

member for Kitchener. At one point I could not even understand whether he was answering the question or going into debate. I could see that hon. members to my left were quite disturbed about what was going on, but I really could not follow the answer, so I called the House to order because I felt that the Chair had to know what was going on. The minister proceeded with answering the question. I called the minister to order also when I was able to realize that he himself was going into debate. Then I felt he should be allowed to proceed to the end of his answer, but even at the end I had to ask him whether he had really finished answering the question; I could not hear because of the noise in the House.

These things happen. I know hon. members like to protest when they feel that their privileges are being encroached upon, and I listened carefully to what I could hear. I do not really think that today we went beyond what is acceptable. The hon. minister jibed hon. members on the other side of the House, but this happens both ways, when questions are asked and when answers are given, and I allow a certain amount of that, politics being what it is.

I accept the remarks of the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker), and I am happy that I will have the co-operation of hon. members on his side of the House as to preambles. I will try to check that answers from the other side are not too long and are not used in a way which is improper in question period.

I apply instant justice here. When looking into the record I might find that instant justice might have been applied in different ways at different times; but it is instant justice, and if after looking into the record I feel that I have been perhaps a little too lenient on one side or the other, I try to check that the next day. That is the only thing I can do.

I welcome the feelings which have been expressed by hon. members about the question period. I would like to recognize many more members, and I am happy that I will have co-operation with regard to preambles. I will try to look after the answers. I would even like to suggest in some cases, especially toward the end of the question period, that perhaps there not be supplementaries because supplementaries are not always supplementary. Hon. members will agree with me on that. Perhaps toward the end of the question period I could use my prerogative. It is my prerogative, but I try to go along with custom because I respect custom. I think custom is very important and sometimes more important than rules.

However, if hon. members agree, toward the end of the question period I might not allow as many supplementaries as I have in the past, in order to allow more members to ask questions.

I accept the remarks of the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton and those of all the other members as well.

*Privilege—Mr. Sargeant*

**PRIVILEGE**

MR. SARGEANT—NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION SESSION—REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF S.O. 43 MOTION BY HON. MEMBER FOR WINNIPEG-ASSINIBOINE

**Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege arising out of a motion moved under Standing Order 43 by the hon. member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie). In his motion the hon. member called for my condemnation and my removal from the NATO Parliamentary Association because he does not like the way I voted on a resolution brought forward at a plenary session in Luxembourg last Saturday.

I might point out that the hon. member misled the House a bit in saying that this motion referred only to the Afghanistan situation. It referred to many other situations besides the Afghanistan situation. I might also point out that the entire Canadian delegation felt that the resolution should have referred only to Afghanistan and left out the pot-pourri of other things that it contained. If it had done so, I could easily have supported it.

I do not really feel it is necessary that I explain my vote, but in this case I will very briefly. Because I strongly supported the Afghanistan clause in the resolution, I could not vote against it. However, because I am morally opposed to clauses in the resolution which effectively call for an escalation of the arms race, I could not vote in favour, so I abstained.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that Canada is still a democratic country; it is my understanding that all 15 member states of the North Atlantic Assembly are democratic countries; and it is my understanding that in a democratic country freedom of expression, whether by voice or by vote, is a basic right. Although I personally disagreed with the way some of my colleagues voted in Luxembourg, I recognize and respect their right to vote as they please, and I do not ask for their condemnation.

If I were to follow in the same vein as the hon. member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine, I would ask that he be censured because he seems to have no respect for or belief in the tenets of democracy. However, I respect his right to freedom of speech, so I will ask, respectfully, only that he withdraw his motion.

**Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg-Assiniboine):** Madam Speaker, any member is entitled to move whatever motion he feels fit to move in this House. Your Honour accepted my motion and asked for unanimous consent, which request was turned down.

The hon. member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant) has highlighted the deep divisions within the NDP over NATO and NORAD and over the buying of the new fighter aircraft. The hon. member for Selkirk-Interlake mentioned the arms build-up motion which he could not support. Clause 5 of the