

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I think we are still having some discussions regarding the general policy and the Minister of Justice has written me a letter commenting on the document. I will see what the cabinet is going to decide about that. As far as the Crownsnest pass rates are concerned, I have said, so many times in this House, what I think about them that I do not think I have to repeat myself.

**Mr. Horner:** A short supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can I assume from the minister's remarks—I have always had confidence in his view of the Crownsnest pass rates—that he is still fighting with the Minister of Justice, and that the Minister of Justice still wants to destroy those rates?

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Minister of Justice wants to destroy anything. I think he is trying to protect the western farmers and I support him in his efforts.

\* \* \*

### MANPOWER

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH PROGRAM—SUGGESTED INVESTIGATION IN VIEW OF ALLEGED STATEMENTS BY VANCOUVER CO-ORDINATOR

**Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of charges of patronage in connection with the awarding of OFY grants levelled by a Vancouver alderman last week, and an admission by the program co-ordinator in Vancouver that they try to keep patronage to 12 per cent in British Columbia and to 25 per cent in Quebec, and in view of the fact that delay in cabinet approval of the program results in hasty decisions on applications and the awarding of funds only to people with the ability to find their way through the process, would the minister call for an immediate investigation into the OFY mess?

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know one comment that the hon. member made in his preamble to the question that has any validity whatsoever, and I see no reason for an investigation on that basis.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Yewchuk:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a brief question of privilege. With the greatest respect to Your Honour, I think that when a member is recognized for the purpose of asking a supplementary question, he should be given the courtesy of completing his question before another member is called upon.

**Mr. Speaker:** With due respect to the hon. member, his difficulty arose from the fact that he was attempting to say that the answer that had been given by the minister was not an answer. It was, therefore, difficult to recognize him to continue with a supplementary in those circumstances. I think that the hon. member is the author of his own misfortune.

*Privilege—Mr. Kaplan*

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

#### PRIVILEGE

##### MR. KAPLAN—PROCEDURE FOLLOWED IN STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Bob Kaplan (York Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege of which I have given you notice. Yesterday in *Hansard*, as reported at page 5915, column two, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) accused me of obstructing the work of the House finance committee, which I chair. He said:

This obstruction was carried out on Thursday, May 15, by the newly elected chairman, the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan)—

The issue before me, Mr. Speaker, was whether there was a quorum to vote an estimate. I followed the Standing Order, pursuant to which there was no quorum present, and held that I could not put the question. This is the conduct which the hon. member characterizes as obstruction. The hon. member has accused me in committee of being biased, high-handed, autocratic and of twisting the rules.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

● (1500)

**Mr. Kaplan:** I reject all these descriptions as unjustified and totally misrepresentative of my conduct, and offensive to me as a member of parliament. The quorum rule of our committee is clear, and it is in writing and I applied it. Anyone is entitled to disagree with the ruling of the Chair, but accusations of obstruction put my chairmanship in question, especially on my first day on the job. I would accept the apology in the House of the hon. member.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Kaplan:** If you find this is a prima facie case of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin):

That the question of my chairmanship ruling as to a quorum in the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, as referred to by the hon. member for York-Simcoe in *Hansard* on May 20, 1975, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I do not know whether there are other members who want to contribute to this very interesting question of privilege, but I would propose to re-examine the words of the hon. member and the comments of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), who allegedly made the remarks initially, and give the matter some consideration before making a ruling.

**Mr. Clarke (Vancouver Quadra):** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to rise on a point of order at this time, but I was not at all clear, from the answer given me at the close of the question period by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras), whether he is in disagreement with a statement made by his officials in Vancouver concerning the OFY program. I understood him to say that he was not sure about the validity of my comments. Let me point out that I was merely asking the minister to conduct an