

### PRIVILEGE

MR. DOMM—ALLEGED UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE OF MR. LAPIERRE

**Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough):** Madam Speaker, I would like to draw your attention, and the attention of the House, to a comment made last night, reported at page 24889 of *Hansard*, by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Lapierre). I would like to point out the Parliamentary Secretary's statement wherein he refers to the Hon. Member for Peterborough most indignantly as a "frog basher" and accuses me personally of "francophobia". I would like to ask, Madam Speaker, under a question of privilege which I rose on, for a retraction, and failing that, for a referral of this matter—

**Madam Speaker:** Order. First of all, the Hon. Member is now rising on a point of order. He is then telling me he is going to rise, or that he intends to rise, or did yesterday rise, on a question of privilege. If there was some unparliamentary language spoken in the House yesterday, the matter was probably dealt with by the Speaker who was then presiding over the proceedings. Obviously, the Speaker did not feel there had been any unparliamentary language, that whatever words the Hon. Member is referring to were the kind of sometimes violent, sometimes not so violent, debate which occurs in the House. There is no point of order and there is no question of privilege. At any rate, a question of privilege, I believe he knows, requires a written notice to the Speaker.

\* \* \*

### POINT OF ORDER

MR. BLENKARN—VOTES IN MAIN ESTIMATES ALLEGED IRREGULAR

**Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South):** Madam Speaker, I rise on three points of order with respect to the Main Estimates filed with this House, three matters which I believe the Chair should rule on, or at least I should draw to the attention of the Chair, so that when these matters are eventually brought to a vote the Chair can rule as to whether it is possible for the House to vote.

The first matter is Vote 40 for the Export Development Corporation. Under the estimates for External Affairs, on page 952 of the Main Estimates, under Vote 40, there is a vote required to allocate \$35 million to cover losses of the Export Development Corporation. You will note, Madam Speaker, that the Export Development Corporation's financial statement has been filed with this House indicating that there are no losses. It would strike me that it is impossible, therefore, for the House to be asked to vote \$35 million to cover losses for which the House is already apprised that there are no losses, the consequence being that that vote must, therefore, be stricken from the record or from the estimates presented.

### Point of Order—Mr. Blenkarn

The second matter I draw to your attention, Madam Speaker, is a matter immediately following Vote 40 on the same page of the Main Estimates. It purports to be a statutory matter calling for \$164 million to be transferred to the Export Development Corporation, presumably under a statutory authority contained in the Export Development Corporation's incorporating statute, being Chapter E-18 in the Revised Statutes, as amended. The only Section, Madam Speaker, under which any money can be possibly transferred to the Export Development Corporation is under the provisions of Section 11(2) of the Export Development Corporation Act. Under that Section there is a requirement for the Minister and the Cabinet to make a decision and then ask for the money. This particular matter is treated as a statutory non-budgetary matter. The fact is that it must be a budgetary matter because the terms of the Statute, being Section 11(2) of the Act, require that the Minister "may", if the Minister of Finance concurs, subscribe for shares. In other words, "may" is permissive. There is a requirement for a decision by the Governor General in Council. There therefore must be an appropriation which is directed to the House rather than the matter treated as a statutory matter. Therefore it must be put to the House for a vote. Unfortunately, the way the estimate is drawn and treated, it is a statutory, non-budgetary matter on which the House cannot express an opinion.

● (1510)

I therefore ask you to rule that the matter be treated as a budgetary matter, one that the House can direct attention to so we can express our opinion as to whether we should grant to the Export Development Corporation \$164 million for subscribed capital and such other matters the Corporation may want or the Minister may seek.

The third matter I draw your attention to is Vote 25 under Industry, Trade and Commerce, found on page 14.6 of the Main Estimates. That deals with an appropriation for \$185 million to be paid under the Small Business Investment Grants Act. Madam Speaker, you will know that this House dealt with that Act last week and it has now been dealt with by the Senate. The Bill provides that the entire Act expire as of April 1, 1983. Only applications applied for prior to that date could receive a grant.

The Minister has already received part of this \$185 million under the advance payment we voted on earlier this year. There is certainly no grounds in the statutory law for any grant to be made under this Act, and therefore I ask that you rule that Vote 25 be ruled out of order, the matter having been dealt with by the House and no longer appropriately before the House.

**Madam Speaker:** I thank the Hon. Member for raising these points. I will look into them and rule on them later.