

*Privilege—Mr. Corbin*

came to a conclusion, it was obviously under a different consideration because it followed the Michener precedent. This motion does not come within that precedent at all. Therefore, I find this to be a different case and do not consider it to have a priority which can be attached to this kind of motion if it does in fact affect the privileges of the House.

**Hon. J.-J. Blais (Nipissing):** Mr. Speaker, I recognize from the comments which you have made that you have recognized, not only today but in the past, the importance of the principle of cabinet secrecy and its impact upon financial documents such as the budget. From what you have said, sir, I do not hear any withdrawal from that recognition which you have advanced in the past. I trust that what you have said in your decision is that we are completely free to present such a motion as would be in order in terms of calling the privileges of the House into play so that in effect we could get a reference to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections as was the case with the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid).

I trust that we are not debarred by your ruling today, sir, on circumstances that may involve circumstances which we have already identified, from presenting a motion that would be in order.

**Mr. Speaker:** If the hon. member is asking me to rule in advance on the procedural irregularities of a motion which I have not seen yet, he knows that I would not do that.

**Hon. Walter Baker (President of the Privy Council and Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, there still arises the question raised by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) as to what extent does an absolute denial by a Minister of Finance with respect to a particular leak exist. I assume that we have not come to the time when the Minister of Finance would have to face another motion drawn on exactly the same set of facts on another occasion, and to which he would give the same denial. That would be a waste of time for the House, and that is certainly within the purview of the opposition.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. It seems to me that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Baker) is on precisely the same ground as the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais). It is premature to speculate on what procedural decisions will have to be made until we see the motion.

I have notice of questions of privilege by the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) and the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco).

*[Translation]*

MR. CORBIN—LANGUAGE USED BY MEMBER FOR KOOTENAY WEST (MR. BRISCO)

**Mr. Eymard Corbin (Madawaska-Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 35 which says a member cannot use offensive words against either House, or against any member thereof. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, during

[Mr. Speaker.]

the debate in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-20, the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco) said the following:

*[English]*

Mr. Chairman, I would ask if this is Parliament or is it a zoo? Because those are the animals over there, and I am damned well ashamed of them.

*[Translation]*

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me in accordance with the very spirit of Standing Order 35 and considering Beauchesne's citation 319, it is clearly indicated no member shall use blasphemous or indecent language. Beauchesne's citation 324 dealing with unparliamentary expressions says, and I quote:

—much depends upon the tone and manner, and intention, of the person speaking:—

The language may be abusive, unparliamentary or indecent. Mr. Speaker, I believe the tone goes far beyond the words, and the tone the hon. member for Kootenay West used to make that statement yesterday appeared to me at first glance both malicious and vicious. I was not the only member who rose on a point of order or a question or privilege yesterday. There was also the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Loiselle) who dealt with the same matter. In addition, in Beauchesne, in the list of forbidden parliamentary expressions, it is clearly indicated that the word "animal" is prohibited.

Mr. Speaker, I would not want to make this point of order harder than necessary. I quite simply ask you, if you think I am right in my argument, to ask the hon. member of Kootenay West to withdraw his offensive words toward all members on this side of the House, men and women alike.

*[English]*

**Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, at the time of my outburst yesterday I felt it was warranted. I would like to correct the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) who has used the descriptive adjective "vicious", and say that I do not have a vicious bone in my body. I have read my remarks, which were directed at no one in particular. I have also read the comments of the chairman, who felt that I was not out of order because I had not directed them to anyone in particular.

However, for the sake of the decorum of this House I do not hesitate to withdraw the word "animals".

**Mr. Speaker:** I think we have two principles here. The first is that it is always the individual presiding over the meeting who is in the best position to judge. The chairman at the time made a ruling with which I would not want to interfere, since he was the one present at the meeting when the words were spoken. The second principle is that technically it is difficult to ascribe an absolute meaning to any word so that in all circumstances it will be unparliamentary. But without waiting for that, the hon. member, having had an opportunity to reconsider his intervention, has rather generously withdrawn it. I think that that is in accordance with the best principle of the conduct of the House.