

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, May 7, 1971

The House met at 11 a.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. MACDONALD (EGMONT)—ACCURACY OF HANSARD
REPORT OF ANSWER BY MINISTER OF JUSTICE

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of privilege. I received yesterday's *Hansard* just a few moments ago so it was not possible to give Your Honour notice of my question. In looking at yesterday's *Hansard* I note that when the Minister of Justice replied to my question in which I asked him whether there would be a presumption of guilt, on the same basis as in the public order legislation, with respect to the bill of rights which he is shortly to introduce he said that the government was again going to pursue a presumption of guilt. This has been rewritten in yesterday's *Hansard*—I am not sure by whom, to read:

Mr. Speaker, the assumption is again wrong. We have always held the presumption of innocence as paramount.

I am sure that along with myself many other hon. members heard the minister yesterday afternoon when he spoke in the House, and while he may not have meant to say what in fact he did say, he did say it. I think that this trespasses upon the rights of members to have an accurate reflection of the debates and comments made in the House. I hope Your Honour will take steps to provide an accurate rendition.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member knows the situation. It is rather difficult to change *Hansard* after it has been published. When the minister is in the House perhaps he might give an explanation. I might say in all honesty that what I heard the minister say was not what the hon. member heard, but I have not reflected on it at all, of course, and I may easily be wrong. I will listen to the tape which is available to the Chair. Perhaps that might be considered to be the authority, and eventually when *Hansard* is published officially the exact words of the minister will be reported accordingly.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of privilege. Every Member in the House yesterday heard the Minister of Justice give his answer. He obviously made a slip of the tongue and as soon as the words were uttered he corrected them. He did so publicly and every member here heard him. Obviously, the hon. member is being very small.

● (11:10 a.m.)

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): On a point of order, I am very grateful to have the Prime Minister's confirmation of the exact rendition of what did transpire. All I am

asking is that the correct rendition of what was said be reflected in *Hansard*. That is all I am asking for.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

First report of Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development—Mr. Watson.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

AGRICULTURE

INTERPROVINCIAL MARKETING—QUEBEC LEGISLATION—
REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE
MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to propose a motion which I consider to be of urgent and pressing necessity. This matter concerns the amendments to the Quebec Agricultural Products and Food Act and the Quebec Agricultural Marketing Act, which go into effect immediately and enable the government of Quebec to close the Quebec borders to the farm products of other provinces as of now, and the failure of the federal government to assert and protect the principle of free trade between provinces which is guaranteed by the constitution.

Therefore, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I ask unanimous consent to move, seconded by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner):

That in the opinion of this House the government should give immediate consideration to exercising its jurisdiction in this area under the residual powers of the BNA Act, until such time as the matter has been resolved by the Supreme Court or by this Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion which requires unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity and the motion cannot be put.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, before we leave the order for motions I wonder if the