

*Point of Order—Mr. Domm*

**Mr. Domm:** Madam Speaker, I think the comments made by the minister require a response. When the minister spoke to me yesterday about his request regarding privilege in the House and with regard to speaking to my question of privilege, I advised the minister at that time—since he has brought the subject up today—that if he brought the subject up again in the House yesterday, I would stand and ask for equal time.

That was our discussion. Having said that, he rose, and he now accuses me when I correct one word—which is further explained in the third paragraph—the word “minister” to “ministry”. There could be no doubt in the mind of anyone in this House who has listened to the conversation and my accusations since this dispute first arose over this misleading information that I was directing all my comments and my concerns at the minister’s ministry and not at the minister.

Having said that and made my comments yesterday, on which the minister has given notice of his intention to rise on a question of privilege, I then said to the minister that I agree that it is his department that I am criticizing. It is his ministry I am criticizing, and I have offered to change the word from “minister” to “ministry”. Having said that, the minister then stood up and pursued the subject by asking for an apology, which I consider is not necessary because I am not accusing the minister.

However, if the minister is not going to assume responsibility for his ministry and if his ministry is negligent and remiss and fails to give the right information out to a member of Parliament, then I do not intend to withdraw my accusation. The minister is responsible for his ministry, and he should not ask for an apology when it is his ministry which is negligent.

**Hon. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Madam Speaker, there is just one sentence I should like to utter. I hope the next time Your Honour rules with respect to a question of privilege that there is no question of privilege and that the matter is ended, that Your Honour will not allow hon. members to reopen it under the guise that there is a new point.

**Madam Speaker:** In reply to the hon. member, I think in some instances there might have been a fine line between discussing a new question of privilege and the one on which I had ruled, but as soon as I felt that that fine line was being trespassed upon, both hon. members came back to the question they were supposed to be debating. It often happens that an hon. member wanders by way of explanation without questioning the ruling. I do not think any hon. member did question the ruling.

However, the hon. member is right. Sometimes there is a fine line and I try to watch it, but as soon as I come to the point at which I want to intervene, things seem to be re-established.

**PRIVILEGE****MR. NIELSEN—EDITING OF OFFICIAL REPORT—DISCREPANCY WITH “JOURNALS”**

**Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, I have two questions of privilege, both related to *Hansard*. You will recall that on Wednesday, July 9, I raised a question of privilege with respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan (Mr. McRae,) who referred to “bushels of hay”, which expression was not accurately reflected. Indeed, it was changed in *Hansard* to refer to “bales of hay”.

In addition, you will recall in my remarks when I raised that question that I put before the Chair the deletion from the final record of a whole series of interjections which were in the blues, and which I personally read and checked before returning them to the *Hansard* office.

I want to refer to something even more serious with respect to *Hansard*, and I certainly do not attribute any motive here with respect to the admirable job being done by the *Hansard* reporters. But the malaise seems to have spread.

● (1530)

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Nielsen:** The members of the socialist party to my left might not be interested in running this place as democratic institutions should be run, on the basis of accuracy, but we are.

**An hon. Member:** What about the pipeline which is costing only \$22 billion?

**Mr. Nielsen:** On April 28 of this year—I am quoting from an extract from *Hansard* of that day at page 449—there appeared a motion put forward by the hon. member for Parkdale-High Park (Mr. Flis) to this effect, and I must quote it so that the differences become apparent. It reads:

That on the fortieth anniversary of the Katyn forest tragedy, this House sympathizes with fellow Canadians of Polish extraction over the great human sacrifices Poland had to endure during the course of the Second World War and declares that those who lost their lives at Katyn and all other sites of tragedy in Poland will long be remembered.

That is the exact verbatim quotation from *Hansard* of that day, and what prompted me to look at this matter was the motion of yesterday. But in checking the *Journals* of April 28 at page 86 and again *Journals* of April 30, page 104, we find the following:

Pursuant to Standing Order 43, on motion of Mr. Flis, seconded by Miss MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands), it was resolved—That this House sympathizes with our—

I emphasize the word “our”.

—fellow Canadians of Polish extraction over the great human sacrifices Poland had to endure during the course of the Second World War and declares that those who lost their lives at Katyn and all other sites of tragedy in Poland will long be remembered.

Madam Speaker, you will notice that there has been the insertion in the *Journals* of the pronoun “our” and the deletion from the actual motion cited in *Hansard* of April 28 of the