

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. Moreover, the fact that in this case a committee of the House of Commons would be investigating the work or operations of a joint committee makes it even more difficult and, from a jurisdictional point of view, more awkward. The question may be asked: If this does not constitute a question of privilege, is the House without a remedy in these circumstances? I think all honourable Members would be quick to agree that such is not the case. In the first place a substantive motion can be put forward for an investigation, presumably by joint action in this and the other place. Since it would not, in those circumstances, be under the restriction of privilege, it would likely have more freedom from a procedural point of view. Furthermore, it seems to me that there might not be great difficulty in the committee itself which, since it is a joint committee of both places, can, if it wishes, investigate further into this mishap and may, perhaps, proceed to do so. Of course, I am referring to hypothetical circumstances now; if there was a difficulty posed by the terms of reference in connection with that special joint committee, it seems to me from the attitude expressed on all sides of the House yesterday that there would be little difficulty in getting those terms of reference expanded if, indeed, that were necessary. I would think there would be considerable question as to whether it would be necessary for the committee to get extended terms of reference if it wished to go on and inquire into circumstances surrounding the leak of a confidential report. However, I put that forward only as a suggestion which honourable Members may wish to consider. As I say, because the motion lacks the precision and specific detail alleging conduct which constitutes a breach of the privileges of this House from a procedural point of view, while it deals with a point which in the abstract, or in general terms, certainly touches the privilege of the House, I feel the motion is not sufficiently specific to enable the Chair to grant a question of privilege at this time.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), seconded by Mr. Sharp,—That Bill C-73, An Act to provide for the restraint of profit margins, prices, dividends and compensation in Canada, be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate continuing;

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Jarvis for Mr. Halliday on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Messrs. Marceau and Lefebvre for Messrs. Cyr and Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi) on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Messrs. Abbott and Martin for Mr. Trudel and Mrs. Appolloni on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Symes for Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands) on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Allmand, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Auditor General on the examination of the Accounts and Financial Statement of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (Dependants) Pension Fund for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1975, pursuant to section 55(4) of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Pension Continuation Act, chapter R-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 301-1/232A.

By Mr. Cullen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Department of National Revenue, Customs, Excise and Taxation for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1975, pursuant to section 5 of the Department of National Revenue Act, chapter N-15, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 301-1/19A.

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Activities of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1975, pursuant to section 3 of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations Act, chapter F-26, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 301-6/3A.

By Mr. MacEachen,—Report of the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission for the year ended March 31, 1975, together with the Report of the Auditor General on the Financial Statements for the year ended December 31, 1974, pursuant to section 7 of the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission Act, chapter 19, Statutes of Canada, 1964-65. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 301-1/229.