

*Motions for Papers*

Scotia, Hon. James M. Harding, minister of public welfare, F. R. MacKinnon, deputy minister of public welfare and Dr. Harold Nason, director, department of education; Newfoundland, Hon. Myles P. Murray, minister of public welfare, R. L. Andrews, deputy minister of public welfare and R. S. King, director of northern Labrador affairs; New Brunswick, Hon. William R. Duffie, minister of youth and welfare, J. E. Anderson, deputy minister of youth and welfare, and Mrs. Mary T. Gillis, director of social assistance—

**Mr. Howard:** I wonder if I might raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker? I do not want to interrupt the hon. member unduly, but surely this recitation of those who attended the conference and the subject matters discussed, is something completely outside the ambit of the motion before us. The motion is to table certain documents, namely the presentations of the various provincial governments. The parliamentary secretary is using this, I submit, as a sort of propaganda platform. It is something a speech writer has provided for the department and describes in glowing terms what the government wanted to do. I submit this is completely out of order. We are here simply—and this ruling has been made a number of times—to discuss the merits of disclosing or making public certain documents.

**Mr. Gray:** I should like to speak to the point of order. May I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is completely out of order, according to my understanding, for the hon. member to impute motives to another hon. member because of the way he refers to a particular aspect of a question in this house. I think that is what the hon. member for Skeena appeared to be doing—at least to me.

**Mr. Howard:** Raise another point of order, then.

**Mr. Gray:** Furthermore, I think that a high degree of latitude has been permitted in the last few days in the manner in which an hon. member may approach a particular subject. Certainly the hon. member who was speaking appeared to be referring to something related to the conference, which is the subject matter of the motion. I respectfully submit, therefore, that what he was saying was in order.

**Mr. Churchill:** On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I feel the point of order is very well raised. Certain documents are requested in this motion, not a recitation of those who attended a confer-

[Mr. Badanai.]

ence. Surely some arguments would have to be produced by the parliamentary secretary as to why these documents cannot be produced. We are interested in who attended the conference, but that is not the purpose of the motion now before us. It would be shorter to let us have the documents, with the names attached to them, and we could read them ourselves.

**Mr. Brewin:** I should like to support the point of order that has been made, Mr. Speaker, and for this reason: Under the rules there is a very limited time during which these motions for production are allowed to be debated. I think it is two hours and forty minutes, or something like that. If Your Honour should accept the proposition put forward by the hon. member for Essex West, Essex East, or Essex somewhere, then anything related to the papers could be discussed and we may never arrive at any finality on this motion for production until the time has run out. Surely it is not good enough, on a motion for production, to say this relates to a particular conference and therefore anything relating to the conference whatever is in order. Furthermore, the hon. member suggested that the hon. member for Skeena was imputing motives. He imputed no motives but merely described what the hon. member was doing.

**Mr. Greene:** On the point of order; first of all, I would concur in what the hon. member for Essex West had to say with regard to the fact that it is highly improper for the hon. member for Skeena to infer that the speech of the parliamentary secretary was written by someone else. We take responsibility for any words we may use in this house. The hon. member for Skeena may feel that these are not original thoughts. It would be a tragic thing indeed if we could only express original thoughts in this house. If such were the case, the hon. member would never have gotten out of Skeena, from anything I have ever heard. I think the parliamentary secretary is taking full responsibility for the words he is using here.

In so far as the reference to the persons who attended the conference is concerned, contrary to what the hon. member for "Deadwood" had to say, I say that quite clearly this motion—

**Mr. Brewin:** Did the hon. member refer to my constituency as "Deadwood"? If he did, I assure him he is entirely in error and I resent the imputation on behalf of my constituents.