

perhaps a misunderstanding concerning the practice relating to the tabling of documents.

On the matter of tabling documents, Standing Order 46(2) states quite clearly that:

A Minister of the Crown, or a Parliamentary Secretary acting on behalf of a Minister, may, in his or her place, in the House, state that he or she proposes to lay upon the Table of the House, any report or other paper dealing with a matter coming within the administrative responsibilities of the government, and, thereupon, the same shall be deemed for all purposes to have been laid before the House.

Ministers, and not the Chair, are responsible for anything they might table concerning the administrative responsibilities of the Government. The Chair is competent to determine whether or not the tabling procedure observed is correct. It is not responsible for the content of the documents themselves. In the present case, the printed budget documents were properly tabled on budget night and the supplementary material was properly tabled at a subsequent sitting. Neither the privileges nor the procedure of this House has been breached.

I must therefore find that the Hon. Member for York-Peel does not have a question of privilege.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

PETITION

MR. OGLE—CLOSURE OF NATIONAL FILM BOARD OFFICES

Mr. Bob Ogle (Saskatoon East): Madam Speaker, I have in my hand a petition which has been signed by people from the City of Saskatoon and citizens of the northern parts of Saskatchewan. It states that the offices of the National Film Board presently located in the City of Saskatoon, in the Province of Saskatchewan, are facing closure; that the services rendered by the offices of the National Film Board in Saskatoon have been of immeasurable value to the community; that there is no comparable service with resources to provide a similar public service to the community; that the closing of these offices would deny, to countless individuals in northern areas, rural communities and prairie cities, ready access to a form of Canadian culture and creativity which their tax dollars help to make possible; and that the closing of these offices represents an irreplaceable loss in the quality of service to the community.

Therefore, the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to urge the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox) to reverse the decision to close the National Film Board offices in Saskatoon. The petition has been presented by teachers, by professors from the university, by senior citizens and by a broad sector of people. I hope the Minister will listen attentively to it.

Order Paper Questions

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT, 1971

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE BENEFITS TO ADOPTING PARENT

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-683, an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (benefits to adopting parent).

He said: Madam Speaker, this amendment to the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 would entitle an adopting parent, whether male or female, to benefits equivalent to pregnancy benefits currently accorded to natural mothers under the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, if question No. 4,527 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that question No. 4,527 be deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

EQUIFAX INC.

Question No. 4,527—**Mr. Parker:**

1. Have any government departments or agencies done business with the firm Equifax Inc. in the past two years and, if so, what was the nature of the work?

2. Is Equifax Inc. presently performing any work for any government agencies or departments and, if so, for each agency or department, what is the nature of the work?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Smith: Madam Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. McKinnon: Madam Speaker, a question of mine is on the Order Paper. It is a starred question, which is supposed to incite a little haste on the Government side. It has now been on the Order Paper since May 19 of last year, and it concerns Mr. Geoff Wright. A clear case of petty discrimination has been made against this young gentleman, and the Department of National Defence is refusing to allow him to enrol in the reserves. No real acceptable reason has been given, and I ask that an oral answer be given in the House with the utmost dispatch. I also understand that the answer has been sitting on the Minister's desk for several weeks or months.