

report or other paper dealing with a matter coming within the administrative responsibilities of the government. I believe that the Chair should give the widest interpretation to those words."

Later on Thursday afternoon, after the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) had raised this question of privilege, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) tabled a notice of motion to amend the Income Tax Act and the Estate Tax Act pursuant to Standing Order 60, subsection (1). Then, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2) he attempted to lay on the Table a document which the Minister described as "explaining the Ways and Means motion and giving some illustrations of the consequent changes in taxes". The honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), supported in his views by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), took exception to the procedure. The Chair then suggested that no further proceedings be taken and that the tabling be held in abeyance while the point of order and the previous question of privilege were being considered.

It is fitting to consider first the question of privilege raised by the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) about the tabling of a document by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier). The honourable Member, as well as others who supported his question of privilege, contend that the said document is not one which can be tabled under Standing Order 41(2). Secondly, they argue that the minister erred when he attempted to reply to questions put by some honourable Members by another method than that prescribed by the Standing Orders. After much thought, I must decide in favour of the honourable Members who questioned the procedure used, and especially the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who raised the second objection.

According to the Standing Orders, a question put during the daily oral question period may be answered either by an oral answer, by an order for return or by a ministerial statement on motions. I must express the opinion that the new Standing Order 41(2) does not provide for the establishment of a new procedure for answering oral questions.

Therefore, I must conclude that the question of privilege was justified. I suggest to honourable Members that as far as answers to questions are concerned, Standing Order 41(2) should be given that interpretation.

I should like to consider now the procedural point raised in connection with the attempts by the Minister of Finance to table the memorandum to which I have already alluded. As honourable Members know, Standing Order 41(1) corresponds word for word with the previous rule, Standing Order 40, subsection (1). The Standing Order reads as follows: "Any return, report or other paper required to be laid before the House in accordance with any Act of Parliament or in pursuance of any resolution or Standing Order of this House may be deposited with the Clerk of the House on any sitting day, and such return, report or other paper shall be deemed for all purposes to have been presented to or laid before the House."

This rule, corresponding, as I have said, to the previous Standing Order 40(1) determines the class of documents or papers that must be tabled by a Minister pursuant to a statutory provision or to a Standing or other Order of the House.

The House has now adopted the additional Standing Order 41(2) which reads 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