

new situation and one which is bound to give rise to certain very real complexities. It is a situation which deserves to be treated more seriously than it has by the parliamentary secretary.

I hope that as a result of recognizing the importance of this matter, that it is a new development in the life and history of Parliament and that you have fundamental obligations to protect the privileges of members of Parliament, Madam Speaker, you will reserve judgment today in order to study all the implications of this new practice. It is a practice which may involve an extension beyond the accepted terms of the subsidy by the government of the Liberal party, and may very well involve an intrusion upon the confidentiality which Canadian citizens have a right to expect in communications passed by them to their member of Parliament and, consequently, to the Government of Canada.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I should like to make a statement on this particular question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor). I do not like to accumulate questions of privilege and I feel that, if possible, I should rule upon them immediately so that the House can pursue its business.

● (1610)

In the beginning, I was quite sure that this whole matter was completely outside the competence of the Chair. I have heard representations from both sides, but the more recent arguments by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) will cause me to reserve on this question of privilege. I must say that many arguments have been offered and not too many facts. In any event, I wish to look into the matter a little more deeply and make a judgment on another day as to whether there is a prima facie case of privilege.

\* \* \*

## SPORTS

### DISBURSING OF FUNDS FROM LOTTERIES

**Hon. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton North):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a very important point of order. With due deference to the Chair, I am not a member of the New Democratic Party. I am still in the Conservative party, just in case Madam Speaker does not realize that.

Another Loto Canada cheque has been presented to the minister of sport, which means a total amount of \$12,700,000 in money for culture and art. In view of the new face on federalism the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is trying to portray to Canada, surely the Prime Minister would like his ministers to recognize that such jurisdictional questions as resource taxation, offshore mineral rights, federal spending power, lotteries, federal trade and commerce, power and communications are as important and valid as patriation of the constitution. How can the Prime Minister allow a minister, an ex-premier, to procrastinate, to break an agreement with the provinces which was duly signed by the federal and provincial

## Business of the House

ministers under the guidance of the PCO and the Department of Justice, and deny the culture, arts and sports community the money that they need? They are bankrupt.

The Secretary of State (Mr. Fox) told me personally he needs money for symphonies and cultural arts, and this minister is not cashing the cheques. This is important because they need the money.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member is really engaging in debate. This is not a point of order.

\* \* \*

## POINT OF ORDER

MR. COSSITT—REQUEST THAT RULING OF MADAM SPEAKER BE RECONSIDERED

**Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds-Grenville):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a very brief point of order to ask for clarification from the Chair. If I understand correctly, Madam Speaker, you have reserved decisions on two matters of privilege raised today. If I heard correctly, you said there were many precedents to study, and I think rightly so. Therefore, I would ask this question for purposes of clarification. In view of these many precedents that need to be studied, would you undertake to reconsider the decision of yesterday against the same precedents to see whether it should be reversed?

**Madam Speaker:** I am afraid I could not do that. The precedent I wanted to look at was cited by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) on a different question of privilege. Therefore, I am afraid I cannot accommodate the hon. member on that point.

\* \* \*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. Today being Thursday, I wonder if I could ask the government House leader what he intends for us for the rest of the day and next week. We understand there are two days he wishes to allot to the opposition as allotted days under the rules.

**Mr. Pinard:** Madam Speaker, we will consider Bill C-39 and then Bill C-22.

[Translation]

As for next week's program, I can confirm that next Tuesday and Wednesday will be set aside for the opposition, more specifically for the Progressive Conservative Party. I hope that Monday we shall be able to complete third reading of Bill C-30 which is now in committee. I hope that it will be reported to the House so that we can complete consideration of this bill on Monday or as soon as possible next week. This is the bill to authorize additional government borrowing.