

Petitions

leak it to *The Globe and Mail* in the morning or the night before and then have justification for a question being asked on a document that it itself had leaked. Let us be honest. It cannot have it both ways.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the same subject. I was ready to give the Government the benefit of the doubt because, in any event, we are supposed to be honourable people in this House and we should take those who inform us at their word.

So I was prepared to take the Government word and give them the benefit of the doubt. But the previous speaker has just confirmed for us that they were very disappointed that we had no questions to ask about this document, which was definitely released to the press in time for the morning news in the hope that we would swallow the bait and ask questions about it. But that is contrary to the rules of the House. If we want the House to be orderly, we must proceed in an orderly manner.

Mr. Speaker, it seems very clear to us that the Hon. Minister, seeing that no question was coming from this side of the House, decided to ask one of his troops to put a question or a half-question.

Mr. Speaker, I think that you should once again tell the Cabinet and the House that such conduct should not be accepted here. Otherwise, order is impossible; it would be a circus! And if people want this to become a circus, I can tell you that I personally do not like taking part in such a free-for-all! And I think that if this were to become the general pattern, we would join in . . . But I warn you that not much would get done in this House.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members I think have made their feelings quite clear. I want to respond to the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary. I do not think the Chair was suggesting that just because a question comes from a government Member to a Minister that that in itself is in any way improper, not at all. It may well be that the question is asked with respect to some information that has just very recently been made public. That in itself does not make it improper.

The Chair interrupted the Hon. Minister this morning not because the Hon. Minister was answering the question but because the Hon. Minister was extending that answer with extensive detail in a way which is more appropriate for a Minister to make under the proper rubric of Routine Proceedings for Ministers statements. That, of course, is what the reform exercise was all about.

I want to assure Members on both sides that the Chair, I think, can recognize legitimate questioning when it is there. The Chair can also recognize, and this will come as no surprise to Members on either side of this House who have on other

occasions been on a different side, when a question is asked to illicit a statement from a Minister that might very well be more properly put in a different way. So I do ask for the cooperation of all Hon. Members and I know we will receive it.

Presenting Reports from Interparliamentary Delegations—
The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. Hawkes: Tabling of documents.

Mr. Speaker: I want to assure the Parliamentary Secretary that I was trying to get to him.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to 18 petitions numbered as follows: 332-4326, 332-4513, 332-4514, 332-4551, 332-4558, 332-4561, 332-4563, 332-4572, 332-4573, 332-4577 to 332-4583 inclusive, 332-4588 and 332-4610.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I hesitate to go on with Statements by Ministers.

* * *

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

MANAGEMENT AND MEMBER'S SERVICES—REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, we shall try to end the week on a joyful, optimistic note.

And a chairman is always pleased to be able to table the budget voted by his committee and not rely on the clock, or deadline that implements the budget automatically if the estimates were not voted on in time. It is a very bad principle in the British system . . .

• (1220)

[*English*]

In the British parliamentary system it is very bad to say that if one does not have time to vote one's Estimates, they are automatically voted after a certain date. It is with great pride that I inform the House that the Standing Committee on Management and Members' Services, which I have the honour