

*Speaker's Decision*

clerk was not producing the documents was because he felt the expense for producing such documents should be paid by the house, whereas a member suggested it should be paid by the member who moved the motion. In another case, the man involved was a witness who had appeared before a committee and had refused to produce a book which was in his possession.

Now, I do not think I should deal with all these particular cases. I believe the hon. member should be satisfied with the reasons I have given so far. I would perhaps refer him further to May's fifteenth edition, which gives the general theory, and which is to the effect that returns may be asked for, but if there is a failure to comply, however ample the power of each house to enforce the production of papers may be, a sufficient cause must be shown for the exercise of that power, and if considerations of public policy can be urged against a motion for papers, it is either withdrawn or otherwise dealt with according to the judgment of the house. In this case, if the hon. member wishes to complain further about the non-compliance with the order, it is not a point of order or a point of privilege, and he must do so by moving the proper motion if he deems that advisable.

**Mr. Fulton:** I am grateful to Your Honour for the consideration you have given to this matter and the information you have given the house. Naturally, I accept your ruling with respect to the possibility of your making an order that this return be discharged. I would say only that in referring to May's twelfth edition, which is the one referred to in Beauchesne's second edition, I find there at page 562 the following:

A return which has been presented has also been ordered to be amended.

It occurs to me there may be some possibility of further action along those lines, and that I may request an order of the house that it be amended at a later stage.

Then I also note in citation 452 of Beauchesne's second edition:

When papers are presented, an order may be made that they be taken in consideration on a future day, and on the consideration thereof a motion may be founded.

I have no such motion right at the moment, because I wished to hear Your Honour's ruling; but I refer to that citation now, indicating the possibility of action along those lines. Otherwise, if no such action were taken, it seems to me there would be a pretty effective iron curtain of secrecy around the things we are trying to do. So I just mention that.

**Mr. Speaker:** Would the hon. member repeat the number of the last citation in Beauchesne's second edition.

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Mr. Fulton:** It is No. 452 at page 138. I mention it to Your Honour by way of notice, because I was waiting for Your Honour's ruling and I had not prepared anything at the moment along these lines. But I give notice now that something along these lines may be brought forward.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the hon. member would look at May's seventh edition, because since May refers to cases which happened between 1820 and 1876 it would be well to look at the edition of May, which is closer to the period. The seventh edition was published in 1873. And if the hon. member would look at page 561 he would find the following, indicating what the old practice was with respect to these returns. It says:

In the commons, when a minister of the crown has any papers to present, he goes to the bar, and, on being called by the Speaker, he brings them up; and they are ordered to lie upon the table: but papers are also presented by other official persons. When such papers are brought up, they are generally ordered to lie upon the table, as a matter of course: but upon the question that they do lie upon the table, a debate has on some rare occasions, arisen.

Now, when the hon. member looks at citations 445, 450 and 452 in Beauchesne's second edition he will find that he is dealing with the procedure as outlined in May's seventh edition, as I have just indicated.

**Mr. Fulton:** With respect, the reference in Beauchesne's second edition is to May's twelfth edition; and it is in the twelfth edition I find the reference to the fact that a return which has been presented can also be ordered to be amended. Then citation 452 in Beauchesne's second edition, to which I referred, has no reference to the specific authority upon which it is founded. So I assume Beauchesne was merely expressing his own opinion as to the practice of the house which would be followed.

However, the matter is one which, so far as I am concerned, I would prefer to go into further, and see if some action along these lines does not lie.

**QUESTIONS****CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP CERTIFICATE, 1953-1954****Mr. Macnaughton:**

1. How many certificates of Canadian citizenship were granted to persons who formerly owed allegiance to other countries, in 1954 and 1953?

2. What is the nationality breakdown of these figures?

3. How many certificates of Canadian citizenship were granted in 1953 and 1954 to stateless persons? In which countries had they been born?

4. What new arrangements have been created in Montreal for the reception, hearing and granting of applications for Canadian citizenship?