

Point of Order—Mr. Kristiansen

the Hon. Member for Mississauga South is strictly a matter of debate which ought to be discussed during the regular time allotted to the consideration of supply.

In so far as the statutory item is concerned, the authority to spend is provided by the Export Development Act which gives the Minister and the Governor in Council the power to act. Again, the Chair cannot be asked to give an opinion on the legality of the Government's request through a statutory item in the estimates. As explained in Citation 484 of *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition*, and I quote:

The purpose of the Estimates is to present to Parliament the budgetary and non-budgetary expenditure proposals of the Government for the next fiscal year. These Estimates include Votes, which Parliament is asked to approve through Appropriation Acts, as well as other items called statutory items, for which the required expenditures have already been approved through existing legislation and are included only for information purposes.

Therefore, I cannot agree with the Hon. Member's request that this statutory item be treated as a budgetary matter in order for the House to express its opinion as to whether the amount should be granted. Citation 498 of *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition* is quite clear on this subject. It reads:

Statutory items which are included in the Estimates for informational purpose may be amended only by the introduction of amending legislation.

The third objection raised by the Hon. Member for Mississauga South concerns Vote 25 which appears under Industry, Trade and Commerce in the Main Estimates. It is a request for an amount of \$185 million for payments under the Small Business Investment Grants Act. The Hon. Member asked that Vote 25 be ruled out of order on the grounds that the Act expired as of April 1, 1983.

In examining the Act, which was passed by this Parliament as Bill C-136 and is now Chapter 147 of the Statutes of Canada 1980-81-82-83, I find that this date of April 1, 1983 is mentioned only in Section 3(3), which indicates that the Minister may make grants only for investment debt obligations incurred prior to April 1, 1983. There is no indication as to the expiry date.

I cannot agree therefore with the Hon. Member and must rule that Vote 25 is also properly before the House.

MR. KRISTIANSEN—ALLEGED UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE
OF MR. NIELSEN

Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You are undoubtedly aware that *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition* at page 104, Citation 320(1)(y), reads:

320. (1) It has been ruled unparliamentary to refer to a Member as:

(y) attempting to distort the facts as he had in the past—

I would ask you, Madam Speaker, to screen the blues of today's *Hansard* because in an answer to a question of mine at

approximately 11.30 a.m. on the matter of Cruise missile testing and the two-track system, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nielsen) said something akin to the following, that "since coming to this House the Hon. Member for Kootenay West has been prone to twisting, distorting and changing colours on any matter". Further, he said that my opinion "should not be accepted on any matter" and that all I do is "twist, ride and distort" on every issue.

I would simply ask you to review the blues, Madam Speaker. This attack on my character and reputation, which used designated unparliamentary words, in my view demands either a retraction, a withdrawal by the Leader of the Opposition, or a temporary eviction from the House.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member mentions that this happened in this morning's sitting. I would remind Hon. Members with regard to unparliamentary language that two conditions have to be met; that is to say, that the language is unparliamentary, and that it creates some kind of disturbance in the House. Certainly the most important point is that these questions must be dealt with as they occur. I do not know whether the Hon. Member raised his point of order this morning but I will certainly look at the blues and try to determine whether there has been any use of unparliamentary language. I will check the language against the list.

I must say that the list is a bit contradictory and again I would ask Hon. Members to refrain from using language which might be offensive. I understand in the course of debate that one sometimes goes beyond one's thoughts, but a bit of discipline from all Members is certainly a good thing to try to achieve.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker—

Madam Speaker: If the Leader of the Opposition wants to speak on this point, I must say that I will look at the blues. I do not think it is necessary to have a discussion.

Mr. Nielsen: I am sure you will insist upon hearing me, Madam Speaker, particularly when I rise to assist the Chair—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen:—and to say that while I did not hear in its entirety the submission of the Hon. Member who complains, what I did hear was uniquely accurate.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Kristiansen: Madam Speaker, I rise on the point of order, not to the substance of the words used but to the matter of disturbance.

Madam Speaker: Order, please.