

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Skeena has raised a matter which he agrees took place outside of this Chamber and the hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin has responded.

There are two aspects of this. The first is whether or not the comments made outside the House affect the privileges of the hon. member who is complaining. On any careful analysis of what privilege is, one will note that the act or comment complained about must either in fact diminish the rights and the ability of the member of Parliament to carry on his or her duties or potentially do that.

The hon. member for Skeena has indicated to the Chair and to the House that he is more than capable of handling debate outside the House, and that is so. If I was to allow privilege in this case, I would have to be saying that this debate which is taking place between himself and the hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin outside the House is somehow impinging on his privileges and his ability to carry out his duties as a member of Parliament. I do not think we can go that far. As a consequence, I will have to reject the hon. member on the question of privilege.

There is another point here. That point has been alluded to by the hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin. It apparently concerns the content of a paper written by an official in the Library of Parliament. The hon. member has brought that to the attention of the Chair by separate letter, not through this particular application this afternoon, and I am considering that matter.

I want to point out, first of all, that the librarian is not an officer of this House; the library is an administrative service of the House of Commons. The research papers are produced by the Library of Parliament. I think all hon. members would agree that it is a very extensive service indeed to which a great many members refer. Certainly I would think it is probably the view of members here that over many years the service that has been given to us by the Library of Parliament has been absolutely splendid and given us a great deal of assis-

Routine Proceedings

tance in doing those things which we must do as members of Parliament in the public interest.

However, I will look at this particular matter and I will respond to the hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin. In the meantime, for any of those who have been listening or watching this, this really is an argument that is taking place outside the Chamber. The withdrawal that took place the other day was a withdrawal, as the hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin has again stated, of improper words relating to the hon. member for Skeena made in this Chamber. At that time, of course, I thanked the hon. member for his courtesy in doing that. In fairness, the hon. member for Skeena has publicly commended the hon. member for that withdrawal. The rest of the debate they have to do the best they can with.

As I say, on the question of the paper, I will try to see if there is some resolution and some assistance that can be given in this matter by the Chair.

I thank both hon. members for their courtesy in the interventions today.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

WESTERN ARCTIC INUVIALUIT CLAIM
IMPLEMENTATION

1990-91 REVIEW

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, copies of the 1990-91 Annual Review of the Western Arctic Inuvialuit Claim Implementation.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to nine petitions.