

travel agent, would have been presumed to know that when entering Mozambique a visa is needed. They entered Mozambique from a country which does not have close relations with Mozambique, South Africa, and which in itself is probably a suspicious factor for the Mozambique authorities.

They entered without a visa as required by Mozambique law. On attempting to leave Mozambique, they therefore had no valid visa on entry and no stamp on their passport. They were apparently detained because of the illegal entry. Within the bounds of Mozambique law, as far as we can ascertain, that seems to be a valid offence.

They were held rather long because of the holidays. We do not have a resident mission in Mozambique. I might say we are very grateful to the British and the American officials, especially the British ambassador, who assisted us in getting these people released from that country. I might add that our High Commission in Lusaka dispatched notes of thanks to those who rendered us this service.

While the circumstances of the tensions were undoubtedly very bad, there is no evidence that they were any worse than those to which citizens of Mozambique are normally exposed and to which others charged with the same offence would be subjected. In other words, there is no evidence of unusual treatment at all. On the basis of those facts as we now have them, there would be no grounds for a letter of protest.

The reason we have not yet answered the hon. member is precisely that we are awaiting a full report from our High Commissioner in Lusaka as to whether there are any other facts or aspects of the problem of which we are not aware. When we have received that final report and make a final decision on whether to send a letter of protest, at that point we will be in touch with the hon. member and give him the answer to which, I agree, he is entitled. However, at the present time there is no foundation to the question he has raised.

Madam Speaker: I am prepared to rule on the question. It is obviously not a question of privilege. The hon. member went to some length to say he was not complaining because he was not satisfied with the answer, but he was not satisfied with the way in which the minister dealt with the commitment he seems to have made to him, inside or outside the House. That, too, is a complaint. The hon. member might be highly dissatisfied with the sense of urgency of the minister and he can complain about it, but that in itself does not constitute a question of privilege.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. MUNRO (ESQUIMALT-SAANICH)—STATEMENT MADE BY MR. MACGUGAN

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacGuigan) would not want to mislead the House, but had he checked *Hansard* for January 16, 1981, page 6271, column two, the question asked by

Order Paper Questions

the hon. member for York North (Mr. Gamble) was "has the Government of Canada sent a stern note of protest to the government of Mozambique". To convert that into "will the government be sending" was, I am sure, inadvertently misleading.

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, as the hon. member has raised a separate point of order, let me say that I was giving the sense of the undertaking. If all the hon. member wants to know is whether a note has been sent, obviously a note has not been sent. Surely what he wants to know is whether we will protest. He can ask the same question every day. I interpret the question to mean that when we have made a decision as to whether we are going to send a note or not, will we let the hon. member know, and, Madam Speaker, we will do that.

Madam Speaker: I am not sure whether that is a point of order. However, that exchange was probably conducive to bringing out more information. We will leave it at that.

MR. HNATYSHYN—NOTICE OF POSSIBLE QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order in light of an exchange that took place between members of our party and the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy). During the course of his response, as I recall it, the minister said he was in the process of obtaining affidavits by members of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, ostensibly to proceed to undermine the chairman, Miss Anderson.

I rise on this point of order to reserve the right, after having had an opportunity of reviewing the transcript of the official *Hansard*, to see what the minister in fact stated, with a view to determining whether a question of privilege should be raised tomorrow. I do that as well because of the absence of the minister at this time. I think it would be appropriate for me to look at the situation to determine whether he is making reference to a collection of these affidavits, and, if that is the case, to request that these affidavits be made public and tabled in the House of Commons. I simply bring that point of order to Your Honour's attention.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. D. M. Collette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, the following