

Point of Order—Mr. McMillan

allocation of fish which is under federal jurisdiction, not the jurisdiction of the province or the private sector.

According to the tapes for the relevant exchange between the Minister and myself, the Minister said, "I will be making an announcement about it", meaning the reopening of the plant, "in the near future. It is not a question of months". That was his quotation. Those last words, "It is not a question of months", are entirely absent from *Hansard*, though they are on the tapes to which the Editor and I listened very carefully. Consequently, the real import, the pith and substance of the Minister's response to me in the House on Friday, has been lost from the record. It is clear from the tapes, but not from *Hansard*, that the Minister said in effect that Georgetown Seafoods will be reopened in a matter not of months but rather weeks or even days. Without the missing words, one could be left with the impression, as I think one is in fact left with the impression, that the plant would be reopened only some time in the distant future. The exact opposite is what the Minister actually said on the floor of the House of Commons on Friday in response to my question.

I draw this matter to your attention, Sir, and to the attention of the House in hopes that the record stands corrected pending a more official change to the *Hansard* record at a later date.

I hasten to add that I raise this matter not as a reflection upon *Hansard* officials, nor even as a reflection upon the Minister, who I am sure would want the record to be corrected along the lines I have suggested.

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: On that particular subject, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister should read what the Hon. Member said and, if necessary, make his contribution before the changes are made.

[English]

MR. DOMM—REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It rarely occurs in the House that there is an air of unanimity. I gathered from the conversation which occurred earlier in the question of privilege raised by the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) that the matter dealing with the \$500,000 grants, namely the Canada Community Development Program, be referred to a standing committee for examination, it would appear from a cursory observation that it would be the desire of the Chair to accept whatever appeared to be the unanimous consent of this House.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of the Hon. Member? The Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) raised a question of privilege. The Chair found that there was no prima facie case of privilege. What is the purpose of the Hon. Member's intervention?

Mr. Domm: Following that question of privilege, there was a desire on the part of the Official Opposition to accept, through

unanimous consent of the House, that the matter be referred to the Standing Committee. All I am asking—

Mr. Speaker: A motion has to be introduced according to the procedures of the House. The Hon. Member is aware of the options open to him and to his House Leader to put motions on the record. Obviously the Hon. Member does not have a point of order, nor does he have a point of privilege at this point.

Mr. Domm: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I rose on a point of order, but I am prepared to make a motion.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member cannot make a motion at this point on a point of order of this nature. The Hon. Member, if he seeks to introduce a motion, would have to have unanimous consent to introduce it without notice. Normal procedures are not being followed.

Mr. Domm: I would seek the unanimous consent of the House, in light of the matter before the House, that is, the way we will treat the subject matter brought up by a Member of the Government—

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member is rising to seek the unanimous consent of the House for leave to introduce a motion. Is that what he is trying to do? Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a good idea if the Hon. Member were to give detailed notice so that we know exactly what the motion would include.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

PETITION

MR. WENMAN—TAXATION OF SMALL FARM HOLDINGS

Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I have the duty and responsibility to present a petition on behalf of taxpaying farmers in my constituency of Fraser Valley West. The nature of this petition is to express concern over Section 31 of the Income Tax Act which unfairly penalizes small farmers who need other jobs to finance their farms. As taxpayers, the petitioners are also concerned with the callousness and insensitivity of tax officials with Revenue Canada.

The purpose of this petition is to ask the federal Government to repeal Section 31 of the Income Tax Act so that valuable small farm holdings are maintained and farmers are not taxed unfairly. The petitioners also want tax assessors to treat taxpayers in an equitable, courteous and dignified manner.