

Privilege—Mr. Friesen

House, much less agreed to. That was the reason I took objection, because that question was never posed to the House.

I want to say that I objected to the additional questioning of the Minister because I did not think—

Madam Speaker: Order. The House is quite aware that the Hon. Member is objecting to the additional 20-minute question period after the statement made by the Minister. He did that yesterday. Having received the guidance of the House and having confirmed that there was unanimous consent of the House at that time, I ruled that the question period would continue for a further 20 minutes. I had some discretion about allowing a 20-minute discussion after the statement from the Minister of Finance and I used that discretion.

On the particular point which the Hon. Member is now raising under a question of privilege, but which should be a point of order, I must repeat to him that that particular incident is closed and I cannot allow him to comment further on a ruling which I made yesterday.

[Translation]

MR. FRIESEN—PRODUCTION OF PAPERS ALLEGED INCOMPLETE

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, you will recall that yesterday I sought permission to look into the allegations made by the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen) so as to be able today to complete briefly my argument and add a few remarks. I did read the lengthy comments which you had the patience to listen to yesterday and I did not see anything in the facts—

[English]

Mr. Nielsen: On a point of order, I hope the Government House Leader will forgive me for interrupting, but I notice that the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen) is not in his seat.

Madam Speaker: He is here now.

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I was about to say that I have examined the Hon. Member's allegations, and realized that, to bolster his case, he based his arguments on two documents of which he was allegedly made aware subsequently, that is after the documents were tabled in the House. The first point I want to make is that the documents to which he referred have nothing to do with the order of the House. The order of the House—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The Minister would be doing me a great service were he to give me the additional information he promised yesterday and confine his remarks to giving me that additional information; otherwise, I will again have to hear other Members for a second time on a question of privilege. Yesterday the Hon. Member asked whether he would be allowed to seek further information and provide that information to the House a little later. That I can allow, I

mean he may provide additional information because yesterday he sought permission to do just that, but I cannot let him embark upon a new argument because the practice of the House is that I can hear Hon. Members only once on a question of privilege.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I was about to do just that. I would refer you to Beauchesne's Citation 390 and point out that the documents mentioned by the Hon. Member have nothing to do with the order of the House, that his case does not rest solidly on facts and that there are no grounds for a question of privilege. If he wants another address to be presented to Her Majesty for the tabling of documents, he ought to introduce another motion. All that is provided for by parliamentary practices, and if you do not want to hear further arguments, that sums up the facts, as far as I can see. All you need to do is to read carefully Citation 390 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition and go by those references rather than those submitted yesterday by the Hon. Member, which relate to incidents dating back to 1820, 1834, 1835, 1841 and 1876 and which have nothing to do with the evolution of parliamentary practices. Citation 390 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition refers to cabinet directive No. 45 since 1973. Quite obviously, we never did have an opportunity to ask for exemptions. We were waiting to see whether the Hon. Member wanted other documents in addition to those he had asked for, and that is why we are exercising our exemption right. Therefore, I am doing that now because we had no opportunity to do so and I reserved my right to that effect yesterday. Be that as it may, the documents to which he referred have nothing to do with the order of the House and, since the facts are contradictory, there simply cannot be a question of privilege.

In essence, Madam Speaker, that is the new fact I wanted to bring to light by referring you to Citation 390 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. It spells out the exemption which is provided for and the rules which govern the tabling of documents by the government. In light of the facts related by the Hon. Member, once again he has no justification to say that we did not abide by the order of the House. Finally, you know that the documents were tabled on July 29 and that the House sat until August 4 inclusive. The Hon. Member is definitely late in raising his question of privilege.

• (1210)

[English]

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I am afraid that does not dispose of the very serious question that was raised by the Hon. Member yesterday. What is before the Chair is hard evidence, read into the record, of some documents which were not produced pursuant to the unanimous order of this House that all documents be produced. Not all relevant documents, not all documents subject to any condition or qualification, but all documents.