

Privilege—Mr. Bosley

other parts of Canada. During the course of his remarks the Hon. Member referred to me as being a stooge for the CNR and as being a hypocrite, and he used similar language which I think goes far beyond the bounds of what is acceptable in debate in this House. This is particularly so because in this case what we were trying to do was cool down an inflammatory situation which had been caused by the Hon. Member, who had relayed false information in that city. We were trying to relate, on behalf of the CNR, what its intentions were and to provide a proper solution to the problem.

To be accused of being a stooge by the Hon. Member extends far beyond what is normally acceptable in this House.

Madam Speaker: I understand the reasons for the Hon. Member not raising this question before, but in his absence the Hon. Member for Parkdale-High Park (Mr. Flis) raised it. At the time I ruled that questions relating to unparliamentary language have to be dealt with immediately when the language is used. The reason we do not allow unparliamentary language in the House is that it is likely to create difficulties, such as a commotion in the House or noisy rebuttals and so on. If that kind of atmosphere was not created at the time and if the Speaker did not have to deal with anything, then I suppose we have to let it go by.

To satisfy the Hon. Member who is complaining about the use of the word "hypocrite", I have to say that it might please him to know that Beauchesne puts it in the list of words that are acceptable and also in the list of words that are not acceptable. I am puzzled that the word appears in both lists but I suppose Speakers have put it in both lists because it depends in what context it is used. In this particular case there seems to have been no incident which might have prompted the Speaker who was on duty at the time to intervene.

I thank the Hon. Member for raising the question. This might be a reminder to Hon. Members that, as far as I am concerned, even if the word is in both lists, I feel Members should try to use words that are not liable to give rise to objection from other Hon. Members.

MR. BOSLEY—RESPONSE OF MR. FOX DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege of which I have given notice to you and to the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox). It arises out of an article which appeared in the November 13 issue of "TV Guide" containing an interview with the Minister. It gave substantial and lengthy quotes from the Minister's October 14 memorandum to Cabinet on broadcast policy.

You will remember, Madam Speaker, that when we released that document it contained a substantial section on the marketing plans of the Government with regard to its broadcast policy. It also indicated that its earliest plank would be an interview with "TV Guide" because it was felt that that was the way to spread the message.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I should like the Hon. Member to tell me forthwith what his question of privilege is.

His note was quite incomplete. I can perhaps accept that, but I cannot accept that the Hon. Member should start to argue the case or to expose the question before telling me exactly where he feels his privilege has been breached.

Mr. Bosley: Madam Speaker, according to the Minister's words, that interview had to have been given on or about October 2. In the House on November 2 the Minister answered a question about whether he intended to give such an interview by saying that as to communication plans there was no final decision on these matters and that obviously, from time to time, he would make speeches. The implication of that answer was that the Minister had no intention of giving such an interview or that no interview had been given.

My question of privilege is that, as a Member of Parliament, I believe that I am entitled to complete answers on these matters and I believe the Minister seriously misled the House.

Madam Speaker: I see that the Hon. Member has chosen his words. Of course, he is entitled to complete or better answers to his questions if he feels that he has not received them, but that does not constitute a question of privilege. The Hon. Member can seek satisfaction by asking further questions of the Minister until such time as he is satisfied. Perhaps he will never be satisfied with the answers, but the fact that he is not satisfied with an answer given by a Minister does not constitute a question of privilege.

Mr. Bosley: Madam Speaker, I accept what you say. The normal remedy in such circumstances is to raise the matter through the late show debate. But when the Minister has said in the House that nothing has been done and one does not find out for three weeks—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. If the Hon. Member accepts what I said, then I advise him to accept it.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

CULTURAL POLICY REVIEW

TABLING OF REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMITTEE

Hon. Francis Fox (Minister of Communications): Madam Speaker, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 41(2) I should like to table the final copy of the Report of the Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee, and it is a great pleasure for me to do so.

[English]

Madam Speaker, I take great pleasure in tabling in the House, under Section 41(2) of the Standing Order, the final copy of the report of the Federal Cultural Policy Review