

not impossible that the government party themselves might be interested in a similar arrangement in the not too distant future.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, following today we will be continuing with consideration of Bill C-58. If there is completion of the discussion of motions tomorrow, I hope there would be general agreement that any votes would be deferred until Monday. In any event, Bill C-58 will be continued at the report stage for the time being, and then as soon as possible we will take third reading. When that is disposed of, we will continue second reading of Bill C-68. I should like to express my hope that we can also fit in Bill C-82 and Bill S-10 and complete consideration of them.

As the House leader of the official opposition has reminded us, there is a very dramatic event next week which may or may not elevate one of the members of his party in the House to the position of leader. At any rate, this great event is an important one and I quite agree that the courtesies of the House should be extended to all parties when they enter upon these considerations. There were various adjectives I could have applied, but I will not do so. Therefore, I propose that we should not sit on the evening of Thursday, February 19, and that we should stand adjourned until Monday, February 23. I wonder whether there would be unanimous consent to make the following order:

That the House shall adjourn at five p.m. on Thursday, February 19, 1976, and shall thereupon stand adjourned until Monday, February 23, 1976.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There having been some discussion on this matter, since at this point we are discussing a point of order raised by the hon. member for Peace River, such a motion, if it were to be entertained by the House, could only be presented to the House at this time by unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Jones: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There not being unanimous consent, such a motion cannot be considered at this time.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a supplementary question regarding the House business. There were reports this morning on CBC radio about what I can only call leaks respecting the confidential report now being reviewed by a joint committee of the House and the Senate having to do with employer-employee relations in the public service of Canada. I had originally thought that this might be a question of privilege, but the only action that could be taken in that event would be to have the matter go to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, which would probably be futile.

I think that our anxiety, which I am sure is shared by the Chair, is to establish procedures of some kind where this kind of thing ought not to happen; indeed could not happen. Perhaps it might be better if I asked the government House leader whether he would consider accelerating the formation of the special committee that has been discussed regarding rights and immunities of members of parliament. Rather than have an examination of this par-

Business of the House

ticular matter, I think we ought to have an examination of all the matters affecting the security of documents in so far as this might apply to documents in House of Commons committee reports and other reports. Not doing so could only lead to embarrassment, and on many occasions could only lead to misleading of the public. Since this matter does affect the rights and privileges of members, I would ask whether or not any thought has been given by the government House leader to dealing with the matter in the way I suggest.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, I must say I had not given consideration to that particular aspect of the matter. However, I did view very sympathetically the suggestion made by the House leader of the official opposition, and I hope we can get together to discuss the terms of reference.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order with regard to the business of the House. May I say that when it looked as though the motion for the adjournment for sake of the Progressive Conservative convention would be accepted, I was going to ask whether we should not consider the possibility that the Conservatives might not be able to finish their balloting on Sunday, and that maybe we would have to take Monday off as well. I should like to make that offer, provided, of course, it would get the support of the hon. member for Moncton.

With regard to the business of the House, may I ask the minister two questions? My first question relates to Bill C-208 which, according to notices posted in the lobbies, is to be dealt with at four o'clock tomorrow. In view of the wide support for this bill having to do with Heritage Day, especially on the government side, can the government House leader say whether the government will make additional time available, if necessary, to get this bill through third reading, if that does not happen in the one hour allotted to it tomorrow?

My second question relates to the statement that the Minister of Veterans Affairs was to make today on the proposed legislation regarding Canadian veterans who were prisoners of war. This is a promise that has been made to us on four separate occasions, namely, that we would get such a statement today. May I ask whether we are to have that statement?

Mr. Sharp: First of all, with regard to Bill C-208, this is a private bill. The government is also concerned about the matter, and if this particular bill is not approved it is the intention of the government at a later stage to introduce a bill that will deal not only with the subject matter of that bill but other related issues. It is our view that it would be better to put these matters all into a complete package; but, of course, if the House approves this bill, one part of the package would be approved. However, it is not the intention of the government to give any more time to this private bill because it believes that the subject matter can be dealt with better and more expeditiously through a government bill that also deals with related aspects of the subject of the hon. member's private bill.