

ment so that hon. members would have an opportunity to compare that document with the majority report of the conciliation board and the House could satisfy itself if in fact changes were made. The minister has refused to do so. Therefore I move, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 17—this is the first and only opportunity I have had to raise the matter—that the substantive matter contained in my question of privilege, whereby the House would have an opportunity to compare the government's position with the conciliation board report—be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member rises on a question of privilege and proposes that a motion be debated by the House at this time relating to a dispute between himself, possibly other members, and the minister as to the facts. There are many authorities as the hon. member and hon. members generally well know, to the effect that a dispute as to facts or statements made in the House cannot form the basis of a question of privilege. I would think that the motion proposed by the hon. member is a substantive motion and cannot be debated at this time under the heading of privilege. I would hope that the question as to what was or was not said, or what the facts were, could be pursued by the hon. member for St. John's East or by other hon. members in some way other than a debate under the heading of privilege.

• (1430)

**Mr. McGrath:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I ask for the unanimous consent of the House so that I can table the two documents and the House can then make its own judgment?

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

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There are two difficulties here. One of them, of course, is that by the rules of the House and the practice of the House there is no provision for private members to table documents as is suggested by the hon. member. Even if this were done by asking for unanimous consent, the hon. member has heard, as I have, that there was not unanimous consent, so that second aspect in hypothetical.

**An hon. Member:** Who said no?

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the hon. member can ascertain that. As far as I am concerned I go by my ears and I heard that there was not unanimous consent. Therefore, obviously the motion cannot be put.

**Mr. McGrath:** Mr. Speaker, is the government House leader prepared, with the consent of the House, to table under the provisions of Standing Order 41 the government's memorandum of settlement so that the House may make a judgment on this matter?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, an answer to that question has already been given by the Postmaster General.

**An hon. Member:** What are you hiding?

### Oral Questions

[Translation]

#### MANPOWER

##### LOCAL INITIATIVES PROGRAM—INQUIRY AS TO REASON FOR DELAY IN APPROVING PROJECTS

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

With regard to the LIP projects submitted to the officials of his department since December 5 last, is it normal that it should take so long to reach a decision? Can the minister tell us why it is taking so long to give an answer?

[English]

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I hate to disagree with the hon. member but I think that by any past standards—and there is only one previous year of experience—we are dealing with these projects and approvals faster than previously. We have had some 14,000 projects from which to select those we can honour or approve, and a budget of \$165 million versus appeals for something like \$473 million. As of this date we have approved \$128 million in projects, and we are pressing to get final approval through for the rest of the projects so they can come under the remainder of the allocation.

[Translation]

**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question.

Can the minister tell us how many projects have been accepted out of the 17,000 submitted to date?

[English]

**Mr. Andras:** Mr. Speaker, the best information I have right now is 4,195.

[Translation]

##### LOCAL INITIATIVES PROGRAM—INQUIRY AS TO NUMBER OF PROJECTS APPROVED IN EASTERN TOWNSHIPS

**Mr. Heward Graftey (Brome-Missisquoi):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary?

Can the minister explain why, compared with last year, less than half the projects in the Eastern Townships of the province of Quebec alone have been approved so far?

[English]

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, nationally I think the ratio of 4,195 approved to 14,000 received indicates that if the hon. member has had half his projects approved he is in pretty good shape.

**Mr. Graftey:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister again why in the region I represent only half the number of the projects have been approved in comparison with last year?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi—order, please.