

● (1520)

## POINT OF ORDER

MR. WRIGHT—BILL C-30—QUESTION TO PRIME MINISTER  
RELATING TO STATEMENTS IN STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Bill Wright (Calgary North):** Madam Speaker, I hope you will entertain my point of order. It is related to a statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) yesterday in this House. I was able to check *Hansard* today, and I believe this is a point of order.

I asked the Prime Minister a couple of questions, and in his non-answer to me he said that we should all be aware of commenting on what happens in committee. The question I asked him related to statements made in committee on July 10 with regard to Bill C-30. That bill has been passed in the House, and I asked him questions which were asked in the committee in relation to that bill. They were incidental to the bill, but they were still asked during that period of time. I have checked *Beauchesne*, and there is no objection to my asking any question in this House related to any item which was in committee, which has come back to the House and which is the property of the House.

[Translation]

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** That is no reason, Madam Speaker, for the hon. member not to have looked into or not to look into what went on in committee. Be that as it may the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has given more details in his answers to the hon. member's questions so that he surely got a more complete answer than he was expecting on the point he had raised. So the Prime Minister started by telling the hon. member, and I recall that very well, that he should be aware of what goes on in committee, but the Prime Minister did not stop at that, he went on with his answer. I do not think the hon. member has a right to complain.

\* \* \*

[English]

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Oberle:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My point of order is not entirely unrelated to the discussions which have been going on here, but it is more with respect to House business. A report in *The Globe and Mail* seems to indicate that it is the intention of the government to bring in a freedom of information bill before Friday or before the House recesses.

That being the case, I wonder if the President of the Privy Council could indicate whether that is the case, whether such a bill is being introduced and whether it is also the intention of the government, jointly or embraced within that bill, to keep a promise which was made in the throne speech with respect to section 41(2) of the Federal Court Act. Will that also be introduced before Friday?

## Point of Order—Mr. Domm

[Translation]

**Mr. Pinard:** Madam Speaker, we keep our promises, and this very day a notice has been given for the introduction of such legislation.

\* \* \*

[English]

## POINT OF ORDER

MR. DOMM—REQUEST FOR APOLOGY FROM HON. SECRETARY  
OF STATE

**Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough):** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I ask if the Chair would entertain a response from me with respect to a request for an apology from the Secretary of State (Mr. Fox). Can that question or request go without an answer, or would Your Honour entertain my comments on his request for an apology?

[Translation]

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** Yes, Madam Speaker, I suggest the hon. member has a nerve to rise on this subject. Through a correction made to *Hansard* he has managed to get away with it after having unjustly accused the minister yesterday. Had he had a minimum of courtesy he would have apologized and withdrawn his allegations. Rather, he chose to proceed by way of a correction to *Hansard*, which does not show much courage to start with. So I regret to see him bring back this subject and try to have a follow-up on the request made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Fox) who asked him in a very courteous and parliamentary way to withdraw his statements. So not only did he act in a less than courageous way by proceeding through a correction to *Hansard*, but he should have withdrawn his words, pure and simple, and he should have apologized to the minister for having misled the House.

[English]

**Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Madam Speaker, I submit respectfully that the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) acted quite appropriately. In fact, I can tell Your Honour that he was seeking the floor precisely for the purpose of correcting the record so that the record would be clear. I think that was an appropriate action for him to take.

Given the appropriateness of his action, I say with respect that it would be inappropriate—if the hon. member feels there is a unjust accusation in something the minister has said—if the hon. member is not allowed to reply. Then the Chair would have both sides of the issue, if there is an issue, before it in order to make a decision.

**Mr. Domm:** Madam Speaker—

**Some hon. Members:** Come on.

**Mr. Waddell:** You are wasting the time of the House.