

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, February 19, 1973

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MRS. MacINNIS—STATEMENTS BY PRIME MINISTER RESPECTING POSSIBILITY OF CONTROLS ON FOOD PRICES

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, according to media reports the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) stated over the weekend that suggestions that controls be put on food are crazy. He added that this could not be done without rationing. He stated further that countries that have imposed controls have all excluded controls on food.

My point of privilege is that the statements of the Prime Minister prejudice a decision which the Special Committee on Trends in Food Prices has the power to make and his statements are therefore in contempt of the committee, which means they are in contempt of parliament. If the Prime Minister feels he has to make statements of this kind, and since he cannot make them on the floor of parliament while this matter is in the hands of the committee, the place for him to make such comments is before the committee itself, either as a witness or by becoming a member of it. If you find, Mr. Speaker, that I have a prima facie case of privilege, my motion would include a recommendation that the Prime Minister appear before the committee at an early date.

When the Prime Minister appears before the committee I trust he will be prepared to substantiate his statement that countries that have imposed controls have all excluded controls on food. The fact is that what he is saying is not true. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter of debate, but my point of privilege is that the place for this debate is in the committee. Mr. Speaker, if you find that I have a question of privilege I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the statements made outside the House by the Prime Minister concerning controls on food prices be referred to the Special Committee on Trends in Food Prices and that the Prime Minister be requested to appear before the said committee.

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure whether the right hon. Prime Minister wishes to reply to the point made by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway. In any event, there should be no debate. But the Chair, by long-established practice, has allowed a member who has been referred to in a proposed or alleged question of privilege to reply if he wishes to do so. If this is not to be done in this case, I should have to remind the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway that it has long been established that statements made outside the House by a member of the House cannot form the basis of a question of privilege. On this basis the motion proposed by the hon. member for Van-

couver-Kingsway cannot be put. I rule that there is not a prima facie case of privilege.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

MANPOWER

CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF LOCAL INITIATIVE PROJECTS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I request unanimous consent from the House to move a very important motion concerning the Local Initiative Program and its administration.

In view of the very high flexibility of the criteria used in approving those projects which have been submitted and in view of the very large number of disappointed applicants, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise):

That the administration of the Local Initiative Program be immediately reviewed by the appropriate standing committee of this House; and that this same committee call as witnesses the minister responsible for this program as well as all officials directly involved in approving projects, in order to throw light on the real criteria used for approving local initiative projects.

Mr. Speaker: Under Standing Order 43, this motion requires unanimous consent from the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: As there is not unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

[English]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PICKERING AIRPORT

Question No. 50—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. Does the government intend to proceed with the Pickering Airport?