

I believe, Madam Speaker, that this is a very substantive breach of the privileges of this House and indeed, a contempt of your office by the Government of Canada, knowing this matter has been raised and not decided upon, to commence a new series of advertisements or advertising programs. That is one matter which I think you should judge.

The other matter which is equally important, is that the information in at least one of these documents is false information. I have not had the opportunity to read all the documents in extensive detail, but I can draw your attention to at least two statements in one of the documents which are false and one statement which is very seriously misleading.

A statement which is false in the document entitled, in English, "Highlights of a Proposed Resolution Respecting the Constitution of Canada", appears on page 1 and states that this proposal would provide as follows:

An amending procedure will ensure that all changes to the constitution can be made in Canada.

That is not true, Madam Speaker. What the Government of Canada is trying to do, what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is trying to do, is not to have all changes made in Canada but, instead, to take certain changes which he proposes and smuggle those through Westminster so that they will be beyond the reach of this Parliament and will be decided, instead, by a foreign parliament in a foreign country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Therefore, Madam Speaker, the statement in this document does not reflect the attitude of hiding in the skirts of Westminster that is being evinced by this government in relation to certain of the amendments that it prefers. That statement is false.

The second statement that is false also appears on page 1 of the same document, and reads as follows:

If the proposed resolution is endorsed by Parliament, the Government of Canada will submit the joint address to the Queen—

It is our understanding, Madam Speaker, that what would be endorsed as a basis for a joint address to Westminster—is not the resolution but simply a procedural motion—a motion of concurrence in a committee report. It will not at all be an endorsement of the substance of the resolution; it would simply be the vote on the procedural question. That, too, Madam Speaker, is a matter that is false.

Madam Speaker: Order, please, I shall put this in the form of a question because I need to be enlightened on what the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) is leading to. If he is raising a question of privilege that flows from today's deliberations, that is one thing, and that is why I have listened to the right hon. member, because what he was saying was very close to it. But he seems to be asking about something which took place outside the House. The right hon. member could raise a question of privilege concerning something which occurred outside the House if he wished to, but I would need to have notice. The only question of privilege that I can hear from the right hon. member is if it flows from the

Privilege—Mr. Hnatyshyn

deliberations of today's question period. Therefore, I would ask the right hon. member to argue on something which has been discussed today rather than something which happened outside the House. Otherwise, I will have to ask him to give me notice.

● (1510)

Mr. Clark: Madam Speaker, I will naturally take your guidance on the matter. I thought a question of privilege could be raised without notice, either if it arose from the proceedings in the House or if it came to the attention of a member during the proceedings of the House. But if you are ruling otherwise, and I gather you are, I stand to give you notice of an intention to raise this question of privilege substantively tomorrow.

I would say in passing, before I resume my seat, that I think it would be appropriate for the Government of Canada, on a matter regarding which a decision has to be rendered by the Chair, to stop these advertisements until Your Honour has made a ruling.

MR. HNATYSHYN—PUBLIC OPINION POLLS—ADVERTISEMENT
SPONSORED BY GOLDFARB CONSULTANTS

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege of which I have given written notice to Your Honour. It is with respect to a matter raised in the question period today. It was originally raised under a point of order yesterday by my colleague, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath).

It relates to the question of the polls which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chrétien) has refused to deliver and disclose to members of Parliament. In the course of developing the basis upon which my question of privilege is made I might just point out that we have an offering, as you will know from the question period, from the Goldfarb Consultants organization. This advertisement appeared in the *Financial Times* for October 11, 1980. It was a full-page ad in which it is pointed out that the Goldfarb organization will publish a report to include a detailed treatment of public attitudes toward the debate surrounding a new Canadian Constitution. On the other hand, the polls in question which are being refused to us as members of Parliament by the Minister of Justice covering polling by Goldfarb Consultants Ltd., deal with Canadians' attitudes toward and expectations for constitutional reform. The similarities, notwithstanding the excuses given by the Minister of Justice, are quite outstanding.

These particular studies seem to be upon the same topic and the same subject matter, so we are faced with two particular problems. One is the whole question of the basis upon which the minister has refused to give and disclose those particular polls. The minister has apparently referred to and used the spirit of the freedom of information bill which is now before the House of Commons. Even though he was aware that this matter was going to be raised as a question of privilege, he has left the House, as my colleague has just mentioned. The fact is that the spirit of that particular bill which is now before the House is being used by the government as a basis of exclusion to disclosure of these documents. On the other hand, we, as