

*Points of Order*

**Mr. Claude-André Lachance (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice):** See reply to question No. 1,718 of the third session of the thirtieth parliament, *Hansard* No. 146, page 6724, dated June 26, 1978.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

\* \* \*

## POINTS OF ORDER

MR. MCKENZIE—DELAY IN ANSWERING QUESTION NO. 238

**Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This afternoon the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) stated that he would be providing us with the necessary information to deal with Bill C-12, to amend the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act. I wish to ask the parliamentary secretary and the President of the Treasury Board whether they would consider answering a question I placed on the order paper on October 17. It was in regard to whether there was in excess of \$9 billion in the Public Service Superannuation Account. That is question No. 238. The answer to this question would certainly help hon. members to deal properly with Bill C-12 concerning retirement benefits.

● (1532)

MR. ELZINGA—DELAY IN ANSWERING QUESTION NO. 223

**Mr. Peter Elzinga (Pembina):** I, too, rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, with regard to question No. 223. This is the third session during which it has been on the order paper and the government has had some two years to answer it. It simply deals with special or annual air passes granted to presidents of Crown corporations and government commissioners, and asks how often these special passes have been used. I wonder if I could get a commitment from the parliamentary secretary allowing me to expect an answer in the near future.

[Translation]

**Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, as regards the first intervention, we will give the question serious consideration, and attempt to provide the best possible answer, as quickly as we can.

As for the second intervention, the hon. member must understand that his question is directed to several agencies and departments. It will certainly cost Canadian taxpayers a lot of money to satisfy his fancy, but we will nevertheless take his question in serious consideration.

[Mr. Brisco.]

[English]

MR. ORLIKOW—DELAY IN ANSWERING QUESTIONS ON CROWN CORPORATION SALARIES

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I rise more in sorrow than in anger to ask the parliamentary secretary whether the government will, some time this session, answer a series of questions which have been standing in my name on the order paper for a long time—I think this is the second year—having to do with senior officers of Crown corporations, who they are, and what salaries they receive. If the government does not want to answer the questions, I wish the parliamentary secretary would tell me so, in which case I might pursue them at some appropriate time in one of the standing committees. It does seem to me that the questions are not so complicated nor so difficult that the government cannot answer them in a matter of two years if ministers put their minds to it.

[Translation]

**Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** With respect to this intervention, I can tell the hon. member that I can see his name very often in the questions I have the occasion to answer. I can see he looks happy. I will try my best to keep that happy look on his face as long as possible.

\* \* \*

[English]

## PRIVILEGE

MR. LAWRENCE—MINISTERIAL CORRESPONDENCE

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I want to indicate to the House today that I have come to some conclusions with respect to a question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) on November 3, having to do with a number of matters which were the subject of an interesting discussion at that date. I have not made up my mind on two or three issues which I think should be discussed further; I want to leave them with the House in the hope that they may be argued at some convenient time.

Perhaps I might simply say at this stage that on November 3, the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham raised a question of privilege which came to his attention as a result of certain testimony before the McDonald royal commission. Briefly, the facts are as follows. In reply to a query on behalf of a constituent, the member for Northumberland-Durham received from the then solicitor general, on December 4, 1973, a letter which read in part:

I have been assured by the RCMP that it is not their practice to intercept the private mail of anyone and I trust the above explanation will set your constituent's mind at ease.

The hon. member for Northumberland-Durham indicated to the House that in testifying before the McDonald commission in relation to this particular letter, former Commissioner Higgitt had said: