

No. 84

JOURNALS
OF THE
HOUSE OF COMMONS
OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1969.

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: On Thursday last the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) rose on a question of privilege in relation to the tabling of a report by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier). When tabling the paper, the Secretary of State used the following words: "Mr. Speaker, I should like to table a report concerning the security agents in some of our national museums, which report constitutes a reply to the numerous questions put to me in the House in the last few days."

The report appears to have been presented to the House under Standing Order 41(2). The honourable Member for Peace River has expressed the view that the terms of the Standing Order are not sufficiently broad to include the tabling of that particular document. The honourable Member has been supported in his contention by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre has submitted the additional argument that the Secretary of State contravened the rules and practice of the House when he replied to oral questions by tabling the answer under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2). In reply to these objections, the Honourable President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) suggests that Standing Order 41(2) should be given a wide, rather than a restrictive, interpretation. The substance of the Minister's argument is summed up in the following words reported at page 4928 of *Hansard* of Thursday, January 30: "While Standing Order 41(1) is really quite precise as to the documents referred to, Standing Order 41(2) is in the broadest possible terms. It permits a Minister or a Parliamentary Secretary to lay on the Table of the House any