

Committee Procedure

which have in no way contributed to the problems that he alleges exist is secondary in his mind. I want to develop this further, because the minister then states there are four good things he is trying to accomplish by this bill. He stated:

What we do want is: first, the continuance of a situation wherein there is no interference with the freedom of Canadians to read *Time* and *Reader's Digest*—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTION TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—External Affairs—Proposed establishment of subcommittee to investigate CIDA; the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco)—Society for the study of the Heritage of Canada—Reason for payment to society to compensate for use of name "Heritage Canada"—the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay (Mr. Johnston)—Regional Economic Expansion—Request for statement on negotiations with British Columbia for projects.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions, public bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Motion No. 2, the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander).

Mr. Caccia: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If Your Honour will call notice of motion No. 38, I believe you will find there is agreement to deal with it this afternoon.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is it agreed that all notices of motion prior to No. 38 stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Stevens.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PROCEDURE FOLLOWED IN COMMITTEES RESPECTING HEARING OF WITNESSES

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River) moved:

That this House: Holds that it tends to a contempt of parliament and a subversion of the constitution to assert, as did the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources before a standing committee of this House in a previous session, that a minister of the Crown may order a witness not to attend a committee or to withhold evidence from the committee where, in the minister's opinion, the witness has an advisory responsibility to the minister or the government:

Informs the minister and others of the government that the implementation of this pernicious doctrine by obstruction, threat, intimidation, molestation, offer of advantage, other corrupt practice, or at all, is a crime against the law and custom of parliament;

Affirms that it is the undoubted right and ancient privilege of this House that all witnesses to attend before this House or before any committee of this House have and enjoy the privilege of this House in coming, staying and returning; and

Declares that it is a breach of the privilege of this House to tamper with a witness in regard to his evidence to be given before this House or before any committee of this House, or endeavour, directly or indirectly, to deter or hinder any person from appearing or giving evidence, or attempt by persuasion, solicitation or advice of any kind to induce a witness not to attend or to withhold evidence or to give false evidence, or otherwise interfere with his freedom to form and express his own opinions honestly in the light of all the facts known to him.

• (1700)

He said: Madam Speaker, I did not want to deprive you of the privilege—I would have liked to have heard the terms of the motion in French; I think it would be good for members of the government side to become acquainted with them.

I was only persuaded to proceed this afternoon because members over there were so disappointed with the performance of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) last Thursday that I thought this whole issue should be reviewed and discussed again. I trust this will have the effect of persuading them to change their minds so that they will no longer be the unthinking members on the government side that they have been in the past. The motion is phrased in colourful terms. It states:

That this House holds that it tends to a contempt of parliament and a subversion of the constitution to assert, as did the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources before a standing committee in a previous session that a minister of the Crown may order a witness not to attend a committee or to withhold evidence from a committee where, in the minister's opinion, that witness has an advisory responsibility to the minister or the government;

Informs the minister and others of the government that the implementation of this pernicious doctrine by obstruction, threat, intimidation, molestation, offer of advantage, other corrupt practice, or at all, is a crime against the law and custom of parliament—

Had there been an opportunity, I would have amended this motion so as to include the Prime Minister and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) because they, too, brought themselves into contempt of the House, having asserted last Thursday and on other occasions that they possessed this right. However, I cannot change the motion now. I merely wish to make it plain that I am not picking on the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald). I am thinking, too, of the Prime Minister and his seatmate, the President of the Privy Council: the words have application to them. I bring to the atten-