

*Privilege—Mr. Domm*

## PRIVILEGE

MR. DOMM—ALLEGED UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE OF MR. LAPIERRE

**Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough):** Madam Speaker, immediately following Question Period this afternoon I rose on a question of privilege and you ruled that I did not have a point of order. Perhaps there was some misunderstanding as to why I rose at that time. According to the Standing Orders, as I interpret them, a question of privilege can be brought to the attention of the Speaker without notice if it arises from *Hansard* or discussions in the House. I rose on a question of privilege, not a point of order, and I would ask the Chair to give consideration to my question of privilege at this time.

**Madam Speaker:** I thought the Hon. Member had risen on a point of order. Let us now allow that he has risen on a question of privilege. Did he not tell me in his presentation that he was referring to proceedings which took place yesterday?

**Mr. Domm:** Madam Speaker, I was referring to proceedings which took place yesterday in this House during the adjournment debate. You will realize that at that time it is impossible to enter into a question of privilege; you have to wait until you have seen the remarks as printed in *Hansard*. In trying to present the case I would ask that you at least give me perhaps 45 seconds in which to make my points to show that this is a legitimate question of privilege.

**Madam Speaker:** First of all, the matter of unparliamentary language should be dealt with under points of order. That is why I thought the Hon. Member rose on a point of order. Therefore I do not see that he can deal with a matter of unparliamentary language under a question of privilege.

The point he is arguing now is that a question of privilege may be raised if it deals with the proceedings as shown in *Hansard*. I think he knows that a question of privilege may be raised without notice if it deals with proceedings of that day. The Hon. Member refers to yesterday's proceedings and that definitely requires a written notice. I am just putting the Hon. Member on notice now that the matter of unparliamentary language should be treated under a point of order. If it was not dealt with during the proceedings, it means that no one in the House had objection to it.

As I said, unparliamentary language has to be dealt with as it occurs. Sometimes *Hansard* has to be checked because it may involve interjections which the Chair might not have heard and an Hon. Member says that he does not think he uttered those particular words. There are two things that have to be considered, the actual words spoken and the fact that it created a disturbance in the House. Those two conditions have to be looked at in dealing with unparliamentary language.

**Mr. Domm:** Madam Speaker, with all due respect, if the House is adjourned at six o'clock and there are no Members in the House, how do you raise a question of privilege?

**Madam Speaker:** The Hon. Member is equating debate with an adjournment. If it happened yesterday, the matter has to be dealt with today by notice. If the Hon. Member had risen at the time it occurred or immediately afterwards, he could have dealt with it then. If he wants to raise a question of privilege, I need a notice.

**Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North):** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I take it that the matter can be dealt with by proper notice from the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm). Words such as those used by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Lapierre) are absolutely objectionable. That is what the Hon. Member wants to clear up. They have appeared in *Hansard*, he has made his point that you cannot do it during the adjournment debate, and what he wants to ask the Chair is how he goes about seeing that language like that is stricken from the record. Surely what is at issue is the unparliamentary language of the Parliamentary Secretary.

**Madam Speaker:** Well, I have told the Hon. Member three times that he can send me a notice. If he sends me a notice and describes briefly what his question of privilege is all about, I will hear him as I always do. That is simple and I said it three times.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

## PETITIONS

MR. TAYLOR—RECONSIDERATION OF BILL C-85

**Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River):** Madam Speaker, I have great pleasure today in tabling another petition, this one signed by some 256 Canadians, mostly producers from many areas of Alberta. The petitioners pray that the Government will listen to their plea not to pass Bill C-85, an Act to establish a corporation called Canagrex, unless it first eliminates the clauses dealing with the buying and selling of all agricultural products.

These petitioners join with thousands of other producers in Canada in this request and all pray that the Government will hearken to their representations.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,720 and 4,768.