

ment for not providing information with regard to air crashes. Finally the minister's office came up with the additional 20 pages. This is further evidence as to why we should proceed with Bill C-40 at this time when we have statements such as this one.

I discussed this accident with the widow of one of the victims last Sunday and she informed me—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I think the hon. member, being on a procedural point, should stick to the merits of the question of privilege.

**Mr. McKenzie:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Even the widow could not receive the full report. So I would like to ask the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, either to withdraw his remarks that this documentation is available through making inquiries to his department—because in fact it is not available; this one page document he gave me is not complete as there are 20 other pages to be attached to it to have the full report—or explain why he cannot provide us with the full documentation when we phone his department with regard to accidents. As I have said, this is further evidence why Bill C-40 should be proceeded with immediately.

**Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this question of privilege in support of my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie), arising out of the same answer that the minister gave on February 8, as reported at pages 3013 and 3014 of *Hansard*.

● (1510)

The minister in his answer indicated that his department was a very open one and that reports of the kind to which we referred during the question period, reports emanating from the Ministry of Transport having to do with air safety, were placed in the library and were available to the public. My question arose from the fact that back in December of 1977 I asked the Minister of Transport whether he would make available to the House the northern Ontario aviation safety report undertaken by Messrs. Carswell and Slaughter. At that time the minister said he would look into the matter and determine whether it could be made public. The other day the minister gave us to understand by his answer that the department was an open one, that this information was there, that it had been indexed and placed in the library and that it was available to all members who desired to obtain it.

After that exchange had taken place I contacted the library and asked for the full report. I was told the full report was not available in the library either on paper or on film. A copy of an abridged version together with a press release the minister had issued was the only material available to me. Thus, when the minister suggests that his department is open and that reports of this nature are made public, when he suggests that all members have to do is contact the library and obtain copies of the reports they desire, his statements are not in accordance with the facts. If he is not misleading the House he is treading

*Privilege—Mr. McKenzie*

close to doing so, and I suggest the matter be either clarified by the minister or taken under Your Honour's advisement.

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. members who have spoken, particularly the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie), have carried on their usual tactic of trying to introduce all kinds of extraneous matters by way of debate under the guise of a question of privilege, thereby taking up valuable time which would otherwise be available to the House. Of course, they are never likely to let legislation move along easily in this House so they raise these questions time and time again. I presume they had to give Your Honour notice of a question of privilege. I am a little surprised that in this case they did not have the courtesy to give me notice too, so that I could be sure of being here. I was almost out of the chamber before they raised the matter, again an example of the way in which they like to proceed.

The fact is that if you look at my response you will see I was not saying that that particular report would be made available. I was not dealing with that issue; it is one which still has to be reflected upon by me. There are certain things of a confidential nature which come before the ministry of transport and which cannot be made public. I refer particularly in this context to transcriptions of recordings of conversations between pilots and controllers.

There is a bill presently before the House on first reading which has in it a potential for public access to material of this sort, private conversations between controllers and pilots, and I have already indicated—I say this again because I know there will be some concern on the part of pilots and controllers—that I intend to be very open during the committee stage to hear their view as to what additional control ought to be placed upon those matters; their right to privacy demands that there be some protection against too wide open access to material of this kind. There are other matters of a confidential nature which come before government; nearly everyone recognizes that they must remain confidential. That is done. Our objective within that department has been to keep this material within as narrow limits as possible.

I discovered that one of the reasons a number of things were not made public was because they were not of such a nature that anyone wanted to expend the money on printing and publishing them, or, indeed, translating them so that they would be available to all Canadians. In respect to those cases I devised a system a few years ago which now obviously embarrasses hon. members opposite who are presently supposed to have a responsibility in transport; they do not realize they have access to this material. We devised a system of making available documents in our library under which people who wanted copies could obtain them at a charge. Literally every document which did not have some specific, traditional and well accepted reason for being kept confidential is indexed and made available in that library. I do not know the precise number—30,000 or 40,000 documents I think it is—but I will check that figure so that the hon. member does not raise a further question of privilege based on whether I said 30,000