

The honourable Member said that if this limitation is placed on an honourable Member who has the moving of the motion in his care, it applies as well to other honourable Members.

The question I have to decide therefore is whether or not the point of order raised by the President of the Privy Council came too early in our proceedings; in other words, whether or not the motion should have been put first and then the question as to the regularity of the report brought into issue by the House Leader.

It should be recalled that honourable Members who took part in the discussion on the point of order, more particularly the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), the honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), dealt exclusively with the very limited point to which I have referred. Since, according to the submission, the minister's procedural objection could not be raised at that point they obviously did not consider it proper to argue the substance of the minister's arguments. For the moment I will therefore limit my comments to the objection raised by honourable Members to the timing of the minister's objection.

In my opinion it was not improper for the President of the Privy Council to seek to question the form of the committee report at the stage he chose to select. In this regard I bring the attention of the House to citation 323(1) of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, where it is stated: "A committee report may be ruled out of order though it has been received by the House, and a motion to concur therein cannot then be entertained."

It seems to me this citation is directly on point and justifies the minister's submission that the procedural points should be considered and should be determined before the motion is put.

This having been said I would suggest that honourable Members interested in this extremely complex situation should be given an opportunity to express their views in relation to the substance of the points raised by the President of the Privy Council.

After giving much thought to the complex procedural aspects of the matter I am concerned mostly about three specific points. First, it must be determined whether the *sub-judice* doctrine is applicable here. Honourable Members may wish to consult citation 152(2) of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition on this point. Second, I am concerned with the form of the committee recommendation. Normally these recommendations propose that Parliament or the government take into consideration the advisability of introducing legislation for a specified purpose. One might well wonder whether the form of the present report does not constitute a direction rather than a mere recommendation. A further point is whether the report is within the terms of the committee order of reference.

Of course, there may be other points of procedure that honourable Members may want to raise, either in support of or in opposition to the presentation of the motion at this time. Because of the importance and complexity of the matter I would think that honourable Members would want an opportunity to give some thought to the procedural point I have raised and, at their convenience, submit arguments for consideration by the Chair. The honourable House Leaders may want to consult one another or with the Chair in this regard. In view of the circumstances I suggest that the motion should stand.

---

Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid before the House, —Copy of correspondence, dated January 24, 1969, exchanged between the Vice-President of the Council of Ministers of the Province of Quebec and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Government of France. (French).