

Transport and Communications

requirements of Standing Order 99, that the refund motion cannot be moved until committee stage of the bill has been finalized.

The hon. member's reference to Bill C-104 in 1967 in respect of the Bell Telephone Company is clearly distinguishable, because in that case the standing committee had before it a bill which it could not consider by reason of Standing Order 91 unless the appropriate fees had been paid. The applicant had paid the fees in the previous session when the bill was introduced but not finalized, and the committee simply sought the direction of the House that the payment in the previous session would apply in respect to the bill before it. Having obtained such direction the committee then proceeded to consider the bill, a situation totally distinct from the one before us now.

In respect to the hon. member's reference to the Matador Pipe Line Bill C-16 in 1960, again the committee's recommendation was necessary for the calculation of the fees which were required to be paid as a condition precedent to consideration of the bill. It must also be noted that in that case the motion for concurrence was put in the House by unanimous consent, which, of course, eliminates any consideration of it as a precedent.

The hon. member makes two further suggestions. Firstly, he suggests there is no precedent for setting aside committee reports where this sort of difficulty exists. With due respect, I would refer the hon. member to citation 323 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition as well as a ruling of the previous Speaker, Speaker Lamoureux, as reported December 20, 1973 and March 24, 1970.

Secondly, the hon. member suggested that to rule against the acceptability of this report will deprive hon. members of their rightful opportunity to express themselves in committee deliberations, both in respect to legislation in general and on this particular suggestion of refund of fees in particular; but, with respect, I must disagree with both contentions. Hon. members can, of course, influence the terms of reference to the committees, and in any case have ample opportunity to express themselves on matters of legislation through the introduction of amendments.

In respect of this particular case, far from depriving hon. members of an opportunity to bring about a refund of the fees, it seems clear now that the bill has been passed that the proper procedures are envisaged in Section 16 of the Financial Administration Act and outlined in Standing Order 99. Whether the House would give its approval pending or upon passage of Bill C-29, there can be no doubt that the procedures exist for the necessary motion either now or at that time.

Accordingly, I must hold that the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, contained in its second report, is totally beyond the terms and provisions of Bill S-11 and, therefore, beyond the scope of its order of reference, and the motion for concurrence cannot be put.

[Mr. Speaker.]

IMMIGRATION**SUGGESTED EXCLUSION FROM CANADA OF ALEXANDER GRESKO—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION**

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43 I rise to propose a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that Alexander Gresko was deported from Great Britain as a high level Russian espionage agent in 1971, and currently serves as Russian liaison officer for the forthcoming Olympic games, and in view of the fact that the 1976 Olympics are being staged in this country, creating intensive security precautions, notwithstanding our own national security and that this incident has already gone so far as to offer this Soviet spy access to the Prime Minister's office, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay):

That this government for the sake of national security be instructed to seriously consider declaring Alexander Gresko persona non grata and refusing him any further entry to this country.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House has heard the terms of the motion. It being proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43 it cannot be debated without unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The motion cannot be put.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**SPECIAL ORDER RELATING TO ALLOTTED DAY**

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose first of announcing a change in the business for today and, secondly, to propose a special order relating to the business tomorrow.

Today the first business will be the resumption of consideration in committee of the whole of Bill C-32, the petroleum administration bill. At 8 p.m., because of the necessary absence from the House of my colleague, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. MacDonald), on government business we will call Bill S-12, an act to amend the Immigration Act.

Tomorrow, as the House knows, is an allotted day. Following discussions among House leaders it has been agreed that the day should be devoted, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) suggested, to the consideration of the question of conflict of interest, following more or less the lines of the motion which is now on the order paper. However, I propose a small change in that proposed reference to meet the views of hon. members of the House, in that the reference should be to the Committee on Privileges and Elections rather than to the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.