

*Business of the House*

this, and I am happy to say that I appreciate it. The House Leader for the Opposition was one of the people who extended his consent, after receiving this same explanation.

I also believe that Your Honour will find that the documents in the possession of the Journal Branch, the documents which I tabled this morning and the documents to which reference was made by the Hon. Member for York-Peel, are all the same. Those are the documents entitled "Revised Budget Tables, April 19, 1983".

I regret the confusion which appears to have occurred. Near the end of the Hon. Minister's speech, just before the beginning of the reply from the Opposition, someone decided that these documents were not part of the Minister's submission. I am sure that in the confusion it is understandable, but I am also sure that research with Your Honour's own staff will indicate that these documents were given to the Table at precisely that time, and they were circulated to Members of Parliament prior to that time, as the Hon. Member for York-Peel has indicated.

**Mr. Stevens:** I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. May I attempt to help clarify what the Parliamentary Secretary has just indicated? He has referred to the revised budget tables. Yesterday I inquired from the Table as to whether such a revised budget table, a mimeographed publication, had been received on budget night. I was assured, on checking with the staff, that no such document had been received. This morning, I once again checked the *Votes and Proceedings* of April 19 to see whether there was in fact evidence that the revised budget tables had been filed. If Your Honour checks page 5,807, you will find that all of the other budget documents were tabled and recorded, but that the revised budget tables to which I referred were, in fact, not tabled.

If what the Parliamentary Secretary is saying is true, that by unanimous consent he filed such a revised table today, I would suggest to Your Honour that he has made my case for me, because that essentially means that the Minister of Finance did mislead the House on budget night. He did table the wrong documents to conform to what he was representing to the House to be his final version as far as the budget and supporting documents were concerned.

If that is true, I can only presume that Your Honour will find that I have a prima facie case of privilege and that this matter should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections because, in truth, his own Parliamentary Secretary admitted what I suggest happened on budget night.

● (1530)

**Madam Speaker:** The Hon. Member has had a chance to speak on the question of privilege. Unless he rises on another point of procedure I cannot listen to him. I do not accept two interventions in the course of a question of privilege.

**Mr. Fisher:** Madam Speaker, I believe—

**Madam Speaker:** I am not giving the Hon. Member the floor, unless he is rising on some other procedure.

**Mr. Fisher:** It is the same point of order, Madam Speaker. I appreciated the opportunity to speak the first time.

**Madam Speaker:** At this point in the debate I just want to tell the House that I am aware of some of the facts which have been brought forward by the Parliamentary Secretary, namely, that some documents were refused by the Table at one point, I will not venture to say exactly when, because it was not felt that they had been formally tabled. What happened subsequently I will have to check because I think the sequence of events is very important in this particular case. I will investigate all of the facts and the arguments put forward by the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) and will come back to the House on this matter later.

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

## WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Lewis:** Madam Speaker, this being Thursday, could I inquire of the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council as to the projected order of business for next week? While I am doing that, I would point out to the Parliamentary Secretary that on April 18 of this week, on Monday, the Prime Minister made the following statement, as reported on page 24576 of *Hansard*:

—I will make an offer now which I hope that the Acting Leader of the Opposition will accept on behalf of his Party. If we can have all-Party agreement—I would not even say "all-Party agreement"—I would say that if we can have agreement of the Conservative Party to introduce an amendment on property rights and to pass it in 24 hours, I will undertake to do that—

Yesterday during statements made under the provisions of Standing Order 21, the Leader of the Opposition indicated the agreement of our Party after consultation with caucus. I see the Government House Leader has now returned to the House. I am sure he has caught the gist of my request. May I ask him, will the Government now give consideration to introducing the agreed upon amendment to the Constitution with respect to property rights immediately since the Government House Leader does have the agreement of our Party and the agreement of the New Democratic Party is not needed under the terms of the Prime Minister's remarks? Could he tell us when we might proceed with that resolution?

[Translation]

**Mr. Pinard:** Madam Speaker, as far as the business of the House for next week is concerned, I can inform the House that Monday will be the third day of debate on the budget of the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde). I would like to confirm that next Tuesday will be an Opposition day. In accordance with the Standing Orders, next Wednesday we shall be considering Private Members' Business, and Thursday will be the fourth day of the budget debate. If there is an amendment, there will be a vote at 5:45 p.m. next Thursday.

This was the business of the House for next week.