

I would like honourable Members to think that over because it seems to me that in most cases, as far as one can look back in *Hansard* since confederation, that was the decision arrived at. Of course there was a time when these notices of motion for production of papers were debatable and long debates took place upon them. But all leaders of parties, in or out of power, have always agreed that they should not insist upon production of papers which are declared not to be in the interest of the House to get. (See Bourinot, 4th Edition, pages 249-254; Todd's Parliamentary Government in England revised by Spencer and Walpole, Vol. 2, pages 157-160; See also Debates, March 17, 1921, pages 1003-4, Vol. 2, 1921.)

Today, as I say, I will just leave these remarks for the consideration of honourable Members, and perhaps later on I shall hear comments of honourable Members on this reasoning.

The said motion was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

The following Order of the House was issued to to the proper Officer:

By Mr. Diefenbaker: Order of the House for a return showing the names of all personnel in the P.F.R.A. and P.F.A.A. who are officials or field officers, coupled with the salaries and expenses paid to each of them during the year 1954.

Notice of motion No. 7 on today's Order Paper being called;

And the honourable Member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. MacDougall) having requested that the said notice of motion be allowed to stand:

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think I will allow the honourable Member to let his notice of motion stand. I am sorry to appear to be so destructive today. Honourable Members will notice that this motion deals with the war veterans allowance and permissive income. On the order paper there are two other notices of motions on the same subject, one in the name of the honourable Member for New Westminster (Mr. Hahn) and the other in the name of the honourable Member for Hastings-Frontenac (Mr. White). Honourable Members will also have noticed that on the order paper, under government orders, there is in the name of the Minister of Veterans Affairs a resolution which reads as follows:

That it is expedient to amend the War Veterans Allowance Act to increase the allowances and the permissive income; to further extend the benefits of the act . . .

And so on. If we were to allow debate on this motion, it would anticipate a debate on a government order which has priority because the motion which stands in the name of the Minister of Veterans Affairs is one which is the first stage of a money bill. If honourable Members will look at Campion "An Introduction to Procedure of the House of Commons" page 144, under the heading "Rules Relating to Substantive Motions", paragraph (5), they will find this:

Finally, certain matters by their very nature are inadmissible in debate, whether upon a motion or otherwise. Such are matters anticipating an order of the day, and matters which have already been decided during the current session.