

*Privilege, Mr. Hellyer*

I will get to that in a moment in connection with the change he has made in *Hansard*. The last sentence but one reads:

I might say also that the director of the penitentiary will be retiring shortly, a new director will be appointed.

There then appears a full stop after that sentence, and it is followed by this final sentence:

Improvements are being made at the institution.

Every member on this side of the House, and I am sure members of the Press Gallery and yourself, Sir, heard the minister say this:

I might say also that the director of the penitentiary will be retiring shortly, a new director will be appointed, and other improvements are being made at the institution.

The minister, Sir, or his minions have deliberately deleted the words "and other", changing the whole sense of his reply. That, Sir, is dishonest. It is misinformation: it misleads the readers of the official record of our debates.

If the minister is prepared to concede that my recollection of the words he used is accurate, that will be fine. Otherwise, I am prepared to move a motion that *Hansard* be corrected by replacing the words that now appear with the actual words spoken yesterday in that reply.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the minister might be allowed to reply if he wishes, but certainly it would be the responsibility of the Chair to look into the record and the suggestion made by the hon. member that the record has been changed. I am sure the minister will give the same undertaking from his side.

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, the blues were sent to our office in the usual way and I know changes were made, I thought in the usual way. I cannot remember now the exact changes that were made, but I would be willing to check it with you and, if it was out of order, if something was done that was not supposed to be done, I would be glad to comply with your ruling.

● (1430)

MR. HELLYER—REFUSAL OF GOVERNMENT TO PROVIDE  
INFORMATION REQUESTED IN CERTAIN MOTIONS FOR  
PAPERS

**Hon. Paul Hellyer (Trinity):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege with respect to the motions for papers that were just called and subsequently transferred for debate. In refusing to table information of this kind the government is establishing a new practice and departing from precedents which are time-honoured in this House, thereby taking away the rights and privileges of all members of the House.

Historically, Mr. Speaker, it has been the practice that public documents would always be tabled in response to an order of this kind. It has been the practice for many, many years that applications from private companies and persons for assistance of this kind under well-recognized government projects should be made public, that these are matters of public record and it is only internal documents between ministers and civil servants acting within the departments that are considered privileged. That has been the rule for decades, Mr. Speaker, but now a new practice is being established whereby applications from persons

[Mr. Nielsen.]

and organizations outside the government and letters in support of those applications are denied to members of the House of Commons.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Hellyer:** This, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion is a terrible breach of the privileges of the House.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Trinity may have a point of debate, but it seems to me that is the very purpose of transferring his motions for debate. I find that when we have these debates on the tabling of documents we debate the substance of the matter referred to rather than the very narrow point whether a particular document ought to be tabled or not. The hon. member may have a very good point. It is certainly not for the Chair to determine whether he has or not, but I suggest that is the very point that would be debated if and when the matter comes before the House. The Chair would be very happy, when these motions come before the House in private members' hours, if we concentrated on this aspect of the matter, whether certain documents ought to be tabled or not. I hope there can be a useful debate on this point in due course. Oral questions.

**Mr. Hellyer:** Mr. Speaker, it is only because I felt there had been—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Some hon. Members:** Order!

**Mr. Hellyer:** —a deviation from the practice that I brought the matter to Your Honour's attention.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Don Valley. Order, please. I call for the co-operation of the hon. member for Trinity and other hon. members who are arguing across the floor to allow the House to return to work. The hon. member for Don Valley.

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

### THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

#### GOVERNMENT POSITION ON ACTION REQUIRED TO REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT—GENERAL POLICY

**Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In view of the rather interesting statement he made the other day that the seasonally adjusted increase in unemployment was in large measure caused by the high level of economic activity in the country, which is a very unique interpretation, does this mean the government is taking the position that the economy should be slowed down in order to reduce the rate of unemployment in the nation?