

Benson and his remarks. In particular, I should like to quote the following:

Mr. Benson said the decision to try a new approach, through wage and salary guidelines, was taken after the Canadian Labour Congress convention in Edmonton last month showed no willingness on the part of labour to support the voluntary restraint program of the Prices and Incomes Commission.

It would be unrealistic to expect such guidelines would attract support from any substantial segment of organized labour.

Mr. Speaker, I know that two explanations can be advanced. One is the usual course of picking the exact words, the exact question asked by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands and the exact reply, and saying, "See, it really was not incorrect; it really stands up if you examine it." I know that the other explanation or defence will be that the announcement was not made by the government but by Dr. Young.

Mr. Speaker, surely we are old enough around here to know that the Prices and Incomes Commission now speaks for the government. We are old enough to know that it would be impossible for the Minister of Finance not to have thought of these things on Tuesday of last week and yet by Friday be ready to agree with Dr. Young.

If I have gone a little farther than I intended in documenting the question of privilege, I ask Your Honour's forgiveness because I do not want to put Your Honour in the position of having to decide from the Chair today that, ipso facto, there was a case of deliberate misleading. But I do plead with Your Honour, because of the fact that there was all this confusion last week, because there is a real difference between what was said in the House and what happened in Winnipeg, to agree that we have a question of privilege, and that a committee should go into it. I go back to what I said when I first got to my feet, that one of our basic rights is the right not to be misled, the right, when the government makes a statement on the floor of this House, to believe it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If that right is destroyed it will be pretty hard for this place to carry on. In view of last week's developments I believe that the people involved should be asked to appear before the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections so that we may go into this matter and clarify it. Accordingly, if Your Honour should rule that I have presented a prima facie case

Proposals Respecting Wage Restraints

of privilege I would be prepared to move the following motion:

That the apparent conflict between statements on income restraints made by the government on Tuesday and Thursday, June 2 and June 4, in the House of Commons, and the position taken by the government on Friday, June 5, at a federal-provincial conference of finance ministers at Winnipeg, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, so that the said committee may call witnesses and take whatever steps it deems necessary to clarify this situation.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the two previous speakers that it is important that the House be not misled.

An hon. Member: You do it all the time.

Mr. Trudeau: I am afraid both of them have misled the House as a result of their inaccurate reading. They have misled the House by indicating that my answers in some way had been less than truthful. Well, Mr. Speaker, in order for them to establish a prima facie case it would be important for the hon. members to read the questions to which I gave the answers. As the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) indicated, I have not spent the weekend reading *Hansard*, but I did—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau:—while they were talking look at the questions that were asked of me. In every case they were talking to the imposition of taxes on wage gains or to compulsory measures. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) on page seventy-seven twelve, in the right-hand column, is asking—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is page 7712.

Mr. Trudeau: It is seventy-seven twelve or 7712. I do not think there is much difference.

Mr. Sharp: They think we are misleading the House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: He asked if there was to be "a proposal for imposing a federal tax on wage gains in excess of the guidelines", and so on. The next question he asked was a repetition. He asked about "a proposal for a tax on any wage gains in excess of the guidelines", and so on. The hon. member for Peace River lower in the same column