

*Petitions*

On the other hand, it is clear that the rule as it is worded includes a phrase that does qualify the amount of discussion allowed. I tend to agree that the Deputy Prime Minister was probably right in saying that these reports and returns, papers and documents are governed by the phrase "in accordance with an Act of Parliament". As the Hon. Member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) pointed out, this particular document would obviously be discussed once the annual report of the Department was tabled, because it would flow from the report, and under one heading or another Members would be able to discuss it. However, the urgency might be taken out of the matter when it is discussed at that time. That, of course, poses a problem that I cannot solve because I do have to rule within the confines of the wording of the particular Standing Order.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** You could reserve.

**Madam Speaker:** Yes, I do want to reserve on it. But I think it is helpful that I tell the House how I read the Standing Order, so that if Members of the Committee do want to look at the Standing Order again or let me know what the real intent was and whether it was really expressed precisely in the Standing Order, it would be easier for me to rule on the matter.

I am telling the House now that if I were to rule on this question, I would have to consider the phrase "in accordance with an Act of Parliament". I would like Hon. Members to tell me whether they did want to restrict those documents that are "in accordance with an Act of Parliament". If that is what the Members meant, then that is fine with the Chair. I will look at these words as being the important key words in any ruling that I might make.

However, the Deputy Prime Minister has offered to discuss the matter with the House Leaders. It might be that the Deputy Prime Minister will refer this matter to a committee. Therefore, for the time being the House will be satisfied. Indeed, I think it would be wise for me to reserve and study this matter very carefully. Even if the Deputy Prime Minister did allow this matter to be discussed in a committee and referred it to a committee, the situation might arise again, so we may as well think about it now as later.

MR. LEWIS—REPLY OF MR. BUSSIÈRES DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a new point of order. During Question Period the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Bussières), in reply to a question put by my colleague, the Hon. Member for York North (Mr. Gamble), defended the comments of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. LeBlanc), the Minister responsible for housing, who suggested in Toronto that he was considering taxing Canadian tenants who were not paying between 25 per cent and 30 per cent of their income for rent. In answering the question, the Minister of National Revenue referred to reports

received by the Minister of Public Works as the substance and the reason for his making those comments.

In view of the fear tenants have in this country that the Liberal Government is planning to tax anyone who is not paying between 25 per cent and 30 per cent of their income for rent, I would ask you, Madam Speaker, to rule whether or not the comments made by the Minister of National Revenue, in referring to those reports, are sufficient for the House to require that those documents, which have been cited in an answer, be tabled in the House.

**Madam Speaker:** I do not recall that the Minister quoted or cited from those documents. I do not believe that procedure has been changed in the rules. The rules are quite clear that unless a Minister quotes or cites a particular document, he is not obligated to table it, and the Chair would have no authority to ask the Minister in question to table that document. However, the Minister might make a decision to table those documents if he wished to do so.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Madam Speaker, I think that in his comments, the Hon. Member is going much further than the Minister did in his answer. I am truly sorry that the Hon. Member should try to scare Canadian tenants and—

**Mr. Lewis:** The Minister did.

**Mr. Ouellet:** No! The Minister did not say that in his answer, and I think the Hon. Member should not be trying to scare tenants in this way.

**Madam Speaker:** This is debate, but what is done is done.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### PETITIONS

MR. MITGES—OPENING OF ABORTION CLINIC IN TORONTO, ONT.

**Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey-Simcoe):** Madam Speaker, I am happy to present a petition from a number of constituents of Grey-Simcoe voicing their opposition to Dr. Henry Morgentaler's plans to open an abortion clinic in Toronto.

• (1230)

I am well aware that it falls within the jurisdiction of the Province of Ontario to uphold the law by prosecuting to the full extent of the Criminal Code all those who contravene the law by performing illegal abortions. It is my hope and the hope of the petitioners that this in fact will be the case regarding Dr. Morgentaler, if he goes through with his plan.