

There are numerous such examples, but I think that was the most blatant one when the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings, under the guise of a motion of urgent and pressing necessity, asked the House to give its consent to instructing the government to cease its efforts to downgrade the monarchy. Hon. members on the other side with any fairness would realize that this is really going too far.

There are numerous examples of this tactic; some are the result of the co-ordinated effort of hon. members opposite, under the co-ordinated authorship of many of these House tactics, but some of them are the handiwork of individual members. I do not want to go into all the cases—we have them all documented—but I would say that the examples I have mentioned of ignoring the requirement for urgency, of bootlegging speeches under the guise of motions under Standing Order 43, of frivolous motions, and of unfair allegations, are just too numerous to list.

I just want to say that if this type of abuse is not curtailed, either by self-restraint on the part of members or on the part of the Chair, then the government will have to start putting its objections to these motions immediately when they are raised before the House.

I believe, quite frankly, that we on this side of the House up to the present time have been negligent in not raising points of order when these motions have been put before the House.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacEachen:** We have been negligent in not assisting the Chair in ensuring that the rules be observed because it was a tradition—we have seen the reaction of the Speaker, when it was apparent that the matter was not of urgent and pressing necessity—to stop the member in his tracks. I think we will have to go back to that unless members begin to co-operate and restrain their use of this Standing Order in the way it has been used. I hope that we can extend the self-policing feature of the proceedings to the content of the motions as well as to the 15-minute period, but I want to make clear to hon. members that we do not intend to accept the constant repetition of allegations that are unfair, and charges that are unfounded, under the guise of these motions, when we believe that legitimate points of order could be raised when they are put forward.

I would argue that every example I have put forward of these motions could be grounded in a legitimate point of order, and we have not taken advantage of that opportunity. I should like to refer to Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 70(2), which reads as follows:

● (1522)

Any member is entitled, even bound, to bring to the Speaker's immediate notice any instance of what he considers a breach of order.

Unfortunately my conclusion is that there has been a breach of order in many of these motions, and we on this side of the House have been negligent in not bringing that forward on a more systematic basis.

*Point of Order—Mr. MacEachen*

I realize other hon. members will want to contribute, but I should like to deal with one aspect of this rule. Undoubtedly we will hear from hon. members opposite that my objective is to curtail the rights of private members.

**Some hon. Members:** That is right.

**Mr. MacEachen:** We will hear elaborate and indignant statements from hon. members opposite indicating that my purpose is to restrict the opportunities of private members. Let us improve the operation of Standing Order 43 so that an increasing number of private members will be able to put forward motions under this rule.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacEachen:** If hon. members opposite are honest—and I admit they are—

**Mr. Alexander:** I am glad you added that.

**Mr. MacEachen:**—they will admit that the flowering of all these members at two o'clock every day, when a large number of members rise almost simultaneously to put forward motions under Standing Order 43, is not really the result of individual, spontaneous conclusions by each individual private member. It is part of a co-ordinated publicity effort.

**Mr. Paproski:** Prove that!

**Mr. MacEachen:** It is part of a co-ordinated publicity effort aimed at putting party positions on the record on a day to day basis. For this reason, the abuse or misuse of the rule is not as important to hon. members opposite as getting their message to the media, getting political points scored, and getting party positions on the record.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. MacEachen:** I do not blame hon. members opposite for doing that. I blame hon. members on this side of the House for not stopping them earlier as they built their image through a systematic series of motions under Standing Order 43.

Occasionally the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) presents a motion under Standing Order 43. He does so usually to pre-empt the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party when an issue suddenly comes to the fore. That is all right too, but I should like to refer to the record of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby. According to him, these are matters of urgent and pressing necessity, so important that the normal rules of notice have to be waived in order to get them before the House. During the last session, which was comprised of 151 sittings, he managed to dig up no less than 60 matters of urgent and pressing necessity.

**Mr. Alexander:** Was he right or wrong?

**Mr. MacEachen:** He presented one urgent and pressing matter for every three sittings of the House. That is really a