

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would, of course, require the unanimous consent of the House to ask for unanimous consent a second time.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Then if it is agreed, the motion that the hon. member for Peace River put earlier was:

That the green paper on legislation on public access to government documents be referred to the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments.

I understand that the motion was moved by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). The House has heard the terms of the motion and it can be presented at this time pursuant to Standing Order 43 only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent for the presentation of the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The House heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, there has been some discussion which indicates that there might be agreement reached, at this time of Christmas and all that goes with Christmas, to arrange time for debate. I think the understanding is that it will be a short debate. The time, the method, the number of speakers and so on will be discussed. We have no willingness on this side to have a long debate, but I think there should be some discussion about the debate between all the House leaders. So would Your Honour simply let the motion stand? There will be the usual discussions, out of which will flow some tremendous arrangement.

Mr. Speaker: Then I think for neatness we had better deal with it on the basis that, pursuant to Standing Order 43, this motion has now been presented in the regular way. It is moved by the hon. member for Peace River, seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. The motion is now in the possession of the House and I think debate on the motion ought to be adjourned at this time. Equally, it could carry now without debate.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to pass this motion right away. If the opposition wants to talk out the motion or to find some way of not putting this matter before the committee, that is for them, but we are anxious to have it referred to committee. Why does not the House agree to pass the motion right now without debate?

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

● (1117)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Prime Minister is not aware of the discussions that have taken place between the deputy House leader (Mr. Cafik) and myself with respect to this debate. They have proceeded most cordially. I would like to inform the Prime Minister through

Oral Questions

you, sir, that there will be one speaker from each side in the debate at a time to be arranged. Because third reading of Bill C-5 may be reached today on consent, perhaps we might be able to do it later this day. I know that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and the deputy House leader agree that the whole purpose is to ensure that this matter reach the committee as quickly as possible. I deemed it wise to inform the Prime Minister of this arrangement in the event he has not had a chance to consult his colleagues.

An hon. Member: Perhaps he is too dumb to understand it.

Mr. Speaker: We are now well into the question period. In the circumstances we ought to consider that it has been moved by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), seconded by Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton), that this debate be now adjourned. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt that motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

Mr. Speaker: The question period will terminate at approximately three minutes past twelve.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

TRADE

REPORTING OF COMPANIES COMPLYING WITH BOYCOTTS—
REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF CONFLICTING STATEMENTS

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Prime Minister. On the 21st of October, 1976, the Secretary of State for External Affairs took the time of the House on motions to state the government's position on economic boycotts and I quote:

All Canadian firms, however, whether they accept boycott clauses or not, will be required to report all instances of their complying with boycott provisions. Information obtained from such reports will be made available to the public.

Yesterday, outside of the House, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce said that it is not the plan of his department to make public information concerning Canadian firms complying with boycott provisions. Sir, we have a situation here where two ministers of the Crown have made directly contradictory statements. I would like to ask the Prime Minister which minister speaks for the government on this matter?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition were to look at the full statement and the debate which followed, he would understand that there is no inconsistency. In fact, there is still a problem to be resolved with regard to publication. The difficulty, and it also has been expressed by some members opposite, was whether the names of companies which had been invited to participate in the boycott and had