

Order Paper Questions

cable; (b) (i) 1968 through 1974, not applicable; (ii) 1968 through 1974, not applicable; (iii) 1968 through 1974, not applicable; (iv) 1968 through 1974, not applicable; (v) 1968 through 1974, not applicable (vi) 1968 through 1973, not applicable; 1974, These charges were incurred for air transportation costs of travel as in 3(b) and 3(c) above; (vii) 1968 through 1974, not applicable.

I am advised that the following applies with respect to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation: 1 and 2. To be answered elsewhere.

3. (a)(b)(vii) In each of the years 1968 to 1974, CMHC reimbursed Mr. Coates for travel expenses as follows:

Year	No. of Trips	Amount \$
1968	—	—
1969	4	420.95
1970	29	2,029.03
1971	24	3,296.88
1972	4	607.84
1973	—	—
1974	—	—

(c) Information on the purpose and destination of each of these trips is not now available.

4. Nil.

Nil replies have been submitted by other departments.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, it has happened before that starred questions have been answered in this way, tabled as orders for return. Starred questions are deliberately starred so that they shall be answered in the House, and I think it should be a matter of regular procedure if they are not answered in the House that they be appended to *Hansard*.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I think most hon. members who receive answers which are tabled in the House understand full well why they are tabled. They are fairly bulky documents, and if the answers to the questions which the hon. gentleman put down as starred questions were reasonably short and easily replied to, there would be no question about reading them. I continually have the problem of having to make decisions about this.

The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan) raised the point that the last sequence of questions standing in his name ought to have been read in the House. I think when the hon. member sees the answers, and when hon. members read *Hansard* tomorrow, they will agree with me that there really is no alternative but to make them orders for return. I think hon. members must realize that we do operate within certain limitations. Our desire is to get the information out. Our desire is to put as much as we possibly can into *Hansard*, but it is the nature of the questions hon. members ask which causes bulky replies, so the only alternative we have is to make them orders for return.

[Mr. Reid.]

Since we have gone to this system of answering questions every day we have increased the number of questions which have been put into *Hansard*, and we are reducing the number outstanding, but there are certain physical limitations to what can print in *Hansard*, and there are limitations as to what is desirable to print in *Hansard*.

Mr. Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order I will be very brief. I can understand some of the problems of the parliamentary secretary, but most of what he has said is straight garbage. I asked some questions that were very very short but very embarrassing, and they have been made orders for return. That had nothing whatsoever to do with the length.

● (1510)

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): This is an old difficulty, Mr. Speaker. The general requirement is that the questions shall be answered in the appropriate form. There is an exception, however, if the reason is stated. We should insist that the parliamentary secretary give a brief reason why he is asking for an exception or an exemption from the regular order so that the documents might be tabled. This should be construed narrowly as being an exception. I can assure you that the House would be far less fractious about that if somehow or other it were conveyed to the parliamentary secretary that on applying to Your Honour for this procedure he should state his request briefly on every occasion. We would have far less trouble. We would like to see the Chair help us get that across to the parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Jones).

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to your attention and the attention of the parliamentary secretary question No. 1455 which was asked on February 3, of this year. I am anxious to get an answer and cannot see why there would be a delay. It is a simple question and there should be a simple answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In respect to the point of order raised about the tabling of returns I would call the attention of hon. members to the provisions of Standing Order 39(4) which sets out the procedure. There is a difficulty about lengthy replies and the decision on whether they should be read in the ordinary way or tabled. The control that exists on that is the fact that on each occasion upon which the parliamentary secretary proposes on behalf of a minister that a return be tabled as opposed to being read, or that it be made a return so that the reply could be tabled instead of read, the House of course must give its decision. There is a requirement to ask: "Is it the pleasure of the House that the reply or the question be deemed to have been an order for return in order that the return could be tabled forthwith?" When that question is put it is within the power of any member to dispute or disagree, and say, "There seems to be no reason why that should be done. Can the parliamentary secretary give us some reason?"

The fact of the matter is that the Chair can always impose further restrictions on that practice, but that is