

shortcomings in our rules must be dealt with in the normal process by the House itself.

MR. NEIL—NOTICE OF INTENTION TO RAISE QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Madam Speaker: I have a question of privilege in the name of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil). I have had notice of it but it is not detailed and does not contain the necessary statement to allow me to hear his question of privilege today. I will quote the rule to the hon. member. Standing Order 17(2) reads as follows:

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 notice arrived, but there was no statement of what the question was about. I would be glad to hear from the hon. member at another time, on another day, if he would give me that statement.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wonder if I could have the opportunity to file a special statement on Monday, so that I can bring the matter to the attention of the House at that time.

Madam Speaker: Exactly. That is what the hon. member should do if he wants me to hear his question of privilege.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. MUNRO (ESQUIMALT-SAANICH)—PROCEDURE RESPECTING STANDING ORDER 43 MOTION

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, I have a point of order which arises from that portion of the proceedings dealing with motions under Standing Order 43. I proposed a motion relating to the agreements between Canada and the United States to which this House had given unanimous consent on the sixteenth day of this month—its concurrence in the agreements as they now stand and its objection to any changes in those agreements.

What I was seeking today was merely a reaffirmation of that earlier unanimous consent. I did not hear or observe any no from any side of the House and yet the matter was not apparently agreed to. Someone must have heard some noes.

If we accept that there were objections to this particular motion, Madam Speaker, it would suggest that the earlier unanimous consent given to that same motion has been nullified. I am at a loss now to understand how, one day, we can agree unanimously, and another day we can disagree on the same motion. I would just like some explanation as to how the situation is to be reconciled, if not in House records at least in my mind.

Order Paper Questions

● (1220)

Madam Speaker: The hon. member will have to work that out by himself or with other members of this House. The Chair has nothing to do with the substance of these motions. Obviously I heard some noes. The hon. member did not get unanimous consent for his motion. I am not sure whether it was in exactly the same terms as the one which was accepted at a prior date. However, this is a matter for the hon. member to resolve for himself. I am afraid the Chair cannot help him.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. D. M. Collette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 1,204, 1,526 and 1,896.

I ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Text]

PROFESSOR HUGH GEORGE HAMBLETON

Question No. 1,204—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the Solicitor General's answer on May 23, 1980 at page 1350 of *Hansard*, relating to Professor Hugh George Hambleton of Laval University and which states in part, that Canadians can "cavort with whomsoever they want, etc." is this official government policy and does this include members of KGB and, if so, for what reason?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General): The full answer given on May 23, 1980, at page 1350 of *Hansard* states "Canada is a free country, and anyone can talk to whomsoever they want and cavort with whomsoever they want without necessarily breaking any Canadian laws". This statement is a manner of expressing official government policy and should not be quoted out of context as it implies in certain circumstances that Canadian laws could be broken.

MIRABEL DEFICIT

Question No. 1,526—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. What is the estimated loss for each of the next five years on Mirabel Airport?
2. Is action being planned to reduce the losses and, if so, in what way?
3. Does the Minister of Transport agree with the proposals to transfer large portions of Dorval's operations to Mirabel?
4. Is any further expansion planned for Mirabel and, if so, at what cost and over what period of time?

Mr. Robert Bockstael (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The anticipated deficit for 1980-81 is \$21 million including depreciation of \$17,675,000. The deficit for the next four years is expected to be approximately the same in constant dollars.