

*Official Report*

tabling in response to a motion for the production of papers. As one knows, very often confidential documents are released from unnamed sources; but, Madam Speaker, it is not really within my purview to comment on the accessibility the hon. member has to any other documents. I can only speak to the fact that these documents were tabled. The normal practice is that internal memoranda and working documents are not usually tabled in the House, and this has ample precedent in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Practices.

**Madam Speaker:** Usually members do not speak twice on a question of privilege, but if the hon. member can very shortly provide some enlightenment so I can rule on this question of privilege, I will make an exception and give him the floor for a few minutes.

**Mr. McKinnon:** Madam Speaker, I would just like to comment that none of these papers or documents is the kind generally referred to as arriving in brown envelopes. I got most of them at the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. They are not confidential documents; they are simply documents containing information, correspondence and studies that were done which I asked through a privilege of the House to see. In no way are they of a confidential nature at all, unless it has become confidential to point out a lack of freedom of information in this House.

This document in my hand is one of the things that cause me concern. It is called "Organization Analysis and Development Branch". It was approved by Superintendent Fuchs and prepared by Staff Sergeant Langille. It says among other things that they considered numerous memoranda, and audit reports and statistical data were also reviewed in the course of the study.

These are the kinds of things I would like to see to determine whether this move, which is a crippling matter to the economy of Victoria, was well advised. I cannot see how we can conduct public business here if everything we want to see or read is to be classified for the benefit of government members.

**Madam Speaker:** I will take this particular question of privilege under advisement. I would like to look into the whole question.

\* \* \*

## OFFICIAL REPORT

## PRACTICE RESPECTING CORRECTIONS MADE BY MEMBERS

**Mr. Bob Rae (Broadview-Greenwood):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order simply in reply to the intervention by the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy). I think when he was here he was asking to correct some things he said in the House. I do not think there was any dispute that the minister in fact said those things, but I hope it will be clearly understood that what he actually said as recorded will be left in the record, that what will be corrected

will appear in today's *Hansard* simply as a correction. Because in fact he did use the word "luxuries". If Your Honour looks at *Hansard*, page 10584, you will note an interruption from an hon. member—I do not know who that might be—saying "luxuries", and the minister carries on. There should be no attempt to change the record of what exactly the minister said.

**Madam Speaker:** The usual way to handle these corrections is to do as the hon. minister has asked the House to do. On the day he made his statements, I suppose he was making them in good faith, but on checking with *Hansard* he seems to have realized there was some discrepancy in the figures. What is usually done, I believe, and I stand to be corrected by the officers at the Table, is that the actual statement of the minister on that day is corrected.

**Mr. Rae:** No, Madam Speaker. I rise on a point of order.

**Madam Speaker:** I stand to be corrected if I am wrong, but my understanding is that when a minister or someone rises and says "I had said \$2 million but I realize now it is \$1 million", the \$2 million is changed to \$1 million.

**Mr. Rae:** On that very point, Madam Speaker, I have no objection to the minister's stating the next day, to be recorded at the front of *Hansard*, that what he meant to say was so and so, and then changing the figures accordingly. But I do object most strenuously to an attempt to change the record of what was said on the actual day. He did use the word "luxuries". The word "luxuries" was raised by way of an intervention by an hon. member from this side of the House, and the minister then carried on. Today he looks at *Hansard* and says: My gosh, I should not have said "luxuries", I should have said "items". That is too bad for the minister; he used the word "luxuries", and the word "luxuries" has to stand in *Hansard*, as do the figures he quoted. If he corrects himself the next day, I have no objection to the minister's making that clarification. But I do object to the implication that *Hansard* will be changed and that certain words will be expunged.

**Madam Speaker:** I understand that there will appear at the beginning of *Hansard* the correction as stated today, but that the bound volume will include the correction in the actual statement. That is the usual way in which these matters are handled in the House.

**Mr. Rae:** Madam Speaker, do I take that ruling to mean that we can then change what we said the next day and that that will appear in the final edition of *Hansard*? That has never been the understanding on which I have operated in this House or, indeed, other members of my party have operated. *Hansard* is sacrosanct in respect of what one said and it cannot be changed; but what can be changed the next day is a correction in terms of what one meant to say, and that appears in the bound edition as well. I understand that you cannot change what you actually said in the House of Commons. Once we start doing that, Madam Speaker, ministers can get up every day and say: This is not what I meant to say, and