

**Mr. Speaker:** As there does not appear to be any other member wishing to continue this discussion, let me say at the outset that there can be no question about its seriousness. There was some difficulty put forward based on the fact that this is a joint committee, and some comment on the fact that a similar motion or a similar application is expected to be made later this day in the other place. It might be interesting to speculate on what would happen if different results ensue in both places. Let me say at the outset that I propose to reserve my ruling and examine the arguments and reconsider the precedents.

The question is not without difficulty. In the first place, there is precedent that the leak of confidential documents or their publication does in fact constitute a question of privilege. But does that mean a question of privilege in the abstract, or a question of privilege involving a specific member of the House of Commons who may be accused of having given out information which is confidential? The Chair will need to examine the precedents in detail, not simply the citations, to see what were the facts of those previous cases.

There is also a long-standing practice that it is unusual, perhaps even without precedent, for one committee of the House of Commons to examine the operations or the transgressions, as it were, of another committee. That question is particularly complicated when a joint committee of the two Houses is involved. This touches the point which was raised by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). If we are to embrace the principle that an investigation can be carried out, as a result of this question of privilege, to find out whether in fact a question of privilege exists, then we shall have extended considerably the premises of a question of privilege.

It is suggested that the fact of the publication of a confidential draft report becomes in itself a *prima facie* question of privilege, the details to be filled in when it gets to the committee. On the face of it, that seems to me to be an extension of the question of privilege as we have known it, and if there is not a specific allegation of a transgression by someone it is most difficult to rule that there is a *prima facie* question of privilege. On the other hand, there is an obvious disposition in the House that some investigation of this matter should take place.

It may be that it does not qualify as a question of privilege as we know it, and certainly there is no desire to extend the definition of a question of privilege. It may be that a substantive motion to investigate this matter would be acceptable and might receive the unanimous support of members of the House without its being treated as a question of privilege. In any case, in a day or two the answers to some of these questions may be a little clearer than they are at the present time.

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

[Translation]

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

### Order Paper Questions

**Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 1,848, 1,849, 2,623, 2,891, 2,962, 2,981, 3,009, 3,017, 3,024, 3,036 and 3,156.

[Text]

#### INTERNATIONAL FESTIVAL OF FRANCOPHONE YOUTH

Question No. 1,848—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. By name, how many countries participated in the International Festival of Francophone Youth in Quebec, August 1974?
2. By title or designation, how many individuals attended from each country and what was the extent of their participation in the Festival?
3. By title or designation, how many individuals attended the Festival from Canadian provinces and which provinces were represented?
4. For each group, from each country or province, what was the cost of (a) travel (b) accommodation (c) meals (d) local transportation (e) *per diem* expenses (f) packing (g) unpacking (h) shipping (i) insuring any equipment and/or materials and by whom were such costs met?
5. Was any coverage by any branch of the media paid for and, if so (a) what was the nature of such coverage (b) the cost involved in each case (c) by whom were such costs met?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** 1. The 25 member countries of the Agency for Cultural and Technical Cooperation participated in the International Festival of Francophone Youth; they are: Belgium, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ivory Coast, Dahomey, France, Gabon, Haiti, Upper Volta, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malagasy, Mali, Mauritius, Monaco, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Chad, Togo, Tunisia, Vietnam, Laos (associated State), and Canada (including Québec as participating government).

2. The total number of delegates was 1,621. The average number of participants per delegation was 62 including the head of the delegation, responsible officers for cultural and sports activities, some 30 participants to the cultural side and some 30 participants to the athletic side.

3. (a) Québec (participating government): 101 delegates including one leader, 32 participants to the cultural side and 68 to the athletic side. (b) New-Brunswick: 38 delegates including 12 participants to the cultural side and 26 to the athletic side. (c) Ontario: 41 delegates including 15 participants to the cultural side and 26 to the athletic side. (d) Manitoba: 32 delegates including 6 participants to the cultural side and 26 to the athletic side.

4. (a) The Agency for Cultural and Technical Cooperation paid for the international travel of 60 delegates from each country. (b) The Société d'Accueil du Festival international de la Jeunesse francophone paid for the lodging of all delegates at a rate of \$4/night per person. (c) The Agency for Cultural and Technical Cooperation paid \$5/day per person to provide meals to the delegates. All in all, the international travel and the meals provided to the delegates cost approximately \$1.3 million to the Agency. (d) The interprovincial travel of Canadian delegates coming from New-Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba was paid for by the Federal Government; this represented an expenditure of \$17,800 contributed by the Department of National Health and Welfare. (e) No "per diem" expenses were provided, except in the case of a theatrical group that rehearsed in Québec City for eight weeks prior to the opening of the Festival. The Agency for Cultural and Technical Cooperation paid for these expenses. (f) Paid