

Point of Order

member who has properly filed his notice and to the minister.

Is it agreed?

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for not informing the minister. I do not think my office did that and I will be happy to do as Your Honour suggests.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate very much the courtesy the hon. member has extended.

An Hon. Member: The minister is here now.

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the minister for not notifying him of my intention to raise this point of privilege, and I appreciate his coming back into the House to address it.

The point arises from comments that the minister made yesterday in response to my question regarding the Meme breast implant. In response to my question the minister made two comments which attacked my motives in raising this issue. In addition, he made statements which were misleading in themselves.

The hon. minister accused me of making false allegations. I hope you will permit me the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to point out why the minister wrongly characterized my statements as being false allegations.

Studies at both the University of Florida and Laval University indicate that the foam covering the implant breaks down within the body producing a carcinogenic compound.

• (1510)

Mr. Speaker: I listened very carefully to the exchange yesterday. In fact I have it in front of me.

The hon. minister said that the allegations made by the member who was questioning him were false. Those statements did not carry with them the suggestion that they were intentionally false or dishonest, that they were wrong or incorrect. That happens very often in exchanges in this House on both sides.

I have to say to the hon. member that unless he has something more serious than that I do not think he can pursue this very far. Certainly, a question of privilege is not a place to get into debate on the relative merits of medical evidence.

I will hear the hon. member further.

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those comments. Of course it is difficult to respond to an accusation of being false without getting into some of the details, but I am happy not to do that.

The minister also accused me of being irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. That happens in preambles day after day in this House. The hon. minister may be absolutely wrong, and I am prepared to accept at least *prima facie* the position of the hon. member that he is not irresponsible, but that is getting into debate. It is not a question of privilege.

I do not think I need to call on the minister.

Mr. Beatty: I would love to respond.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO BILL C-21

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I indicated a few minutes ago that I wished to comment briefly on the point of order raised by the Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons on Tuesday.

There are two points I would like to raise very briefly in relation to the message from the Senate and the proposed amendments to Bill C-21.

My colleague from Ottawa—Vanier has expressed quite eloquently his opinions as to why the royal recommendation issue is not a valid one to start with, simply because in large measure the amendments proposed by the Senate do not have an impact in the manner in which the minister suggested.

I want to bring one additional point in a somewhat different area of concern. The minister stated in the House as reported at page 10140 of *Hansard* for April 3, 1990:

Had these amendments come from a member of this House, I am sure that citation 698(5) of Beauchesne's sixth edition would have been invoked to rule them inadmissible. They are clearly contrary to that principle of the bill.

He said as well that the royal recommendation of Bill C-21 was infringed upon by the decision of the Senate. He also backed up these comments based on Erskine May and Beauchesne and referred to the fact that this