

*Privilege—Mr. MacGuigan*

consideration, is being hindered by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

If I have a legitimate question of privilege, I would therefore reserve my right to move a motion that it be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

**Madam Speaker:** On proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 43, the Chair only determines whether there is unanimous consent. That is the only thing that is relevant to motions under Standing Order 43.

MR. MACGUGAN—COMMENT OF HON. MEMBER FOR LEEDS-GRENVILLE

**Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, I believe I have a question of privilege because the hon. member for Leeds-Grenville (Mr. Cossitt) opposite has misstated what I shouted across to him in the House.

I have never challenged his right to present any motion in the House, including a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43. I was suggesting that if he wanted my consent he might let me know in advance so that I could consider the terms of his motion. If he did not understand that, then he has not spent as much time in this House as he should have.

**Mr. Cossitt:** On the same question of privilege, Madam Speaker—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I have not given the hon. member the floor. I do now give him the floor. The hon. member for Leeds-Grenville.

**Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds-Grenville):** Madam Speaker, the minister has told the House that I did not listen to what he said. I do not know whether *Hansard* will pick it up, but I do know that when he yelled "No" in a very loud voice and when I asked him why, he said, "Because you did not consult". The minister made it very clear that that was why. In other words, he laid down the regulation that those of us on this side of the House must consult with him if we wish unanimous consent.

That was the point in my previous question of privilege. He has twisted what he said himself into something else entirely in order to try and make it look as if I am raising something that is not so. But he knows what he said. I hope the record will show what he said, and he is very definitely infringing on the privileges of members of this House.

[Translation]

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** Madam Speaker, I think one thing ought to be made clear. What the hon. member just said is not totally accurate. The minister said that if the hon. member wanted to move a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43, he was absolutely free to do so on any subject at all, insignificant though it might be. We are used to hearing silly motions in this House. However, the minister said that as far as he was concerned, if the hon.

member wants the minister's consent and not the unanimous consent of the House and if the minister refuses to give his consent, logically unanimity no longer exists. The minister would rather be consulted in advance because in the field of external affairs, most matters are touchy. It is a simple matter of politeness and courtesy.

I do not want to compel my colleague to be courteous and polite, but I would not want him to feel offended if he does not have the minister's consent on issues of external affairs. What the minister said in no way infringes the privileges of the hon. member or of other members of the House. Progressive Conservative members have the right to move any motion they wish under Standing Order 43, it is their privilege as it is the privilege of all members of the House. We have nothing against that. However they should not take exception to the fact that there is no unanimous consent or that they are not getting the consent of a particular member or minister. Every member on either side of the House has the privilege of answering yes or no to these motions.

Again, Madam Speaker, all members are absolutely equal. So if it is true that the hon. member is at liberty to move any motion he wants, insignificant as it may be, it is equally true that all members, be they ministers or Progressive Conservative or New Democrat members are all free to say yes or no. That is the way the Standing Orders of this House are set up.

**Madam Speaker:** It is clear that we are engaging in a debate on what a minister or a member said or did not say. Therefore this does not constitute a question of privilege.

[English]

MR. HOVDEBO—ROGERS PASS PROJECT—REMARKS OF MINISTER OF TRANSPORT

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege regarding an answer given to this House by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin). This was an answer to a question about corporate blackmail by Canadian Pacific Railway in threatening to freeze the \$300 million Rogers Pass project until Ottawa agrees to reverse the Crownest rate for grain shipments. The minister's answer as it appeared in *Hansard* yesterday is as follows:

● (1210)

Madam Speaker, one of my dedicated assistants was in touch with the CPR this morning, and I am somewhat amused by the result of that call as the CP rail authorities maintain that they have been misquoted on this subject. So, for a change it is interesting to see that businessmen can also be misquoted. This is not what they meant to say.

We have confirmed that the statement which I used yesterday was not a misquote, that the several reporters who were present all came away with a similar understanding. There has been no retraction from Canadian Press, and the Edmonton *Journal* had an almost identical story yesterday. It therefore appears that the Canadian Pacific Railways misled the minister in suggesting they had been misquoted and that the