

Routine Proceedings

there is a great deal of money invested in that site. A lot of the construction work has been done. There are contractors in all areas of northern municipalities who stand to lose a great deal of money. That is how I became involved in this question, because some of the contractors are in my riding and they contacted me. They said: "What is happening? Why are we being treated this way?"

The government keeps saying that it is going to this new contractor. The tender from the new contractor is no longer active so they have to get new prices from him. The story goes on.

Meanwhile, I am told today that the owner of Cohole Development is delivering a \$2 million callable bond to the people in Toronto. I am asking that they continue to look at this matter, to stop the massive losses, not only of those contractors but of the government itself. It has invested many dollars in this project.

When the foundations are in, the site has been cleared, the steel has been done and the architectural work has been done, it is a serious business to suddenly change the site completely. They are going from one end of town to a completely new site owned by Nelson Brothers Construction, there is no doubt in my mind.

I will tell you that I hope the hon. member for Timiskaming will lead the way in making sure that the government treats absolutely everyone as fairly as possible.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the hon. member for Timiskaming in a moment, but I may be able to assist the House.

I have listened very carefully to both sides because the issue is complicated, but the issue that I have to resolve is simply this: in the way the question was put, is the hon. member for Sudbury out of order or has there been a breach of privilege with respect to the position of the hon. member for Timiskaming.

• (1040)

I remind hon. members who may want to say something about this that this is the quote: "I want to know the real reason behind this nonsense. Is it because the owner of the second sight and the member for Timiskaming just happen to be brothers-in-law?"

That was then denied by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works. Someone then shouted out: "It sure helped the brother-in-law", and another hon. member said: "all in the family".

I have to take the mood that was created by the question somewhat into account. That is basically where the Speaker has to decide whether those words were appropriate under the circumstances, whether they were something that was a breach of order in the House or whether they go further.

Mr. MacDougall: Mr. Speaker, your words are exactly all that I want to be concerned about.

It is strictly a business agreement between Public Works and the tenderers. My concern is to clear my name and my family name.

Mr. Speaker: I think in keeping with the other matter which we discussed a little earlier this morning, I am going to look at this carefully and consider it.

I do point out that however I decide, I think hon. members can see how when an imputation is made by way of a question or by a response by a minister, it becomes very personal and can be hurtful. There is difficulty that it creates in the Chamber and with each other.

I am going to look at it and see if I can come down with a procedural response which is appropriate. I thank the hon. member for Sudbury. I know she had some difficulty being here yesterday. I received that message very early in the morning and I appreciate the fact. I hope that the hon. member would pass on to her staff our appreciation. That message was brought.

I appreciate the tone set by the hon. member for Timiskaming in bringing what certainly is to him a painful matter to the House.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

ANNUAL REPORT: EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT, 1991

TABLING OF REPORT

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration) and Minister of State (Seniors)): Mr.