

As to the appeal procedure he referred to, I fail to see what it is all about. That is not what I talked about. I explained that our officials—and I repeat this for those who are interested—when they are dealing with amounts under \$600, and I recall very well saying that in the House, our officials have agreements to the effect that no action is taken against people, and so on.

If the Hon. Member is not satisfied with the facts I gave, which are all true, that is his problem, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize but not to him, I mean he is not satisfied with the facts, I do not see where there is a question of privilege and I make no apology in that respect.

● (1510)

[English]

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has listened to the exchange between Hon. Members and I would like to make just two observations. First, a question of privilege must be brought to the attention of the House at the first possible opportunity, and I cite *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition*, Section 82. Mr. Speaker Jerome ruled on September 27, 1971 that this has to be taken quite literally. A delay of a few days denies the essential element of priority in the discussion and any finding that has to be made.

The Chair is tempted to remark at this point that there appear to be differences as to fact. The Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) has set his case clearly on the record and the Minister has made her observations. This is Parliament, and at this point the Chair has to find there is no *prima facie* case of privilege.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, we know that tomorrow is an allotted day. May I ask the Government House Leader what the business of the House will be for next week, as far as he can take us?

Mr. Pinard: Yes, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is an allotted day. Monday will be the seventh day of debate on the Speech from the Throne. Tuesday and Wednesday will be, assuming Bill C-12 is not disposed of today, Bills C-12, C-14, C-7, C-8, C-15, C-16 and C-9. Thursday will be the eighth day of debate on the Speech from the Throne, and I would like to indicate that the Prime Minister will want to speak early next Thursday, mainly to, among other things, report on his peace initiative. If any Members on the other side would like to speak on the same subject, they know in advance that the Prime Minister will speak in the House next Thursday on this issue.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Government House Leader for that outline. He said "early" next Thursday. Can

he indicate now whether the Prime Minister will be rising first at eleven o'clock on that day?

Mr. Pinard: It is certainly the intent to have the Prime Minister speak at the very beginning of the parliamentary day, but it is difficult to know in advance who will have had the floor previously. That can be arranged among ourselves. I am willing to discuss this with the House Leaders to make sure that if we plan a day to debate peace issues, the Prime Minister could speak at eleven o'clock followed by whoever wants to speak on this issue from the other side. I am open-minded on that. Failing any firm agreement, I think the Prime Minister will seize the first opportunity next Thursday to report on his peace initiative.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. EPP—TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE BY MR. LALONDE—
RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker: At this point the Chair is prepared to rule on matters raised on Monday, January 30, involving the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) and others, as well as the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald). Is it the wish of the Opposition House Leader that the Chair rule now or await the presence of the Hon. Member for Provencher in the House?

Mr. Nielsen: The House Leader of the Opposition would like to hear the ruling now.

Mr. Speaker: On Monday, January 30, 1984, the Hon. Member for Provencher raised a point of order relating to the procedure of tabling of documents by a Minister, and more specifically the tabling of certain correspondence by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) on Friday, January 27, 1984.

I have reviewed the contributions of Hon. Members to the procedural debate that ensued. Their comments have been most useful in assisting the Chair in reaching a decision on this question.

I would first like to address the major points made by the Hon. Member for Provencher. He raised four basic and important issues relating to the rules and practices of the House pertaining to the tabling of documents pursuant to Standing Order 46.

In the first instance, the Hon. Member stated that the Minister required unanimous consent to table the documents in question. In support of his argument, he quoted Speaker Jerome from *Hansard* at page 5955 on June 1, 1978. A close look at the proceedings of that day reveals that my predecessor was in fact responding to a request from a member of the Opposition to print, as an appendix to *Hansard*, by unanimous consent, a certain document that had been referred to during a debate on an alleged question of privilege. The said document was indeed tabled and printed by unanimous consent. That was a proceeding and a decision of the House to proceed by