

down western separatism as a minor replay of the Quebec game?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, in spite of the fact that the hon. member has taken several weeks to prepare his question, I wonder whether he has not changed the subject for the object. I am not taking shots at Quebec and Alberta; they are taking shots at me. If the hon. member will travel to these two provinces, he will see that this is the case.

Mr. Paproski: Madam Speaker, we have just had another perfect example of the Prime Minister being glib and misbegotten.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: The Prime Minister's view of western separatism is as accurate as his pronouncement that Quebec separatism was dead. Is this what he is saying about western separatism? It did not take me two weeks to prepare that one.

Mr. Trudeau: Madam Speaker, I wish that the hon. member had taken two weeks to prepare that one. When I said Quebec separatism was dead, it was on the eve of the 1976 election—

Mr. Paproski: November 16.

Mr. Trudeau:—when the Quebec separatist party did not have the nerve to run as a separatist party, because it agreed with me that separatism could not win.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: That is why they got 14,000 people at the Forum last week.

Mr. Trudeau: I see that the political experts in the NDP are guffawing at that one. I wish they would answer my allegations. If separatism was a winner, why did the separatist party not run on a separatist plank and hold its referendum on the separatist plank? Because it knew that separatism was a loser. Therefore, I was right, and I believe that the same thing is true for Alberta.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: We will wait and see, Pierre.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I would like to make a statement in relation to today's supply proceedings. As hon. members are aware, the special order passed by the House on Tuesday, April 29, 1980, states that today is the last allotted day for the supply period ending December 10, 1980, and that all questions necessary to dispose of the Appropriation Act based on the main estimates shall be put at twelve o'clock midnight without further debate and amendment.

Privilege—Mr. Cossitt

However, the special order does not cover the Supplementary Estimates (B). Pursuant to special order, the House will be sitting today from two o'clock to twelve o'clock midnight without interruption. It would be the Chair's intention when twelve o'clock midnight is reached to interrupt the proceedings in progress and put every question necessary to dispose of all the remaining stages of Bill C-47, the Supplementary Estimates (B), and the bill based thereon, without further debate or amendment.

As was the practice in the past, the supply bill based on the supplementary estimates will be distributed to hon. members as soon as possible. Is it agreed that this will be the procedure which will be followed tonight?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. COSSITT—ALLEGATION OF EXISTENCE OF GOVERNMENT GUIDELINES RESPECTING ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Madam Speaker: I have notice of a question of privilege from the hon. member for Leeds-Grenville (Mr. Cossitt). If hon. members will bear with me, the hon. member for Leeds-Grenville has given me a notice of his question of privilege but has not included a statement on what that question of privilege will involve. It is quite clear in our Standing Order 17 that the Chair requires a notice and a written statement on the object of the question of privilege.

Recently in the House another hon. member failed to give me a statement on his question of privilege, and upon my making a similar remark, he offered to co-operate with the Chair and give the Chair a written statement. He raised his question of privilege the following day. I point this out to the hon. member for Leeds-Grenville, and I regret that he has not submitted a complete statement on his question of privilege.

I do want hon. members to be on notice that the Chair in the future will require statements on the object of a question of privilege.

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds-Grenville): Madam Speaker, I admit that in my notice I named the subject but did not go into a statement of detail, the reason being that on previous questions of privilege I have raised in this House in the eight years that I have been here, I simply said that I would like to raise a question of privilege at three o'clock, or whatever time, and named the subject. This procedure has never been questioned before. I am aware of the Standing Order, but I felt that it had become the custom of the House—rightly or wrongly, as the case may be—to indicate my intentions as I have done in this case.

I would certainly be glad to meet with the Speaker afterwards and present the evidence which I feel pertains to this subject if I could be permitted to proceed now.