

Reference to Statement in Budget Papers

of the house to place on the record without reading them certain tables, those are tables appearing in the budget speech of Thursday evening and they do not include the white paper at all. I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman that he is quite wrong in his approach to that matter.

As to the content of this statement in the white paper, I tried to make it quite clear that the legislation that was contemplated when this white paper was written, and is still contemplated, has not yet been passed and has not yet been introduced under pressure of business of the house. You have suggested, Mr. Speaker, that the word "proposed" be inserted, and I indicated that I should be entirely happy to accede to that suggestion in order to clarify the matter.

The house has not been misled. There is no suggestion that anything has been done or will be done that has not the approval of the house. The accounts for the year 1958-59 have not been closed. So far as the provision made or proposed to be made for the payment to Newfoundland of sums recommended for the fiscal years 1957-58 and 1958-59, they will be so recorded in the accounts of the government for the year 1958-59 when parliament has so authorized and certainly not before.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word because I want the record to be clear. The Leader of the Opposition, with what appeared to be synthetic annoyance engendered beyond the importance of the matter, made the statement that the reason that he did not raise this question—

Mr. McIlraith: Who is exhibiting synthetic annoyance now?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the hon. gentleman who is now interrupting, and whom the former administration put and kept in a position of subservience, kindly be quiet?

Mr. Robichaud: We hear that from the Prime Minister.

Mr. Pickersgill: The usual courtesy.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must ask the house to give the Prime Minister the opportunity to discuss the question of privilege.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The hon. gentleman made the statement that the reason he did not raise this matter on Friday was that he had not before him *Hansard*, which did not come out until three o'clock in the afternoon, as I remember it. The hon. gentleman apparently did not realize that it appeared attached to *Votes and Proceedings* of Wednesday, April 9. Therefore the care with

which he explained the fact that he could not raise this alleged question of privilege until today falls down. It indicates that the examination he made over Sunday was not made when it could have been made of *Votes and Proceedings*. I just mention that matter because the hon. gentleman was explaining why he had failed to raise this matter earlier. It is apparent that those who read for him had not seen this in *Votes and Proceedings*.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, once again I have been brought into the argument. The Minister of Finance has raised a smokescreen of argument, I admit, but the Prime Minister has raised a smokescreen of political claptrap. If I was not able to digest all the details of these budget papers in the 48 hours from Wednesday to Friday, it is obvious that the members of the government were not able to go over these papers in the two or three weeks during which they were considering the budget. Otherwise they would never have allowed this table to appear.

The Minister of Finance has called attention to the fact that it appeared on Wednesday, and in that I think he is quite correct. But it and the other papers were introduced on Thursday in *Hansard*, with the consent and approval of the house. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, as reported at page 2410 of *Hansard* the minister—and I am sure he will agree with this—asked for the inclusion in *Hansard* of a table which appears on that page as table 1. It is headed "Federal contributions to the provinces" and there is no argument, I am sure, between us as to when he asked permission to include this table in *Hansard* and when it was included.

In this table—and this is a supplementary criticism which I make of the government on this occasion—the minister included a figure of \$13.6 million as the federal contribution to the province. If the Minister of Finance, irrespective of what the Prime Minister has said, will just carry out the promise he has given us to correct this paragraph by putting the word "proposed" before the word "Newfoundland", and change the word "amounted" in the fifth line to "would amount", the record will be corrected and the house can go on with its business.

Mr. Speaker: In so far as there may be an affront to the house in the description of the act in the white paper, the minister who is responsible for it has agreed to add the word "proposed" before "Newfoundland additional grants act". Does the minister accept the other suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition, the substitution of the words "would amount to" for the words "amounted to"?