

Standing Order 94. Accordingly, I am directing the table officers to drop that item of business to the bottom of the order of precedents.

[*Translation*]

The "Private Member's Hour" will therefore be cancelled, in accordance with Standing Order 94. Since the House has no business to deal with at 1 p.m., the House should take recess, after the prayer, until 2 p.m.

[*English*]

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, we are once again up against one of the problems we have with our Standing Orders. As all members are aware and so there are a number of options for us to handle the situation for Private Members' Business on Monday. I think you might find consent for the motion that we have used in the passed. I move:

That notwithstanding any Standing Order, on Monday, October 1, 1990 the House meet at one o'clock p.m. and proceed to the consideration of Government Orders from one o'clock p.m. to two o'clock p.m.

Mr. Lapierre: No.

Motion negatived.

Mr. Cooper: I heard the noes. Then we have a couple of other options, one of which may help us resolve the situation leaving, I think, the House officers in a difficult position. I would put that second motion. I move:

That notwithstanding any Standing Order, on Monday, October 1, 1990 the House meet at two o'clock p.m. for Statements by Members, followed by Oral Questions and the remaining order of business as provided for Mondays.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I feel it necessary to raise a matter arising from Question Period.

Privilege

It is the second day I have been obliged to raise matters with regard to the Minister of Finance. He was given notice that I intended to rise but did not choose to stay.

At the conclusion of Question Period he rose and referred to having said that I had deliberately misled the House in a question that I put to him. He said that he would withdraw the word "deliberately". He then proceeded to convey the impression that I had indeed misrepresented. The authorities are mixed on whether the word misrepresent is unparliamentary. In *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition* it can be concluded that it is either unparliamentary, on page 109, where attempted to misrepresent has been found unparliamentary or, it has been accepted, as noted on page 112.

• (1220)

I feel it is necessary to make the point that I did not fail to check numbers, nor did I attempt to misrepresent in the question that I put. It was a question relating to the goods and services tax and the extent to which the tax will affect a shift in taxation in Canada from businesses to households. In the minister's own statements in this House in second reading debate, he said that it was \$6 billion.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: The issue was first raised by the hon. member for Ottawa South and raised immediately and properly with the Chair on the question of "deliberately misrepresent." There is no doubt in my mind that "deliberately misrepresent" is unparliamentary. The question of "mislead" or "misrepresent" may or may not be unparliamentary, depending on the context in which it is used. If it is an argument over facts, that goes on in this place all the time. If it is said, and it may well have been, in the matter that the hon. member quotes, it may have been said in a context in which the accusation was a very severe one indeed. That is why I caution hon. members not to just look in *Beauchesne's* to see what words have, at one time or another, been ruled as unparliamentary, but to remember that it also has to be considered in the context.

In this case, I understand the hon. member, who is a conscientious member in this place, wanting to establish that he did not make this statement carelessly. If the hon. minister has a view about it which is different than his own, that is a matter of debate. However, the hon.