

[English]

BRIDGES

VANCOUVER HARBOUR—GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL
CONTRIBUTION TO CONSTRUCTION OF PROPOSED
THIRD STRUCTURE

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Is the government prepared to make its promised contribution of some \$123 million to assist the city of Vancouver with its transportation difficulties and for whatever form of transport the city council decides is most desirable?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I do not recall any such commitment. I would need more details.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, would the minister refresh his memory on the details of the matter? Also, since the Minister of the Environment and the minister responsible for urban affairs have recently made contradictory statements on the matter, would the Minister of Transport set the public mind at rest with a policy statement on government policy on the proposed third crossing?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, I think everything that we can say on the subject has already been said.

Mr. Lewis: On both sides.

Mr. Jamieson: After all, a bridge that does not have both sides is not much of a bridge, is it?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

IMMIGRATION ACT

INQUIRY AS TO AMENDMENT—SUGGESTED REFERENCE
TO COMMITTEE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Manpower and Immigration in the hope that the answer may be more informative and less voluble. In view of the fact that amendments to the Immigration Act, which was supposed to be amended last session, do not appear on the new list of legislation for this session, has the government abandoned any intention of amending the Immigration Act to clean up the existing mess and, if so, will the government do what it can to have the matter referred to a committee for attention?

• (1150)

Mr. Ray Perrault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in the course of reviewing his new ministerial responsibilities, my minister is studying the Immigration Act and any suggestions that it be amended.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before we call orders of the day, I believe the hon. member for Calgary North wishes to raise a point of order.

Release of Yves Geoffroy from Penitentiary

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

RELEASE OF YVES GEOFFROY FROM ST. VINCENT DE
PAUL PENITENTIARY—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF
LETTERS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I want to refer briefly to page 51 of *Hansard* for February 21, yesterday, where the minister said:

On June 28, 1971, Mr. Geoffroy sought permission to marry Miss Carmen Parent with whom Mr. Geoffroy apparently had had a continuing liaison. The reason he cited to support his request was that marriage would provide a mother who would look after the needs of his three children—

The minister quoted from a letter written by Mr. Geoffroy. He may have taken the quotation out of context. We do not know what the rest of it contains. The minister quoted this part:

At present they are being looked after by my family. However, no one is legally authorized to look out for their education or to request social assistance on their behalf.

At the bottom of page 51 of *Hansard* the minister quoted from a letter written by Miss Cornellier:

Miss Cornellier wrote that both brothers, and I quote:

"suffer from fairly serious cardiac pathology and therefore in the event of death, the children would be destitute. In this event, Miss Parent could support and take responsibility for the children, the marriage giving her the right to be their guardian."

We then come to the question of a public document. The minister referred to a letter from the Reverend J. A. Nickels, Chief of Chaplaincy Services, in which he said:

In view of the positive nature of the reports, approval is given for the marriage.

I do not want to prolong this point, but in light of these and other statements surely the minister, having given his undertaking yesterday that if there was any irregularity or illegality he would agree to an inquiry, should now be prepared to file these documents. I refer to page 134 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, 1958, citation 159:

A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House, unless he be prepared to lay it upon the table.

That is what I am asking the minister to do, to lay these documents upon the table. The situation is similar to the rules of evidence in a court of law which prevent counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence. For example, if a lawyer refers to a letter and reads one paragraph, then in the normal course of events the judge says that the whole letter must go in as evidence. The whole document has to be produced.

There is a reason behind this idea of jurisprudence. By taking a couple of lines out of context you may leave the wrong impression. If the whole document is tabled it will be before the House of Commons. If the minister refuses to disclose these letters, I ask that an order go forth that the documents connected with this affair shall be produced and be tabled now in accordance with the rules. I ask for such an order. I believe Your Honour has this right under the rules. At the top of page 135 of Beauchesne it is set forth that Your Honour has the right to make such an order, if necessary.