

Finance

The second point I would like to make is with regard to research and the reporting of it to the House. I may not have understood Your Honour's words in this regard, but it seems to me that Your Honour is saying that because you have not been informed that any prosecution has been started, or that the Attorney General has given his approval for a prosecution, or that a writ of search and seizure under the Official Secrets Act has even been issued, therefore this is all hypothetical and may not even be a question of privilege. I would like to suggest that Your Honour's research should include the very basic question that a threat to a member of this House, in this building and in his office—not necessarily an act but the threat of an act—does not constitute a breach of the privileges of a member of this House and does not fall within Your Honour's jurisdiction. Sir, I think—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The latter point raised by the hon. member relates to my last remarks. At the moment the matter has not perfected itself as to form in terms of a question of privilege, so I do not have before me the ingredients of a question of privilege in a definite form which enables me to deal with it. If that is what is included in any motion which is ultimately put by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Cossitt), that is what we will research.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. STEVENS—ANSWER BY MINISTER OF FINANCE DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In the question period the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) put a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) concerning the rate of interest payable on the \$200 million which will be taken down pursuant to the \$1.5 billion line of credit. The English translation—and I checked this with the French side of *Hansard*—heard the minister state that it was three eighths of 1 per cent over the LIBOR rate in London. I believe that was an incorrect representation. I believe the figure should be five eighths of 1 per cent over the LIBOR rate, and I would like the minister, if he so wishes, to correct the record.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I sent Your Honour a note during the question period telling you that I meant to say five eighths. I said three eighths; my staff verifies that. I have seen the blue. I was so sure that I said five eighths that I checked the blue, but in fact I did say three eighths. The rate is five eighths above the London rate for the first three years and, to be more precise, three quarters after three years.

[Mr. Lawrence.]

OFFICIAL REPORT

Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a correction made in *Hansard* for Tuesday, February 28, at page 3331. I was speaking in the late night adjournment debate. I have written to the *Hansard* office about this. I compared what is recorded in *Hansard* against the television recording, and there are a great many differences. Lines have been left out, there are gaps, sentences have been changed around and sentences have been left out. I realize that *Hansard* has a very difficult job and that I do not speak from a text. I speak quickly. I have great sympathy for the *Hansard* reporters, and I recognize the great job they do, but I must make a complaint about this.

I would like to correct the third paragraph on page 3331. It now states:

On February 15 during a television program the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Jamieson) pretended the Gull Island program is now going ahead just because there is an election coming.

I did not say that in relation on the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I referred to the first ministers conference and said it was televised and that on February 15 the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) pretended the Gull Island program was now going ahead, not the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Further down in the same paragraph the report reads:

● (1732)

This was the most dishonest television program ever seen in the history of television. The Secretary of State for External Affairs should have been given an enema award instead of an Emmy award.

I meant to say that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources should have been given an enema award instead of an Emmy award. I should like to have that corrected because I want to make sure the right minister is identified as getting that award.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, because of the matters that took place earlier and as you are aware by looking at the clock, the allotted day which was designated for the New Democratic Party has virtually been used up. There has been some discussion among House leaders about the way in which the right to use the day by an opposition party might be protected. That discussion has led all of us to the conclusion that perhaps if this day was designated as an opposition day or an allotted day, it ought to be now undesignated and we ought to use the balance of this day for government business. That would be on the understanding that an allotted day would be reserved to the New Democratic Party at a time we might discuss. To be fair it would have to be a long day.

The other side of this question and the *quid pro quo*, not unreasonable in the circumstances, is that we would deal with the bill affectionately known as COLURA and the CNR