

*Privilege—Mr. Parry***PRIVILEGE****ALLEGED INCORRECT ANSWER DURING ADJOURNMENT
MOTION PROCEEDINGS**

Mr. John Parry (Kenora—Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege arises out of a statement made last night during the adjournment debate proceedings by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Thacker). I feel that my privileges may in some way have been infringed upon by letting stand on the record of *Hansard* a statement which is in fact untrue. More to the point, I believe that when a statement that is false is allowed to remain on the parliamentary record, the privileges of all Members of this honourable House are in fact impaired.

Hansard is used as a journal of record, and while obviously it records the partisan interpretations, the invective, the differing analysis of the three Parties, nevertheless I believe that where a statement is presented as fact, it should really be fact. The specific statement made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport is found on page 16317 of *Hansard*. In talking of documentary evidence he stated:

Despite persistent efforts by my officials to get a copy of this document, a copy has not been forthcoming.

The Parliamentary Secretary was talking about an export permit related document, in fact, a packing slip, and this document, which had been requested from my office by Mr. David Ryan, the Director of Export Control, on May 12, after my question, was unfortunately not sent to Mr. Ryan until May 17 because of a problem in identifying which part of the documentation was required and because of the intervention of a long weekend.

Nevertheless, this document was indeed, contrary to what the Parliamentary Secretary said, sent to Mr. David Ryan, the director of Export Control, and, indeed, the Government already had possession of a copy of that document, or should have had, if the export control process was working because right on the packing slip it says that a copy is to go to the Department of National Defence as part of the export permit process.

Therefore, should you, Mr. Speaker, find there is a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege involved in that statement, I would be prepared to move the appropriate motion. Should you not find such a *prima facie* breach of privilege, I would nevertheless request that you refer this question, not as a specific instance but as a matter of general practice, to the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure in order to determine what measures could or should be taken to ensure the veracity of the parliamentary record.

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am sure this does not constitute a question of privilege. However, notwithstanding that, my colleague opposite has raised a problem and I am more than happy to refer it back to the officials and try to get

the correct chronology. We will get to the bottom of it one way or the other.

Mr. Parry: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Parliamentary Secretary for that assurance and I should have pointed out in presenting the question of privilege that there was absolutely no reflection intended on his veracity or sincerity, since he was merely presenting the notes the departmental officials had given him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair thanks both Members for their comments and their graciousness.

* * *

[Translation]

POINT OF ORDER**CORRECTION MADE BY HON. MEMBER FOR SAINT-DENIS**

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) on a point of order.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I said yesterday in the House on the debate on a Member's motion and the two votes that if I was mistaken, I would not hesitate to apologize today. I just wanted to tell you that I do not have to apologize because I was not mistaken. It is true that Raoul Wallenberg is already an honorary Canadian citizen.

So, Mr. Speaker, you know that the Speaker did me the honour of appointing me chairman of the legislative committee on the Bill to amend the Bretton Woods and related agreements. I have the honour to report to the House, to show that cooperation still exists and that there is no boycott and everything proceeds normally when people want to cooperate. If only the spirit of the legislative committee that studied the Bretton Woods and related agreements prevailed in this House, we would not have had this morning's unnecessary debate.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**BILL C-126—PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF LEGISLATURE
COMMITTEE**

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of reporting to the House that the report of the committee I have the honour to chair, on the subject of Bill C-126, an Act to amend the Bretton Woods and Related Agreements Act, will be tabled and that pursuant to order of