

I want to go on to say that what is on the record in Parliament, and can certainly be referred to in this House, are the words of Commissioner Inkster to the committee.

If, rather than the staff sergeant's words being stated in court, they had been made in an interview to the press or a speech before an audience, then I doubt very much if the parliamentary secretary would be attempting to say that we cannot go into the implications of the his words in light of the testimony by Commissioner Inkster, apparently contradicting those words, before a parliamentary committee.

So, I ask you to consider, Sir, from the parliamentary perspective, which perspective deals with the words of Commissioner Inkster, why it should make any difference whether the words of the staff sergeant were stated in court rather than to a journalist or to a meeting or to somebody whom he ran into in the street. In all these cases the issue, I submit, arises with respect to whether what was said in a parliamentary committee gives rise to the issue of contempt of Parliament.

So, I respectfully suggest to you, Sir, that we want to be sensitive to the whole matter of *sub judice*. However I repeat briefly what I said yesterday, it is for the purpose of protecting the accused and ensuring the accused a fair trial. It should not be for the purpose of enabling the government in any way to escape its responsibilities.

So, I submit to you, Sir, that I think there could well be a basis for you to look favourably on the request which has been made to you. I do, however, want to say that while I think there is a basis for this, if you accept the request and rule that there is a *prima facie* case of privilege, our practice does require that the motion ask that the matter be sent to the Standing Committee on Elections and Privileges. But aside from that, I think that there is a basis for your accepting the request that there is a *prima facie* case of privilege. I respectfully make that submission.

Mr. Speaker: I think I have heard sufficient on this. I take it the hon. member for Oshawa is prepared to move the appropriate motion if I should decide that way.

There are two issues involved in this application. One of them, of course, is the general issue of *sub judice* to which the hon. parliamentary secretary has referred. The other is the issue of a situation which is taking place in a committee. Under all the circumstances, I will reserve

Routine Proceedings

and I will try to come back to the House and deal with both this issue and yesterday's issue at the same time.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF REGIONS

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration) and Minister of State (Seniors)): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table in the House of Commons, in both official languages, the report of the comprehensive review of the unemployment insurance regions.

* * *

ORDER IN COUNCIL

TABLING OF APPOINTMENTS

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of Order in Council appointments which were made by the government. Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(1), these are deemed referred to the appropriate standing committees, a list of which is attached.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

GROWING TOGETHER—A VISION FOR CANADA'S AGRI-FOOD INDUSTRY

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, I wish to table a document, in both official languages, entitled *Growing Together—A Vision for Canada's Agri-food Industry*.

* * *

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both