

members that that kind of complaint or grievance could be found every day and we would spend the entire time of the House considering presumed or suggested questions of privilege.

If the hon. member feels there is a question of privilege, he should make his point as quickly as possible. He has before him a document and has referred to certain pages. I understand he has now reached page 5 where there is another statement to which he takes exception. My interpretation of what he has said up to now is that he may have a complaint, but I still do not see how this can be considered a question of privilege that ought to be referred to a committee or investigated by the House, or that should be the subject of a debate this afternoon.

Mr. Alexander: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, you know I always abide by your rulings, but this is an extremely important matter which constitutes a question of privilege. If this were a general investigation implemented by the government I would have to sit down, and I will do so in any event if you suggest I should. But this was an investigation carried out as a result of specific terms of reference which called not only for an investigation of one side of the question but of both sides. My point in respect of this report is, Sir, that it seems to me only one side of the matter has been investigated. That is my question of privilege. I am sure hon. members would like this to be a fair report, but I must say that the report is unfair and misleading to the House. This is so because when a report is tabled and no one stands up to question it, it is immediately put out on the street and everyone thinks it is all right because the members of the advisory committee have investigated the situation. I say they have not done so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the advisory committee has not investigated the whole situation. I do not want to abuse the rules of the House. I did yesterday because I was carried away, but in this case I believe I have every right to bring this point to the attention of hon. members.

Yesterday the minister, for the first time, referred to disentitlement rather than disqualification. Hon. members apparently did not catch the drift of that. I know how it started but I will not point my finger at the hon. member who wanted it cleared up. There is a vast distinction between disentitlement and disqualification. We did not ask for an investigation in that regard; the advisory committee was not asked to make such an investigation. I suggest that is very clear.

I think I have made my point, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to thank you for the indulgence you have shown to this point. I do believe that when the government requests the advisory committee to look into allegations it should look into all the allegations, as the minister said it would. I respectfully suggest it has not done so. In view of the terms of reference, the least the advisory committee might have done was study both sides of the matter, and particularly those complaints in the city of Toronto which initiated the whole matter.

Indian Affairs

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has risen on what he considers, with respect but very strongly, to be a question of privilege. I have not been convinced that it is a question of privilege. In accordance with our practice, the minister or another member to whom the question of privilege is directed is allowed to comment. I have no objection to the minister commenting now, although I doubt that whatever he may say will change my view as to whether this is a question of privilege.

I would hope that we might try to get on with the business that is before the House, which I believe was a motion by the hon. member for Skeena. It was somehow sidetracked. The minister is seeking the floor and I will recognize him. I will then recognize the hon. member for Skeena who had the floor before this suggested or alleged question of privilege was raised. For the moment, I will recognize the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

● (1510)

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, point of order, or whatever you want to call it, I find that the most incredible, the most significant and most interesting omission in all the bombastic rhetoric we have heard, with all these quotations from this document I have just tabled, is the failure of hon. members to read the final paragraph in its entirety, although the hon. member came close to it. I quote:

The committee will now undertake the second phase of its study and concentrate its efforts on a review of the operations of the program, from the standpoint of the claimant, and examine the appeal procedures available to the claimants and other related matters. These considerations will constitute the second part of the committee's interim report of its review of the benefit control program.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair will recognize the peaceful and non-controversial member for Skeena.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

On the order: Motions:

April 4, 1973—Mr. Howard.

That the second report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, presented to the House on April 4, 1973, be concurred in.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): With the sort of precise recognition you have just given me, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but get unanimous consent for what I asked earlier.

Mr. Speaker: My understanding is that the hon. member for Skeena was seeking unanimous consent for the submission of his motion for concurrence in the second report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

An hon. Member: Absolutely no.