

Reference to Statement in Budget Papers

of revised *Hansard* and the *Journals* of this house. Surely such a development would be objectionable in connection with the privileges of the House of Commons, referring in our records to an act which has not yet even been introduced in the House of Commons as justification for the insertion of certain figures into our records. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill):

That this house instruct the officials of the house to delete line 4 of table 11 and the first paragraph appearing below table 11 on page 55 of the budget papers and to replace the same in the revised *Hansard* and the *Journals* by a statement reflecting the true facts of the situation.

Mr. Speaker: I should like to be sure that I understand the privilege of the house which is involved before I hear the minister, who I presume will wish to speak to this matter before the motion is dealt with. If the Leader of the Opposition could tell me explicitly what privilege of the house is involved in the statement I would appreciate it.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the privilege in short is the appearance in the records of the house, in a table which was introduced into those records at the request of the minister and with the approval of the house, of a reference to an act of parliament as something which has been passed and which justifies certain statistical material, when that act of parliament has not even been submitted to the house, let alone passed by the house.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Hear, hear. Parliament still has some rights.

Hon. Donald M. Fleming (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the house has just listened to a most extraordinary statement from the Leader of the Opposition. He began first of all by saying that in the course of the budget speech certain tables were placed on *Hansard* by leave of the house, but what he refers to is not something that was put on *Hansard* by leave of the house on Thursday evening during the course of the budget speech at all. He is referring now to something that was in the white paper tabled on Wednesday afternoon before the budget ever came down. That is the first of a number of errors in the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. Pearson: That is wrong.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Then when you come to see what he takes issue with, it is to be found on page 55 of the white paper which by decision of the house, indeed on motion of the house unanimously passed on Wednesday, became part of the records of the house. On page 55 of the white paper, as now

[Mr. Pearson.]

appended to *Hansard* of Thursday last, he draws attention to the item, additional grants to Newfoundland—this is the fourth line of which he speaks—which for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1959 amount to \$13.6 million.

He takes up the time of the house to make this appear as a great mystery, when there is nothing mysterious about it at all and it is completely in accord with what the Prime Minister announced in the house the day before the house rose for the Easter recess. It was made very plain then that it is the purpose of the government to submit to the house legislation—it will be first of all a resolution and then a bill to follow the resolution—to provide for the payment to Newfoundland in accordance with the recommendation of the royal commission on the terms of union with Newfoundland of the payments for the first two years of the five year period in question, and it was made perfectly clear in the Prime Minister's statement that the payments for the fiscal years 1957-58 and 1958-59 would be charged to the federal government's accounts for the year 1958-59. That is perfectly plain for everyone to see, and that is precisely what is proposed.

As to the amount, the Prime Minister made it clear that this is the amount that is provided for in the recommendations of the royal commission on the terms of union with Newfoundland. It amounts to the annual payments that are recommended less the transitional payments which are now in decreasing amounts as they run out, and the sum of \$13.6 million represents two years' net payments after deducting the transitional grants in accordance with the provisions of article 29 of the terms of union with Newfoundland. Nothing could be plainer than that.

It has not taken legislative effect yet and cannot, of course, until parliament passes the legislation. It is the intention of the government, as the Prime Minister then indicated, to introduce the necessary legislation. First of all there will be a resolution, and if the house approves the resolution the bill will then follow. The amount that has been named in the report of the commissioners for these many months now is the amount that was indicated by the Prime Minister; and this statement indicates, Mr. Speaker, that it is the intention of the government that these payments for the two fiscal years—

Mr. Chevrier: It does not. It does no such thing.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): —1957-58 and 1958-59 should be charged to the federal government's accounts for the year 1958-59. What could be plainer, what could be fairer,