

briefly. If necessary, I can put it in the form of a motion. I am a Member of Parliament, Mr. Speaker, but I am also a Canadian. In April of 1982 the Parliament of Canada, with the endorsement of Her Majesty the Queen, passed the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. One of those freedoms is the freedom of speech, and it is clearly set out in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I cannot believe that any rule of this House, past or present, with respect to references to Members of the other Chamber can affect my right of free speech as guaranteed to me under the Charter.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to look at the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and determine whether it does not overrule any precedent built up over a period of years with respect to matters like that, which would allow you to interrupt proceedings in this House, specifically statements made on important matters, simply to say that we should not refer to a certain person in a certain way. That surely is not excluded under the Charter.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member, under Standing Order 21, made specific reference by name to two Members of the other place. The Chair is guided by the rules adopted by the House. When Standing Order 21 was adopted, and the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has on a number of occasions brought this to the attention of the Chair, it precluded personal attacks either on Members of this House or of the other place, which is part of Parliament. I cite again from the guidelines issued by my predecessor, Madam Speaker Sauvé. She said: "The opportunity is not intended to be used for making personal attacks, conveying congratulatory messages, or reciting poetry for anything other than serious purposes".

Again, there are a number of instances where the Chair has interrupted personal attacks. Until such a time as I receive guidelines from this House indicating otherwise, the Chair will do its best to observe the Standing Orders as the Chair interprets them to be. The Hon. Member has made reference to a motion; he certainly has that privilege. He knows exactly what he can do if he feels the Chair is not serving the House within the rules given to the Chair. However, as long as the present incumbent has the responsibility, personal attacks, either on other Members of this House or by name on members of the other place, will not be permitted.

The Hon. Member for Edmonton North (Mr. Paproski) on a matter of privilege.

MR. PAPROSKI—STATEMENT BY MR. JOHNSTON

**Hon. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton North):** Mr. Speaker, it has just been brought to my attention by Canadian Press that the Economic Development Minister, Donald Johnston, differed sharply today with federal policy—

**Some Hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Paproski:** —by criticizing government involvement in sports pools and lotteries.

**Some Hon. Members:** Order.

*Point of Order—Mr. Clark (Yellowhead)*

**Mr. Paproski:** Just a minute.

**Mr. Speaker:** Will the Hon. Member please indicate how his personal privilege as a Member is affected?

**Mr. Paproski:** The Minister differs with government policy. He said that the proposed sports pool and the lotteries are little more than a tax which preys upon the poor and disheartened.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Paproski:** He differs with government policy, and he should resign.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. A statement outside of the House can hardly be a matter of privilege in the circumstances. The Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark).

\* \* \*

#### POINT OF ORDER

MR. CLARK (YELLOWHEAD)—DURATION OF QUESTION PERIOD

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead):** Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order having to do with Question Period, and I will not recite any poetry. I noted that Question Period today began at 17 minutes after 11, not at a quarter after 11, yet it stopped precisely at noon. I do not challenge the right of the Chair to terminate Question Period at noon, as the Standing Orders indicate, but I was simply wondering whether the Chair had noted the hour at the end of Question Period, and if we were to allow that extra two minutes, that deserved two minutes, to be added to Question Period, there are a number of us here with questions to ask.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Chair has very high regard for the Right Hon. Member, whose observance of parliamentary rules has been exemplary. However, the Chair would point out that, by the clock I was watching, it was two minutes past 12.

My second comment is simply that the Chair at that point was in difficulty in terms of rotation. In the normal rotation the Chair would have to go to the third Party. That again opens up a question and a supplementary. Hon. Members seem quite unwilling to accept the Chair's cutting off a supplementary, even when it goes past 12 o'clock.

May I suggest that an examination of the record will show that the Chair has allowed an Hon. Member who has been recognized just before or even just after 12, to have the full supplementary, if it was required. The Chair has gone as much as five minutes past the hour at least twice in the last week. It is difficult to administer perfect equity and justice, and it was a difficult call for the Chair because today was not the easiest of Question Periods.