

I am wondering if the government House leader can shed some light on a very important undertaking which was given to this House by two senior members of cabinet?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I wonder why the House leader could not get himself on the Question Period list today which he submitted to the Speaker. Some member of his party was on it and asked those questions. They were answered as a matter of fact. I think the evidence will show, and anybody who has been watching will see, that in fact the government has been totally forthcoming in terms of allowing officials to come forward with all documents and so on.

I can understand why, perhaps, the opposition wants to go on with a bit of a continuous witch hunt. If you keep bringing people before the committee, even if they have nothing to do with the issue, you never know what is going to happen. I think we should leave all that up to the committee. I believe that is what the former Secretary of State for External Affairs in his capacity as Acting Prime Minister said, that the committee is looking into this thing, doing a fine job and why do we not let it continue with it.

Mr. Dingwall: Through you, Madam Speaker, to the hon. House leader. I want to thank him for his obvious, unequivocal and clear undertaking to subscribe to the statements which have been made by the Minister of Finance, the Deputy Prime Minister and, of course, the Secretary of State for External Affairs on May 28 and 30.

Mr. Andre: Madam Speaker, as was indicated, that question was asked in Question Period. It was asked last week. It does not become more legitimate when it is asked by way of a bogus Point of Order after Question Period.

He knows the answer. It has been given several times. Repetition of that order is in fact a little insulting.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I think the hon. member does know as well as I do that this is the type of Point of Order that is normally raised immediately after Question Period. We are now into Routine Proceedings. We have had a motion passed. We are almost finished with Petitions.

Routine Proceedings

I have a difficult time to see how this is a Point of Order, honestly. I will recognize the hon. member, but I would like him to tell me which of our rules is not being followed at this time, and explain the Point of Order.

Mr. Dingwall: Madam Speaker, it is certainly not my intent to be disputatious, but it must be clear that the subject matter which I have raised on a Point of Order is of great importance for the continued deliberations of hon. members in this particular House, as well as those hon. members who serve in another committee. Madam Speaker, I appreciate your bringing to our attention the fact that this was not raised at a more timely occasion than when I did raise it. I wish the record to show that I believe the government House leader was involved with some discussions with the Solicitor General. I thought it a courtesy that I would wait until those deliberations had been completed.

In point of fact, I believe the hon. government House leader was vacating the Chamber when I summoned him to remain in his chair so that I could raise the point of order. The matter has now been resolved. I clearly accept, through you, the undertaking of the government House leader that he will abide by the statements made by the Deputy Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs on May 28 and May 30.

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will resume Petitions.

* * *

PETITIONS

WAGE CONTROLS

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean): Madam Speaker, I would like to present, pursuant to Standing Order 36, a petition signed by many people of Quebec, Ottawa, Nepean and Kanata, with regard to the high interest rate, the high dollar policies and 33 new tax increases since September 1984. They are saying that the government is taking the purchasing power away from consumers and this will only deepen and prolong the recession.

They also deplore the fact that the Conservative federal government intends to impose a freeze on the federal Public Service wage increases for fiscal years 1991 and 1992. They feel that the government is taking away their collective bargaining rights.