

I had indicated, on the consensus which appeared from all sides of the House, applications for motions pursuant to Standing Order 43 which relate to some speech made by a member of the House and seek to be critical of it in some way fall on several grounds. In the first place, they are of a purely partisan nature; and in the second place, in my opinion, they totally lack the urgency and the pressing necessity required under the rule. With the consensus of members of the House I intervened on that occasion and on several other occasions.

Later this morning, after the hon. member's application, the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) sought to put a motion the preamble to which had to do with the absence of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Allmand). In that particular case it may very well have been that the hon. member's motion would relate to food prices, in which case I would have been obliged to put it to the House. In fact, I listened to the motion and found that it did not, that it related to the absence of the minister on this day. Therefore, I did not put the question to the House, but I had to hear it in order to make that determination.

In the case of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Cossitt), he referred to a speech made in Vancouver yesterday by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and to some reports that the Prime Minister, during the course of that speech, had lost his temper. I do not have to go any further to tell him that that is not the proper use of Standing Order 43 and I do not have to hear the motion.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to finish my question of privilege. I think you used the words, sir, that there has been a consensus that motions under Standing Order 43 can be ruled out in some cases if they are inflammatory. May I say with all respect, sir, that in no way was the preamble to my motion inflammatory. I quoted three words from the news services which were widely circulated throughout the country. They were not my words and they were in quotes, but I will not read them at this time. I realize that at one time there was a rule in Beauséjour which stated that members should not quote from newspapers, but I am also given to understand that the latest edition of Beauséjour's rules states that, if former rules were adhered to the fullest extent, it would become impossible to ask almost any question in the House. I do not believe that my preamble could be considered inflammatory.

With regard to the motion itself, as it was not read—I do not think it is possible to judge whether or not it was of urgent and pressing necessity. Had the Chair heard the motion, I could then well understand that the Chair could make a ruling as to whether or not it was indeed of urgent and pressing necessity. In the seven years that I have been in the House—and maybe it has happened on a day when I have not been here—I do not recall a member being cut off before he was at least allowed the privilege of beginning to read his motion to indicate whether or not there is something about it that is out of order.

I only wish to refer, sir, in substance, to what I intended to do, and that was simply to reaffirm, not just that the Prime Minister but that the leaders of all political parties in Canada

should be prepared to listen to the youth of this country, to their suggestions and their questions on national issues, without being called "creeps", without being held up to ridicule, and without threats to walk off the stage. That happened yesterday, and I think it is a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. I would say the same if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) had indulged in similar tactics, which I know of course he would not.

May I conclude by saying these few words. We sit in the House for various reasons, not the least of them being to set an example to the Canadian people, and particularly to the younger Canadian people who will follow us and sit here. Therefore, when something is very much out of order in the opinion of one member, regardless whether he is right or wrong, at least he deserves the right to be heard and to express his opinion on the actions of a political leader. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that usually with most members of the House you have a willingness at least to hear the motion before a motion is made—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is no need to carry this any further. I have indicated to the hon. member—and I have invited him to check the record—that on several occasions I have done exactly what I did with him this morning. If the hon. member wishes, I can cite specifically the day on which I made that ruling. If the hon. member would like to check the record for February 13, he will see that I did so to a government member who sought, by way of a preamble, to introduce a motion which I believe would have been critical of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark). I did not regard that as a proper use of the rules; I did not regard his preamble as a proper use of the rules, and I took precisely the same action and the same decision on both occasions. The hon. member has no point of order or question of privilege.

● (1210)

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski).

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, on a further question of privilege—a further question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton Centre.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, on a further question of privilege, which is my right.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton Centre.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, how can you prejudge me?

Some hon. Members: Sit down.