

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, December 16, 1974

The House met at 2 p.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

## EGG MARKETING

First report of Special Committee on Egg Marketing, in the two official languages.—Mr. Fox.

[Editor's Note: For text of above report see today's Votes and Proceedings.]

\* \* \*

[English]

## PRIVILEGE

MR. LA SALLE—REFERENCE TO REMARKS OF HON. MEMBER FOR TÉMISCAMINGUE

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, this is the second or third thrilling instalment of the question of privilege which has been raised before Your Honour in this House concerning comments made by the hon. member for Témiscamingue. I think it is good that this matter be settled and I may say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to move a motion at the conclusion of my remarks provided, of course, that Your Honour finds after discussion that there is a prima facie question of privilege.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member. However, I think we are all aware that on Thursday evening the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) made certain remarks which are the subject of the general question with which the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) proposes to deal. Those remarks allegedly involved the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) who raised the matter on Friday, and was supported in that by the hon. member for Peace River.

There can be no question in my mind that those two actions on Friday made it apparent that the matter should be dealt with at the first opportunity. The hon. member for Peace River was good enough to give me notice of his question of privilege. I am most anxious to deal with this problem, and I thank the hon. member for raising it because I think the House ought to give its attention to this. I notice, however, that the hon. member for Témiscamingue is not in his seat at the moment and I feel that we ought not to deal with it when the hon. member is not here. I wonder under the circumstances if it might not be simpler to agree to defer it until tomorrow.

Is that agreeable?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## MANPOWER

LOCAL INITIATIVES PROGRAM—DENIAL OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN AND NOVA SCOTIA—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43 relating to last week's announcement by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) that an additional \$4,914,100 has been allocated to the 1974-75 Local Initiatives Program. In view of the fact that LIP is a national program, designed to benefit Canadians in all parts of the nation and in view of the fact that three provinces in Canada, namely, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia have apparently been precluded from participating in the latest funding, I move, seconded by the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse):

That this House instructs the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to consider including the three provinces which have been arbitrarily excluded from these extra funds and to make additional funds available in proportionate amounts for selected areas of need in Nova Scotia, Manitoba and Saskatchewan; and that the minister should, at the first opportunity on motions or otherwise, provide the House and the country with the rationalization for leaving out three of Canada's provinces from a program which is national in scope, at a time when economic conditions are uniformly worse all across the nation.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The House has heard the terms of the motion being proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43. The motion cannot be adopted without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There not being unanimous consent, the motion cannot be debated at this time.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

TABLING OF FOURTH REPORT OF CLERK OF PETITIONS—RULING BY MR. SPEAKER ON READING OF REPORT

**Mr. John Roberts (St. Paul's):** Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, December 11 when the fourth report of the Clerk of Petitions was presented Your Honour indicated some doubts or concern about whether a request which I presented to have a petition read was one you could accept. As a result of your invitation for some contribution on this issue I have done some research on precedents and I think I now know more about petitions than I really want to know. You indicated concern about the language of the petition and mentioned twice in your remarks that a petition should not have in it any reflection upon a decision taken by this House, the government, or by other