

I was interested to learn from the Postmaster General (Mr. Côté) that this subject has been raised three times. I am somewhat surprised at this. I am sure that when the original debate on this subject took place in the House most hon. members were bombarded by communications from all these organizations about the possible effects of the new legislation. I would be surprised if any such organization or non-profit group which found it was being forced out of business had not communicated with the Postmaster General or another cabinet minister and sent a copy of that correspondence to certain Members of Parliament. I am sure that such organizations would send copies of their correspondence to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who occupies a strategic position which in matters of this kind enables him to put embarrassing questions to the government during the question period.

I believe the Postmaster General has fully explained the reason why these documents were not revealed to the hon. member. Principally, it is a question of cost and common sense. Surely all hon. members of the House have received a list of the names of most of the organizations which were severely affected by that legislation. This matter boils down to a question of cost. The minister indicated that it would be necessary to search 5,000 files, which would take about 540 hours and cost over \$2,000. Surely this is reason enough for not producing the documents.

[Translation]

**Mr. Prosper Boulanger (Mercier):** Mr. Speaker, having listened very carefully to the hon. minister and heard the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), we are now sufficiently informed about the question and we might proceed to the vote.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** Is the House ready for the question? All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** In my opinion the nays have it.

**Mr. Orlikow:** On division, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** I declare the motion negatived.  
Motion negatived.

**An hon. Member:** Six o'clock.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** Do hon. members agree to call it six o'clock?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** In view of the very light attendance in the House, and because I have not

### *National Security Measures*

had much time to prepare a few remarks, I shall not abuse my powers of poetic licence at this time.

At 5.40 p.m. the House took recess.

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### NATIONAL SECURITY

#### APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION TO DEAL WITH EMERGENCIES CAUSED BY LAWLESSNESS OR VIOLENCE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner, Ottawa-Carleton (for the President of the Privy Council):

That a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons be appointed to examine, inquire into and report upon the nature and kind of legislation required to deal with emergencies that may arise from time to time in the future by reason of lawlessness or violence in Canadian society and that endanger the existence of government or the maintenance of the peace and public order;

That twelve members of the House of Commons, to be designated by the House at a later date, be members of the joint committee on the part of this House;

That the committee have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House;

That the committee have power to report from time to time, to send for persons, papers and records, and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee;

And that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours thereof.

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few comments with regard to the acceptance of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). I would willingly give up the opportunity to speak at this time if the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) would give a binding agreement to this House that the concerns expressed in the amendment will be covered. We could save a great deal of time if the Minister of Justice would give that assurance. Without that assurance it would be more appropriate to discuss the legitimacy of the motion rather than the legitimacy of the amendment.

I understand that it is one of the unwritten parliamentary rules that we do not engage in hypothetical discussion in this House or in committee, yet in the motion before us we have such a hypothetical situation. The main question that should have been considered prior to debating the acceptance of this amendment is whether the motion is in order.

• (8:10 p.m.)

We are being asked to consider emergencies which might arise from time to time in the future, but the motion does not suggest the form these emergencies