

Citation 327(5) applies only to public documents and not to personal letters. No member of the House can be forced to table a personal letter even if an excerpt has been quoted. Citation 327(2) makes this very clear. Moreover, even if we were dealing with a public document, since there was no quotation, the argument that it might have influenced the debate is therefore denied, as the hon. members can see for themselves in *Hansard*. We have in no way influenced any debate whatsoever, and I would go so far as to ask of which debate the hon. member is talking. All this occurred during the oral question period and I do not know to what debate the hon. member refers. In any event, even if we were to admit that the Oral Question Period and I do not know to what debate the hon. way influenced. As you can see for yourself, Madam Speaker, the document involved is a personal letter of which no excerpt was quoted, and Citation 327 of Beauchesne which seems to me very relevant in this regard therefore settles this whole matter.

[English]

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker—

Madam Speaker: The hon. member for Yukon knows that I have already heard him. Does he have anything to add to the point of order he has raised?

Mr. Nielsen: No, Madam Speaker, I do not intend to add to it. I merely invite the Chair, when considering the matter, to take what we would call in court judicial notice of the title on the front page of *Hansard*. *Hansard* is entitled "House of Commons Debates".

Madam Speaker: I will take this question under advisement and rule on it later.

MR. TOWERS—PROCEDURE RESPECTING S.O. 43 MOTION

Madam Speaker: Yesterday the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) rose on a point of order with regard to his motion under Standing Order 43. I said that I would look at the motion a little more closely, because it is very difficult when one is just listening to a motion in the House always to judge whether it is in order. Especially if the judgment is challenged I think it is prudent to read the motion a second time and to try to see whether my decision was a bit too hasty.

I did look at it, and I see no reason to change my view on that. I also looked at the motion presented by the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen), which I did accept and put to the House. There was a difference between those two motions which justified my decision to put the motion by the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton, but I did not feel I could accept the motion of the hon. member for Red Deer.

● (1530)

The hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton did expose reasons of pressing necessity, while the hon. member for Red Deer did not. The motion from the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton did refer to something that had happened within the last few days. Moreover, the motion of the hon. member for Red Deer

Tabling of Documents

put me in a difficult position. If I had accepted his motion, then the next day I would have had to accept a motion to encourage every other group in society which renders a service to the community, such as doctors, nurses, firefighters, and so on. It is a very commendable idea, but I am afraid it does not qualify for a motion under Standing Order 43. I regret that I have to refuse the motion.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Thank you for your consideration, Madam Speaker. One of the reasons why my motion was not presented in the form that you would like was that you had made an earlier ruling in the House that we were not to refer to what was taking place in the committee meetings with regard to the Constitution.

You will remember that the police commissions made a representation to the constitutional committee, and my motion was related to that. I did not refer to the representations they made to the committee because of your ruling. However, I thought it was of urgent and pressing necessity because of what we have heard today, that the resolution is to be returned to the House by February 13. The representations made by police commissions across Canada are tied in with my motion under Standing Order 43.

Madam Speaker: That is the difficulty in which hon. members put the Chair when they bring things into this House that are being discussed in a committee. The Chair has no idea what is going on there, and is not present during the deliberations. If the hon. member followed the rule that he should not cite proceedings of the committee in the House, I commend him for that, but he also has to follow all the other rulings and, when bringing in a motion under Standing Order 43, he has to do it according to the rules that apply to that Standing Order. Since he did not, I cannot accept his motion.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

ESTIMATES

TABLING OF PROPOSAL RESPECTING REFORM IN PRESENTATION

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (President of the Treasury Board): Madam Speaker, it gives me pleasure under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2) to table documents relating to the government's proposal for the reform of the estimates, in both official languages.