

*Government Orders*

assure her that I am not in this case applying the *sub judice* rule.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the situation, as I understand Your Honour's ruling, then, the question put that Your Honour said you thought might be out of order and did not allow the minister to answer was a proper question, and the minister could have answered the question had the minister chosen to do so.

I note the minister invoked the *sub judice* convention as the reason for refusing to answer the first time which she may or may not do, but as to the propriety on that Your Honour did not comment. Of course we object to the minister using the *sub judice* convention in that circumstance because we do not think it is a proper use.

**Mr. Speaker:** Just a moment. We have heard the point raised by the hon. member for Ottawa West. I hope I have made it very clear what my thinking is on the subject.

Remember, it is not for a Speaker to trespass with respect to a minister who chooses not to answer. As long as we understand that, I think we can close that off now.

\* \* \*

**PRIVILEGE**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND THE SOLICITOR  
GENERAL

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, as I have given the Speaker notice, I rise to give notice of a question of privilege. The item of privilege arises out of a matter that came before the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General this morning. I believe it pertains to the rights and privileges of all members of the House of Commons.

Because of uncertainty at this time as to the agenda of the House and the agenda of that particular committee, I think it would best serve the needs of the House if my putting of the question of privilege be deferred until a time more appropriate after those uncertainties are cleared up. If that is acceptable to the Speaker, then I would proceed in that fashion.

**Mr. Speaker:** It may or may not be privilege. In any event, I appreciate the fact that the hon. member sent me a note on this.

I will take this as notice, which is not to indicate that I necessarily think it is privilege. It may well be that events will preclude any necessity to pursue the matter further.

---

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**PETRO-CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT**

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. McDermid that Bill C-84, an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada, be read the third time and passed.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** When the House took recess, the hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley had the floor. Since the hon. member is absent, the Chair will now recognize a member from the other side of the House. The hon. member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon.

[English]

**Mr. Joe Comuzzi (Thunder Bay—Nipigon):** Mr. Speaker, a short while ago *The Ottawa Citizen* put very succinctly in 12 words what I think is the whole feeling with respect to Bill C-84 before the House today. It read very simply: "Selling Petro-Canada: wrong time, wrong reason, wrong price, wrong decision". We on this side of the House agree wholeheartedly with that statement.

We heard today, at second reading and in committee, what the sale of Petro-Canada would mean to Canada. We have heard very little about what is Petro-Canada. Let me just emphasize again what this great Canadian corporation really is. It has over 7,000 Canadians working in all of its areas. It has over 3,500 retail outlets where we in this country buy our gas and oil. It holds over 6.9 million hectares of land. It has a production capacity of over 22,000 cubic meters of oil a day and for crude oil and liquid reserves it has a reserve of over 92 billion cubic meters. It has natural gas production of 13.7 million cubic feet per day, and in those reserves in natural gas alone, almost 100 billion cubic meters.