

Unsatisfactory Reply to Question

this a matter of principle, because the government refuses deliberately to answer the questions we put to it.

Mr. Speaker: The member, in conformity with standing orders, gave me written notice of the question of privilege he intended to bring up.

He claims that a minister did not give him the information requested through a question on the order paper, and he made a motion to adjourn the house.

The hon. member for Lotbinière quoted the provisions of paragraph 3 of citation 181 of Beauchesne's *Parliamentary rules and forms*, and I quote:

A Minister may decline to answer a question without stating the reason for his refusal, and insistence on an answer is out of order, no debate being allowed. A refusal to answer cannot be raised as a question of privilege, nor is it regular to comment upon such refusal. A member can put a question, but has no right to insist upon an answer.

If, according to standing orders, a member cannot insist, by way of a question of privilege, upon an answer, it is obvious that a question of privilege cannot be raised when an answer has been given, even if the hon. member is not satisfied with it. Therefore, I must conclude that the question of privilege is not in order.

As concerns the adjournment of the house for the purpose suggested by the hon. member for Lotbinière, I suppose his motion is based on standing order 26. If so, the subject of the motion does not meet the conditions for urgency listed in citation 100 of Beauchesne's *Parliamentary rules and forms*. Anyhow, whether it is a pure and simple question of privilege or a motion under standing order 26, the rules do not authorize me to present the hon. member's motion to the house.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

First report of standing committee on agriculture—Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean).

[*English*]

Second report of standing committee on national resources and public works—Mr. Hopkins.

[*Note: Text of foregoing reports appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[Mr. Fortin.]

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT**REQUIREMENT THAT DRUG LABELS SHALL LIST INGREDIENTS**

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-140, to amend the Food and Drugs Act (labelling).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that pharmaceutical firms must state clearly on the package the side-effects of the drug. At the present time, no legislation requires, for example, the manufacturer of an antihistamic drug to indicate that his products might slow down reflexes or induce sleepiness.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

LABOUR CONDITIONS**NEWFOUNDLAND—UNEMPLOYMENT
RESULTING FROM FISH PLANT
CLOSING**

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the right hon. Prime Minister because the Minister of Fisheries is not in the house. In view of the really shocking telegram from the Minister of Fisheries to the Newfoundland Fishing Trade Association this morning, in which the government appears to wash its hands of any responsibility to help prevent the imminent closure of a number of fish plants in Newfoundland affecting some 6,000 plant workers and over 10,000 fishermen, leading to a crisis of catastrophic proportions if it takes place, will the Prime Minister indicate whether he is prepared to request the Minister of Fisheries to attend the house today to answer questions? Will he also indicate to the house whether the information conveyed by the Minister of Fisheries to the Newfoundland Fishing Trade Association is a final decision of the government in this regard?

Right Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Fisheries might be asked to answer the first part of the question tomorrow. I believe that yesterday he had already dealt with the question of existing and future programs, on which he will be making announcements at a future date. Obviously we cannot speculate