

Privilege—Mr. Rose

fully informed on all aspects of this proposal that relate to safety, particularly safety in regard to transboundary implications. The aide memoire states—and I think, sir, perhaps the hon. member should have read right through to the end of the aide-mémoire:

—it is aimed at eliciting information which will enable the Canadian government to determine whether the Skagit Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, would present a significant risk of injurious transboundary impacts. If so, the Canadian government may request consultations for the purpose of addressing unilaterally any problems that we may perceive.

In other words, if there are significant environmental and safety impacts on any part of Canada, we would want to discuss that matter directly with the United States government, and that is what was conveyed in the aide memoire of August 29.

Furthermore, as I stated in my letter to the hon. member today, he will recognize that the hearings in connection with this plant—and that is the hearings for the licensing of such a plant, not the hearings for zoning within Washington State which are taking place later this week and which involve a local matter—have been postponed indefinitely by the nuclear regulatory commission in the United States. Therefore, it is not a matter which is imminent and before the government at the present time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House will realize, of course, that we have an area of perhaps disagreement between the two parties. Therefore, this does not fall within the ambit of a question of privilege.

I think I must take this occasion to say to the House that up to this point in this session I think I have been lenient in allowing members the opportunity to rise on questions of privilege, even though they essentially have been raising areas of disagreement with a minister. The difficulty in my continuing to do so is clearly that whenever this takes place, the member having put one side of the question it is only appropriate, of course, that the minister have an opportunity to respond.

I do not single out this particular case today as there have been a number of them, but the end result is that the member who raises such a disagreement with a minister is in effect extending the question period and getting an additional go-around which every member would like to enjoy.

If I am to be generous in this regard, and then allow equal time for a minister to respond in each case, what I will in fact be doing out of this generosity is inviting members to do more than they can accomplish in question period by attempting to extend the question period through some procedural point after the question period is over. That would be patently unfair and would also take up a great deal of debating time as, for example, today when there is a motion which, of course, the House is anxious to debate.

I do not distinguish this case from any others that have taken place. I do not take a more severe view of this case than of any other case. I simply say to the House that I will have to take a little harder line in respect of these questions, and if members rise to their feet and indicate at the outset a matter

not of significance immediately but rather one of disagreement, I will probably have to stop them before they develop the point for too long and, therefore, before it would be only fair to invite a minister to respond.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. PAPROSKI—ALLEGED SLUR ON INTEGRITY OF MINISTER BY HON. MEMBER FOR YORK CENTRE

Hon. Steven E. Paproski (Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport and Multiculturalism): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which relates to a question appearing at page 935 of *Hansard* put by the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan). He has involved me in a gratuitous and unjustified manner in his question, and slurred my integrity as a minister.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Perhaps he did it unwittingly, as he does so many things. I do not accept the premise of the question posed by the hon. member for York Centre. I would like him to be very careful of the way he distorts his questions. I want him to be aware that on page 33, and you will know this, sir, of the annual report tabled by the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Atkey), where it states, “the principle of family reunification” etc., etc., and I will not read it right now—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Paproski: Sir, you were on a trip to the U.S.S.R.—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand the desire of the hon. minister to make an intervention. However, he is seeking the floor on a point of order essentially to take issue with something that took place yesterday, and I think it would be an unwarranted extension of our rules to permit that to take place at this time.

MR. HARQUAIL—REQUEST MAJOR STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS BE MADE IN HOUSE

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, I rise by way of a point of order on what may very well be a question of the collective privilege of all members of this House. It has to do with the position of the government in making statements outside this House.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Clark) and members of the government have said repeatedly that they would show respect for this Parliament, yet we saw yesterday the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) at the beginning of his speech in Toronto saying in fact he was making a major announcement. I feel that is totally unacceptable to members of this House. Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister, I would enjoin him to show more respect for members of Parliament. If he has major statements to make on air transportation policy or any other aspect of his department he should show respect to the