

*Privilege*

the Supreme Court, hoping to get that decision reversed. It is because of these situations that there is a growing feeling of alienation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the same situation is involved in the question asked by the hon. member for Oxford with reference to the rental reassessments that are now taking place in the national parks. This, again, was a policy agreed to only after long consultation with the advisory councils and the people in the parks, and it has nothing to do with the current increases of up to 4,000 per cent.

On the strength of the points I have made, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that I be allowed to table some documents, with the consent of the House, which put the record straight. I am sure all hon. members would want this to be done in light of the distortions arising from the discussion yesterday.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. As I indicated a moment ago, the hon. member got the floor on a question of privilege of which he had given the Chair due notice according to the Standing Orders. The observations of the hon. member were not followed by a motion so that in the ordinary way we cannot pursue the matter further. In any event, I have serious doubts whether there is an actual question of privilege.

The minister tabled the letter or document yesterday under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2) which gives a minister the right at any time to table a document or a paper. The hon. member suggested that the minister should perhaps have obtained his prior consent or permission. This is certainly not a requirement under the Standing Order and the Chair has to be guided by the Standing Orders.

I respectfully suggest to the hon. member that it would have been competent for any hon. member, under a motion for production of papers, to request the tabling of this and any other paper in the possession of the minister, under the terms of the Standing Orders. This is perhaps all *obiter dicta* because the hon. member has made his point. He has not followed his point by a formal motion which the Chair would have to put to the House. That would conclude my ruling on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member.

As a sequel to his observations he has suggested that additional papers might be tabled. The House is responsible for its own procedures. The House can accept the tabling of any documents whether it be by a minister or

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

by a private member on one side or other of the House. If that were the wish of the House I am sure that so far as the Chair is concerned there is no objection to the tabling of the documents to which the hon. member for Brandon-Souris has alluded. But that would not be in accordance with any of the Standing Orders of the House. Standing Order 41 to which I have referred, under which the minister has tabled the letter in question, provides as follows:

A Minister of the Crown, or a Parliamentary Secretary acting on behalf of a Minister, may, in his place in the House, state that he 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—

That Standing Order does not appear to extend to a private member. If there is unanimous consent the papers can be received at the table. If there is not unanimous consent perhaps the hon. member would wish to seek another way of bringing them to the attention of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** No.

**An hon. Member:** You wouldn't, Macdonald.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** For my own information, Mr. Speaker, do I take it from your decision that ministers have the right to table partial documentation that distorts the situation and misleads the House?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** We should not get into debate on this matter. I do not make the rules. I took the trouble of reading all of the Standing Order and it gives the minister the right to table the document. If there is agreement by all hon. members that additional documents be tabled the Chair, as I said, has no objection, but my ruling is simply a reading of the Standing Order. I did not write it. The Standing Order is a rule of the House, and I can only bring it to the attention of hon. members. It is unfortunate if the Standing Order has the effect that the hon. member suggests and difficulties result, but I would not think I am in a position to rectify the situation as a procedural matter.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** I rise on a question of privilege, Your Honour. This matter arose as a result of a question I directed to the minister yesterday. The minister requested permission to