

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

but is loaded with argument and fabrication which is irrelevant to the motion before the House. Because the hon. member has imported all these irrelevancies into the amendment, it must fall and cannot be accepted.

On April 28, 1953, during the debate on the National Housing Act, the Chair laid down very clearly that an amendment could not be partly in order and partly out of order. If it is partly out of order it is totally out of order. If another precedent is required I would refer you to a ruling the Chair made in 1971. A motion was made to refer the subject matter of a bill to a committee. That was ruled procedurally improper because, in addition to the actual moving of the subject matter to the committee, the motion contained additional material that was quite irrelevant to the main motion. The Chair ruled the amendment out of order on the ground that the amendment was irrelevant because it imported into it a considerable number of other matters. I suggest, without making any long argument about it, unfortunately this amendment is also out of order. However, we anticipate that the official opposition can do better.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Like Governor General's warrants, they cannot be a little bit in order and a little bit out of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I gather that contributions, for which the Chair is grateful, are concluded. A ruling or rulings will be made at eight o'clock. Perhaps we can now agree that it is five o'clock.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, should you not also express gratitude on behalf of those at the table?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Some will be at the table over the supper period, but I am afraid those at the table will not.

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

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order No. 40, to advise the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall)—External Affairs—Viet Nam—Proposed peacekeeping force—Source of funds to cover cost of Canadian participation; the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Old age security—Inquiry as to increase in basic amount and lowering of age of eligibility; the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo (Mr. Beatty)—Communications—Bell Canada rate increase application—Inquiry as to opposition by government.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely private bills, notices of motions and public bills. There are no private bills or

[Mr. MacEachen.]

notices of motions listed on the order paper, so the House will proceed to public bills.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

### ADMINISTRATIVE DISCLOSURE

#### MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR PUBLIC'S FREEDOM OF ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION ABOUT GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey-White Rock)** moved that Bill C-9, to better assure the public's rights to freedom of access to public documents and information about government administration (administrative disclosure) be read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth time I have put forward this particular bill in this place. On previous occasions hon. members have talked the measure out, and I have but little hope that anything other than the same fate awaits it this evening. I do urge hon. members to give serious thought to at least sending the subject matter proposed in the bill to the appropriate committee which was indicated by Mr. Speaker.

• (1700)

In the interval since 1965, following successive re-introduction of the bill, the government took two or three tentative steps in the direction proposed by the bill, the aim of which is that the public should have the right to know, without hinderance, how the government and parliament conduct the public's business. I will refer to those two or three tentative steps later, but first I would like to read the two clauses of the bill. Its title is:

An Act to better assure the public's rights to freedom of access to public documents and information about government administration (administrative disclosure)

Clause 1 reads:

Every administrative or ministerial commission, power and authority shall make its records and information concerning its doings available to any person at his request in reasonable manner and time.

Clause 2 states the exceptions to that general rule. It reads:

Section 1 does not apply to records or information

- (a) affecting national security;
- (b) concerning matters that are exempted by statute from disclosure;
- (c) concerning trade secrets, and commercial or financial matters of a privileged or confidential nature, obtained from private persons;
- (d) concerning any matter of private interest to the degree that the right to personal privacy excludes the public interest.

If this proposal were endorsed and legislation along this line enacted, it seems to me the appropriate administrative authority would be the Federal Court of Canada. My bill puts into words a basic parliamentary principle that public affairs should be conducted publicly. I think that