

Business of the House

to adjourn at ten o'clock. But I believe there is an understanding that a late show will take place tomorrow night.

One of the problems had to do with when members could be informed of the questions that would be scheduled. I think we are agreed that that could be done by five o'clock this afternoon.

Since there is agreement among the three of us, perhaps that could be made an order of the House.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, so that it could be made an order I would like to say that we concur. I think it is an excellent idea.

Mr. Collette: Agreed, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: The House agrees. It is therefore so ordered.

Mr. Collette: Madam Speaker, in relation to the discussion we have just had, we neglected—obviously because we are not sitting tomorrow—to announce the business today, and should inform hon. members that the President of the Privy Council informed me a minute ago that we will be dealing with the Judges Act, which is Bill C-34, on Monday next.

Mr. Knowles: Ahead of freedom of information?

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, did I hear correctly that we will be dealing with the Judges Act ahead of freedom of information? What is the matter with this government? We had a great argument a few moments ago when the Minister of Communications complained that we cannot deal with these bills expeditiously; he will want to go outside the chamber and blame that on the opposition. I want the public to know that the government prefers to deal with the salaries of judges first, over freedom of information, and I think that throws a lie, if I may use that phrase, or casts a pall over the kinds of things we have been dealing with.

Is there any chance that the government will change its mind with respect to that order of business prior to Monday? If the parliamentary secretary would tell me that, it would be very helpful.

Mr. Knowles: Madam Speaker, I join in this protest vigorously. Every time we have had a lineup of business, including business such as the freedom of information bill and the bill regarding judges salaries, I have received from the government the commitment that the freedom of information bill was to come first and that the Judges Act was to come later. The other day when we were dealing with the Post Office the problem was to get it out of the way so that we could get on to freedom of information and judges salaries later. For the parliamentary secretary to stand up now and tell us that on Monday we are not going to deal with freedom of information but a bill to raise the salaries and pensions of judges is making a travesty of this place, and it is quite a reflection as to the government's priorities.

Mr. Collette: Madam Speaker, I was trying to be helpful in view of the previous questions put by the hon. members. It seems that they are willing, likely and liable to make political points out of the order of business, and I can only say to my colleague, the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton, that he knows that the government is flexible on all matters.

Mr. Epp: Oh, yes, like the committee.

Mr. Collette: The hon. member made a representation on the floor of this House a minute ago, as did the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. All such representations are taken into consideration. Basically I was trying to be helpful to the House by informing it of information I had just received.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. SHIELDS—INTERPRETATION OF SPEECH IN FORT McMURRAY

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I have always made it abundantly clear in this House and in my constituency that the delays in the construction of the Alsands plant in Fort McMurray and the plant at Cold Lake in my opinion were caused by the lack of an oil pricing agreement between the province of Alberta and the federal government. Last evening the hon. member for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Simmons) clearly questioned my integrity when he said the following about me:

The disappointing thing—

He was referring to me.

—is that he did not say in the chamber last night what he said in Fort McMurray last Friday before his constituents.

The hon. member claimed that he read something.

Also I read the comments he made in Fort McMurray last Friday night.

To my knowledge the comments I made in Fort McMurray last Friday were not printed, and I suggest that the hon. member should have to produce my printed comments.

The hon. member said that I laid the blame squarely upon the government of Alberta. The hon. member for Burin-St. George's is clearly accusing me of saying things which I have not said. This undermines publicly my credibility as a member of Parliament. However, more important, it undermines my position in my community and thereby interferes with the job I do. Because of the communication gap which exists between northeastern Alberta and this House of Commons, my constituents depend on me to carry back to them clear and precise messages and to repeat to them the things I say in this chamber. The hon. member continually spreads falsehoods and half-truths. This particular member seems to have done this on a number of occasions in a misguided attempt to feed what appears to be—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me I heard a word which is not very parliamentary. Perhaps the hon. member would like to rephrase his sentence. I do not think an