateness of an Acting Speaker taking part in debates.

[English]

If he goes further now into a comment about what the Member said, then the Member is entering into the area of comment about another Member—

An Hon. Member: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Yes he is, I suggest.

Mr. Gauthier: Impartiality.

Mr. Speaker: Let me put to the Hon. Member that if he believes something was said yesterday which affects the impartiality of the Chair, in his view, and he is then saying that that would become a question of privilege, it would not.

Ms. Copps: What would it be?

Mr. Speaker: Any Member of this House may speak from his seat in the House in any way he or she chooses. I appreciate the fact that the Hon. Member takes this matter seriously and I believe the Hon. Member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Charest), and other Members take these questions seriously, but if the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques is trying to base a question of privilege on the existence of an intervention, then I need to hear how he proposes I should consider that.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): I have read the jurisprudence related to impartiality, Mr. Speaker. I think it has been established, and I think all Hon. Members recognize that as a start. Now I think I have to go into some detail to explain that one Hon. Member was not impartial. We are not talking about an ordinary Hon. Member; we are talking about an Hon. Member who is a presiding officer. That is the point. Otherwise debate is debate, and I understand that. We are talking about a presiding officer and that is my point. I think I have been clear from the beginning.

Privilege—Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)

Mr. Speaker: Let me see if I can help the Hon. Member. What he is raising is not a question of privilege. He is making an objection to an intervention having been made. If he feels very strongly on that subject, he has other recourses that are open to him, notably some form of substantive motion, if that is his choice.

It is clear from the record, from our history, that the Hon. Member for Sherbrooke is by no means the first Deputy Speaker to rise in his place and speak in this House.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): What did he say though?

Mr. Speaker: In fact, Deputy Speaker Lamoureux did speak once when he was Deputy Speaker. Clearly it cannot be the content of a Member's speech that gives rise, by its very existence, to a question of privilege from another Hon. Member.

Our history and traditions are very clear that if a Member wishes to make a comment in any way about what another Member has done, then that reference must be by substantive motion, not by raising a question of privilege. I think if the Hon. Member looks at the citations on that, he will find that that goes back to Speaker Michener, Speaker Lamoureux and Speaker Jerome. I want to be very clear about this. There is not, in my view, in our precedents a question of privilege here.

On the issue of the right of a deputy Speaker to speak as a Member, there is no question about our rules speaking strongly about what the Speaker may or may not do. But the rules are silent on what a deputy Speaker may do. Assistant deputy Speakers have spoken in the past, and this deputy Speaker also chose to speak. I am subject to some pretty severe constraints as the Hon. Member knows, and must be.

If the Hon. Member is suggesting that the House may wish to consider whether it wants in future to change the constraints or to create constraints that apply to deputy Speakers, then the House would be free to do that, but I can find no rule, that I know of, that would prevent a Member of the House, having been asked to be a deputy, deputy, deputy Speaker, from speaking. Whether one should or should not do so is a question of judgment that various deputy Speakers have exercised in various ways.

If the Hon. Member wants to pursue the matter, either the subject of the impartiality of the Chair or that of the conduct of another Member, either of those matters have to be pursued by a substantive motion. I think the Hon. Member knows that.

I am saying this because I think the Hon. Member knows from our practices that I need to hear some foundation for a question of privilege. I am trying to say that so far I have not heard it.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I understand the Member who has been speaking has a motion to propose.

Mr. Speaker: He only gets to propose the motion if I find there is a *prima facie* case of privilege.

I should not be doing this here, perhaps, but the Hon. Member has another route. If he has a motion he wishes to