

Point of Order—Mr. D. Munro

sport said that there had been no communication. Therefore, it makes the point that I was raising all the more relevant, namely whether the Prime Minister, when he was consulted, pointed out the very real contradiction in Canada's position in that now we are officially supporting a boycott, according to the Prime Minister and this government, but at the same time we have two Canadians officially taking part in the opening ceremonies of the Olympic Games. It does not seem that you can have it both ways. I wanted to know if the Prime Minister communicated with Mayor Drapeau when he was consulted about this decision.

* * *

[Translation]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

DISPOSITION OF BILL C-36

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, further to consultations I had earlier today with the other House leaders, I am pleased to confirm that, with regard to Bill C-36 respecting the national anthem of Canada, we have come to an agreement pursuant to Standing Order 75A, in order to dispose of this legislation in a very short and specified length of time.

Therefore, pursuant to Standing Order 75A, I move:

That Bill C-36 go through each and every stage as follows and without interruption:

1. On second reading, after one spokesman per party has been heard;
2. In Committee of the Whole House, without debate, and with only one amendment pertaining to the coming into force of the said bill, such amendment being also passed without debate as proposed by the President of the Privy Council;
3. At the report stage and on third reading, without debate.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

[English]

THE OFFICIAL REPORTINCORRECT TRANSLATION OF HEADING RESPECTING
ESTABLISHMENT OF MINISTRY OF STATE FOR SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order related to the use of unacceptable terminology in *Hansard*. It has been brought to my attention by that eminent watchdog of Canadian Parliamentary practice and procedure, our former colleague in the other place, Eugene Forsey, that some unparliamentary, if not indeed unconstitutional, language has appeared in *Hansard*, not, we hope, as a means of marking the centenary of that publication in Canada.

It is my understanding, Madam Speaker, that Mr. Forsey has also communicated with you on this matter, but it seems to me that the matter is of such importance that there ought to

be a record in *Hansard* of this serious transgression of the linguistic bounds that no Canadian Parliament can accept. In this way, hopefully, the error will not be repeated.

On April 24 of this year, and again on June 16 and 17, *Hansard* records an element of the day's proceedings in this manner at pages 368, 2153 and 2187 respectively:

Government Administration—Decree Respecting Establishment of Department of Social Development

This term was repeated in the index of each of the days in question. It is the word "decree" that exceeds the bounds, I contend, of parliamentary acceptability in English. What follows this heading deals with a proposed text of an order in council tabled in the House of Commons on April 21, at which time, as reported on page 206, incidentally, the term "decree" does not appear in the English version of *Hansard*. It is obvious that on the three or four occasions when the matter appeared as government business, it was an order in council that was at issue.

● (1210)

Having compared the English and French versions of *Hansard* in which this terminology occurs, I reach the conclusion that the English word "decree" has been employed as an all too obvious translation of the French word *décret*, because the original version was placed in French. *Décréter* may be an acceptable parliamentary word in the French language, but "decree" in English conjures up semantic vibrations which Mr. Forsey has said are altogether too reminiscent of imperial Rome and even imperial Russia.

Your Honour will permit me to reveal a bias at this point when I add that these sorts of vibrations connected with words such as "decree" are to be avoided at all costs when this present government is in power. This government needs no encouragement to proceed along those lines, and all the paraphernalia and baggage—as well as the terminology—of rule by divine right have got to be kept well beyond its reach.

Power, it has been said, does strange things to those who exercise it. It does even stranger things to those who exercise it for unusually prolonged periods of time; they get to like it and are prone to abuse it.

For this reason, if for no other, I urge that before the definitive version of *Hansard* recording the proceedings of the first session of Canada's Thirty-second Parliament is issued the offending term "decree" be expunged and replaced with the more acceptable English equivalent of *décret*, that is, "order in council".

A second matter related to this deserves comment. The so-called "decree"—or, as we now agree, I think, order in council—was said to deal with the establishment of a department of social development. It is clear, both from the form in which the order in council was drawn as well as from the discussion which centred around that particular order of business, that what was at issue was in fact the establishment of a ministry of state for social development, not a department, which is quite another matter. It is not a full operating department but a co-ordinating office.