

Supply

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, they are internal documents to the secretariat, the civil servants and political staff of different Ministers. It is an internal document which was circulated to people who attended a meeting. It is in the form of minutes, Mr. Speaker. Okay?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order. No, I cannot accept "okay". The rules are very clear on this. If the Hon. Member is to quote any more documents, he has to describe these documents in a recognizable fashion, not calling them "committees" or "groups" or "confidential". Is that clear?

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, that presents certain difficulties to a Member of Parliament. I will describe them as five pages which I have in my possession, which I will table, and from which I intend to quote. Is that adequate, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Waddell: What is the title?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): The Hon. Member will be allowed to quote from a document if he describes the document. This is a long-standing tradition of this House. I am not coming up with a new item which is unknown to Hon. Members. If the Hon. Member is not able to describe the source of the document, he will kindly refrain from quoting from it.

Mr. Waddell: If you are going to table it, describe it.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, may I have the unanimous consent of the House to table this document and let Hon. Members decide?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Is there unanimous consent to table the document?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Speaker, under the Standing Orders the Hon. Member has no right to table documents. Only Ministers are entitled to do so. Otherwise, the Table would disappear under an avalanche of paper. The Standing Orders do not give Members the right to table documents, and the Hon. Member seems to be ashamed of this one since he is even afraid of identifying it!

[*English*]

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I believe that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes), is in the process of addressing a particular motion we now have before us, and in the course of his remarks is in fact reading into the record extracts from a document, which I feel is quite appropriate, with the greatest of deference. As the Hon. Member from the Government side has pointed out, there is only provision for the tabling of documents by Ministers of the Crown unless unanimous consent is obtained. We must interpret the rules to make sure that freedom of speech and freedom of a point of view, especially as it relates to Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, is not hindered. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that to restrict my colleague with respect to the presentation of his case by limiting his ability to

quote from a document would be a serious infringement on the right of speech of any Member of Parliament.

I understand that the point is that the rules must not be abused and we are not to read speeches. However, if these are documents in the Hon. Member's possession and he is prepared to stand behind these documents, there should be no reason at all why he is not able to quote from those documents, and quote extensively, as long as they are germane to this particular debate. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to exercise your discretion with respect to this matter and allow freedom of speech and not constrain Hon. Members in terms of a serious debate relating to the practices of this Government, which are under serious attack not only by Members of the House of Commons but by Canadians across this land.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. To assist the Chair, I believe the rules are clear that the Hon. Member has to have a name to the document. Was it Shakespeare who said "What's in a name?" Sometimes there is a lot in a name and perhaps the Hon. Member has a name for his document; for example, an internal memo dealing with employment practices, or an internal memo dealing with grants, or a memo from a particular Department. Surely the Hon. Member has to identify the document in some sort of way before he quotes from it. The Hon. Member should be able to do that if he is prepared to table the document.

● (1300)

Mr. Crombie: Mr. Speaker, when the Chair makes its decision it should have in mind that the Hon. Member is not trying to hide anything. He has offered to table the document. It seems to me that ought to be sufficient. If that is going to be denied by the Government side, then it places the Hon. Member in a very awkward situation. He needs unanimous consent in order to table the document, and that may be denied by the Hon. Member across the way. The Hon. Member indicated that he is willing to have the document made public by offering to table it, and I hope the Speaker will take that into consideration when he makes his decision.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Speaker, to take up the point raised by the Hon. Member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie)—

[*English*]

—I want to bring to his attention the problem of how I can accept the tabling of a document when I have a Member in front of me who does not have the courage, or enough belief in the document to identify it. I am not ready to give my consent to tabling the document unless I know the identity of the document. If tabling is going to permit him to read a speech from that document because he has nothing to say in the debate, well, he is supposed to be here to make speeches in his own words, not by reading documents or quoting from unknown documents.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order. There are two points to be considered. First, the Hon. Member is asking for a