

*Routine Proceedings*

I must say to the hon. member that I cannot hear him further at the moment. Perhaps he can find some other way to engage the minister or ministers on the same issue.

\* \* \*

**PRIVILEGE****CRITERIA FOR ADMISSIBILITY OF QUESTION DURING ORAL QUESTION PERIOD—SPEAKER'S RULING**

**Mr. Speaker:** I promised yesterday that I would return with respect to a question which was put—

[*Translation*]

—by the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier yesterday, a question on a subject that is of course very important to all members of this House.

[*English*]

I think hon. members will remember that yesterday I said there were really two issues. One is whether the question as put was in or out of order. The second is whether the subject matter of the question can be pursued in the Chamber.

I think I was correct in clearly pointing out to the House that there were two issues.

The issue I have to decide is whether the question as put was within the rules. I should say to hon. members that the substance of the issue concerned comments made by a Canadian who was appointed to a board by the Government of Canada relating to the question of bilingualism.

I have looked very carefully at the question as put which was:

Will the Prime Minister call Mr. Crispo, tell him that the impression he left with his comments is wrong, dead wrong, absolutely wrong? Will he ask Mr. Crispo to get his facts straight or keep his mouth shut?

**Mr. Dingwall:** Good advice.

**Mr. Speaker:** I must respond to this issue in a purely procedural manner. My judgment yesterday was that it is out of order as asked; it is not seeking information.

I still maintain that as asked it is not within the administrative competence of the government.

Having said that, as I think all hon. members conceded yesterday, the issue is of importance. The hon. government House leader said:

I can say on behalf of the government with assurance that Mr. Crispo does not speak for the Government of Canada.

Now at that point we had some discussion as to the question and perhaps we were also getting on to some discussion of the issue itself. I have to say that I remain with my ruling of yesterday. I am also indicating to hon. members that there are probably other ways to pursue the issue in Question Period.

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

• (1510)

[*English*]

**GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS**

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 10 petitions.

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

\* \* \*

**HOUSE MANAGEMENT****22ND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 22nd report of the Standing Committee on House Management, pursuant to Standing Order 108.

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

\* \* \*

**DIVORCE ACT****MEASURE TO AMEND**

**Mr. Stan Wilbee (Delta)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-332, an act to amend the Divorce Act (granting of access to, or custody of, a child to a grandparent).

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

**Mr. Wilbee:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to make sure that grandparents, who are very often a stabilizing influence in family life, have equal access to the spouses in a divorce situation. Rather than having to