

2. What is the government policy with respect to scientific research on live foetuses where such research might affect the life or health of the foetus?

Return tabled.

[Translation]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the other questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Are the other questions allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[Translation]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I ask, Mr. Speaker, that all notices of motions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Does the House agree?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[English]

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I realize that hon. members opposite would feel very badly if I were to let a day go by without calling attention to the fact that question No. 1,232, asking for comprehensive details in connection with the swimming pool at 24 Sussex Drive, has never been answered. It is a very basic question and asks for the names of the donors, if indeed such donors do exist, and the amounts of money they have given. It further asks for the names of the designers of the pool and for various other technical details having to do with this somewhat peculiar enterprise which has been hidden, and which continues to be hidden, from the Canadian people.

I feel that parliament has a right to know about anything that goes on on public property, and 24 Sussex Drive is public property: it is the Prime Minister's official residence, but it belongs to the people of Canada. I fail to see, therefore, how the government can continue to abstain from answering legitimate questions about an enterprise which has been conducted on public property. Persons unconnected with the government have gone on to that property and dug a hole in the ground and taken part in a sizeable enterprise, apparently without permission from anyone, according to the Prime Minister, and I think it is about time the government put up or shut up about this smelly matter.

Mr. Speaker: Order of the day.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, before we embark upon a continuation of the debate on Bill C-73, I would respectfully draw to your attention a major deficiency in the bill. The bill was distributed to hon. members without bearing a number; in other words, at the time authorization was given for first reading it did not carry a royal recommendation. It was only by delving into *Votes and Proceedings* that I was able to examine the recommen-

Privilege—Mr. O'Connell

dation which was made and compare it with the provisions in the bill. This work having been completed, I wish to draw to Your Honour's attention something which goes to the root of the bill and which is out of keeping with the royal recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if I might interrupt the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). I had intended to deal with the question of privilege raised yesterday by the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. O'Connell).

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That is fine, Mr. Speaker, but orders of the day were called, and that is this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is perfectly correct, I did call orders of the day; but before the bill was announced I had intended to deal with the question of privilege raised yesterday by the hon. member for Scarborough East.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. O'CONNELL—PRESS PUBLICATION OF CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION POLICY—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: Yesterday the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. O'Connell) raised a question of privilege concerning the publication of the draft report of the Special Joint Committee on Immigration Policy. I wish to reiterate at the beginning of my observations today the point I made yesterday which was referred to by all who took part in the discussion, namely, that the House guards the confidentiality of draft reports of this nature at this stage of a committee's proceedings, and the publication of such a report would raise the strongest suggestion that some act had taken place which offended the privileges of the House.

The difficulty about the motion before us is not that it fails to deal with what appears to be a well accepted question of privilege in general terms but, rather, that it fails to be sufficiently specific. I refer to the absence from the motion of any allegation of misconduct which is specifically complained of in terms of a breach of the privileges of the House. Has there been an action by the publishers of the newspapers involved, or by the radio or television station, which constitutes a breach? The motion does not say. Has there been an action by a member of the House of Commons or by a member of the other place? The motion does not suggest it. Has there been an action by a staff member, perhaps, here or in the other place? Again, the motion does not suggest it. In other words, it seems to me that what the motion seeks is not an investigation of a prima facie case of privilege but, rather, an investigation to determine whether a prima facie question of privilege exists or whether a substantive motion would be in order.

There is a second difficulty: it is that the motion, if allowed, would lead to one committee of the House of Commons investigating the work or the operations of another committee, and that is a situation which has been carefully avoided in the past, and for good reason. More-