

making specific reference to this particular case in its report to the House with recommendations as to how the House ought to treat the question of premature publication of documents, including all of the difficulties about whether it ought to amount to an inquiry into the conduct of members, whether it should be treated automatically, whether the House should pass a resolution similar to that passed in the United Kingdom and the difficulties that the House might experience in that regard.

I would find technically that until those inquiries or problems are cleared up that I would not hold the matter to be a matter of privilege that would be sent to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and therefore set that aside. However, I think I ought to ask the House now if it would give its consent to take that motion and refer it at this moment to the special committee of the House on rights and immunities with the express mandate that it clarify the problems that I have indicated and report back to the House on this one specific reference to this one problem which was raised by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt).

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: If I sense that I have the consent of the House to do so, it will be so ordered.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) yesterday raised by way of a point of order the question of tabling of documents. With respect, I think the point lacks some precision. I wonder if the hon. member might agree that I treat it as a notice of an intention to raise a point of order by him so that perhaps one day next week it can be argued in greater detail.

I have attempted to pull together the references. There is some lack of clarity as to whether or not reference is being made to documents referred to by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) or perhaps by the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) on different days. In both cases the ministers treated the documents referred to somewhat differently and I think different precedents would apply.

I therefore ask the hon. member if he will examine the references that I have here, with which I will be glad to provide him, and perhaps give some indication to the government of an intention on an agreed upon date next week to argue the point so that I can have a little more precision on it. I would like to have a little more precise argument before making a decision on that matter, if that is agreeable.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed Bill C-26, an act respecting the organization of certain scientific activities of

Speaker's Ruling

the government of Canada, with an amendment, to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to our procedures for this month, I wish to inform the House that the questions to be raised at six o'clock p.m. are as follows: the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Darling)—Customs—effect on tourist trade of allegedly unreasonable taxing of United States citizens; the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen)—Royal Canadian Mounted Police—investigation of operations of Bank of Montreal in Vancouver—request for report; the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta)—Consumer Affairs—possibility of establishing food policy council to consider national food policy.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I apologize I did not raise this earlier, but you were on your feet and it is not proper for us when you are on your feet to make a request.

As a point of clarification and elucidation for the House, possibly there should be an amendment of the order of the House on the point to which you alluded. In view of the fact that we are approaching the end of this session, possibly that committee should be empowered to continue on into the next session, notwithstanding that it would not have completed its work. The House has the power to give it that authority. If unfortunately this session prorogued, there would have to be a further reference to the committee. The House could dispense with that at the present time if the order of the House were amended to the extent that the committee shall continue on beyond the present session until it shall have reported.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, if that suggestion is in order, we have no objection. However, I was under the impression that a reference died with a session. We could give the undertaking to renew the same terms of reference in the new session which would have the same effect.

Mr. Speaker: The undertaking of the minister, I am sure, is more than enough in the circumstances. I might say that committee has reported to the House on matters and suggestions *sub judice*. It has now under review the very important matter of changes in the rights and immunities of members with respect to television and radio broadcasting of the House and will go on to consider many other problems relating to special rights and immunities. I express now the clear understanding that that committee will be carrying on its work for quite some time. I am sure it will be expected that when the session ends, as the minister has indicated, that its mandate will be renewed. Orders of the day.