

*Tabling of Documents*

I have attended appointment hearings, and the very first question raised by members of the Opposition is about membership of a political Party. We know what members of the Opposition are trying to achieve. They are trying to build up a record so that they can rise in the House and say that only Conservatives were appointed. Particularly in respect of human rights, I know of several members of the Conservative Party who in the past wanted to serve on human rights tribunals but were never permitted to do so, even though they had distinguished careers in the area. They were never permitted to serve because they were members of our Party. There is a small group of human rights people who feel that unless we adopt its narrow view, we are no longer qualified. That is what they are trying to do, and that is fundamentally wrong.

I think, Mr. Speaker, you could take it as judicial notice that a question of privilege must be a most serious matter. This question of privilege does not qualify, as the vast majority of applications do not qualify. It is simply an attempt to discredit the Government in any way possible. It is unfair to the people who have given of their time to stand for public office. I submit that it should be dismissed out of hand for that reason alone.

**Mr. Speaker:** If it is the general disposition of the House, I think this is the appropriate place to move on to another proceeding. I want to say to the Hon. Member for Burnaby and to the Hon. Member for Hamilton East that I will consider very carefully their representations. I say to all other Hon. Members that the Chair will give the matter full consideration.

Also I say to them something about which some Hon. Members with a lot of experience in the House may be wondering, that is, why the debate has gone on as long as it has. It has gone on as long as it has because, in the opinion of the Chair, when all Hon. Members agree upon parliamentary reforms—and clearly the whole process we are discussing is one of those reforms—it takes a while for them to find out how to make a new approach work. I hope the discussion which has taken place today will assist Hon. Members in making the system work.

The Chair will look very carefully at the evidence which has been given here and at the comments of all Hon. Members. I say to all Hon. Members who have contributed to the discussion this afternoon that the Chair is grateful for their interventions. It is to be hoped that the Chair can make a ruling on the matter which will assist the House to continue in the spirit of reform, and at the same time have appropriate consideration for the sensibilities of witnesses who are called in front of committees of the House. The Chair will endeavour to deal with the matter in an appropriate way. Again I thank all Hon. Members for their interventions. If it is the disposition of the House, the Chair would now want to move on to other matters.

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS***[Translation]***UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

## TABLING OF REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 67(2), I wish to table, in both official languages, two copies of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry on Unemployment Insurance.

\* \* \*

**LAW REFORM COMMISSION**

## TABLING OF THIRTIETH REPORT

**Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** As Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, report No. 30 of the Law Reform Commission of Canada entitled "Recodifying Criminal Law", Volume I.

\* \* \*

**UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

## RESUME OF REPORT OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, we have just tabled in the House the Summary of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry on Unemployment Insurance.

*[English]*

I want to thank the commissioners for their efforts on what is acknowledged by everyone to be a complex issue. We regret that the commissioners were unable to present a consensus report.

I am tabling the report of the commission which includes a minority report of two commissioners and supplementary statements by four commissioners.

*[Translation]*

Over the past few years the Macdonald Commission, the Newfoundland House Commission and others have analyzed the unemployment insurance system. The recommendations flowing from these various studies do not necessarily reach a consensus.

The Government does not endorse the Forget report nor any other, and it will not respond directly and specifically to the Forget report recommendations. However these reports will be used as background papers whenever the Government undertakes a study of the unemployment insurance question.