

last 24 hours we shall meet that when it arises. In the meantime, with due deference to the opinions that have been stated, I must rule that in my opinion this motion is now properly before the house.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

### INCOME TAX ACT

**Hon. Donald M. Fleming (Minister of Finance)** moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 232, to amend the Income Tax Act.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, as you will expect, I hold the same view with respect to the introduction of this bill without a prior resolution, but in view of the ruling you made on the previous bill I will not press the point at this time.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has had his objection noted. I have not had the opportunity to read this bill, but I take it from statements made in the house that it does not impose any new tax but is simply a bill to reduce taxation and therefore—

**Mr. Fleming:** That is the fact.

**Mr. Speaker:** —comes within the opinion I have already expressed on the other bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

### CLOSURE OF DEBATE

#### MOTION TO REPEAL STANDING ORDER 33 TRANSFERRED TO GOVERNMENT ORDERS

On the order:

That standing order 33 of the standing orders of the House of Commons be repealed.—The Prime Minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** By the standing orders this matter is automatically transferred to government orders and needs no other action of the house at this time. I refer the house to standing order 21, subsection 2, which provides for the automatic transfer of the motion to government orders.

### MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

#### CALGARY CITIZENSHIP COUNCIL

##### Motion No. 44—Mr. Pickersgill:

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged since July 1, 1954, between the minister or any official in Ottawa of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, on the one hand, and any of the officers of the Calgary citizenship council, on the other, respecting the citizenship reception centre.

Motion agreed to.

96698—132

### Motions for Papers

#### COLUMBIA RIVER—PROPOSALS FOR HYDROELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT

##### Motion No. 45—Mr. Hahn:

For a copy of the preliminary report entitled proposals for the hydroelectric development of the Columbia river system in Canada.

**Hon. D. S. Harkness (Acting Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I must oppose this motion. Hon. members will perhaps recall that there was a considerable amount of discussion in the house last week with regard to the particular document in question. It was indicated at that time that we did not consider it in the public interest to table this document at the moment, at least, and I should like to state that there are really two grounds on which I would oppose the motion being adopted.

First, it is a departmental document of a type which is not normally tabled. Second, and more important, negotiations with the United States in regard to the Columbia river system and the development of hydroelectric power on that system have been going on and will probably continue for some time. We do not consider it in the public interest that this document should be made public during the time these negotiations are in progress.

**Mr. Hahn:** The reason for putting the motion before the house is that I am desirous of getting this particular information. The hon. member will recall that on Thursday last the hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet (Mr. Lesage) had this document in the house. On that occasion, as recorded on page 1890 of *Hansard*, the minister read from the documents proposals for the hydroelectric development of the Columbia river system in Canada. I am not taking particular issue with the fact that the minister says this is a confidential document or an interdepartmental document, but my plea is based on citation 277 of Beauchesne's third edition, page 110, which says:

A minister of the crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a dispatch or other state paper not before the house, unless he be prepared to lay it upon the table.

I am fully aware, sir, that the minister did not have this document in the first instance, and did not bring it into the house. Apparently the hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet did. However, I say the minister should not have read from the document, but since he did the house should have access to it.

**Mr. Harkness:** On that particular point, I would remind the house that I did not read from the document. All I did was to read