

[English]

PRIVILEGE

MR. KORCHINSKI—DELIVERY POINTS FOR GRAIN

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which I believe affects all members of the House. On Monday last I rose to ask the minister responsible for the Wheat Board to inform us whether the Wheat Board was providing an opportunity for farmers to deliver grain to more than one delivery point. He replied that the Board did this a year and a half ago. I pursued the question, thinking that possibly the minister did not understand what I was getting at. I asked him whether there was an opportunity to deliver to five or six alternate points—*Hansard* reported it as six. The minister said he had indicated in his previous reply that delivery could be made to any point and that this had been the situation ever since the Wheat Board allowed this to happen last year.

However, there was a point of confusion here because I am also a producer and as such I am entitled to a permit book. In applying for a permit book I have to indicate a primary delivery point plus one alternate point. I rose later on a point of order, hoping that perhaps the minister would be able to correct his reply and thereby avoid any confusion in the mind of anyone reading his reply. I asked whether he would take advantage of the opportunity to correct the impression he had given. He proceeded to state that for the third time that afternoon he could tell the House that grain could be delivered to any elevator in Saskatchewan.

I telephoned the Wheat Board and checked the accuracy of my information. I found that though the Board had made provision for the previous year, in subsequent years the situation will be such that there will only be one primary point and one alternate point. A representation has been made to me that prior to making any application a farmer should have the option of several delivery points, for various reasons, one being—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is surely not seeking the floor on a question of privilege in order to make a case for making alternate delivery points available, but to discuss whether the minister misled the House by giving the information he did. If there is nothing further the hon. member has to add, perhaps the minister could be allowed to reply.

Mr. Korchinski: Then I will forgo my further remarks, Mr. Speaker, and on the basis of the fact that these delivery points are not available, I move:

That the entire question of the minister's reply be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections to ascertain whether the minister has deliberately misled the House and, if such be the case, to recommend appropriate action thereon.

I will conclude by reminding the House that Mr. Profumo was asked to resign at one time because of a lie told to the House, and I certainly do not want such a situation to develop here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Privilege—Mr. Korchinski

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Justice): Even the hon. member for Rocky Mountain (Mr. Clark) might have withheld his applause until he knew the facts of the situation. I should have thought that the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) would have hidden his embarrassment at not knowing the facts in the first place and refrained from pursuing this matter any further. On the day in question—I refer to *Hansard* at page 6997—the hon. member for Mackenzie asked:

Has the Wheat Board given any consideration to providing the opportunity for farmers to deliver to several alternate points, not just the two points, one being the main point and the other an alternate point?

I answered that the Wheat Board had done that about a year and a half ago. Without checking the dates precisely, let me say this is precisely the fact, and obviously the hon. member for Mackenzie was not aware of it. Even though he is a producer, he does not know what almost every producer in the province of Saskatchewan knows, that the Wheat Board had, in fact, opened the thing wide. The hon. member now reports that he got a clue, from the way in which he was filling out his permit book, that the situation might be different next year. But he was asking me specifically with regard to the situation then, and his question went on to say exactly that, in effect, "Can I, for instance, deliver to six alternate points?" The answer is that he can deliver to six; he can deliver to 3,200 if he likes. That is a possibility right now, and that is how the hon. member was framing his question. It is clear that the hon. member persists in this matter in order to hide his embarrassment.

● (1520)

As for the further part of the question, let me give him this bit of information. While the alternate delivery point on a wide open basis is very much the general intention for the future, the Canadian Wheat Board wants, for a couple of reasons, to have the specific and alternate point indicated in the application form, first of all in order to have an indication of where the grain is likely to be delivered, and secondly because circumstances may arise at some time in the future where such a restriction has to be reimposed in the interest of the orderly delivery of grain. It is not the intention during the course of the bulk of the next year, except in exceptional circumstances, to have this restriction in fact in place; therefore, the hon. member has no need to worry about it.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is really something of an abuse of the privileges of this House for the hon. member to hide his embarrassment about not knowing the facts by bringing in a question of privilege on this point.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A disagreement between the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) and the minister has now been the subject of a number of questions in the question period, a point of order and a question of privilege. It is a disagreement and obviously remains a disagreement. Therefore, it does not constitute a question of privilege. Citation 113 is quite definitive and provides that a disagreement as to facts does not constitute a question of privilege.