

Privilege—Mr. Kilgour

Atlantic fisheries because there is a report before the Government which the Government has said it will release at a later date, and in fact elements of that report are being continually released by way of comments, interviews and material given to members of the press and others which are being published. It is simply that, Madam Speaker—a Government that chooses not to deliver the report to the House of Commons but to deliver it elsewhere.

Madam Speaker: Well, if I understand it, the Hon. Member is getting previews of that report. In a sense, that could turn out to be quite useful. However, I have to maintain my point. I have a lot of sympathy for the Hon. Member's complaint, but it is a complaint and he can bring it up in other circumstances, not under the guise of a question of privilege. I have to rule that he does not really have a question of privilege.

The Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) has a point of order.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. BENJAMIN—REQUEST TO TABLE DOCUMENT

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Madam Speaker, in order to be of assistance to all my colleagues in the House and to the Chair, I would like to seek unanimous consent to table an envelope addressed to Leslie Benjamin, Regina, Saskatchewan, under the frank of the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), a letter on House of Commons stationery asking me for a donation for the P.C. Canada Fund.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Benjamin: Along with a leaflet referring to the Progressive Conservative Party financial statement. I would ask leave for unanimous consent to table these documents in the House.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: Does the House give its unanimous consent for the tabling of these documents?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member does not have unanimous consent. The Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) on a question of privilege.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. KILGOUR—ALLEGED UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE OF MR. BERGER

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona): Madam Speaker, I will be very brief. As I indicated in my notice to you, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Consumer

and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Berger), to the best of my information and belief, used the word "dinosaur" in referring to Members of this Party earlier in Question Period. I have not yet been able to get the "blues", but I am informed that that is the case. If you wish, Madam Speaker, to put the question to him and ask him whether or not he did do so, it is your choice to do so. Otherwise, I would go on to make the case that you should rule that the word "dinosaur" is not an acceptable parliamentary word.

• (1610)

Madam Speaker: I heard the word "dinosaur" but I do not know whether it is unparliamentary. I am just being advised that it is not on the list, so it is not an unparliamentary expression.

Mr. Kilgour: I think it should be.

Madam Speaker: I might rule on that some day! Furthermore, that is not a question of privilege. It is a point of order. I want to tell the Hon. Member that because he rose on a question of privilege and received priority over other Hon. Members who were rising on points of order, I have to apologize to the other Members who were rising on points of order for recognizing the Hon. Member, since he said he had a question of privilege. The Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley-Hants (Mr. Nowlan) told me this afternoon that questions of privilege have precedence, a point of which I am aware.

When Members who have questions of privilege do not rise in the House I cannot recognize them, and that was exactly the case. The Hon. Member does not have a point of order in this particular circumstance. I would remind him that anything concerning unparliamentary language is a point of order.

MR. NEIL—S.O. 43 MOTION OF MR. ALTHOUSE

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Madam Speaker, I will be very brief. My question of privilege arises as a result of a motion under Standing Order 43 this afternoon which was proposed by the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) and seconded by the Hon. Member for Daphin (Mr. Lewycky).

The motion is deliberately misleading in that it attempted to point out that two Members of my Party and I were supportive of the Canagrex Bill but have since changed our minds.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member is debating a motion which the House has dealt with already. There was no unanimous consent to debate the motion under Standing Order 43. He seems to be debating that motion just now, and I cannot allow it at this particular time because the House has dealt with it.

Mr. Neil: Madam Speaker, I am suggesting that if someone makes a statement in a motion under Standing Order 43 which deliberately misleads, there is a question of privilege and I, as a Member, am entitled to raise it.