

Committee Reports

minister's speech of last evening. My reason for bringing this to your attention is the refusal of the minister to comply. I will be very brief, and perhaps Your Honour can take this under advisement after having had a chance to examine the record.

I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, citation 159(2), which states the following:

A minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House, unless he is prepared to lay it on the table.

I submit that that citation is quite clear. I hope Your Honour will examine the record and perhaps make a ruling at a later date.

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I did not have an opportunity to hear all of the argument made by the hon. member. However, I would like to bring to Your Honour's attention, subject of course to verification in *Hansard*, the fact that my personal recollection is that I did not cite the letter in any way whatsoever. I did not have the letter with me. I do not know the contents of it by heart, and I did not cite it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would like to be clear. We seem to be talking about two different problems. I take it one relates to the possibility of the use of documents by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) during his statement on Friday, and I am not clear that there was at any time an application that, pursuant to that, any documents referred to by the Solicitor General might be tabled. Yesterday on a question of privilege the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) clearly referred to and quoted from a letter, but I am not aware that there has been an application pursuant to the reference cited by the hon. member that that document be tabled.

At the moment I am not clear whether in either case there has been a formal application to have a document tabled which was resisted, but I will check the record to see whether that has taken place and, if it has, I will consider whether in either case it was proper for the minister to resist the application.

Mr. Blaker: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I was a little confused about whether this matter related to the current Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer), but to the extent that I understood Your Honour's remarks, it does. On behalf of the minister I would like to check *Hansard* and, if necessary, perhaps the minister could be permitted to make representations on this point of order.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, the confusion which has arisen between the parliamentary secretary and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie) arising out of proceedings in the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications yesterday afternoon should not be left in the state that it is. There have been accusations of untruths. I think there was some mix up in translation, and the parliamentary secretary did not properly and adequately hear what the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre was saying.

Yesterday afternoon the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre did present a motion to the standing committee which was properly ruled out of order by the chairman. Later in the day at a later proceeding in committee, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre reintroduced the motion which the Chair ruled to be a proper motion but simply not possible to put in the context of the bill. There was an agreement that the steering committee would seek a remedy with respect to putting the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. The confusion has nothing to do with the denial by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre of the position taken by Mr. Taylor with respect to the morale of Air Canada employees in Montreal and other parts of Quebec. The two issues were quite separate.

● (1510)

I am sure the parliamentary secretary would not want that type of accusation to remain on the record with respect to the member for Winnipeg South Centre. I am sure the distinguished chairman of our committee would concur in that analysis of what took place.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I could quickly review today's proceedings. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie) put two questions, one of which was answered by the acting minister and one by the parliamentary secretary. The answer given by the parliamentary secretary was a rejection of the interpretation put upon the words of the president of Air Canada by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. In his question of privilege the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre went to the heart of the issue as to whether there was poor morale in Air Canada.

That may be an interesting point of argument. The point of privilege, if it did exist, would have had to be that it was the correct interpretation of Mr. Taylor's words by him rather than by the parliamentary secretary. Whether either or any of those statements is accurate or inaccurate is subject to debate. Clearly it constitutes a matter of disagreement or different interpretation between two members and does not constitute a question of privilege.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Ninth Report of Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs—Mr. MacGuigan.