Petitions

PRIVILEGE

MR. FRIESEN—ALLEGED MISLEADING REPLY OF MR. AXWORTHY

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Madam Speaker, on May 28 I rose to ask a question of the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy) regarding his policy of an across-the-board promotion of immigration officers at Canada's major airports, and he responded, in part, as reported in *Hansard* at page 10012 of that date:

Those were the discussions we had with the unions, and they are in agreement with the basic redrafting of the categories we now have implemented in the department.

My question of privilege is not a matter of a disagreement with the minister, or taking a different point of view; it is a fundamental matter of being able to believe the minister and whether he has accidentally or deliberately misled the House with the information he gave me in his answer of that day.

Yesterday I received by courier, priority or not I do not know, from the Canada Employment and Immigration Union a statement that refutes categorically the statement the minister made in the House. I quote just briefly from that letter to indicate that the minister misled me in the House in the answer he gave me. The official—

Madam Speaker: Order. I get the impression very clearly that the hon. member is entering into debate. There is a disagreement between what the hon. member thinks the minister has told him and what in fact are the facts. That does not constitute a question of privilege.

Furthermore, a question of privilege should be raised at the first possible opportunity. This question dates back to May 28 and, therefore, if it had been a question of privilege it must be settled on an urgent basis; otherwise neither the House nor the hon. member would be able to function. I think the fact that the delay is so long in itself proves that this is not a founded question of privilege. Therefore, I must rule that the hon. member does not have a question of privilege.

Mr. Friesen: Madam Speaker, on a further question, I received this letter only yesterday—

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

PETITION

MR. SKELLY—HEALTH PROBLEMS AND FINANCIAL LOSS ATTRIBUTED TO USE OF UFFI

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Madam Speaker, I wish to present a petition on behalf of a number of individuals requesting assistance from the government in meeting prob-

lems associated with health and financial loss over the urea formaldehyde problem.

[Translation]

CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH JULES AND PAUL-ÉMILE LÉGER FOUNDATION

Hon. Francis Fox (Secretary of State and Minister of Communications) moved that Bill S-23, to incorporate the Jules and Paul-Émile Léger Foundation, be read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[English]

REGULATIONS AND OTHER STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

CONCURRENCE IN FOURTH REPORT OF STANDING JOINT

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe) moved that the fourth report of the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments, presented to the House on Thursday, July 17, 1980, be concurred in.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Beatty: Madam Speaker, as I rise today to move the motion for concurrence in the fourth report of the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments, I have in my hand Volume 1 of the Consolidated Regulations of Canada. Those members of the House who have taken the time to read Volume 1 from cover to cover, as I am sure most members have, will know there are some 775 pages in Volume 1 and that the volume weighs some 5.5 pounds. This is only one volume of a series of volumes of the Consolidated Regulations of Canada. In fact, there are some 18 volumes which all told include some 14,420 pages.

The contents of the Consolidated Regulations of Canada are probably not fascinating reading which most Canadians would have beside their beds each night to read before drifting off to sleep. They contain a number of regulations, a number of ordinances and other provisions which often appear from their titles to be a bit archaic. We have the Guardianship of Veterans' Property Regulations, the Dominion Water Power Regulations, the St. Andrews' Airport Zoning Regulations, the Flying Control Locks Order, just to give four examples of some of the regulations that are contained within these 18 volumes. Also included within these 18 volumes are regulations which affect every Canadian and touch every aspect of our lives, and often which are much better known to Canadians.

Parliament has granted to the government authority to regulate virtually every aspect of our lives, from the homes we