

PRIVILEGE

STATEMENT BY MINISTER—ALLEGED UNTRUE STATEMENTS

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to the attention of the Chair what I believe is a question of privilege. I want to indicate that if the Chair decides I have a *prima facie* point of privilege, I am willing to move the appropriate motion to send it to the appropriate parliamentary committee.

As the Chair is aware, the rules in Beauchesne state we are not to accuse other Hon. Members of making untrue statements in the House of Commons. That is found on page 114 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fifth Edition, as decided by your predecessors on June 21, 1977 and November 16, 1977.

The point I want to bring to the Chair's attention is that a document was tabled in this House on September 9, 1985 from which I have quoted verbatim today in the House of Commons. In view of the fact that this document was tabled in this House, it is therefore a document in your possession, Mr. Speaker. I want you to investigate as to whether or not the declaration I made today in quoting from that document was untrue as alleged by the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen) when he answered a question in Question Period. He alleged I had made to you and to this House untrue statements relating to the letter of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) which was tabled in this House on September 9, 1985.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the Hon. Member knows that is not in fact a question of privilege but a point of order. Second, I think the Hon. Member is asking the Chair to investigate the facts with regard to an allegation. He knows the Chair does not do that.

The question he is asking me to determine is whether the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen) was out of order in his suggestion that something was untrue, that a fact was not a fact. I think that, as the Hon. Member knows, is a matter of debate and not a matter of privilege or of order.

The other point of order I received was from the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary, or would he prefer that I hear the other point of order first? The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) is also rising on a point of order. Would the Parliamentary Secretary prefer that I hear the Minister of National Health and Welfare first?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

STATEMENT BY MEMBER—TESTING FOR RADIATION

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Today in Question

Point of Order—Mr. Lewis

Period I was asked a question. A supplementary question was then directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark). Before the supplementary question itself was posed, the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) put into the preamble something which I think is very damaging, not to me, but I think it is very important when we are dealing with issues of health and safety and radiation that accurate statements be made in the House.

The Hon. Member indicated that we were only testing in Vancouver. We are testing in three other locations in British Columbia. I think it is important that the House have that information in view of people's anxiety about this issue.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is exactly the same as the other case. It is not a point of order.

INTERRUPTION OF QUESTION—CONTINUATION OF TRANSLATION—*HANSARD* CONTENT

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order arising out of Question Period. During the second question asked by the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) the Chair found it necessary to rise to interrupt him, presumably because the question was too long. I was listening to the translation and trying to follow the question in French. Although you rose, Mr. Speaker, and in effect cut off the Hon. Member's microphone in the middle of his last sentence in French, the English translation continued and was completed.

Although I was not listening to the series of questions asked by the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton), I wonder if the same thing happened. I want to be very clear that everyone in this House from all Parties has the greatest of respect for the people who work in the translation booths. We all realize it is a very difficult job.

However, I want to put a question to you, Mr. Speaker. If a Member of Parliament is to be disciplined by being interrupted, and, therefore, is interrupted by Telecast and by microphone, should that discipline not continue—and I say this with respect to Ministers and Members of the Government as well as Members of the Opposition—should that procedure not continue, if possible, through the translation and also in *Hansard*?

I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that the point has never before occurred to me, but if that discipline does occur, live as it were, should it not occur in translation and also in *Hansard*? I do not know the answer to the question. I thought it should be posed.

Mr. Gauthier: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I just want to bring to your attention that translation sometimes has a delay time. Perhaps the Hon. Member does not recognize that. The translators are not translating, they are interpreting so that the interpretation could be different from the translation as a means of communication.