Point of Order-Mr. Lewis

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, since you are responsible for budgets in this place, I submit that there has been a serious misappropriation of funds. This Minister is paid to do his homework and he has not been doing it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Crosbie: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker-

Mr. Dingwall: A point of order-

Mr. Speaker: With great respect, this is verging on real disorder. Could we just leave it here, please?

POINTS OF ORDER

WEARING OF POLITICAL BUTTONS IN CHAMBER

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a separate point of order arising out of Question Period, specifically the questions asked by the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy). In Beauchesne it is very clear, Mr. Speaker, that you are responsible for decorum in the House. I submit that it cheapens the House for Members to wear political buttons in the Chamber.

I suggest this with reluctance because it is obvious that Ottawa Centre, as a provincial riding, deserves better representation than it has had in the past. Also I do so with reluctance because, if that Hon. Member were to wear that button and ask more questions, we would win the election for sure.

Some Hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Keeper: What was the name on the button?

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): How do you spell her last name?

Mr. Speaker: May I say with respect that new Members have just had a small lesson on how to sneak in a political point through a phony point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Privilege, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker: Privilege, privilege, privilege. Actually, that is between all of us as old friends. May I respond to the point of order.

Ms. Copps: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: There is a rule to which the Hon. Member is referring about displays in the House. I take it the Hon. Member was basing his point of order on that. I had seen the badge and had already looked up the citation to determine in my own mind, if it was raised, what was the answer. Citation 333 in Beauchesne's reads:

Speakers have consistently ruled that it is improper to produce exhibits of any sort in the Chamber.

I have checked the precedents. They have referred to a number of other matters in the past. Since most Members are expected in fact to wear pins on their lapels to indicate that they are Members of the House, I would be in some difficulty if I were to rule that a lapel pin was a violation of the House. If I were to rule that some other pin was improper, I would be creating a problem for Members required to wear pins to get themselves into the building. Therefore I cannot find that there has been a breach of the privileges of the House by the wearing of the badge.

I would remind Members of the practices which occurred in the last Parliament during both leadership conventions. I see other Members rising to put pins on. On the basis of the precedents, this is a matter for which the Speaker has some difficulty finding any other solution other than to say that it is not a point of order. Members may wish to have the matter of wearing other than parliamentary badges dealt with in the usual way by the standing committee of the House.

Mr. Prud'homme: On this point, Mr. Speaker-

Mr. Deans: On this point-

Mr. Speaker: I have already ruled on the point. It cannot be on this point.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rose for clarification; that was all. I just wanted to be clear. Was the button the one that read "Elect Evelyn Gigantes"?

Mr. Speaker: Lesson two! Can we proceed?

USE OF UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am seeking some guidance. On a number of occasions, both from the Speaker's chair and from the government side of the House, there have been declarations that this is not Queen's Park. Could the Speaker in fact clarify for the House just what are the regulations in this august Chamber with respect to the issue of truth? It seems to me that when a Member accuses another Member—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I admire the ingenuity of the point and I take it as sincere. Therefore I refer the Member to the rules and to various books, if one wants to look at them—Beauchesne, Erskine May, and Bourinot if one wants to go back that far—and to the rulings given by previous Speakers on the use of what is parliamentary language and what is not. I think that is all I can do today.