

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, January 24, 1969

The house met at 11 a.m.

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

#### PRIVILEGE

MR. MAJOR—PROTEST CONCERNING STATEMENT OF HON. MEMBER FOR SHEFFORD—OBSERVATIONS BY MR. SPEAKER ON PROCEDURE

**Mr. Speaker:** I received earlier today the following notice from the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Major):

I hereby wish to advise you that, pursuant to standing order 17 (1) and (2), I should like to raise a question of privilege in the house, today, this 24th day of January 1969, at the eleven o'clock sitting.

I take this opportunity to point out to hon. members the provisions of standing order 17 and more specifically, subsection (2) of that order, the terms of which follow:

(2) Unless notice of motion has been given under Standing Order 42, any member proposing to raise a question of privilege other than one arising out of proceedings in the Chamber during the course of a sitting shall give to the Speaker a written statement of the question at least one hour prior to raising the question in the House.

The hon. member, as other hon. members in the past, merely gave notice to the Speaker that he wishes to raise a question of privilege and it seems to me that that interpretation of our standing orders is not quite accurate.

Not only must the hon. member advise the Speaker that he wishes to raise a question of privilege, but he must also reveal its nature. It seems to me the English version is perhaps more specific in that it stipulates as follows:

"—shall give to the Speaker a written statement of the question".

I think it would be preferable, in the future, for the hon. members who wish to raise a question of privilege, under the provisions of standing order 17, to not only advise the Speaker, within the time limit stipulated by the standing order, that they wish to raise

a question of privilege, but also to give an indication of its subject matter.

**Mr. Robert-B. Major (Argenteuil):** Mr. Speaker, since it was very late yesterday when we received the official report of the House of Commons Debates for Wednesday, January 22, this is the first opportunity I have to raise this matter.

On that day the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) put to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Hellyer) the following question, and I quote:

Can he tell the house if he will make investigations on the mining rights presently owned by some financiers in the far north of Quebec, who are not only interested in seeing the future international airport built on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, in order to meet their needs better, but who have recently paid the cost of a study conducted by a certain firm, in co-operation with five members of parliament, in order to prove that the future international airport should be located at Sainte-Scholastique, in the constituency of Deux-Montagnes?

Mr. Speaker, the report on the study concerning the Montreal international airport, which was submitted to the Department of Transport by the Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes intermunicipal board was commissioned and paid for by that board, in a spirit of co-operation and motivation seldom displayed by public bodies.

The 43 municipalities in Argenteuil realized, as early as last summer, the economic significance for our area of the future international airport.

I take this opportunity to publicly congratulate all the mayor and reeves for their initiative—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I understand the desire of the hon. member to congratulate the mayor concerned. However, I have to interrupt him at this time. I do not think that there is a question of privilege unless he wishes to move a motion at this time in order to follow up the question which was raised. And, as I do not think this is the intention of the hon. member, I must therefore rule that there is no question of privilege and that there should not be any debate on the matter raised by the hon. member.