

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

\* \* \*

### TRADE

#### TEXTILES—REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION FROM TARIFF REDUCTIONS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar):** Mr. Speaker, I rise, under Standing Order 43, on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity regarding the GATT negotiations going on at the present time, and the effect they would have on the textile industry in Canada. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald):

That because of the nature of the worldwide textile industry, its peculiarities and special problems, the Canadian government ask that textiles be exempt in their entirety from the negotiations on tariff reductions.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The motion can be presented for discussion at this time only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

\* \* \*

### HOUSE OF COMMONS

#### "ICE HOGGY" COMPETITION BETWEEN MPs AND MEMBERS OF PRESS GALLERY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Maurice Harquail (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Young), that the result of an "ice hoggy" competition on Friday last, ice hog day, between members from both sides of the House of Commons and members of the press, be tabled, when supremacy reigned and hon. members won a decisive victory. I have the honour to present to you, sir, the first commoner, the trophy which we won, which is emblematic of our supremacy on this occasion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I cannot think of a better symbol of the skills needed to succeed in the business of this parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

#### Privilege—Answers of Solicitor General

### PRIVILEGE

#### ANSWERS GIVEN BY SOLICITOR GENERAL

**Mr. Speaker:** On Friday last a question of privilege was raised concerning answers given by the Solicitor General (Mr. Blais) during the question period. It was evident at that time that hon. members sought the opportunity to examine the transcript over the weekend and that we have an opportunity, as I said on Friday, to raise again today the same subject and continue the argument after examining the transcript, and particularly to put a specific motion in connection with that incident if that was the desire of members. I have had two notices of request to do so, one from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark), and one from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

● (1417)

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has further requested, and I have given his request serious consideration since it bears on events that took place in the question period, that the matter ought to be considered before the question period rather than after it. It is only under extraordinary circumstances that that can be done. I believe it is a serious proposition and I will, therefore, hear argument first to see whether or not it will have a bearing on the performance in the question period today. I will safeguard the question period by allotting 45 minutes to it when the time comes.

**Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief in continuing this matter which was raised the other day.

We have available to us now, not only the record of *Hansard* recording the remarks of the new Solicitor General (Mr. Blais), but also a transcript of remarks which he made outside the House. In essence, sir, the relevant portions of the remarks made by the Solicitor General are as follows. I will quote from page 2511 of *Hansard* for Friday, February 3:

It will be my policy to leave the McDonald commission to make its own conclusions on the evidence that is adduced. I will not be commenting on a day by day basis on evidence that may be adduced before that commission on a prior occasion.

In other words, the Solicitor General made it very clear that it was not his intention to answer questions in the House of Commons relating to matters that are before the McDonald commission. Later on in relation to ministerial responsibility he offered this view, and I quote:

That ministerial responsibility is dated as of February 1 of this year. What happened prior to that time and prior to the nomination of the previous solicitor general is a matter presently under study by the McDonald commission.

He is referring here to his responsibility for that ministry. In other words, he again seeks to avoid the responsibility of answering questions in this House on those matters because those matters are under consideration by that commission.

I would like to point out that the minister's view of ministerial responsibility and the capacity for it to be curtailed by the appointment of a commission outside this House is a view that, in our judgment, is totally wrong. To underline the