

*Privilege*

If the hon. member for Calgary West or any other members of the House have other concerns or charges they wish to make, I will deal with them afterward, but I hope there will come a time when the members of the government front bench cease from this and, in fact, to reflect his own words, that we develop a sense of civility once known in this House and get on with the business of the country as people expect us to do.

The member for Calgary West made the following allegations: He said that I infringed the privileges of other members of this House when I criticized the committee report on Bill C-79, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act, before the report had been made to the House.

He also said that I made a series of false statements concerning this bill. Among those allegedly false statements were the following: The member said that I was wrong in saying that the government used its majority in committee to reject the opposition amendments to sections 52.8 of Bill C-59. That particular section, Mr. Speaker, is something that has been called the tip-off clause. It says: "No criminal process may be applied for, issued or proceeded with unless the applicant for the criminal process has requested and obtained from the board an opinion concerning the use on which the offence is based".

The government Whip also said I infringed his privileges or was contemptuous of—

**Mr. Speaker:** I think the hon. member for Calgary West wants to say something about keeping the record straight. I will hear him very briefly.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, if we are entering into the points of privilege which I intend to raise, I caution the House that I think it is my right to raise those first.

On the specific point for which I interrupted, I have attended many legislative committees on clause-by-clause review of bills. The clause is a great deal larger than the part of the quote that was just read into the record. For instance, the clause as he read it was the committee's clause of the fourth report which the House endorsed unanimously, including the House leader of the New Democratic Party. But Bill C-79, when it came back from cabinet had a definitional section of that clause which restricted the words "criminal process" to what in effect are court processes and have nothing to do with investigations, but simply with evidence that must be provided before a court. Those courts are in place in

our criminal process to protect all of us from the potential abuse of police authority.

If the hon. member wants at this point to enter a part of that total clause on the record, I think we should, to make sure there is no misunderstanding, put the total clause on the record, including that part of the clause that restricts the words "criminal process" in statute form, to what are in effect six court processes. I am sure his former justice critic sitting behind him would know that they are viewed in our kind of society as essential protections for individuals.

Partial information to the Chamber is not going to be helpful in resolving this issue because it may be in fact the source of the difficulty. It should be complete information, Mr. Speaker, if you are allowing him to head in that direction.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps I can help the two hon. members whom I think are trying to help the Chair. The hon. member for Calgary West has made a tentative suggestion or offer that these differences could be discussed further, after the discussion that took place today in my chambers.

The hon. member for Calgary West has tried to indicate that perhaps some of the things he said, if he had to say them over again, might be said in a different way.

The hon. member for Kamloops in responding is, I think, trying to make clear to his colleagues and to the House that among a number of specific things that were said, he stands in disagreement. I am not sure that we necessarily need to be debating the sections of the bill here.

If it would help in clarification, perhaps the hon. member for Kamloops, if he agrees with the information which the hon. member for Calgary West just gave to the House, could accept that as part of the factual presentation. Of course I am going to let the hon. member for Kamloops proceed at least for a few more minutes. I hope that he would be able without going on too long to meet, for my information, the suggestion that the hon. member for Calgary West has put forward.

I should make it very clear that while I attended a meeting with both hon. members this morning, it was a lengthy meeting, that meeting was asked for by one of the members. If I can be helpful, I would be more than prepared to carry on attending a continuation of that meeting in the interests of resolving these difficulties, as