

*Non-Confidence in Deputy Speaker*

knew what the motion dealt with, that is five or six seconds after reading of the motion had begun.

I claim that the Deputy Speaker took an unfortunate and inexplicable attitude that evening, a prejudiced and partial position. I proved it by quoting from his own remarks which appear in *Hansard*.

The Prime Minister asked leave to present the motion and he proceeded on that basis.

The Deputy Speaker stated that no objection had been raised and later on he said this:

The Prime Minister preceded his remarks by saying that he had a motion to submit—

He said that the Prime Minister preceded his remarks by saying that he had a motion to submit with the consent of the house.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what the Prime Minister said:

By leave, I wish to move, seconded by my colleague—

He did not ask the unanimous consent of the house.

Therefore, that evening, in spite of the objections raised in our corner, the members were denied their rights and privileges by the Deputy Speaker, in order to comply with the wishes of the right hon. Prime Minister.

And here the Prime Minister himself, by his statement, admits that he is not sure of having unanimous consent of the house. Here is what he said as reported on page 911, left hand column:

I began my remarks by asking for leave to present this motion and I had the understanding—

He simply says:

—I had the understanding—

He does not state that he had the unanimous consent of the house.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister himself, by his silence that evening, admitted implicitly that he had not secured the unanimous consent of the house. He began by saying:

I would not have ventured to ask for the leave of the house to bring forward this motion had I not been convinced by information I have received that there has been a very serious deterioration in the situation on the island of Cyprus.

He had the floor at that time, but he never said or admitted that he had the unanimous consent of the house.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the Prime Minister never asked—and we can find evidence of this in *Hansard*—nor received the unanimous consent of the house, despite the statements of the Deputy Speaker to that effect.

The second paragraph of my resolution concerns standing order 42 which stipulates that when an hon. member wishes to move a motion in case of urgent and pressing necessity—and the issue we considered that

evening was a case of urgent and pressing necessity—he can do so by unanimous consent of the house, without notice having been given under standing order 41, provided the mover explained the urgency beforehand.

Now, the Prime Minister did not prove the urgency of the resolution before asking the unanimous consent of the house. The Deputy Speaker, whose responsibility it was to apply the standing orders, did not call him to order and did not ask him to explain the urgency of his motion. And as can be seen on pages 922 and 923 of the official report, I pointed out this fact to the Deputy Speaker who disregarded what I said.

With regard to the third part of our resolution, I submit that hon. members' privileges were ignored and transgressed that evening.

First of all, an hon. member can object to unanimous consent in a case such as the one we were facing that evening. Then, his objection has the same value, regardless of where he sits in the house, whether it is the hon. member for Charlevoix, the hon. member from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), or any other member of the house, or even a minister who makes the objection. In fact, when a member objects to the introduction of a motion, without a previous notice of 48 hours, in short when he refuses to agree to such a procedure, his non-acceptance is just as imperative as that of a member of any party in this house.

Second, we must admit that some members sit quite far from the Speaker so that it takes them a little longer to be seen and recognized. And in this case, that was the situation Friday night; five or six seconds elapsed and the Deputy Speaker should have taken them into consideration.

Third, there is the matter of simultaneous interpretation which we get through our earphones. We have referred to that matter here on many occasions. In fact, as reported on page 916 of *Hansard*, we pointed out that the interpretation always reached us a few seconds late. But in spite of the fact that we mentioned that point to the Deputy Speaker, he did not take it into account. And yet, we have been saying so on several occasions in the house.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I have sufficiently made my point and in conclusion, I wish to say that last Friday, we witnessed some unacceptable actions of several persons in this house.

In my opinion, the first to be blamed is the Prime Minister of the country who has violated the rights of the hon. members.

In the afternoon, the Prime Minister had asked the unanimous consent of the house to introduce the resolution that evening. He