

I say the issue is not whether motions under Standing Order 43 are properly broad or improperly broad, or about the content of those motions; the issue is whether the minister can get away with this kind of abusive remark, in effect calling members of the opposition cowards.

**Mr. Robert Daudlin (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board):** Madam Speaker, my intervention will be short, and it is in support of the position taken by the government House leader.

**An hon. Member:** Shame, shame!

**Mr. Daudlin:** There is absolutely no shame in supporting that position, from my point of view. I do not share the point of view expressed by some members on the other side. I suggest that at the very least there can be nothing more wrong with the phrase that was used, "lacking in courage", than in the phrase "fascist tendencies" as used by the hon. member who spoke just most recently. How they can argue on the one hand that the one is objectionable and the other is not, is beyond my comprehension.

The hon. member for Ottawa Centre, the House leader for the Conservative party—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Daudlin:** The hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) suggests that he has substantial difficulty in understanding why the House leader would stand up and argue what he calls legalese. You are here, Madam Speaker, to administer what amounts to justice in this House and, indeed, to deal with legalisms. For him to find it strange that we should be dealing with legalisms is to admit that he is unable to understand the workings of this House, and surely he has been here long enough to understand that.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has indicated that, in fact, he wants you to examine the record to determine whether the question posed by the hon. member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) had, indeed, been answered. His question essentially dealt with two points. You will find that the hon. member had asked whether the contract that had been signed, was in the nation's interests, and whether it was at the level of 26 per cent as alleged by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). Both of those points or aspects of the question were answered in the response of the Postmaster General.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Daudlin:** I think you will find that is so when you examine the record.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I think the point being raised by the Postmaster General, and what gives me cause to rise and join in this debate, is the fact that members have sat on this side of the House and have recognized, as I am sure you have, that members opposite raise all kinds of allegations in motions under Standing Order 43, and present facts that are dubious and cannot be proved. They then fail to seek the floor in this

*Privilege—Mr. Hnatyshyn*

House and put a question that would force them to substantiate those allegations, or prompt an answer by a minister that would in fact prove the allegations wrong. They do this when they fail to obtain the unanimous consent of the House to change the direction of the business of the House, thereby refusing to allow the government to go forward with the work of the day. They do this when they fail to obtain consent.

I am sure this persistent use of the rule, and I hesitate to say "abuse", which admittedly does exist, in a manner such as this leads one to question whether it would not be appropriate for hon. members opposite to pose a question, having failed to obtain consent under Standing Order 43. This leads one to question whether the hon. members really are sincere or are attempting to use Standing Order 43 as a tool to accomplish some other end. I have in mind their use of Standing Order 43 and their failure to follow up those motions by seeking the floor to ask a question, even recognizing that you, Madam Speaker, cannot recognize everyone who seeks the floor during the question period.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I believe we have two things taking place at the same time, a question of privilege and a point of order. The question of privilege relates to the matter raised by the hon. member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn), and the point of order came later during the intervention by the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) on the same question of privilege. I am not clear whether the point of order was raised in respect of the language used by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Postmaster General (Mr. Ouellet) in his reply. I will have to check the record, because at the time the minister spoke I was not struck by anything that seemed to be unparliamentary. However, since several hon. members have raised questions about the language that was used, I will check the record.

I am not clear whether the word alleged to have been used was "coward", or the phrase "lack of courage" as suggested by some hon. members. Sometimes when an hon. member uses a word different from the one he might like to have used, the hon. member does so to soften the expression. Perhaps the minister followed that course in order not to use unparliamentary language. However, I want to look at the record.

I am sure the minister said of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) that he did have courage. If the implication was not well taken by some hon. members, that anybody else who did not do what the hon. member for Brandon-Souris did, did not have the courage and therefore was called a coward, I will have to look at that matter and review the exact wording in *Hansard*. I will speak to that matter another day.

● (1540)

I can deal with the question raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) with regard to the point that the answer was not related to the question. That is not for me to judge. A question was asked, an answer was given, and I do not have any opinion of the quality or the relevancy of an answer. This opinion is often expressed in the