

I have talked to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Buchanan) and have recommended to him that the reports be made available to the public. I understand the Treasury Board will take up this question and, I hope, resolve it in the way the hon. member and myself would like to see it resolved so that all these reports in the future will be made available to the public.

**Mr. Speaker:** It would seem to me that, from a procedural point of view, the matter between the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lalonde), who is responsible for the status of women, has been resolved.

MR. CROSBIE—ALTERATION IN OFFICIAL HANSARD RECORD

**Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege has to do with the *Hansard* record of a debate in this House which took place yesterday afternoon during private members' hour. I refer to page 1535 of *Hansard* of yesterday where we see a speech made by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin).

● (1512)

The subject under discussion was the Sullivan royal commission on transportation in Newfoundland. The hon. member said—I heard him say it, and other hon. members I have checked with heard him say it—

If the government will agree to reject out of hand the Sullivan royal commission recommendations, it logically follows they will have to implement the recommendations of the Hall commission—

I have checked this with the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre. *Hansard* reads as follows:

If the government will agree to reject out of hand the Sullivan royal commission recommendations—

Then the words “regarding the railway” are inserted.

—it logically follows—

That is completely different from the statement that was made. There are about 100 recommendations in that report. The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre came out against them all. He may have done that by mistake.

He was picked up on that by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), who spoke right after him for about five minutes, and then by the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey), who criticized the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre for not having read the report. However, when we looked into *Hansard* this morning, we found that the meaning of what was said was completely changed to “recommendations regarding the railway.”

The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre has told me that he did change the *Hansard* record. I am not accusing him of anything dishonourable because, if the *Hansard* office agrees, why should we not change the record whenever we like? Whenever we make a mistake in the House, we can just get the “blues” and change what we said. I remember that a

*Privilege—Mr. Crosbie*

month or two ago the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts) changed entirely the sense of what had been said.

I also point out that the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre, who will speak for himself, has said that he has no objection to removing those words. He will say that, but something needs to be done to see just what the rules for changing *Hansard* are.

In this case the meaning has been changed utterly and completely. When we look at the record, which may be useful to us in certain future activities, the meaning will have been completely changed, and I submit that that is a breach of the privileges of the members of this House.

Although the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre is willing to have those words taken out, I think there should be some check into this so that we can determine what is permitted and what is not.

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I was endeavouring to get your eye, as was the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie).

In the course of the private members' hour yesterday afternoon I was speaking in support of the hon. member's motion. As usual, I did not speak from a prepared text and, as many hon. members frequently do, I went to check the *Hansard* report of my remarks.

I did insert the words “regarding the railway” in the sentence referred to by the hon. member for St. John's West, and if that goes beyond what is allowed, I am prepared not only to have those three words stricken from the official record of the House but also to apologize to hon. members and to Your Honour. That was what I wanted to say and what I meant to say, and if I did not say it, I have no business making that change, even though it is on the record that my party, my leader, the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Faour), and others support most of the Sullivan commission recommendations. I am in that same position, the exception being the Sullivan commission's recommendations regarding the railway.

If it is the view of the Chair that the insertion of those three words, which were inserted so that that part of my remarks would be consistent with the whole purport of my speech and the motion presented by the hon. member for St. John's West, go beyond what a member should do, I am pleased to apologize and to have them taken from the record.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) has raised a matter which I think we ought to consider as being one of order as opposed to one of privilege. I think the explanation given by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) closes the door on it in terms of procedure. However, the hon. member for St. John's West has raised a larger question which is really a matter of continuing concern for the Chair, and I think it is appropriate to pause a moment and to consider the background of the experience of the *Hansard* reporters here, which has been an excellent