

S.O. 43

Then it lists (d), social insurance number. Since this matter deals with the Criminal Code of Canada and is under all the penalties of that act, using a social insurance number, would the minister—following his policy indication of yesterday—approach his colleague and have him take that out of the application which becomes effective January 1, 1979?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Because it does, in fact, involve the Criminal Code, there very well may be some positive elements for the protection of the innocent. As a result of using the social insurance number in this way, the individual who is charged is the individual they mean to charge, and not somebody else.

● (1202)

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): My supplementary is very simple. I take it that the policy statement made yesterday by the minister, that they are not going to encourage the extension of the use of the social insurance number beyond the areas parliament has approved, is not going to be supported by the government when it comes to the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General putting Canadians on the computer in the event of any infringement of the Criminal Code; because that is what happens in the case of failure under this act to make a proper application—you become convicted under the Criminal Code, it goes on to the computer, that goes on to the American computer, and we cannot cross the border of another country.

I take it, then, that the minister is repudiating the policy statement he made yesterday in so far as the Criminal Code and the gun laws are concerned.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I would commend to the hon. member a careful reading of the question which was put to me yesterday. We do not encourage the use of the social insurance number beyond the government aspect. Some people have said we are encouraging banks to use it, or encouraging private enterprise to do so, and we are saying we are not. We say there is nothing in the legislation which would permit us to prohibit the use of the social insurance number.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPRESENTATIONS THAT DANYLO SHUMUK BE ALLOWED TO EMIGRATE TO CANADA FROM U.S.S.R.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There remain outstanding a number of procedural matters, and I think we should understand the proper order in which we ought to deal with them now. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) is seeking the floor on a point of order, probably relating to the proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 43 earlier today. I received yesterday a notice from the hon. member for North-

[Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain).]

umberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) of a question of privilege; he indicated he wanted to proceed with that today. In addition I have just received notice of a question of privilege from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Martin). I think the matter arising today pursuant to Standing Order 43 should probably be dealt with and set aside first. Then I will hear the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham.

Before entering into discussion on the matter pursuant to Standing Order 43, I don't know, but the impression may have been created that I set aside that motion simply because the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham was rising in his place on some point of order with respect to it. If that is the impression, it ought to be set aside, because that was not the case.

What happened was that the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) rose and indicated in his preamble that the motion he was about to put was similar to, or basically the same as, the one put by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Siddon) a few days ago. At that time there were a number of negative voices. However, as the matter proceeded the number of negative voices gradually diminished. Notwithstanding this, when I did get to the point of putting the motion there was still a "No". I cannot attribute it to a specific member, but there was a very clear negative voice when I said "The House has heard the question—". At the same time the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham was on his feet on a point of order. That was not the reason for the setting aside of the motion.

This would be two tries at the same motion with respect to the same subject. I do not know whether the House wishes to try one more time to determine whether there is unanimous consent to deal with and pass that motion. If that is the disposition of the House, I am prepared to try, but it is an extraordinary thing to do.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am not disputing that you heard a negative voice. I want you to understand that. I can say, as a member of the House like yourself, that I did not hear a negative voice, and others were in exactly the same position on both sides of the House of Commons. I think the best way to handle the matter would be to recognize that the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) had consulted appropriately with our party—there were also consultations with the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Jamieson); I am grateful to him today for the consultations he had with me. I think it would be appropriate, now, if we were to revert to motions for the purpose of putting that motion and having it dealt with because it is important that the House express itself.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must say I had some impression that the resistance to the motion was not on the basis of substance but rather at the stage where the hon. member appeared to be moving a motion which was rejected at an earlier date—a similar motion from the other side of the House. It did diminish greatly, but it seemed to be still there at the end. I