against Crown corporations, we are reviewing that judgment and will subsequently decide whether we should launch a second appeal. I have no further comment at the present time.

[English]

Madam Speaker: Question period is coming to an end. The Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition is rising to ask a question. I would ask the hon. member for Saskatoon West to defer to his Leader.

Mr. Clark: Go ahead, Ray.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gesture by the Leader of the Opposition. I always defer to the greatest parliamentarian in the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The Minister of Justice rose and bowed, but I was talking about a truthful parliamentarian.

Some hon. Members: Oh. oh!

## ACCESS TO INFORMATION BY PRIVATE COMPANIES

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): The result of this policy decision by the government has been that there is one rule for the governors and one rule for the governed in our country with respect to criminal prosecutions under the Restrictive Trade Practices Act. In view of the fact that the court decision is to prevent the participation of the Crown corporations, how does the Minister of Justice propose to allow the other remaining defendants access to the information which is essential to their defence, or is he trying to cover something up with respect to the government's involvement in this whole issue?

• (1500)

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Justice and Minister of State for Social Development): I think the statement by the hon. member is a bit funny because he says we have two standards. We do not have two standards. We have decided to prosecute both the private sector and the public sector. It has been ruled by two courts that we might not be entitled to prosecute the public sector, but it is not the policy of the government. The policy of the government is to prosecute it, just like the private sector. If it is not legal, it is another problem. We have said many times that we want everyone in this case to have a fair trial. I do not think that the ruling of the court will in any way impede the chance of the defence to have a full defence.

Madam Speaker: I must deal with another matter before calling Routine Proceedings. Someone has signalled to me, and it has been confirmed to me, that the hon. member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) has clearly said that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chrétien) had deliberately misled the House.

Some hon. Members: Right.

Privilege-Mr. King

Madam Speaker: I personally did not hear it.

Mr. Crosbie: I heard it.

Madam Speaker: I would ask the hon. member himself to tell me whether he did use that expression; otherwise I will check tomorrow in the "blues". I am afraid that if it is confirmed that the hon. member did use that expression, I will have to ask him to withdraw; but since I personally did not hear him, I will ask him today whether he did use that expression.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Madam Speaker, I did not use those particular words, no.

Some hon. Members: Oh. oh!

## **PETITIONS**

## MR. MILLER—STUDENTS' PETITION FOR PEACE

Madam Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has laid upon the Table the two hundred and sixty-ninth Report of the Clerk of Petitions stating that he has examined the petition presented by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Alberni (Mr. Miller) on Monday, June 14, 1982, and finds that the petition meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

## **PRIVILEGE**

MR. KING—REMARKS OF MR. PINARD ALLEGING ABSENCE WHEN VOTE CALLED

Mr. Fred King (Okanagan-Similkameen): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege to present for your judgment my case for an opportunity to defend myself and my integrity as an aftermath to the statements made in this House by the government House leader on June 9. Today is the first day on which I have had the opportunity to present this question of privilege following my awareness of the content of those statements.

The offending and untrue statements by the government House leader are contained in *Hansard* on page 18296 as follows:

MR. PINARD: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member misunderstood the point of order raised. He was certainly not on the floor of the House when the division was called. He should be asked about this.

Further, it states:

MR. PINARD: Mr. Speaker, I shall repeat what I just said, namely that the hon. member may have misunderstood the point of order raised. There is no doubt that we all saw him, and he knows he was not on the floor of the House when the division was called.

Madam Speaker: Order. I see what the hon. member is raising as a question of privilege. I must tell the hon. member that he does not have a question of privilege, because obviously, the statement that he made in the House—