

*Government Orders*

Return tabled.

[English]

**Mr. Cooper:** I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

\* \* \*

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bills: Bill C-99, an act for granting Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Government of Canada for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991; Bill C-100, an act for granting Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Government of Canada for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1992.

---

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

#### PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

##### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Andre in relation to amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-79, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act, and the motion of Mr. Hawkes (p. 18849).

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As you know, this motion on Bill C-79 received a lot of debate yesterday, basically on the fact that I was not allowed to introduce some of my amendments which would have ensured that any opinion the board had already given with respect to an investigation that may be ongoing on a member of Parliament or a senator, and the bill reads at present:

— the board or the relevant committee in the Senate may not give that opinion to the police officer who requested it.

In debate yesterday representatives of the Conservative and the Liberal parties indicated that they would be willing to make sure that the Board of Internal Economy

in this House passed bylaws soon to ensure the gist of that would be part of the bylaws of the board.

If we could have that assurance at this time, that those people spoke for their parties, I think you may find that there is a disposition of the House to move quickly on this matter.

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** The member for Ottawa—Vanier and I had discussions earlier and I had his assurance. He is not in the House at the moment but there may be another member of the party who can speak on his behalf. But I welcome the input from my colleague across the way. I can assure him that as a board member and on behalf of the members of my party on the board, we would attempt to incorporate the principle in a bylaw as quickly as possible, once we have it proclaimed and through Royal Assent, and so on. It should be one of the very first bylaws, if not the first bylaw.

The advantage of that may be, in a funny kind of a way, Mr. Speaker, if we get it right it will endure forever, if we get it wrong all members of the House from experience can tell us it should be changed, and we can change the bylaw if we haven't got it right. It has been a clause that has given us enormous difficulty in its wording over time, and so there may be a kind of advantage to doing it by a bylaw which is legally binding on the board and on the behaviour of the board. But if we do not get it right the next time, it will be easier to change and more quickly changeable to make sure that we get it the way the House wants.

I hope that is sufficient confirmation. I do not know if the representative of the Liberal Party is willing to confirm, but I can assure the House that I had that conversation with the member for Ottawa—Vanier at around two o'clock or two-fifteen. He made the offer on the floor yesterday and is still standing by the offer.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** I am afraid I am not in much of a position to help. I have tried to locate the hon. member and he is not in the building at the moment. He will be back later today. If he had the discussion as was indicated by the government Whip—and I have no reason to disbelieve the government Whip in his statements. I am not a member of the board obviously and can give no such assurance and I am sorry not to be in that position—but if the discussion took place between the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier and the hon. member for Calgary West, then I think the hon. member for Churchill could take that assurance.