

Privilege

or grievances as to the contents of answers given to their questions. It is a long established rule that these grievances, although they may be the subject of a debate, cannot found a question of privilege. I refer the hon. member to citation 113 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition:

Members often raise so-called "questions of privilege" on matters which should be dealt with as personal explanations or corrections, either in debates or in the proceedings of the House. A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in parliament.

And further:

A dispute arising between two members as to allegations of facts does not fulfil the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

The hon. member suggests that information conveyed to him in reply to a question on the order paper is incorrect. That may be so. The hon. member said that he was seeking my advice. My advice to him and to the House, and my ruling at the same time, is that I cannot find there is a *prima facie* question of privilege here which should be put to the House for debate at this time.

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the hon. member told us he has a document which he described as "another cabinet leak", and as he quoted from this document, I wonder whether he would be prepared to table it so that it could be before the House in the proper manner. I realize this is a somewhat delicate matter.

Mr. Speaker: The rules do not, of course, provide for the tabling of documents, even official documents or so-called confidential documents, quoted in the House by private members. The rule only applies when such a document is quoted in debate by members of the government. It cannot apply to hon. members generally. The suggestion is very often made in debate, when hon. members refer to or quote from a document, that the document in question be tabled. Certainly we would become involved in a very complicated practice, a practice which could easily lead to abuse, if we made it possible for members generally to table documents. I think that is not the purpose of the rule dealing with the tabling of documents.

Mr. Woolliams: In the light of your ruling, Mr. Speaker—and I must agree with Your Honour that the rule does not apply in this case, which is why I suggested this was a somewhat delicate matter—perhaps the House would give unanimous consent to the document being tabled in the circumstances, bearing in mind the allegation the hon. member has made and that it seems to be a genuine document.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Obviously there is not unanimous agreement. In any case I would hesitate to seek the unanimous consent of the House to allow a private member to table a document. I doubt whether this would be a good practice in which to become involved.

Mr. Oberle: May I make one more comment?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member should resume his seat. He can, perhaps, rise on a point of order but there should certainly be no debate after a ruling has been made. I will hear the hon. member if he has a point of order.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Oberle: The point concerns your reference to my conflict with another member of the House. It is not with another member of the House. It is with the Department of Indian Affairs and the government as a whole.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is, of course, doing what I suggested he cannot do once a ruling has been made.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

FINANCE

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CRISIS—TABLING OF COMMUNIQUÉ ISSUED FOLLOWING SECOND MEETING IN PARIS OF FINANCE MINISTERS

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, over a week ago the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) attended the first meeting of the Group of Ten and of the European Economic Community to discuss the exchange crisis, and later tabled the communiqué of that meeting. I should like to table the communiqué of the second meeting held last week in Paris.

[Later:]

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order that I must raise because it never occurred to me that the President of the Treasury Board would simply file a statement in the House rather than making one. Therefore, in light of this very unusual procedure in the context of a worldwide emergency I must ask the minister whether he or the Minister of Finance will make a statement on motions in regard to this matter tomorrow in order to enable the House to discuss the question.

Mr. Drury: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was not filing or tabling my statement. I was merely tabling the communiqué that resulted from the meeting last week in Paris which I attended on behalf of the Minister of Finance. Because of the widely publicized information given in the press last week I did not propose to make a statement on motions.

* * *

FISHERIES

REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move a motion under Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent necessity. The continuing threat to Canada's marine resources in the North Atlantic dictates the need for emergency action by the Canadian government. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro):

That the resolution on fisheries problems in the North Atlantic presented by an all-party Canadian delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly in Bonn, Germany, last November and accepted by the assembly comprising 15 nations of the alliance be referred to