

union. The former postmaster general, the Hon. Bryce Mackasey, made this suggestion from time to time.

I think it would be very useful if the hon. member's motion were accepted and this matter could be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. For example, it would be useful in resolving some of the tension that exists in the Post Office Department at the moment. I say this because there is a movement afoot where responsible members of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers are anxious that the confrontation which has persisted far too long should come to an end and that the process of reconciliation should commence. For example, in the Vancouver local, they have elected a new president. The position there is a more moderate one. What took place in Toronto just before Christmas is indicative that the vast majority of postal workers are anxious to get to the root cause of the confrontation that has been expressed so eloquently here by the hon. member who presented this resolution.

I would just bring this matter into focus. I strongly support the recommendation that it be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. I believe a discussion there would have a very beneficial effect.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member has raised a question that is always interesting, that is, the position of a member in speaking for the record of the House for the proceeding in parliament and the definition of a proceeding in parliament as it applies to the immunity from prosecution, particularly in the civil sense, in a lawsuit for libel or slander that may result from any remarks that a member makes in the course of his duties, and whether the precedent as it applies to a proceeding in parliament extends through committees and beyond that, as the hon. member stated today, to matters which flow directly from that particular proceeding in parliament.

There are, however, a number of other difficulties that will require some considerable research, not the least of which is whether this House at this stage should take any steps which would interfere with the prosecution of a lawsuit that is duly constituted in the courts. Whether the lawsuit is with or without merit, as the hon. member has argued, and whether it is proceeded with diligently or intermittently is a matter for the courts once the matter is before the courts.

The hon. member has raised several matters which may be more germane to the defence of the action than they are to an argument on privilege. Again that is a difficulty. I do not make a final decision on that. In the final analysis, I am not sure if any relief could be offered to the member by this House in any case, even if the House were to decide that the matter may have privilege surrounding it in such a way that it should be considered on a priority basis by the House and, if the decision were made to move it to the committee, whether that in any way could interfere with the progress of the lawsuit.

Those are all questions that would have to be answered. They certainly will require some considerable research which I

### *Introduction of Bills*

would be glad to undertake on the hon. member's behalf just as soon as I can get out of the chair this afternoon.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### CANADA LABOUR CODE

#### AMENDMENT GUARANTEEING RIGHT TO WORK

**Mr. Frank Maine (Wellington)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-452, to amend the Canada Labour Code (right to work).

**Some hon. Members:** Explain.

**Mr. Maine:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to protect an individual's right to work, thereby ensuring an individual's right to join and maintain membership in a union, and also an equal right not to join or maintain membership in a union. This right to work legislation will protect the basic right of individuals to choose either membership or non-membership in a labour organization. It does not, however, interfere in any way with legitimate union activity, nor does it restrict the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively with their employers.

This bill would provide the basic right of citizens to earn their livelihood as voluntary union members or as non-union members, and it would guarantee that no individual could be denied the opportunity to obtain or retain employment because of membership or non-membership in any labour organization.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 940, 1,199, 1,269, 1,380, 1,408 and 1,420.

[Text]

#### MIRABEL AIRPORT—COSTS

Question No. 940—**Mr. Jones:**

1. What was the total cost for the construction of the Mirabel Airport and what is a breakdown of such costs?
2. Since the Airport has been in operation what was the monthly (a) cost (b) revenue (c) profit or loss?
3. Are the costs to amortize the debt for costs of construction taken into consideration in such a figure and, if so, what are the particulars and details of each item?