

*Privilege, Mr. Reynolds*

## MR. REYNOLDS—AVAILABILITY OF FUEL IN UNITED STATES TO CANADIAN AIRCRAFT—MINISTER'S ANSWER TO QUESTION

**Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta):** Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege revolves around an answer given yesterday by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) when I asked him about the differences between Canadian and American airlines in picking up fuel. He answered that he doubted that in fact Canadian airlines are treated any worse in the United States than American airlines are in Canada.

● (1410)

The facts are these. Pacific Western Airlines, which travels to Hawaii, has been given a quota of 75,000 gallons of gasoline a month with no guarantee that this will be increased or decreased in the future. This means the company will be obliged to cancel close to 10,000 passenger trips in the next quarter, which will cost this country money. In the United States Canadian airlines are paying 58 cents a gallon for gasoline, an increase from 14 cents only two months ago. American airlines flying into Canada, which are loading up excessively right now, are paying only 24 cents a gallon for gasoline, less than half of what they are required to pay in their own country.

My question of privilege arises because the Minister of Transport was aware of these facts—I know he has been sent telegrams and letters by these companies. I realize that in the past Your Honour has ruled that this might be a matter of debate, but I wonder how a private member, when a minister misleads the House either as a result of carelessness in his own office or simply because he wishes to mislead hon. members, is able to seek redress. I know the minister's facts were wrong yesterday. I know he was misleading the House and I think there should be some means by which private members can have the subject discussed in the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections so that ministers will give honest answers and we can solve the problems.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has given notice of his intention to raise this matter by way of a question of privilege. The hon. member thinks there should be some way in which disputes arising as to facts can be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. For the protection of hon. members, perhaps it is fortunate that the practice of the House does not make this possible, because if it did we should have to adjourn the House and spend a great deal of time in Committee on Privileges and Elections. The essence of proceedings in this chamber is that hon. members argue and debate about facts and interpretations of facts. I have to refer the hon. member and the House again to citation 113 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition:

Members often raise so-called "questions of privilege" on matters which should be dealt with as personal explanations or corrections, either in the debates or the proceedings of the House. A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in parliament... A dispute arising between two members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

The hon. member claims that inaccurate information has been given to him in response to a question. That may be so. I assume that the member or the minister who gave the

[Mr. Baldwin.]

information must believe his facts are correct. This is a dispute as to fact between two members. I have to say there is not a prima facie case of privilege which ought to be investigated by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

## RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES COMMISSION

## PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF OPERATIONS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the concern expressed by the Food Prices Review Board in connection with market concentration and restrictive trade practices in the food industry and in view of the fact that for the past two consecutive fiscal years 61 per cent of the operating budget of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, the agency responsible for reporting on such matters to the minister, has been allowed to lapse unexpended, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Nelson):

That this House instruct the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs to look immediately into the operations of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission and specifically into its failure to inquire into and report upon restrictive trade practices in the food industry.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** The House has heard the motion proposed by the hon. member. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is not unanimity.

\* \* \*

## LABOUR RELATIONS

## ONTARIO BILL RESPECTING SCHOOLTEACHERS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to propose a motion under the terms of Standing Order 43. The matter of urgent and pressing concern in the passage last night through second reading stage in the Ontario legislature of Bill 274. This measure, if it becomes the law of that province, will contravene basic civil liberties established in national and international law throughout the world. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn):

That this House instruct the Minister of Justice to examine Ontario Bill 274, and upon confirmation of its violation of the principle that a person has the right to leave his present employment, take the appropriate steps leading to federal disallowance of the legislation.