

Privilege—Mr. Jelinek

that that difference in interpretation constitutes a question of privilege, and I will determine that that difference in interpretation does not constitute a question of privilege. I must therefore tell the hon. member that I cannot hear him any further and that he cannot pursue his question of privilege.

Mr. Benjamin: Madam Speaker, I was hoping you would allow me to complete the third point. There are three points in my question of privilege.

Madam Speaker: Order. In the time I gave the hon. member he was not able to convince me that he had a prima facie case of privilege. Therefore, I am afraid I cannot allow him any more time.

MR. JELINEK—INTRODUCTION OF SPORTS BETTING POOL—
ALLEGED DENIAL BY MINISTER

Mr. Otto Jelinek (Halton): Madam Speaker, I did indeed serve notice of my question of privilege earlier today relating to questions I put to the minister of fitness and amateur sport on June 26 and June 30 relating to his subsequent announcement in the form of a press release dated September 14 regarding the introduction of a national sports betting pool. Obviously this is the first opportunity, Madam Speaker, to bring the matter to your attention and, in order to make my point, I hope you will permit me to quote quickly and briefly from *Hansard* for June 26, 1981.

In my first question to the minister I said in part, and I quote:

It has now come to my attention that the minister is well on his way to extending federal gambling programs to what is known as all-sports betting—

The minister answered, also in part, by saying, and I quote:

I would inform the hon. member that the government has no such plans.

I went on to say, and I quote again:

Is the minister telling us that neither his department nor any other department of government has been considering sports betting? . . . At the same time can he assure the House that all-sports betting or any other new gambling operation will not be implemented, now or in the foreseeable future, by that government?

After sarcastically ridiculing me in this House the minister concluded, and I quote again from *Hansard*:

We do not contemplate any such scheme as the hon. member has mentioned.

Just a few days later, on June 30, I brought to the attention of the minister a sample betting ticket entitled "Sports Select" which was produced by the federal government outlining 15 National Hockey League games to be bet on by the purchaser of the ticket to be sold to the Canadian public at one dollar.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I can see that the hon. member is making many quotations from *Hansard*, but I would like him to tell me right now where he feels that his privilege has been breached. I see nothing in the presentation he has made up until now which would allow me to find a prima facie case of privilege. Obviously the hon. member is not satisfied with an answer given to him by a minister, but that does not constitute a question of privilege, so the hon. member

will have to make some effort to indicate to me where his privilege stands.

Mr. Jelinek: Madam Speaker, if you will bear with me, you will note that I will conclude that the minister violated my privilege as a member of Parliament and, indeed, the privileges of all members of Parliament by either deliberately misleading the House at that time—as my colleague says, not telling the truth—

Madam Speaker: Order. The hon. member of course knows that he cannot say that a member has deliberately misled the House. He risks having to withdraw, and I ask him to withdraw that because he cannot say the minister did it deliberately. He might say he misled the House, but "deliberately" is a different matter. I ask the hon. member to rephrase his sentence so I can listen to him.

Mr. Jelinek: Madam Speaker, it is on the record that he said he had no knowledge of this scheme, including no knowledge of this ticket which was produced by his department.

On September 14 the minister released a press release which says, in part, and I quote:

—legislation would be introduced as soon as possible to permit the operation of a sports pool program—

The record says—not me but the record—that he was deliberately misleading the House. I am not saying that. The record of *Hansard*—

Madam Speaker: Order. The hon. member cannot say indirectly something he would not be allowed to say directly. I ask him to withdraw that phrase. I cannot accept it in the House. Would the hon. member please rephrase that sentence and come to the point of his question of privilege; otherwise I will just have to cut him off.

Mr. Jelinek: Madam Speaker, I withdraw the statement that he was deliberately misleading the House. The record shows that he deliberately misled the House. As a result—

Madam Speaker: Order. I am sorry. It is just as if the hon. member were quoting in the House an article in the newspaper saying something unparliamentary; he is using the subterfuge of quoting an article to say something he would not say directly. I think the hon. member can make his case without being unparliamentary, and I ask him to try to do that.

Mr. Jelinek: I have withdrawn my personal statement saying that he deliberately misled this House, but the rest of what I said stands.

The issue at hand in my question of privilege, therefore, is that both on June 26 and June 30 of 1981 the minister of fitness and amateur sport categorically denied that he, his department or any other department of his government was contemplating or even considering the introduction of a sports betting program—and the record speaks for itself—and then just a few months later while Parliament was in recess, on September 14 to be exact, the minister proudly and ceremoniously announced that indeed they would be announcing such a