

Point of Order—Mr. Hawkes

● (1550)

[English]

Madam Speaker: Does the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) wish to speak to this question of privilege?

Mr. Murphy: Yes, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: I do not think I want to hear another hon. member on this question. Would the hon. member please resume his seat?

The question as raised by the hon. member for Selkirk-Interlake and as stated in his letter to me giving me notice, was in fact a bit misleading. I am not saying this was deliberate, but I will quote from the hon. member's letter. He said that he would raise a question of privilege "arising out of the answer given me yesterday in the House by the Minister of Employment and Immigration". When I heard the hon. member's first remarks it was therefore quite clear to me that he was speaking about what was said in his letter. Subsequently he began to discuss the fact that he had a grievance about the way in which certain actions of the government become known in his constituency, or in constituencies around his.

I repeat that this is not a question of privilege. It is a grievance. It is a matter of debate. It is a difference of opinion. It is all those things, but it is certainly not a question of privilege, and that is the reason I will not hear the hon. member for Churchill.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. HAWKES—OFFICIAL REPORT—INVESTIGATION OF ERRORS AND OMISSIONS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Madam Speaker, I have notified the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy) of my intention to raise this point of order, and his parliamentary secretary has remained in the chamber.

An examination of page 5459 of *Hansard* for December 8 at approximately four o'clock in the afternoon would indicate an omission of a significant exchange between the minister and myself. There are at least two questions and two responses involved. They are totally absent from the record for that date.

The content of at least one of those questions involved my asking the minister if he could explain the discrepancy in the debates as recorded in *Hansard* for Friday, December 5 in which, during the question period, the minister provided me with certain information in response to my question. The blues record that accurately, but the final copy of *Hansard* for Friday was not consistent with what happened in this House on Friday. I asked the minister if he could explain how that came about. In his response to me he indicated he would look into the situation and respond. However, that exchange between us on Monday is totally absent, other parts of the debates of this House on the eighth are also absent, and I

wonder if I could call on Your Honour's good offices to explore that situation and perhaps to provide us with an explanation of it.

[Translation]

Mr. Dennis Dawson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): I have checked *Hansard* both in French and in English to see if there was an omission. The hon. member started his questioning at four o'clock and went on till 4.20 so it is possible that a question asked by the hon. member at that time was missed. I think that House staff will easily be able to check the electronic *Hansard* to see if one of the hon. member's question was omitted. But I think I could refer the hon. member to page 5456, when he started his questioning, right after question period. There I think he will find the answer to his question.

Madam Speaker: It is indeed the responsibility of the Chair to ensure that *Hansard* faithfully reflects the discussions in the House, and if there has been an omission, as the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) claims, then I shall look into the matter and try to listen to the recordings. I think that these two sources should enable us to set the facts straight. I thank the hon. member for bringing this to our attention.

[English]

MR. TAYLOR—PROCEDURE GOVERNING THE TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to request that Your Honour make a special search of Beauchesne and the rules regarding the necessity for unanimous consent to table anything in the House. If there was that necessity, a minister could be stopped from tabling by one dissenting voice. I know of nothing in Beauchesne which requires unanimity for the tabling of any matter.

Mr. D. M. Collenette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, I am sure you could deal with this, but since this point reflects upon what we were discussing earlier I point out that there was no dispute about the ability of a parliamentary secretary or a minister to table a document. We are talking about the long-established practice whereby private members do not have the ability to table documents but can request unanimity on the part of the House to have documents appended to *Hansard*.

Madam Speaker: I stand to be corrected if I am not interpreting the rules properly. A minister of the Crown, or a parliamentary secretary acting on behalf of his minister, can table documents in the House. In other circumstances unanimous consent is required. I think that is what I stated, but I will look into the rules in light of the remarks of the hon. member. However, I think I am correct in interpreting the rules in that manner.