

*AIB Reports*

April 19 to indicate that it may possibly be privilege if the allegation is of deliberately misleading and contained in a proper substantive motion. That was what I was endeavouring to put forward at that time.

I would think, therefore, that the action would be to strike out the hon. member's notice of privilege because it contained the word "deliberately", on the basis of clear precedents. It is entirely without prejudice to the hon. member to raise the matter again in a substantive motion after he has had the opportunity to consult these precedents. Whether or not that course is open, in the light of the interventions that have already taken place by the Minister of Finance in the proceedings to this date, in which the Minister of Finance indicated that he did not mislead the House on those occasions, would have to depend on other precedents in which, when matters of this sort or similar to this have been raised a minister or a member has risen in his place in the House and said that the House was not misled, or, if it was misled, it was certainly not done intentionally. Under the practices of this House his word has always been accepted, and the matter has always been finalized. Since the minister has already said that, whether the matter ought to go further is something only further reflection can determine. However, I did want to give to the House and the hon. members involved the benefit of my examination of these precedents.

● (1512)

The matter remains open for further action which might be recommended, but it would have to be done in accordance with those precedents rather than in the manner which has been attempted up to the present time.

\* \* \*

## POINTS OF ORDER

## MRS. HOLT—SALARIES OF LEGAL SECRETARIES

**Mrs. Simma Holt (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Yesterday I spoke on a motion relating to housewives' allowances, and I feel compelled now to correct an error in *Hansard* at page 3265. I referred yesterday to legal secretarial salaries and compared them with the income per case of their lawyer bosses. I used an old salary rate of \$8,000 a year. It should have been \$11,000 to \$14,000 for what lawyers describe as a "good secretary". The hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson) challenged me in the debate. I would like the record to show that I know he is very generous in recognizing his secretary's remarkable management talent.

## MR. BAKER (GRENVILLE-CARLETON)—CHANGES IN ESTIMATES

**Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Just as a preliminary to my point of order, I gather from what Your Honour said with respect to the previous matter raised by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) that the matter is open to

argument and that Your Honour put precedents before the House so that we can examine them and perhaps speak later. I gather that is the case.

My point of order relates to something which arose during the question period with regard to the fact that, according to the announcement of the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen), estimates will be referred to the appropriate committees tomorrow. During the course of the question period the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Macdonald), in, I suppose, his last question in this House, raised with the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts) who, I suppose gave his penultimate answer in this House, the fact that there is some mistake in the estimates and that the estimates of the Secretary of State would be increased. I think the words used were "raised substantially".

That raises a point of order with respect to the reference tomorrow, and that has to do with whether any other ministers have approached the President of Treasury Board to advise him whether there will be revisions, either upward or downward, in their respective departmental estimates. Prior to any reference being made—preferably today, and certainly tomorrow—there should be a statement made or, on the reference, something substantive should go to the committees so that the committees and this House can be aware of what the situation might be. I raise this as a point of order because I think it deals with propositions with respect to the reference of the estimates tomorrow. Perhaps the President of the Treasury Board can deal with this.

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, I will certainly undertake to examine that situation. This is the first indication I have had that perhaps there was a printing error. However, I will check into this and try to give the hon. member a reassurance at the appropriate time.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

## ANTI-INFLATION ACT

## TABLING OF BOARD'S REPORTS

**Mr. Ed Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Section 17(2) of the Anti-Inflation Act I wish to table, in both official languages, copies of two reports sent to the Administrator by the Anti-Inflation Board.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)