

*Motions for Papers*

files of any description subject to public scrutiny at any time. Such a principle is a denial of the freedom to express thoughts, and inquisitorial attitudes can only spread alarm and a rush to the fireplace with documents. Those who have responsibility for long-term and detailed working papers must be protected from unfair prying and ineffective interference.

Consider, for example, an economist who is preparing a working paper for his department. Suppose he needs the opinion of officials in other departments and in assessing his interim opinion he names certain people as expressing views pro or con on a certain position: then suppose he expresses his interim view and views which are frank but not final. Should those working papers be scrutinized before the official has had an opportunity to fully develop his research material, weigh all considerations and make a decision free from outside, public pressure? I say no, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, such a policy of premature disclosure would inhibit free thought and independent judgment; it would only discourage frankness of expression by civil servants. I respect the right of the expert to work on his projects with that freedom of thought and expression which goes with the nature of his responsibilities.

Surely we have not reached the point where a politically unpopular idea cannot in private be expressed and weighed as to its merits by the officer of a government department. Otherwise all thoughts, ideas and expression of ideas would be weapons to be used in the glare of publicity and in the public, political forum. Government officials are not to be pillaried and spied on. They must be allowed to deliberate in a democratic way as is the case in nearly all businesses and professions. I should like to quote from page 30 of the report of the Task Force on Government Information:

The Report of the Royal Commission on Security (Abridged) acknowledged the fact of the Swedish system of open access but it did not approve of the principle behind the system.

"We would view suggestions for increased publicity with some alarm. We think the knowledge that memoranda might be made public would have a seriously inhibiting effect on the transaction of public business. We believe that the process of policy-making implies a need for wide-ranging and tentative consideration of options, many of which it would be silly or undesirable to expose to the public gaze..."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion and suggest it is six o'clock.

[Mr. Gibson.]

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS****WATER RESOURCES****PROVISION FOR MANAGEMENT INCLUDING RESEARCH AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Greene that Bill C-144, to provide for the management of the water resources of Canada including research and the planning and implementation of programs relating to the conservation, development and utilization of water resources, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please, I wonder whether the hon. member would mind my not accepting his suggestion that it is six o'clock. If hon. members would bear with me, I should like at this point to deliver words of wisdom which are the result of serious consideration of a point of order raised earlier today by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

When the motion for second reading of Bill C-144, an act to provide for the management of the water resources of Canada including research and the planning and implementation of programs relating to the conservation, development and utilization of water resources, was proposed this afternoon, the hon. member for Peace River raised a point of order to the effect that certain financial provisions contained in that bill were outside the terms of the recommendation of the Crown, and that the bill should be set aside or a supplementary royal recommendation should be presented before the bill be finally passed.

The hon. member went on to say that some clauses of the bill provided for certain fees which in his view constituted an imposition of taxation. The hon. member cited Standing Order 62 which is in effect a restatement of section 54 of the British North America Act. That Standing Order reads in part as follows: S.O. 62(1)

This house shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose, that has not been first recommended to the House by a message from the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.