

seriously considered the appropriateness of the Hamilton-Wentworth area for the proposed expansion of the de Havilland facilities?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Madam Speaker, certainly this matter remains under active consideration.

\* \* \*

### THE CONSTITUTION

#### PROPOSED RESOLUTION—POSSIBLE REFERENCE BACK OF JOINT COMMITTEE REPORT

**Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, I have a brief supplementary question to that put by the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton to the government House leader respecting the process being followed in the constitutional matter. Since all phases of the committee reference and report must be passed by both Houses, can the government House leader tell the House how motions to refer parts of the committee report back to the committee would be reconciled with the proceedings of the other place? Could he tell us if he has considered what the status of the report might be if one House referred the report back to committee and the other House took no action; that is, given the possibility of referral back to a committee which goes out of existence as soon as its report is presented.

[Translation]

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** There are many ifs in my hon. colleague's question, Madam Speaker, and instead of speculating and answering purely hypothetical questions, I think we would be much better advised to wait until we know the exact content of the report of the joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate. We shall then be able together to cross the bridge when we get to the river.

\* \* \*

● (1500)

[English]

### PETITIONS

#### NATURAL GAS AND HYDROELECTRIC POWER

**Madam Speaker:** I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has laid upon the Table the report of the Clerk of Petitions stating that he has examined the petitions presented by hon. members on Friday, October 24, 1980, and finds that they meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

*Privilege—Mr. Malone*

### PRIVILEGE

MR. DIONNE (NORTHUMBERLAND-MIRAMICHI)—STATEMENTS MADE BY MR. PARKER

**Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Sometimes the role of a member of Parliament is difficult and we all appreciate assistance when we can get it, and I appreciate the assistance offered during the question period by the hon. member for Kootenay East-Revelstoke (Mr. Parker). But it would have been much more helpful if the hon. member, before he started his grandstanding act, had gotten his facts straight. Every statement of substance he made in putting his questions to the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) was substantially wrong, and therefore he is misleading the House—inadvertently I hope.

**Madam Speaker:** I do not think I see a question of privilege here. Rather, it is debate. It was my duty to listen to the hon. member but I quite quickly ascertained that it was not a question of privilege.

MR. PARKER—QUESTION DIRECTED TO SOLICITOR GENERAL

**Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I stated that I was in Newcastle on such and such a date and we met with members of the town council, who were so concerned about the fact that these commitments were made. I reported and asked a question of the Solicitor General on that matter. They were so concerned they had a Day of Survival in that community.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I think the hon. member did make that point in the course of the question period. It is now obvious that his question of privilege is not a question of privilege, but a continuation of the debate. However, he made his point.

MR. MALONE—PROCEEDINGS RESPECTING S.O. 43 MOTIONS

**Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot):** Madam Speaker, I would like to raise a question of privilege in order to bring to your attention one of the procedures of the House which you might take into consideration, respecting the numbers of people who were able to present motions under Standing Order 43 today. At 2.15 today there were two members of the Progressive Conservative Party trying to present a motion under Standing Order 43, and a member from the New Democratic Party.

I understand that when 2.15 is reached Your Honour has no alternative but to proceed to the oral question period. However, my concern lies with the fact that following prayers and the establishment of a quorum in the House there always appears to me to be a two, three or four-minute delay—not usually four, but very often two or three—before we start with the proceedings under Standing Order 43. I feel that today my privilege was somewhat abused because I wanted to present a motion under the Standing Order which could only be put this day, as it was a representation regarding capital gains tax and