

*Business of the House*

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for York West, I think, has made his point. I would comment that it would seem to the Chair that the Hon. Minister has tried to say that, whatever his comments may have seemed to be, they were not intended in that way. That I think is the clear meaning of the exchange so far. The Chair would ask Hon. Members to be as careful as they can be. I will recognize the Hon. Member for York West on a very short last question.

**Mr. Marchi:** Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Deputy Minister very clearly will he, on behalf of the Government, issue a statement of clarification and apology so that Canadians can re-establish their confidence in an immigration policy which is both fair and progressive for our present day immigrants and immigrants who are going to be landing on our shores tomorrow?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think there are any Members in this House who would suggest that there is anyone more sincere than the Hon. Minister of Employment and Immigration.

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

**Mr. Mazankowski:** I think his very careful and deliberate replies to the questions raised here, in an attempt to explain clearly any misinterpretation that may have been placed upon them, was done in the best interests in the discharge of his responsibility and in the discharge of his responsibility as a Member of this House.

I would simply invite the Hon. Member, before he starts suggesting that someone should apologize, to read in *Hansard* tomorrow precisely what the Hon. Minister has said because I think he made a full accounting and a full explanation for what the Hon. Member is trying to allege he said, which is a wrong interpretation.

**Ms. Copps:** It is on tape.

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

## WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, I do welcome the opportunity to rise on a point of order to ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Mazankowski) what business he intends to call for the next week.

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, today we will continue with Bill C-18, the National Transportation Act, then Bill C-19, the Motor Vehicle Transportation Act which will be followed by Bill C-21, the Shippers Conference Exemption Act.

**PRIVILEGE**

## DECISION BY LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE IN ABSENCE OF OPPOSITION MEMBERS

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege with respect to a decision made by the legislative committee dealing with Bill C-22.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), who is a long-standing Member of this House, has arisen to address the Chair on a question of privilege. I know that Hon. Members would want to hear his intervention.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a question of privilege on a decision made at this morning's meeting of the legislative committee dealing with Bill C-22. At one of the first meetings of that committee, a motion was made by a government Member that a quorum of the committee authorized to conduct the work of the committee should consist of four Members. I moved an amendment, which was accepted, voted on and approved, that among the four Members who would constitute a quorum at least one should be a Member of the Opposition. The two members of the Opposition serving on that committee are the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall) and myself.

The committee at a later date accepted a motion that the committee should meet five times a week and that at each meeting the committee should hear three delegations, each delegation to have 45 minutes and not more. The Member from East Richmond and I argued that this was too restrictive, but that motion carried.

This morning the committee met to hear two delegations, first, the delegation representing the Multiple Sclerosis Organization of Ottawa. That Organization had its 45 minutes. Then came the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. After about 40 minutes, the Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond left. I stayed and when I thought 45 minutes had elapsed, I left. Certainly at the least 43 minutes had gone by.

Just let me go back a step, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the committee discussed future witnesses. The Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond proposed that we invite Congressman Waxman who heads up a committee looking into this question in the U.S. House of Representatives and I suggested that we invite a representative of the American Association of Retired Persons. I suggested, and it was agreed, that we find out whether either of these individuals could come and whether we would have to pay their expenses. If we did, then we could discuss whether the committee had the funds. That was the way it was left.

As I said, the Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond left the committee. Then after I left, believing the time had gone by for the delegation, the committee adopted, without the presence of either member of the Opposition, a motion that no invitation be extended to any possible delegation from the United States. I think moving and passing that motion when