

Privilege—Mr. Siddon

hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood (Mr. Rae) and the other raised by the member who has just taken his seat. With his halo around his eyes, he forgets, he does not see now, he does not remember now that his party's very first act when we came here last January, because his party disagreed with something the government said, moved a motion to adjourn the House. Is that not a waste of taxpayers' money? Just because that party had a difference of opinion, that was not a waste of taxpayers' money. Their holier-than-thou attitude does not sit well. His party should examine its own actions and its own attitude before starting to cast stones here.

Madam Speaker: I do want to respond to that point of order. This is precisely what I was trying to bring to the attention of the hon. member who was speaking on a question of privilege. A question of privilege is a very serious matter which has to be related to the definition of privilege in the House. The hon. member need not read the definition because it has already been read this evening and I have read it before myself.

The hon. member does not leave me much choice. If he continues to discuss substance, I will not be able to hear him. The hon. member for Burnaby is right. As soon as I realize that the matter being raised is not a question of privilege which the member is discussing but something else, I must intervene. I already warned the hon. member that his written statement made me suspect very seriously that there was a basis for a question of privilege. I must also tell him that the arguments he has brought forward up until now have not convinced me either.

Mr. Siddon: Madam Speaker, with all due respect, I believe that you would want to feel that this question of privilege which I raise is "sufficiently involved", to quote from Citation 84(1). I would suggest sufficiently involved means that I should be accorded the same courtesy which other members have received in being granted two or three moments to lay out the case about which I am so concerned.

We have a case where ministers of the Crown have not made any public commitment to a project but they have said in private forums that they concur with such projects.

Mr. Stollery: Order.

Mr. Siddon: This is a very serious matter.

Mr. Stollery: The Speaker has ruled on the matter twice.

Mr. Siddon: Madam Speaker, with your permission, I want to draw a parallel with the Amax project. What we have—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is still discussing the substance. The parallel with Amax will lead him nowhere with regard to a question of privilege. Perhaps it would be useful in a debate, but we are not debating just now.

Mr. Siddon: Madam Speaker, I am very disappointed that the House and the Chair will not hear me out. The matter which I raise could have permanent implications for the people

of my riding and the people of British Columbia. We are going to be faced with a decision that we will regret at some point in the future because ministers have contravened their responsibilities. In the case of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. LeBlanc) it is covered under Sections 31 and 33 of the Fisheries Act. In the case of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Roberts), he has not complied with his own environmental assessment and review procedures which are clearly set out in his mandate and responsibilities.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member says that I did not hear him out, but he started to speak at 8.35 p.m., and that is a little over 20 minutes ago. I have heard him out.

Mr. Nielsen: It is 11 minutes ago.

Madam Speaker: I am afraid I cannot hear him out. It is quite obvious that he does not have a question of privilege. He is debating a question. He probably has a grievance.

Mr. Siddon: It is much more serious than that.

Madam Speaker: The hon. member is disappointed that a certain number of things are being done in his own constituency which have some implications here. The hon. member knows that this is not the time to raise these kinds of grievances or concerns. There are other occasions in the course of the proceedings of the House when he can do that totally within the rules of the House. But just now I refer him to the intervention, which I might have made myself, by the hon. member for Burnaby who was simply quoting Beauchesne that a question of privilege has to be brought at the earliest possible time. This project is not absolutely new. The hon. member probably had an opportunity to bring that matter to the attention of the House before. The hon. member is discussing substance, and I cannot accept that as a question of privilege.

Mr. Siddon: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You have not allowed me to address the question of time limits. Every time I have stood up you have intervened before I had finished. Where is the freedom of speech in this country?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I have allowed the hon. member to speak. I have tried to assist the hon. member in coming to the right type of argument to use in order to prove to me that he had a question of privilege. I have done all that I could and I ask the hon. member to be mindful of the kinds of arguments he has to entertain. I can only conclude that the hon. member had no other arguments to bring forward.

On the basis of what I heard and on the basis of the written notice, I have to tell the hon. member that he does not have a question of privilege.

MR. KILGOUR—ALLEGED CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN GOVERNMENT HIRING OF DEFEATED LIBERAL CANDIDATE

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona): Madam Speaker, I have two questions of privilege. I assume that I may deal