

Bilingualism

negotiate its passage at second reading, sent it to committee, and it is one of our priorities to pass the Bill through third reading before the end of June. If the Hon. Member wants to show a little more maturity and allow Bill C-9 to get out of the way, this will allow us to deal with all of the Bills that are at report stage.

Once again, the Bills that will get priority in this case are the Bills that are at report stage. The Bill to which the Hon. Member refers is not yet at report stage but could be before the end of June. It will be given priority in due time. The sooner Bill C-9 is passed, the better our chances for Bill C-34 to be adopted in this House, as well as Bill C-40, Bill C-37 and Bill C-33.

Mr. Wise: Mr. Speaker, I believe one week ago and perhaps on two or three previous occasions I posed a couple of questions to the Government House Leader regarding the status and progress of two agricultural Bills. This might not be the best way to view the discussions and the attitude presently prevailing in the House—

Mr. Speaker: The last intervention of the Hon. Member turned out to be a 15-minute speech. The Chair hopes he does not have the same thing in mind.

Mr. Wise: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and I can recall your words of caution to me one week ago. I will certainly bear them in mind. I will come directly to the two Bills in question. One was the required amendment to the advance payments Bill. The Minister is well aware why I posed that question. He indicated to me that he was not certain whether the Bill would be passed next week or before the House adjourns for the summer recess. The second one was the required amendments to the National Farm Products Marketing Act to meet the request of the troubled tobacco industry in southwestern Ontario. To help the Minister out, he responded to me on that occasion by saying that the Bill will be introduced once the policy has been approved by Cabinet. Can the Minister give us any further information or tell us if there has been any advancement in the progress of the status of those two pieces of legislation?

● (1520)

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, this question is the same as the one asked last week by the Hon. Member at page 4448 of *Hansard*. My answer appears on the same page and at page 4449 of *Hansard* for June 7, 1984. I invite my colleague to read the answer. It is the same one I have to give today.

* * *

BILINGUALISM

TABLING OF LETTER TO PREMIER DAVIS OF ONTARIO

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wish to seize this opportunity to seek the unanimous consent of this House, presuming that the Tory Party have had the time to read the letter on language rights signed by the

Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and sent to Premier Davis. I again seek the unanimous consent of the House to append this letter which was tabled in the House by the Prime Minister earlier this week to today's *Hansard*.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader never ceases to surprise me, and he has done it again today. The usual courtesy is that we have prior consultation. It does not involve standing up one day with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) attempting to slip in a letter as an appendix to *Hansard* without even having the courtesy of consulting prior to that with other Members of Parliament.

Second, we should look at occasions when we append items to *Hansard* with some care. There should be the fullest consultation. We know that the appending of items to *Hansard* has been restricted almost exclusively in the history and tradition of Parliament to items dealing with budgetary matters.

What I wanted to discuss had I had the opportunity of a *tête-à-tête*, *mano a mano*, eyeball-to-eyeball discussion with my colleague, the Government House Leader, is just what the parameters are with respect to requests on the part of the Prime Minister, the Government House Leader or any Member of Parliament, for unanimous consent to append documents, however important or trivial they happen to be. If the Government House Leader wants me to give my consent right now, I cannot give that consent. I would want to consult, as is the custom in my Party, with my colleagues about this. We are a team over here. We work together. We consult with each other. I always do the courtesy to my colleagues of discussing these matters to make sure that we understand what the rules are, unlike the Government House Leader who seems to have a penchant for autocratic action, given the leadership by his own Prime Minister *pro tem*.

Mr. Speaker: There does not appear to be unanimous consent.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the remarks made by my colleague. This is not the first request for unanimous consent to append this letter to *Hansard*. The Prime Minister made that request on Monday. Therefore, he should not be surprised. I understand that language rights constitute a very sensitive issue for his Party. I am just asking for the same consent asked a week or so ago by the Prime Minister. My colleague should not lose his cool or get upset because I make that request without having talked to him privately and asking whether he read the letter a week ago. He knew of that request. He does not have to agree to it.

I do not agree with what he said about the kinds of documents that are appended to *Hansard*. By unanimous consent we can append any letter or document. If he does not agree, all he has to do is say no. What we are dealing with is language rights, specifically language rights for the French-speaking minority in Ontario. The Tory Party is free to say yes or no to appending a letter from the Prime Minister to a Premier. If they say no, they say no; but they do not have to