

Mr. Speaker: Order. Such a motion is normally receivable only during the time set aside for motions. However, if the House is disposed to make this arrangement, it might be simpler to dispose of the matter now. Does the President of the Privy Council have the consent of the House to move the motion?

Mr. Nowlan: Might I direct a question to the President of the Privy Council?

Mr. Speaker: If there are questions to be asked, it might be better if we adhered to our usual practice. The motion is more properly receivable when we get to that point in our procedure.

Mr. Sharp: Might I continue my report to the House on business? I had to interrupt it in order to explain what the government proposed we should do at eight o'clock. We shall proceed to the consideration of those objections, if the House so agrees. Tomorrow will be an opposition day. On Monday we shall resume consideration of the second reading of Bill C-68. Tuesday is an opposition day. On Wednesday, if Bill C-68 has not been completed, its consideration will be continued. Then we shall resume consideration of Bill C-83.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I understand that it is the intention of the government House leader, with respect to the electoral boundaries matters, that there shall be, following the time set aside this evening, a time appointed to complete consideration of the Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Alberta objections, if necessary, as well as any others consideration of which might have been begun. That is my understanding, and I see that the hon. gentleman is confirming it.

As to one other aspect, I really must protest. Yesterday this House endured an unwarranted intrusion into its regular proceedings in the form of a closure motion with respect to Bill C-68. Instead of dealing with this important bill at the first available opportunity, we find the government today moving on to the revision of the peace and security legislation. I suggest it is improper not to consider Bill C-68 if the need for it was so urgent as to lead to the introduction of the closure motion yesterday. I believe the House leader owes us an explanation.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the business of the House, may I say it will not bother me if the House leader puts Bill C-68 off for six months or a year. We do not want it at all. But may I ask a question which relates to the very welcome announcement, which pleased us all two weeks ago, about legislation respecting Canadian veterans who were prisoners of war. Despite our pleasure at this announcement, some of us are getting anxious as time goes by. Can we be told on what day the bill will be introduced?

Mr. Sharp: I do not think I am privileged to answer the House leader of the official opposition, but may I reply to the question asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre? The bill is in course of preparation, and I expect it will be given first reading soon.

Mr. McGrath: Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order you directed that the Minister of National Health

Business of the House

and Welfare would be given an opportunity today—provided, of course, that the hon. member who raised the question in the first instance, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, put the question to him—to carry out an undertaking the minister gave last Friday to the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby having to do with the Canada Games to be held at St. John's, with federal participation. Since the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby did not raise the subject today, perhaps the House might agree to allow the minister to answer the question now.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair certainly has no objection to following that course. I recognize the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, the federal government participates in the Canada Summer and Winter Games and shares in the operating cost and capital cost of those games on the basis of an agreed budget. Although the games have been awarded to St. John's for 1977, no agreement has yet been signed with the organizing committee of the games. In the meantime, the organizing committee has proceeded, as was mentioned yesterday, to award a contract for a sportsplex without consulting with us. It is clear we shall share only the cost of the agreed budget, and after we have signed an agreement with the organizing committee we shall cost-share only according to an arrangement in which there would be provision to ensure that normal tendering practices will be observed in the expenditure of federal funds.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order occasioned by an answer given earlier in the House by the Minister of Public Works. Last Wednesday, when the issue of alleged interference with judges by members of the cabinet first arose, the minister stated, as reported at page 11457 of *Hansard*:

● (1510)

I think it would be only an irresponsible member who would try to persist in having an effect or influence on a judgment on appeal.

Later in the same answer he said:

I would have refrained from intervening or from having any conversation with him.

That referred to a judge considering an appeal. In respect of a question I put to him today, the minister has raised a very serious matter, it seems to me, when it is considered in conjunction with the answer he gave in the House last Wednesday. When he gave the answer, I think a number of people understood that the intervention of the phone call which the minister had admitted he made to Judge Hugessen in fact took place prior to the commencement of the hearing. A number of us would have had objections about that in principle, but at least it might have been contended that what was being done then was simply an attempt to ascertain some information about, for example, the date of the commencement of the hearing.

Now, as a result of what the minister said today, namely, that his phone call was made to the judge a day after the appeal started, I submit that such a phone call could not—I repeat, “could not”—have any other effect except to be some kind of intervention in the judicial process. My point is that given the fact that the minister acknowledged today