

proceedings televised, when can we in this House expect to discuss televising the proceedings of the House?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacFarlane: If I have not been heard, perhaps I could put my question again.

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it is the government's intention to bring before this House a resolution recommending the broadcasting of certain parts or all of its proceedings on television. In the meantime, I have been preparing material that I think is necessary for the proper conduct of the debate as to the necessary changes to the lighting, and so on, in this chamber. As soon as that is completed, it would be my intention to put a resolution on the order paper for that purpose.

* * *

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

BILINGUAL LABELLING—REQUEST FOR CONSULTATION WITH BUSINESSMEN—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): My question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. As members of parliament are receiving complaints from businessmen across Canada who are opposing any legislation which requires bilingual labelling on pre-packaged products, is the minister planning any changes in this legislation and would he meet with the Canadian Federation of Independent Businessmen to discuss their problems in this regard?

[Translation]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have already answered a similar question asked two weeks ago by a colleague of the hon. member, the hon. member for St. John's East.

[English]

Mr. McKenzie: I do not know whether the minister has an answer to the following supplementary question. As a number of Canadian business firms are seriously concerned about foreign manufacturers stating that they will not comply with Canada's bilingual labelling regulations and will stop exporting to Canada, can the minister inform the House what action he will be taking to resolve this problem?

[Translation]

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Speaker, I have already answered the question, and I expect to make a statement shortly on the matter.

Oral Questions

[English]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

AVAILABILITY OF TRANSCRIPT OF PRELIMINARY INQUIRY INTO HAMILTON HARBOUR CASE TO FORCE

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): My question is for the Solicitor General. As recorded at page 3575 of *Hansard* yesterday, the minister indicated that the transcript of the preliminary inquiry in Hamilton became available to the RCMP in Toronto only a few days ago and was not available to the force in Ottawa. In view of the fact that two Toronto newspapers, the *Globe and Mail* and the *Toronto Star*, have had the complete transcripts for many days, the *Star* since February 19 and the *Globe and Mail* since February 21, does the minister not now feel that he should request the entire transcript and either read it for himself or have his legal advisers, not the RCMP, prepare a summary for him? In this way he will have as much knowledge about a matter under his jurisdiction as the newspapers apparently have.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): It is an interesting question how the newspapers got it before the RCMP did. I should point out that the RCMP in Toronto requested a copy of the transcript from the Crown prosecutor in Toronto as soon as it became available, which was approximately ten days ago, to the Crown prosecutor in Toronto. Even now the RCMP in Toronto do not have a full transcript, although they obtained parts of it from the Crown prosecutor in Toronto. The RCMP in Ottawa also requested a full copy of the transcript ten days ago, but we have not yet received it. As soon as we receive it, I will take steps to examine all the parts that relate to the question at hand. I might say that there are six volumes of this transcript, a lot of this material being irrelevant to the parts that are being questioned. But as soon as we get it, we will consider that question further.

* * *

HARBOURS

HAMILTON HARBOUR COMMISSION—POSSIBLE IMPLICATION OF MEMBERS IN COURT PROCEEDINGS—DISTINCTION BETWEEN CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY AND POLITICAL MISCONDUCT

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): I am very pleased that the minister will eventually get this evidence.

Since he stopped short yesterday of answering my question fully about members or ministers being implicated in such a way that there could be cause for concern about their role in the Hamilton harbour matter, and later in the day confined his answer to saying merely that there was no evidence at that time to lay further criminal charges, is he making a real distinction between criminal responsibility and political misconduct. If he is making that distinction, will he say so and answer my question more fully?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): I have made that distinction, but I will not say anything further at this time. As I pointed out in the House last night, section 467 of the Criminal Code states that we should not make