

MINISTER'S KNOWLEDGE

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, we would not be speculating if the studies were made public. We can only go by what we can learn. However, the Deputy Prime Minister could tell the Opposition whether the study we are referring to, even if we are not defining it as precisely as he would like, was conducted with the full knowledge of the Minister of the Environment?

● (1200)

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Defence): The fact that it was being conducted, Sir, was in the public domain last Friday. The hon. gentleman will recall that I tabled 21 such reports here in Parliament and I see no reason why the follow-on studies should not be tabled as well.

* * *

TRADE

SOFTWOOD LUMBER EXPORTS—U.S. INDUSTRY'S PETITION—
CANADIAN REPRESENTATIONS

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. A few moments ago he said it was totally inappropriate for the Prime Minister to raise the matter of the softwood decision that was made today in the U.S. with the President. In reply to a question in the House on the very day the Prime Minister was writing his letter the Secretary of State for External Affairs said, "Mr. Speaker, that question, among others, was raised by me in my meetings on Friday with Secretary Shultz in Halifax". If it is appropriate for the Minister to raise this question with the Secretary of State in the U.S. why could not our Prime Minister have done the same thing with the President of the United States?

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is time to call a stop to what the rules of the House require me to call inadvertent misrepresentation by the Leader of the New Democratic Party. What I raised with Secretary Shultz, and what was raised by a number of Canadian representatives, was our great political concern about the implications to Canada of this decision.

What the Member from Windsor was asking me to do earlier when he referred specifically to the double jeopardy argument was to have the Prime Minister of Canada make a legal intervention in his political capacity, thereby intervening politically.

What they were asking us to do is have the Prime Minister ask the President to do something which is forbidden under American law. Of course we were not going to do that, and those facts should be understood by the people of the country and not misrepresented by the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

Privilege
PRIVILEGE

ALTERATION TO HANSARD—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: On Wednesday, June 4, 1986, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) raised a question of privilege relating to the comments of the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs as recorded by the electronic *Hansard* and an apparent discrepancy as to how those comments are recorded in the printed *Hansard*. First, the Chair must say that, having now reviewed both the *Hansard* and the taped proceedings, I cannot find any matter of privilege in this case. This issue raised is more akin to a point of order. What was said by the Right Hon. Minister and what can be viewed and heard on the electronic *Hansard* is the following:

—even to the point of having his assistant down now working with one of the leading opponents in the U.S. Congress of acid rain legislation, legislation that would be helpful to Canada.

What was reported in the printed *Hansard* at page 13902 is the following:

—even to the point of having his assistant now working with one of the leading opponents in the U.S. Congress on acid rain legislation, legislation which would be helpful to Canada.

The obvious omission in *Hansard* is the word "down". The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry feels that this is an omission of substance. The Chief Editor of *Hansard* has reported to me that this was an error on the part of *Hansard* and that the usual *erratum* will be printed. Indeed, such an *erratum* would have been printed on June 5 but, because the Chair had taken the matter under advisement, the Chief Editor deferred the *erratum*, which will now be printed in the next issue.

The Chair must also make it clearly understood that there was no intervention by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and no alterations of the "blues" by him or members of his staff.

The larger issue surrounding the point of order that the Hon. Member has raised is the status of the electronic *Hansard*. Unfortunately, the House has never defined the status of the television tape. Speaker Jerome, while ruling on a similar point on November 28, 1978, clearly identified the dilemma:

An examination of the record through these electronic recording devices is being resorted to by more and more Canadians all the time. Therefore, additional strain is being put on the reporting staff who have enjoyed this editorial licence in the past. They now find themselves under the constraint of matching their records exactly with the language used on the radio and television.

Speaker Jerome went on to say that such a task was not an easy one for the *Hansard* reporters and it will continue to be difficult until the House clarifies once and for all the official status of the electronic *Hansard*, and defines clearly what margin of inevitable discrepancy it will tolerate.