

*Point of Order—Mr. Althouse*

Speaker, you could shed some light on this. Is it not an accepted practice?

**Madam Speaker:** It goes several ways. It is not a rule; it is a matter for the Speaker to determine whether the Speaker needs to hear a response on a question of privilege.

In these cases this afternoon I did not feel I required any response on the part of another Hon. Member. If they had been in the House and had sought the floor, perhaps I would have heard them, but I had to deal with this business. A question of privilege, as Hon. Members know, has a character of urgency and takes precedence over other business. I have been able to rule on these questions without hearing responses, and that is perfectly proper.

**Mr. Harquail:** Madam Speaker, just to finalize this, I defend those Members who are not here and reserve on the record their right to have the opportunity to respond and rebut the points which have been made.

**Some Hon. Members:** Tomorrow!

**Madam Speaker:** No, they would not have an opportunity to respond because, once I have ruled, the matter is closed. The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Smith) might have chosen to respond in the names of the Hon. Members who were referred to. They did not ask for the floor and I was able to rule on those questions. I was sufficiently informed about the substance of what were not questions of privilege by the way, to rule on them.

● (1620)

MR. ALTHOUSE—REFERENCE BY MR. NEIL

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre):** Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) has just referred to my motion which I moved under the provisions of Standing Order 43 today as being deliberately misleading and an attempt to deliberately mislead the House, which I think casts aspersions on me. My motion was based specifically on what was recorded in *Hansard* at page 14471 and attributed to the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw. The point contained in my motion this day was that the Conservatives had been in favour of the buying and selling option. I shall quote from *Hansard*—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The Hon. Member should not be discussing his motion. He has raised one point; that is to say, the Hon. Member used the expression “deliberately misleading”. I believe I heard that expression. Is the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) quite certain that is what he wanted to say, or would he care to withdraw those words? The only way that charge can be made is in a substantive way.

**Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw):** Madam Speaker, I deliberately made certain that I did not accuse the Hon. Member of deliberately misleading the House. I said that the motion was deliberately misleading; I did not say that the Hon. Member was deliberately misleading the House.

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

**Madam Speaker:** I think the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre can accept that. If he will, I think we can resolve the matter.

**Mr. Althouse:** Madam Speaker, on the point of order, I simply refer the House to page 14471 of *Hansard* where we find that the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw said:

As far as I am concerned, Canagrex as a corporation should be concerned directly in sales, in co-ordinating sales with foreign governments and the industry in Canada.

Further down the page, we find:

—the name of the game should be sales.

It was very clear that he discussed sales, and a buy and sell option was part of that.

**Madam Speaker:** I could not hear the last sentence of the Hon. Member because of the noise. Does the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre consider that the intervention by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw satisfies the point of order he raised earlier?

**Mr. Althouse:** Yes, Madam Speaker. I am satisfied with the Hon. Member's statement that I have not misled the House. I was simply pointing out that the motion itself was not misleading the House either, as *Hansard* itself shows.

**Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, on that very point, the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) has said that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil), stated that he withdrew the charge of deliberately misleading. In fact, what the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw said was that the motion was deliberately misleading—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. That matter is settled to the satisfaction of both Members. That is the spirit in which this rule is applied. If Members are satisfied that they have not been offended or that language which is not parliamentary has not been preferred against them, then they are both satisfied and the matter is closed.

MR. SCOTT (HAMILTON-WENTWORTH)—REPLY OF MR. BERGER  
DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Geoff Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth):** Madam Speaker, my point of order arises from an answer given to me earlier this day during Question Period by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Berger). This is the earliest opportunity I have had to raise my point. The Parliamentary Secretary asked me where I got information that metric conversion was voluntary in Canada. I want the record to show that the Government's own brochures which are being sent out by way of—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The Hon. Member asked a question during the course of Question Period. He received an answer. If he is not satisfied with that answer, he may not bring it back under the guise of a point of order. This is not a point of order. He may ask another question tomorrow during