

Privilege

concern to this House and to all who cherish and respect this institution.

As Speaker of the House, and upon its instructions, I therefore reprimand you as guilty of a breach of privilege and of a gross contempt of the House.

The hon. member may retake his seat.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, may we have an outline of the business for the next week?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): It is my intention tomorrow to call Bill C-22, the bankruptcy legislation, for completion at second reading.

Hopefully we will have completed Bill C-12 this afternoon but if that is not the case, we will proceed with C-12 tomorrow.

On Monday it is my intention to call Bill C-36, dealing with the conditional release of prisoners, to begin and hopefully complete its second reading stage.

On Tuesday and Wednesday of next week it is my intention to call for report stage and hopefully completion of report stage and commencement of third reading of Bill C-17, dealing with firearms.

On Thursday, November 7 it is my intention to call Bill C-31, the Extradition Act, the act to make our extradition procedures more efficient, and to complete third reading on Bill C-17 at that time should it be necessary. I will have the usual consultations with House leaders with respect to Friday of next week.

* * *

• (1510)

PRIVILEGE

COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege arises from Question Period. When you have the opportunity to review the "blues" from the first answer of the hon. Minister of the Environment, I believe that you will find that there is in fact a *prima facie*

case not of debate but of the minister presenting information contrary to the facts. That might be described as an intention to mislead the House.

The reason that I say that is there is a memorandum from the Director General of Operations of the Federal Environment Assessment Review Program office to the minister which has two sentences completely contrary to the facts that the Minister of the Environment placed before the House during Question Period. I quote them: "If approval is sought from the Governor in Council it will be seen as an effort to bypass the EARP, it could lead to a legal challenge similar to that mounted against the exemption order for the Kemano completion project in British Columbia. Given that a Governor in Council decision is soon going to be announced regarding the transit of nuclear submarines through Dixon Entrance, the issuance of another Order in Council for a similar activity on the west coast could draw undue attention to the use of this technique to avoid the application of the EARP".

That was provided to the minister. It is now a public document. Mr. Speaker, I believe that you will see that there is a *prima facie* case that what the minister said about the Kemano court ruling of May 14, 1991 is not sustained by the facts.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Bill Attewell (Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville): Mr. Speaker, this point also deals with Question Period.

I think one of my privileges should be to ask a question. In 45 minutes we on this side of the House were only permitted two questions, and as well the procedure is that we cannot even ask a supplementary. Surely it is not asking too much of the Speaker to allow this side to ask at least three questions.

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, to facilitate his particular objective perhaps the hon. member could have conversations with the government House leader and the parliamentary secretary and then the matter could be raised at a House leaders' meeting and we could extend, for the benefit of all and with the consent of all, the length of Question Period to accommodate the hon. member.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, with regard to my hon. friend's intervention I would like to