

I have listened with considerable care to the Hon. Member from Ottawa—Vanier, the Hon. Member for Kamloops and the Minister.

The position that both the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party is taking in this argument is that because of changed circumstances the Order, despite the fact that it was obtained by consent, ought to no longer bind the House. I think that is the point.

#### SITTING SUSPENDED

**Mr. Speaker:** I am going to ask the co-operation of the House to stand down for a short while as I consider this unusual circumstance.

The sitting of the House was suspended at 5.11 p.m.

#### SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 5.34 p.m.

#### PRIVILEGE

##### LEAK OF BUDGET DOCUMENT—SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** On April 19, 1989, an Order was made by this House. It was a unanimous order as a consequence of discussions as so often happens here between Leaders of all three Parties. That Order—I am citing this so that Hon. Members and the public will clearly understand what is taking place—related to the presentation of a Budget. The agreement entered into prior to the Order being presented to the House and the unanimous consent that was given to the Order when it was presented to the House were clearly based on the expectation that the Minister of Finance would rise today and present his Budget. I read the Order:

That, notwithstanding any Standing or Special Order of this House, at 5.00 o'clock p.m. on Thursday, April 27, 1989, the Speaker shall interrupt any proceedings then before the House and proceed forthwith to the consideration of Ways and Means Proceedings No. 1, for the purpose of hearing the Budget statement of the Minister of Finance;

That, immediately following such budget statement, the House shall revert to the Routine Proceedings "Introduction of Government Bills" and, following introduction and first reading of a bill or bills, the Speaker shall recognize a member of the Official Opposition in debate on Ways and Means Proceedings No. 1; and

That would mean in the usual course a representative of the Official Opposition would speak and, if that took place, would have unlimited time. It continues:

#### *Privilege*

That the House shall not adjourn until the adjournment of the debate on Ways and Means Proceedings No. 1, following which the Speaker shall adjourn the House until the next sitting day.

And by unanimous consent it was ordered:

That, on Friday, April 28, 1989, the House shall meet at 11 o'clock a.m. with Statements by Members pursuant to Standing Order 31 at that time, Oral Questions at 11.15 o'clock a.m., until 12 o'clock noon, followed by the Daily Routine of Business;

That, immediately upon the completion of the Daily Routine of Business, the House shall proceed to Government Orders, Ways and Means Proceedings No. 1 (the Budget motion);

That, during the debate on the Budget motion, on that day, there shall be one speaker for the Official Opposition followed by one speaker for the New Democratic Party and, that both speakers will be allowed whatever time is necessary to complete their speeches; and

That, immediately upon completion of the speech by the New Democratic Party speaker, but in any event not later than 3.30 o'clock p.m., the Speaker shall adjourn the House until Monday, May 1, 1989, at 11 o'clock a.m.

That is the Order which was entered into by consent.

Several things have happened in the last 24 hours as Hon. Members and the public know and as a consequence the Government decided that the Minister of Finance had to proceed with the presentation of the Budget by way of a press conference yesterday evening rather than wait until today and present the Budget by way of the Special Order.

It is not for me to argue about these events except to record, as Hon. Members and the public are aware, that the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party have argued this afternoon that it is not appropriate to proceed under this Order even though consent was given before because circumstances have changed.

Both the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party have taken the unusual step of advising the House that under the circumstances they withdraw their consent. By that I take it to mean that they no longer feel that they ought to agree that the House should proceed under the provisions of the Special Order.

I am quick to point out that there are negotiations that take place here all the time and sometimes when agreement seems to have been reached, but prior to it having taken effect on the floor of the House, circumstances may change.

Sometimes what may have seemed to have been consent earlier is not followed through because of changed circumstances.