

That indicates that there is a discretion, and in some cases it is even thought advisable to do away with that practice. It seems to me that the Hon. Member is raising his point of order a bit too late. Perhaps it might have been dealt with differently if it had been raised at the time the motion was put.

Of course, the purpose of having these documents read is to give the Speaker and the House enough information upon which to make a decision. Clearly, I did have enough information. I do not say that it would not have been valuable to have more information, but I did have enough to make that decision and I ruled. The House subsequently gave its decision to send the matter to the Committee.

I wish to refer the Hon. Member to a case in our own House from January 24, 1975, concerning the Hon. Member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) when he raised a similar question of privilege. The Hon. Member did not then quote passages from the newspaper articles in his statement to the House. His motion at page 7937 of *Hansard* of July 23, 1975, only mentions "articles contained in the July 24, July 25 and in subsequent editions of the *Montreal Gazette*".

Furthermore, the Chair must emphasize that it is not the articles mentioned by the Hon. Member for Lincoln that have been sent to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, but the entire matter; that is, the specific question of privilege.

Finally, while the Chair took this point of order very seriously, the Chair would like to point out that the point of order should have been raised before the House pronounced itself. Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 237, is quite clear on this:

A point of order against procedure must be raised promptly and before the question has passed to a stage at which the objection would be out of place.

However, it is a very good reminder to the House if Members, from time to time, would point this out to the Chair. It also reminds the Chair of how proceedings can be dealt with more completely. I am grateful to the Hon. Member for having raised the matter.

Therefore, I must say that the matter is properly now before the Committee and, of course, ought not to be discussed any further.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Lewis: Madam Speaker, this being Thursday, I would ask the Government House Leader if he could give us the House some idea as to the course of business for the balance of this week and next week.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, today we will debate a motion very soon and there is an understanding that after the vote is taken on that motion, questions to dispose of third reading of Bill C-139 will be put and we will dispose of third reading this afternoon.

Business of the House

There is also an understanding that tomorrow we will give final approval to all remaining stages of two Bills: first, Bill C-130 dealing with international financial institutions; and second, Bill C-144 with relation to the Small Businesses Loans Act.

[Translation]

As far as the business of the House for next week is concerned, Madam Speaker, and assuming that the motion to limit debate on Bill C-143 is adopted, on Monday we shall consider and complete the report stage of Bill C-143, the Borrowing Authority Bill, and Tuesday we shall continue the debate on the same Bill, the third reading stage this time, which we shall be completing at the end of the day, so that we shall have two votes on Bill C-143, one vote at 5.45 p.m. on Monday and another at 5.45 p.m. on Tuesday.

Wednesday is the day designated for Private Members' Business, and as provided under the new Standing Orders, we shall adjourn for Easter at 6 p.m. on Wednesday and return to the House on April 11, 1983.

[English]

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, I have two matters which I wish to raise with the Government House Leader. The first and easiest matter concerns a question with regard to the Standing Committee on Labour. I have been informed that the Committee has not yet had its organizing meeting. There are matters that I think Members from this corner of the House, at least, would like to see considered by the Committee. Would the Government House Leader perhaps bring the matter to the attention of the appropriate persons and have some action taken in that regard?

The second matter concerns Bill C-141, an Act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act. I understand that the Minister of Justice has agreed, after prolonged negotiations, to take out of Clause 14, Subclause (2) a clause that many people found offensive. With that in mind, and since it now appears to deal with the dispute that had arisen both in the House of Commons and out, is it possible for the Government House Leader to tell the House when Bill C-141 might be called and disposed of in order that those people most affected by it can have the benefit of the law protecting them?

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, with respect to the Hon. Member's first question, I will inquire about the organization of the Committee on Labour. It is news to me but I will look into the matter.

In relation to the second point raised by the Hon. Member concerning Bill C-141, it is correct that there have been negotiations among the three Parties. There was an amendment moved by the Official Opposition deleting Subclause (2) of Clause 14 of Bill C-141. We are in agreement with that amendment and we are also willing to call that Bill next week, most likely next Tuesday during the lunch hour between one o'clock and two o'clock, as negotiated between the House Leaders and provided that all recorded divisions, if any, are deferred until the end of that day.