

down, and which we discussed in the past few days in our debates will include statements of obvious principles, or is a method for bringing the principles into a concrete and viable form also included in the policy statement? I ask this because so far a great deal of time has been spent on statements of the obvious.

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** Mr. Speaker, some, of course, think everything is obvious; for others, it is somewhat more complicated. Everybody cannot be a genius in this world.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** No doubt, if we want to have a national policy, it should include some principles. But I do not think we should restrict our policy to statements of principle or to general policies that will have no bearing on the system as it exists now. Without doubt, while we are working on a philosophy or a policy, we are working on projects which will be related to this philosophy.

\* \* \*

#### FINANCE

##### INQUIRY WHETHER THERE WILL BE A BUDGET BEFORE END OF JUNE

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, in order to reduce a little of the confusion about government policy, may I ask the Prime Minister whether he intended to indicate that there might not be a budget between now and the end of June when he said that in all probability there would be one. I ask this because of the firm statement the Minister of Finance made several times, to the effect that there would be, hopefully, a budget before the end of May?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** No, Mr. Speaker. When I said in all probability, I merely indicated that we are all in the hands of God in this matter.

**An hon. Member:** So, there is a higher authority.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has finally found a higher authority than his own on which to blame things.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

\* \* \*

#### THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

##### INFLATION—POSSIBILITY OF FURTHER MEETINGS SEEKING CONSENSUS ON RESTRAINT

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I would ask, who is giving the House correct information, the Acting Prime Minister, who said before the Prime Minister arrived that no decision has yet been made by his colleagues as to whether there will be future meetings on the subject of consensus, or the Prime Minis-

*Privilege—Mr. Andre*

ter, who assured the House after he arrived that there would be future meetings?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, what I was answering a member of the NDP, I believe, relative to meetings with businessmen was that, according to my understanding of the meetings, they did not consider the matter closed and that although opinions were divided, we expect there will be further meetings with them.

● (1500)

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

##### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, could the government House leader tell us what the business will be for the rest of this week and for next week? I sympathize with him in his attempts to arrange the time of the House efficiently in light of the indecisive approach taken by the Prime Minister to economic issues and in light of the discussion which has just gone on. Can he also tell us whether we shall be debating the budget in the first two weeks of June?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, if there was as much unity on the other side of the House as there is on this side, we would have far less difficulty in arranging the program.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sharp:** Today we shall proceed with Bill C-47. When that is concluded, I have in mind calling Bills C-24, C-58 and C-20. I should like to have some latitude for rearranging the order, but those are the bills which are next on the list.

\* \* \*

#### PRIVILEGE

##### MR. ANDRE—PROCEEDINGS IN STANDING COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL RESOURCES AND PUBLIC WORKS—RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

**Mr. Speaker:** Yesterday, the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) raised a question of privilege. Despite its intricacies, I think, after a day's reflection, that it still boils down to a suggestion that in some way the Chair ought to sit in appeal on decisions taken or procedures followed in a standing committee. I need only refer hon. members to the decision reached by my predecessor in December, 1973, which is appropriately reported in the *Journals*. He ruled, then, that no practice of the House exists under which the Chair sits in appeal of decisions taken in the standing committees.

The procedures for discussing points of order in a standing committee are well known to hon. members. I refer to the procedure of the steering committee there. The reports