

Privilege—Mr. Stevens

the motion. The chairman then ruled there was no quorum and refused to put the question. He did this by ruling that a member of the official opposition who was present was not a member of the committee inasmuch as neither he nor the committee clerk had been notified under Standing Order 65(4)(b).

If the Chairman had not been notified, as he alleged, Mr. Speaker, that was a deliberate failure for which the chief government whip is responsible. The appropriate change in membership had been effected by the responsible officials of the official opposition chief whip's office in plenty of time for the chief government whip's office to make the change. I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the government has a majority sufficiently large to supply members on committees at all times. Yet in this case they left one sole member on the committee, the hon. member for York Centre. There is no reason for these government members to be absent from their duties in committee and, if it please them, to outvote opposition members in committee under the rules. To fail in their duties as members but yet to obtain their way by trickery and obstruction markets them as devious, and the government to which they adhere as devious. I leave the conduct of the chairman and of the minister to their several consciences: I merely point out to the chairman that his conduct is not conducive to co-operation.

The result of this deviousness and obstruction of the business of the committee will probably be that vote L20 will not be considered; it will be deemed to have been passed and reported to the House. No consideration will have been given by the committee to the dubious expenditure of almost \$40 million of public moneys for a questionable adventure. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the same Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce circumvented the same committee in the last parliament with respect to a similar purchase.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the hon. member can confine himself to the events at hand.

Mr. Stevens: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am prepared to move, if you find my question of privilege is well founded:

That the subject matter of this question of privilege be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

If Your Honour decides that the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization is more appropriate, I will so change my motion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I see the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan) rising in his place to speak to the question of privilege. While this might tend to lend some balance to the remarks which have been put forward by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), the fact of the matter is that both hon. members must realize that proceedings in a committee may be all of the things that have been described but they may have been otherwise motivated. However, surely it is not for the Chair to judge what the motivations were or whatever the actions were on the part of members of the committee as referred to by the hon. member for York-Simcoe.

The fact of the matter is that even if I accept all of the descriptions of the motivations involved and the results thereof, I am sure the hon. member is aware that even if

[Mr. Stevens.]

the descriptions were correct in every case, with regard to which I am sure there must be dispute—otherwise the hon. member for York Centre would not be seeking to enter the question—none of the actions so described constitute a question of privilege.

Mr. Lefebvre: Mr. Speaker, you have ruled that this is not a question of privilege, but since personnel in my office have been mentioned I think it is up to me to make sure that this is rectified, and with your permission I should like to do so.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have ruled on the question of privilege without giving the hon. member for York Centre the chance to speak. Having ruled on it, I really feel that there should be no further comment.

Mrs. Appoloni: On the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I should like the record to show that the hon. member for York South (Mrs. Appoloni) was present at that meeting and doing her duty.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE**PROVISION TO INCREASE PENALTIES FOR IMPAIRED DRIVING**

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-391, to amend the Criminal Code (impaired driving).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Ellis: Mr. Speaker, the bill I propose will provide for more appropriate penalties for conviction on charges of impaired driving. Specifically, the bill provides for penalties of imprisonment from nine months to ten years where death results, and from six months to five years where injury results. The bill further provides for stiffer penalties even if death or injury does not result. These range from a fine of \$50 to \$500 for a first offence to imprisonment for three months to 12 months for a third offence. In addition, conviction on any of these charges would result in loss of licence to drive for up to three years.

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

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**THURSDAY AND FRIDAY OF THIS WEEK ALLOTTED DAYS**

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I should like to confirm that Thursday and Friday of this week be allotted days, pursuant to Standing Order 58.