

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I wonder if the minister will tell us whether it is still his intention to give priority to Bill C-56 in terms of government business, and whether there is any change in the list of legislation he announced a couple of weeks ago.

While the minister is answering, I wonder if he would be prepared to designate Wednesday, June 14, and Thursday, June 15, as allotted days.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, there is no change in the legislation which is now before the House. That will be continued, and there is no change in the list of legislation which I mentioned to my colleagues and to the House of Commons. When we finish the debate on the present bill, that will probably be a good time to review the situation with a view to concluding our business by the end of June. I, of course, designate next Wednesday and Thursday as allotted days.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could use this matter of House business to indicate that the motion for the allotted day tomorrow is as follows:

That this House notes with concern the secret trial of Alexander Peter Treu and the harassment of the *Toronto Sun* and its editor, Peter Worthington, under the provisions of the Official Secrets Act, and urges the establishment of a special committee of this House to recommend such changes in the act as will limit its scope to matters directly related to national security and defence.

That motion will be in the name of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin).

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, with respect to House business, since the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen) made reference to an intention about which we have known for some time, namely, to try to bring this part of the session to a conclusion on June 30, can he tell the House whether the government has any plans respecting the two holidays, June 24 and July 1, both of which this year fall on a Saturday? Every year when these two days come along certain questions are asked. Does the government have any plans about sittings of the House with respect to those two days? I do not mean we should sit on those days, but are there to be compensatory days off?

Mr. MacEachen: No, Mr. Speaker. I am surprised that the hon. member would even suggest to his colleagues in this House that we should not sit on the greatest possible number of days. It is not our intention to make compensation for holidays which fall on Saturdays. Therefore, it will not be our intention to change or to eliminate the sitting on Monday, June 26. It is not my expectation that the House will be sitting on July 3, but if it should happen by some misadventure that we do sit in July, it would not be my intention to compensate for the July 1 holiday.

Privilege—Mr. Baldwin

[Translation]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, can the government House leader tell us if the French-speaking staff of the House of Commons, who usually have a holiday on June 24, will have the day off later on or at a date set by the government that will cause the least disturbance, since this year that holiday falls on a Saturday?

[English]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to turn this question over to the rightful authority.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. BALDWIN—STATEMENT ISSUED BY JUDGE MAYRAND OF MONTREAL

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has raised a question of privilege concerning the remarks of Judge Mayrand respecting some interventions by the hon. member for Peace River in this House and their reference to the trial of Peter Treu.

Since that question of privilege has concerned the right of a member of the House of Commons to speak in this House in criticism of proceedings in our courts, it has provoked a good deal of discussion. That discussion was contributed to at great length by a number of hon. members who had done some study on the matter. They made very useful contributions, and rather than attempting to refer to those individual contributions in terms of particular arguments to which I will be referring, I simply want to recognize the very useful contributions which have been made, and to say that they have been of great help to us in researching the matter.

The hon. members to whom I refer are the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn), the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay), the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of Privy Council (Mr. Pinard), the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Young).

The arguments in favour of finding this language by Judge Mayrand to constitute a question of privilege relate primarily to three areas, that is, that these remarks themselves were made for the purpose of intimidating a member and could really not have had any other purpose; that the remarks, coming as they did from a judge speaking, for example, of not being able to tolerate the remarks of a member of parliament certainly have more weight than those of perhaps an editorial writer or any other citizen; and, finally, that the remarks of the judge were obviously based on a misunderstanding of what the hon. member for Peace River in fact had said in the House